Gendering the Historiography of the Suffragette Movement in Edwardian Britain: some reflections
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The historiography of the British women’s suffrage campaign is contested ground. This article, written by a feminist historian, contributes to the debate by offering some reflections on the writing of the history of the suffragette movement in Edwardian Britain during the twenty years or so that it has been the focus of her research. In particular, it critiques the gendered ‘masculinist’ approaches to the writing of the suffragette pasts and discusses some of the public and private debates that the author has been engaged in, when challenging such perspectives.

My current area of research, the suffragette movement in Edwardian Britain, is a field that is riven with debate and controversy in which I, as a suffrage scholar, have been involved. My trajectory in this field may, perhaps, be a topic of interest to feminist historians. What I shall do in this article is give a brief overview of my entry into suffrage research, and then explore some of the problems I have encountered when researching and interpreting the suffragette past.

Entry into Women’s Suffrage Research

The term ‘suffragette’ is usually applied to the members of the Women’s Social and Political Union or WSPU, founded in 1903 by Emmeline Pankhurst and a small...
group of socialist women to actively campaign for the parliamentary vote for women. A women-only organisation that originally ran parallel to but was never formally affiliated to the Independent Labour Party (ILP), the suffragettes of the WSPU became the most notorious of the groupings campaigning for women's enfranchisement in Edwardian Britain. With the slogan ‘Deeds, not words’ they engaged in forms of civil disobedience—such as processions to parliament and the assertive questioning of politicians—as well as illegal tactics, especially from 1912, such as attacking property, secret arson attacks, vandalising post boxes and mass window smashing of shops in London's West End. And it is the illegal 'militant' activities that have captured the imagination of historians in the past and present, rather than the law-abiding methods of the 'constitutional' wing of the women's suffrage movement, led by Millicent Garrett Fawcett of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS).

On the outbreak of war in August 1914, Emmeline Pankhurst called an end to militancy and developed a new strategy, encouraging women to engage in war work as a way to win their enfranchisement. In 1926, eight years after the war ended, a Suffragette Club—later termed the Suffragette Fellowship—was founded to create a formal archive that would house memoirs of the militants as well as collect relics. During the 1920s and after, many suffragettes published their autobiographies, explaining how they had become politicised and radicalised. Further, during the 1970s, Brian Harrison conducted a number of oral history interviews with former militants, extracts from which were broadcast on BBC Radio 4 Archive Hour on 11 February 2012.

By the late 1980s, when I began researching the suffragette movement, I had published extensively on the education of working-class women in nineteenth-century England, the subject of my PhD thesis, and considered myself a ‘feminist’ researcher, seeking to make women visible where they had been hidden in male-centred histories of the past. My feminist consciousness had been raised by the advent of second ‘wave’ feminism in America and western Europe in the 1970s, and nurtured by full-time postgraduate study at the Open University, from 1978 to 1981. This was a heady time to be a PhD student since feminists of differing persuasions were establishing Women’s Studies courses in our universities. In particular, radical feminist writers, such as Dale Spender, who emphasised the power relationships between the sexes, were formative influences on me. At the same time, I eagerly devoured the publications of socialist feminist historians such as Sheila Rowbotham, Sally Alexander, Anna Davin, Barbara Taylor, Jill Norris and Jill Liddington, all associated with History Workshop Journal and its various conferences; it was these women who were defining the emerging field of British women's history and mapping out the main directions of research. Their main concern was to reveal the ways social class and gender divisions interacted, a topic that generated much debate. Yet despite this eruption of feminist activity, there were few academics in history departments at this time keen to supervise a sociologist such as myself, with a passionate interest in women’s lives in the past. And so, at the Open University, I had been located in the Education Department with a feminist sociologist, Madeleine Arnot, as my supervisor.
By the late 1980s, my publication record had helped me to secure lectureships in the higher education sector and I was wondering what new field I should research next.

I had already read one of the well-known suffragette autobiographies—Emmeline Pankhurst’s *My Own Story*, first published in 1914—and found it deeply moving. My *Own Story*, which includes transcripts of what Mrs Pankhurst said in her own defence in court, is an impassioned exposition of men’s double standards in a society that treated women as second-class citizens and condemned them for fighting for those democratic rights that men upheld so dearly. Women were justified, argued the leader of the WSPU, in adopting the same methods that men had used to win their enfranchisement. Militant men in the past had not selected uninhabited buildings to be fired, as the suffragettes did, but had burnt historic residences over their owners’ heads. In contrast, the suffragettes had injured no one. The only blood that had been shed was by the women themselves against whom violence had been committed, including the horror of forcibly feeding those prisoners who had gone on hunger strike as a protest against being treated by the authorities as common criminals rather than political offenders. ‘Window-breaking, when Englishmen do it, is regarded as honest expression of political opinion. Window-breaking, when Englishwomen do it, is treated as a crime.’ Emmeline Pankhurst makes it abundantly clear that the militants were fighting ‘in a woman’s war’ for their emancipation in a male-dominated society that refused to concede their justified claim for enfranchisement. Their agitation was not just for the parliamentary vote but a ‘Women’s Revolution’ that would transform gender roles in society and bring women equality. Suffragettes appeared before the courts ‘not because we are law-breakers’ but ‘in our efforts to become law-makers’. It was not the women who were on trial, Emmeline Pankhurst concluded, ‘It is the men.’

Such stirring words echoed to me across the decades—should my next research project be the suffragette movement? After speaking to David Doughan, then head of the Fawcett Library (now The Women’s Library) about it, I decided to research the life of Christabel Pankhurst, Emmeline’s eldest and favourite daughter who had been the co-leader of the WSPU and its key strategist. Doughan suggested that I contact the filmmaker Jill Craigie, who was writing a book on the women’s suffrage movement in Britain, since she had a lot of Pankhurst material that had been bequeathed to her by Grace Roe, a former suffragette and close friend of Christabel’s. All this seemed like an exciting project to which I could relate. And so, with some trepidation I began to focus upon the suffragette movement more generally, and Christabel Pankhurst in particular.

I began reading the more recent secondary sources on the militants but, to my disappointment, sympathetic portrayals were few. Antonia Raeburn’s *The Militant Suffragettes*, written for a popular audience, caught my imagination since she had drawn particularly on the personal testimonies of the participants—and had also met a number of the former activists, including Theresa Garnett, Mary Phillips and Grace Roe. But what struck me most about the historiography at this time was the hostility shown towards the suffragettes and the leaders of the
WSPU by not only most male writers—who favoured the constitutional tactics of the NUWSS and universally condemned the post-1912 militancy of the suffragettes as counterproductive in winning the vote—but also by influential socialist feminist historians. Thus, the WSPU’s prioritising of gender rather than class led Rowbotham to dismiss it as a bourgeois ‘pressure group’ that failed to build a mass movement or to mobilise women workers to strike. Liddington and Norris’s study of Northern working-class women suffragists—mill hands, weavers, laundryresses, and others—presented Christabel Pankhurst, in Jill Craigie’s words, as an ‘out-and-out villain’ who caused bitter divisions and destructive splits within the movement, as if she were ‘far more deserving of contempt than the foolish politicians who chose to imagine that votes for women would wreck the stability of the state’. Yet this portrayal of the key strategist of the WSPU paled when compared with David Mitchell’s extremely hostile biography of her. Mitchell presents Christabel as ruthless, cold, ambitious, autocratic and deranged—with incestuous desires upon her mother!

Jill Craigie and I became friends. She was relieved to find someone who at long last wanted to talk about Christabel and Emmeline, rather than Sylvia. Jill, too, was a frequent critic of male suffrage historians, lambasting the ‘academic brotherhood’, as she called them, who tended to make their facts ‘conform to an unconscious anti-feminism’. And there was something else that Jill and I shared in common. We were both critical of Sylvia Pankhurst’s influential text *The Suffragette Movement*, first published in 1931, regarded as an authoritative account of the WSPU—and of the Pankhurst family.

As I was later to articulate, as a participant in the suffragette movement Sylvia had insider knowledge about some of its activities. But as a socialist feminist, she was critical of the more women-centred politics of her mother and sister, Emmeline and Christabel, who broke formal links with the ILP, at the central level. She disagreed with many of the WSPU’s tactics, including the arson campaign, and presents the suffragette movement as a single-issue campaign, supported mainly by middle-class and aristocratic spinsters. Further, in *The Suffragette Movement*, Sylvia, who was expelled from the WSPU in 1914 for allying her own organisation, the East London Federation of the Suffragettes, to the labour movement rather than keeping independent of it, takes her revenge on her mother; she portrays Emmeline as not only a failed leader who constantly deferred to the separatist feminist politics of the hated Christabel, the favoured daughter, but also a bad mother who neglects her less favoured children, Harry, Adela and Sylvia herself. As Jane Marcus tellingly observes, in Sylvia’s ‘matricidal prose’, she is the ‘heroine’ who keeps the socialist faith of her dead father, placing herself much more centrally in the suffragette movement than was the case. Sylvia even claims that her arrangement to get the anti-suffrage Prime Minister Asquith to receive her East End delegation in June 1914 was the key to winning the parliamentary vote. Thus she claims victory in the name of socialist feminism, a victory less over the Government than over ‘her real enemies, her mother and sister, the separatist feminists who have become increasingly more aristocratic and concerned with personal power’.
those male historians who adapted and caricatured its portrait as they adopted what Sandra Holton has termed a ‘masculinist’ approach to suffrage history writing.25

**Masculinist Approaches to Women’s Suffrage History**

‘Masculinist’ approaches, which assume that the category ‘man’ is a universal category that typifies all that is human, view the suffragette movement as a ‘deviant, marginal and even dangerous aberration from the established’ political male norm, and tend to ‘blame the victim’ for the failings of successive Liberal governments which, ‘acting against their own basic principles’, resort to brutality as a way to deal with their female opponents.26 Sexist stereotypes are often deployed that when they do not mock, either ‘marginalise’ or ‘refuse’ women ‘a place in the larger narratives of community, state and nation’.27 As Holton tellingly observes, masculinist perspectives have created the image of the twentieth-century suffragette as ‘abnormal among her sex, simultaneously hysterical and mannish, weak in her political understanding and exhibitionist in her search for the public spotlight’.28

Amongst the first and certainly the most influential of the masculinist histories of women’s suffrage was George Dangerfield’s *The Strange Death of Liberal England*, first published in 1935 and reprinted many times.29 Written in an engaging, journalistic style, it is largely based on the plot in Sylvia’s *The Suffragette Movement*—but redraws and distorts much of its content. ‘[W]hen a scene as ordinary as English politics is suddenly disturbed with the swish of long skirts, the violent assault of feathered hats, the impenetrable, advancing phalanx of corseted bosoms . . . then the amazing, the ludicrous appearance of the whole thing is almost irresistible.’30 Such gendered descriptions present the women’s movement as deviant from the traditional historical narratives about male elites. Further, the suffragettes are described in sexist stereotypes as ‘puppets’, an army of ‘intoxicated women’ who responded automatically and unthinkingly to the dictates of Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst, ‘a pair of . . . infernal queens’.31 Unable to comprehend the notion of a women-only political movement where networks of friendships and bonding were important, the WSPU is dismissed as a form of ‘pre-war lesbianism’, a ‘brutal comedy’. How can one avoid the thought, asks Dangerfield, that the suffragettes sought their sufferings ‘with an enrapured, a positively unhealthy pleasure?’32 For Dangerfield, Sylvia Pankhurst is the heroine of the story, just as Sylvia portrayed herself.33

Throughout his book, Dangerfield adopts the stance of the disinterested, detached historian, portraying the suffragette movement as one of the number of causes of the downfall of the Liberal Party. But as a Liberal, his approach was not unbiased. His interpretation of the suffragette movement as a single-issue campaign; his mocking of the militants, and his blaming of them for the failure of successive Liberal governments to grant women the parliamentary vote were to become common themes in the masculinist school of suffrage history—and create a paradigm that has exercised a powerful sway in suffrage writing ever
since. As Marcus has commented, as the first ‘historian’ to treat the women’s movement seriously, Dangerfield invented the narrative and historical plot from which subsequent historians have seldom been able to break free.  

One can see the influence of the Dangerfield version of events in the various accounts written by a number of male scholars from the 1950s to the present. Thus, although Roger Fulford claims that he has striven to avoid ‘diminishing the dignity’ of the women’s cause and of those who fought for it, he nonetheless bemusedly asserts that the suffragettes were ‘a curious blend of Cromwell’s Iron-sides, the Irish Fenians and some shady little body of leftists’. Fulford diminishes the prison experiences of the militants, claiming that forcible feeding ‘was not dangerous’, merely ‘a familiar form of treatment in lunatic asylums’. Andrew Rosen’s academic and more nuanced Rise Up Women!, which he asserts is the first ‘full length scholarly monograph’ of the WSPU ‘based on extensive research into archival source material’, nonetheless concludes that militancy was a form of millenarianism, and thus ultimately irrational. Brian Harrison, who offers a more sympathetic approach to militancy, pointing out that it was a temporary tactical response to the failure of legal and peaceful methods, nonetheless trivialises suffragette activism when he states that it more ‘closely resembles the schoolgirls’ surreptitious breaking of the rules when the headmistress is away than the revolutionary’s contemptuous and frontal challenge to the established order’. For Harrison, who favours the constitutionalists, it was militancy that was ‘counter-productive’ for winning the vote, not the intransigence of male politicians. David Mitchell elaborates on a further dimension when he describes the suffragettes as sex-starved ‘ferocious spinsters’ who really wanted sex with a man:

As the campaign lengthened and tempers shortened, near (and sometimes actual) rape became a hazard of the tussles in Parliament Square and at the stormier by-elections. Clothes were ripped, hands thrust into upper- and middle-class bosoms and up expensive skirts. Hooligans, and occasionally policemen, fell gleefully upon prostrate forms from sheltered backgrounds. Wasn’t this, they argued, what these women really wanted? Perhaps in some cases, and in a deeply unconscious way, it was.

Although Mitchell’s comments are extreme, he, like the other male historians writing from a masculinist perspective, emphasises ‘the otherness, the strangeness, the difference, and ultimately the ridiculousness of women in pursuit of their own political and personal ends’. As Krista Cowman comments, rather than using a focus on women to challenge the masculine gendering of political history, such writers reaffirm politics as a masculine preserve. All the male writers considered here show little understanding of what the women’s movement meant to its participants. Adopting a political history approach that focuses upon the militants’ machinations with the Prime Minister, Cabinet Ministers, Members of Parliament (MPs) and the parliamentary process generally, they fail to explore satisfactorily the question that Annie Kenney, a member of the WSPU inner circle, asked in her autobiography—‘Why were women Militant? ... What inspired women to suffer imprisonment, to lose
friends, and to be exiled from family and home? Indeed, what is remarkable about these masculinist histories is the lack of engagement with suffragette autobiographies and other forms of personal testimony that recount women’s experiences. Martin Pugh, for example, condemns the militants’ own accounts as ‘largely fantasy’. Similarly, Rosen is dismissive of any approach to history writing that focuses on the ‘personal experiences of individual suffragettes’. This silencing of women’s voices is deeply troubling for the feminist historian. Personal testimonies reveal not only the deep commitment of suffragettes to the women’s cause but also the way in which forcible feeding was experienced as a brutal, life-threatening and degrading procedure, performed by male doctors on struggling female bodies.

By 2000 Pugh was reiterating the common claim of the masculinist school that the women’s suffrage campaign was a single-issue demand; that by 1900 the NUWSS had won over the anti-suffragists to their cause, and that the militancy of the suffragettes was counterproductive in that it alienated MPs. His gendered, masculinist bias is evident in a number of statements such as, ‘Unfortunately the Pankhursts had no desire to be treated as frail women in need of male protection’. He claims that feminist historians, such as Susan Kingsley Kent, who interpret the suffrage campaign as a ‘sex war’ whereby women wanted to transform gender relations in society, have used selective quotations to support their dubious case. It seems to me that a ‘sex war’ is particularly evident in the writing of suffragette history.

I and other feminist historians, while not always in accord with each other’s views, have challenged these masculinist histories in various ways—by exploring the nature of militancy and the friendship networks between women across social classes and the militant/constitutional divide; by researching the wide social reform agenda of the WSPU; and, above all, by presenting the suffragettes as rational political activists who were fighting oppressive gender structures in an Edwardian society that saw them as inferior and subordinate beings. And some influential socialist feminist historians of the 1970s and 80s, such as Jill Liddington, who were decidedly anti-WSPU, are now more sympathetic to the militants, although not necessarily to militancy. Nonetheless, Sheila Rowbotham in a 2010 book has still clung to the old stereotypes. Thus, in *Dreamers of a New Day: women who invented the twentieth century* she seems unaware that the suffragette struggle for women’s enfranchisement was never a single-issue campaign but part of a wider reform movement to end women’s subordinate role in British society. The only Pankhurst she discusses in her book is the socialist-feminist Sylvia. Rowbotham makes only a passing, put-down reference to Emmeline and Christabel, noting that while Sylvia was not ‘particularly interested in fashion … Emmeline and Christabel … were studiously elegant’.

**Controversies**

Looking back, it now seems inevitable that I would become embroiled in controversy with Martin Pugh. Pugh and I were both writing books about the
Pankhurts—he a group biography of Emmeline and her three daughters, Christabel, Sylvia and Adela, while I was focusing on Emmeline, having postponed my plan to write a biography of Christabel. Knowing that two biographies on similar themes were in the pipeline and that both authors held differing views, the *Times Higher* asked both historians to contribute to a debate which would be published in January 2002. Advance publicity by *The Observer* in June 2000 for Pugh’s book had made prurient claims that Emmeline and Christabel, together with Annie Kenney, had led a ‘promiscuous lesbian lifestyle’. I was astounded by this story. The following day I phoned the newspaper to complain and was advised to send in a letter for publication. It was not published, nor were two subsequent letters that were sent. Some four months later, a producer for BBC Radio 4’s *Woman’s Hour* asked me to appear on a programme with Pugh to discuss his now published book. Reluctantly, I agreed. When Pugh heard this, he refused to take part if I was also present and so I was excluded from the programme and he appeared alone.

In *The Pankhursts*, Pugh fails to engage with feminist scholarship on the subject and demeans the suffragettes by claiming that their politics ‘was a substitute for love affairs’ with men, and ‘hero-worship [of Christabel] an alternative to physical passion’. He also has definite likes and dislikes, idolising the heterosexual, socialist Sylvia, casting Christabel as emotionally stunted because of the lack of men in her life, and portraying Emmeline Pankhurst as a weak leader who, throughout her life, looked for ‘a stronger personality to depend upon, first Richard [her husband], then Christabel’. Emmeline Pankhurst’s life, he asserts, was ‘a mounting personal tragedy’.

Pugh largely adopts the representation of Emmeline in Sylvia’s *The Suffragette Movement*, making at least fifty-eight references to this book. He marginalises the voice of Emmeline. Since I profoundly disagreed with Pugh’s analysis—especially his failure to recognise Emmeline’s strong, self-reliant nature—it is not surprising that my exchange of views with him in the *Times Higher* was acrimonious, one of its journalists remarking on its ‘vehemence’. The debate continued in the letters page of this newspaper, running over four weeks, the letters overwhelmingly in my favour. During the midst of all this I enquired about joining the Biographers’ Club and was startled to receive a reply from Andrew Lownie saying, ‘Martin Pugh attends meetings and I think it would be wrong to have you both as members’. I asked for the reasons why I was being refused membership. ‘Because I’ve heard you’re trouble and it’s a private club where I decided who joins.’ I then discovered that Lownie was Pugh’s literary agent.

I expected my exchange of views with Pugh to be the first and last of my public forays about the historiography of the suffragette movement, but it was not so. In 2005, Christopher Bearman published in the *English Historical Review*, not known for its feminist credentials, an article on suffragette violence. He was particularly critical of feminist historians for focusing on what he called the ‘personal’ issues of the campaign—‘biographical work on leaders and membership of suffrage societies, their motivations, the violence used against them and their sufferings in prison’.
Bearman describes as ‘grotesque’ the suggestion by Elizabeth Crawford and myself that the leaders of the WSPU did not know about the first serious act of arson, committed by Helen Craggs in July 1912 when she was found, at one o’clock in the morning, with inflammable oil, a boxes of matches and firelighters in the garden of Nunham House, the country home of Lewis Harcourt, one of the Liberal Government’s leading Antis.61 Although Emmeline Pankhurst personally announced that Helen had acted ‘solely on her own responsibility’, Bearman cannot accept this.62 Yet again, Sylvia Pankhurst’s The Suffragette Movement is cited as the voice of authority to support the case. ‘Sylvia Pankhurst specifically stated that the 1912 arson campaign was begun on Christabel’s initiative, and Helen Craggs had been in WSPU employment as an organizer since 1910.’63 Refusing to engage with feminist scholarship that has shown time and time again that acts of militancy were often undertaken without the knowledge of the leadership, Bearman claims that ‘the general perception was that the WSPU leadership was thoroughly in control and responsible for everything that happened’.64 The only serious attempts to examine the ‘practical issues’ regarding suffragette violence have come, he asserts, from ‘two distinguished male historians—Andrew Rosen and Brian Harrison’.65 No such words of praise are lavished on the feminist historians he mentions, who are robustly criticised, one by one.

About one year later, in the autumn of 2006, I was contacted by the editor of BBC History Magazine, aimed at a popular audience, to ask if I would write a reply to a piece he wished to publish by Bearman, claiming that the suffragettes were like modern-day terrorists whose tactics alienated politicians and the public.66 I duly wrote my reply, pointing out that for Bearman to locate his discussion about suffragette violence within the context of modern terrorism was ahistorical and sensational. Throughout the suffragette campaign, and especially from 1912, Emmeline Pankhurst had emphasised that human life was sacred. As the former suffragette Mary Leigh recollected in 1975, ‘Mrs. Pankhurst gave us strict orders . . . there was not a cat or a canary to be killed; no life’.67 I pointed out that, unlike the present-day suicide bomber, the suffragettes killed no one.

I also emphasised that while Bearman made much of the lawlessness of the suffragettes, he made no reference to the context of their campaign. The increasing levels of violence committed by some suffragettes, especially from 1912, were a reaction to the obdurate stubbornness of a Liberal Government that, over a long period of time, debated women’s suffrage bills but never passed them, and then excluded women from protesting in public arenas. ‘Finding evidence in this shadowy underworld is highly problematic’, I argued, ‘so that Bearman’s analysis is primarily based on newspaper accounts, all filtered through a male gaze that thought the women were irrational, even crazy. Nowhere does he cite the works of the activists themselves’.68 In my penultimate paragraph I referred to a letter that Bearman had sent to a third party, for publication in a magazine, suggesting that I, as a professor employed in a British university, my salary paid out of public funds, had a duty to be a responsible historian and if I choose to ignore this, in order to pursue a feminist agenda, then that was a public scandal which should be addressed by my superiors.69
This debate also reached the *Times Higher*, as well as the *Daily Telegraph*. ‘Suffragettes “were like al-Qa-eda”’ ran the headline in the latter. Yet again, a lively correspondence ensued with Bearman insisting that the issue was not what he thought about feminist historians ‘but who is using the full range of sources [my emphasis] and interpreting them responsibly’. The aggrieved Bearman wrote to my Vice Chancellor asking him to discipline me, and was given short shrift.

The overview offered here about gendering the historiography of the suffragette movement in Edwardian Britain reveals that the history of the British women’s suffrage campaign is a keenly contested ground in which feminist historians have been leading players. Indeed, it may be the case that the public controversies in which I have been involved can be read as a rearguard reaction against the *success* and *power* of feminist historical interpretations. Nor is this all. Feminist scholarship on the women’s suffrage movement has expanded and diversified in interesting ways over the last twenty years to include transnational and international frameworks that ‘decentre’ the British movement. Some of these studies have explored the complex relationship between imperialism and Edwardian feminism in Britain, as well as the transnational roots of the feminist avant-garde. Literary, media, drama and cultural studies scholars too have extended the parameters of the field, beyond the methods commonly used by social historians, discussing the use of ‘spectacle’ in British suffrage campaigns or the ‘performative aspects’ of suffragette militancy. All this makes for an exciting, dynamic field in which the ‘kaleidoscope keeps on turning’, and in which the masculinist approaches, so dominant in the past, have lost their hold.
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