Poverty in the 19th century

- The census of 1851 recorded half of the population of Britain as living in towns - the first society in human history to do so. Over the previous 70 years, the population of Britain had risen at an unprecedented rate.
- The towns offered a better chance of work and higher wages than the countryside, where many families were trapped in poverty and seasonal employment. On the other hand, the countryside was healthier.
- A baby born in a large town with a population of more than 100,000 in the 1820s might expect to live to 35 - in the 1830s, life expectancy was down to a miserable 29.
- A comparison between a desperately unhealthy large town and a small market town shows the costs of migrating in search of work and prosperity.
  - In 1851, a boy born in inner Liverpool had a life expectancy of only 26 years,
  - Compared with a boy born in the small market town of Oakhampton, who could expect to live to 57.
- Large towns were thus desperately unhealthy. New epidemics were stalking the cities - cholera and typhoid were carried by polluted water, typhus was spread by lice, and 'summer diarrhoea' was caused by swarms of flies feeding on horse manure and human waste.
- The problem was easy to identify and difficult to solve. Too little was invested in the urban environment, in sewers, street paving and cleansing, and in pure water and decent housing.
- Matters started to change from about 1860. The conditions of the towns seemed intolerable and a source of danger - being filthy might lead to death for the rich as well as the poor.
- The power of small property owners was weakened when more people were granted the vote with the second Reform Act of 1867 this granted the vote to all householders in the boroughs as well as lodgers who paid rent of £10 a year or more, reduced the property threshold in the counties and gave the vote to agricultural landowners and tenants with very small amounts of land. Men in urban areas who met the property qualification were enfranchised and the Act roughly doubled the electorate in England and Wales from one to two million men.
- Consequence was that political parties now needed to be seen to address issues that effected these people such as poverty and crime.
- From about 1870, there was a massive increase in the level of investment in public health. The most striking example was in Birmingham, where Joseph Chamberlain became mayor, and embarked on a massive programme of spending.
- By the end of the 19th century cities throughout Britain ceased to be built on the cheap, and by 1900 life in the great cities was just as healthy as in the countryside.
The sanitary reformers used the literary techniques of Victorian novelists to create a sense of crisis.

Edwin Chadwick, the author of the report on the sanitary conditions of British towns, consulted Charles Dickens over how to describe the situation - and Dickens himself obtained graphic accounts of the vile conditions of reeking graveyards from his brother-in-law, Henry Austin, a leading sanitary reformer. The imaginative force of their writings made people aware of the need for action.

The poor had to depend on private charities or on the state-established system of poor relief for help in bad times.

**The work of the social reformers**

- Most Victorians had believed that the poor were somehow responsible for their own poverty – for example, because they were lazy or drank their money away; but by the end of the nineteenth century people were beginning to see that there were some social and economic reasons for poverty, and that it was not always the fault of the poor themselves.

- The key organisations and individuals in changing these attitudes in the 1890s were the Salvation Army, Charles Booth and Joseph Rowntree. They each had different motives and used different methods of research but they drew some very similar conclusions about the plight of the poor.

**Charities**

- Private charities gave help in the form of money, clothes or food. Sometimes they provided accommodation for the elderly and destitute. By 1905, there were 700–800 private charities operating in London alone. In towns and cities throughout Britain there were thousands of abandoned children. They lived on the streets by begging and thieving, and many of them died from starvation, disease and neglect.

- Some charities dealt specially with children. Dr Thomas Barnardo started one such charity in 1867. By 1905, when he died, Dr Barnardo had set up a network of children’s homes across the country. He had rescued some 59,384 children from destitution and helped around 500,000 to lead better lives.

- The Salvation Army was founded in London’s East End in 1865 by one-time Methodist Reform Church minister William Booth and his wife Catherine. The Salvation Army was modeled after the military, with its own flag and its own hymns. In 1878 it had 45 branches and by 1900 it was running training centres, a labour exchange to help people find work as well as a farm and brickworks to give people skills and employment.

**The Poor Law**

- The most dreaded and feared type of help, however, was that provided by the State through the Poor Law.

- Workhouses provided food and shelter for the poor. They were grim places. Conditions were awful.

- The usual form of relief, however, was outdoor relief (meaning outside the workhouse): payments sometimes in cash and sometimes in goods or services, to people in their own homes. It was one thing to be poor, but
quite another to accept relief. This meant being labeled a ‘pauper’ and tremendous shame and disgrace was attached to this.

• Amongst the poor there was a deeply ingrained dread of the workhouse and of accepting any kind of relief attached to the Poor Law. To accept relief was to give up responsibility for yourself and your family; it was to admit defeat.

• Men and women were expected to save from their wages so that they had enough money to help them through bad times. Few poor people could do this and so most dreaded sickness and unemployment. Above all, they dreaded retirement, when they were too old to work. Unless they had relatives willing and able to look after them, the poor faced a miserable old age.

• By the end of the 19th century only about 20 per cent admitted to workhouses were unemployed or destitute, but about 30 per cent of the population over 70 were in workhouses. The introduction of pensions for those aged over 70 in 1908 did not result in a reduction in the number of elderly housed in workhouses, but it did reduce the number of those on outdoor relief by 25 per cent. The workhouse system was not abolished in the UK until 1930

The background 1890–1905

• The nineteenth century saw many reforms that affected ordinary people. By 1890:
  - Hours of work were reduced and working conditions improved in shops and offices, mines, factories and mills.
  - Houses were healthier. Slum clearance had started. By 1890, most houses had piped water and lavatories connected to a sewerage system.
  - All children had to go to school and education was free.
  - All male householders had the right to vote in elections.
  - Wages had risen and the average family was better off at the end of the nineteenth century than it had been at the beginning.

• Yet it was also clear to anyone who looked closely enough at the lives of ordinary people in British cities that there were still a lot of poor people.

• The question was ‘whose job was it to do something about this?’ Was it the government’s job, or the charities’ job, or should the poor people sort out their own problems?

Charles Booth

• Charles Booth (no relation to William and Catherine Booth) was born into a wealthy Liverpool ship-owning family and in the mid-1870s, he moved the company offices to London.

• In the 1860s Booth became interested in the philosophy of Auguste Comte, the founder of modern sociology. Booth was especially attracted to Comte’s idea that in the future, the scientific industrialist would take over the social leadership from church ministers.

• In 1885 Charles Booth became angry about the claim made by H. H. Hyndman, the leader of the Social Democratic Federation, that 25% of the population of London lived in abject poverty. Bored with running his
successful business, Booth decided to investigate the incidence of pauperism in the East End of the city. He recruited and paid a team of researchers that included his cousin, Beatrice Potter.

- Over a period of around 17 years (1886–1903) he and his team investigated the living conditions, income and spending of over 4000 people and reported their findings on a regular basis.
- These were published between 1889 and 1903 in 17 volumes, called *Life and Labour of the People in London*.
- Charles Booth found that nearly **31 per cent** of Londoners were living below what he called the ‘*poverty line*’. By this, he meant that they did not have the money to buy enough food, shelter and clothing. One of the proposals he made was for the introduction of **Old Age Pensions**. A measure that he described as "limited socialism". Booth believed that if the government failed to take action, Britain was in danger of experiencing a socialist revolution.
- In the 1890s, there were still those who believed that if someone was poor, it was their own fault because they were lazy, alcoholic or stupid. They had to sort themselves out. So perhaps most important was that Booth worked out that **85 per cent** of people living in poverty were poor because of problems relating to unemployment and low wages. In other words, poverty wasn’t their own fault, as so many Victorians had believed.

Booth divided the poor into four groups:

**Class A**  
The lowest class: street-sellers, criminals, loafers. Their life is the *life of savages with extreme hardship*. 11,000 or 1.25% of the population.

**Class B**  
Casual earnings: widows and deserted women; part-time labourers; many shiftless and helpless. 110,000 or 11.25% of the population.

**Class C**  
Occasional earnings: hit by trade depressions. 75,000 or 8% of the population.

**Class D**  
Low wages: less than 21 [shillings] a week; wages barely enough to stay alive. Includes dock labourers and gas workers. 129,000 or 14.5% of the population.

*From Charles Booth, Life and Labour of the People in London, 1889–1903*

**Seebohm Rowntree**

- Benjamin Seebohm Rowntree belonged to the family of York-based chocolate manufacturers. The family were Quakers and their principles led them to treat their workers well, by the standards of the time.
- Rowntree was particularly interested in Charles Booth’s findings about the London poor and wanted to see whether what he had discovered was also true of poor people in York.
- He calculated that a family of five (two parents and three children) could live on 21s (shillings) 8d (pence) a week. Using this as his baseline, he found that around 28 per cent of the population of York were living in poverty.
He divided this poverty into two kinds:

- **Primary poverty**: No matter how hard a family worked, they would never earn enough to provide themselves with adequate food, shelter and clothing. These families didn’t stand a chance.

- **Secondary poverty**: These families could just about feed, clothe and shelter themselves, provided there were no additional calls on their income. These families were living on the edge.

About 10 per cent of the people of York were living in primary poverty and around 18 per cent in secondary poverty. Rowntree then drew on Booth’s idea of a poverty line and worked out when individuals might find themselves above or below this line.

Rowntree’s study provided a wealth of statistical data on wages, hours of work, nutritional needs, food consumed, health and housing. The book illustrated the failings of the capitalist system and argued that new measures were needed to overcome the problems of unemployment, old-age and ill-health.

Rowntree, a strong supporter of the Liberal Party, hoped that the conclusions that he had drawn from his study would be adopted as party policy. David Lloyd George, President of the Board of Trade, met Rowntree in 1907 and the two became close friends. The following year Lloyd George became Chancellor of the Exchequer and introduced a series of reforms influenced by Rowntree, including the **Old Age Pensions Act (1908)** and the **National Insurance Act (1911)**.

David Lloyd George asked Rowntree to carry out a study of rural conditions in Britain. His report, **The Land**, published in 1913, argued that an increase in small landholdings would make agriculture more efficient and productive. In 1913 Rowntree also published **How the Labourer Lives**, a detailed study of fifty-two farming families.

**Why did poverty become a political issue?**
• There had always been poor people in Britain. Why did they become an important political issue in the early 1900s?

• The researchers Seebohm Rowntree’s book, Poverty: a Study of Town Life, was read by thousands of people and Charles Booth’s books on the labouring poor in London were consulted by hundreds more. Some of these people, like the young MP Winston Churchill, would soon be in a position to do something about the grinding poverty in which millions lived.

• The Boer War In 1899, the British army began fighting the Boer settlers in South Africa. Young men volunteered to fight and in their thousands they were rejected as unfit. In some industrial areas of Britain, as many as two out of three volunteers were turned down because they failed the army medical examination. This was worrying enough in itself, but there were wider implications. The economies of countries such as Germany and the USA were highly successful because of the skills and hard work of their workforces. It looked as if the British workforce hadn’t got the strength or the stamina to compete.

• The Labour Party In 1900, all the socialist groups in Britain came together and formed the Labour Party. This new political party pledged to get better living and working conditions for working people as well as a fairer distribution of the country’s wealth. The Liberal Party was afraid that the Labour Party would take members and votes from them.

• Enter the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party swept to power in the general election of 1906. In the new Parliament there were 400 Liberal MPs, 157 Conservatives, 83 Irish Nationalists and 29 Labour MPs. Almost immediately the Liberal Government embarked on a far-reaching and unprecedented social reform programme. Why was this?
  - Many younger Liberals, like David Lloyd George (Chancellor of the Exchequer) and Winston Churchill (President of the Board of Trade), had been challenging the traditional Liberal view that people should be free to work out their own solutions. These ‘New Liberals’ believed the State should provide the framework within which everyone could live in security and freedom.
  - The ‘New Liberals’ inside and outside Parliament had read, and were convinced by, the writings of Charles Booth and Seebohm Rowntree. They were impressed by the new understanding that the poor were rarely to blame for their own poverty, and were shocked that many people were so poor that they could do nothing to lift themselves out of poverty.
  - Towards the end of the nineteenth century, some local authorities had taken on responsibility for such things as providing clean piped water to houses, connecting all houses to sewerage systems, lighting the streets and cleaning them. These schemes, often run by Liberals, showed what could be done on a local scale and raised the possibility of what could be done nationally.

The Reforms
Children

- In 1906 local authorities were allowed to provide free school meals.
- The 1908 Children and Young Persons Act introduced a set of regulations that became known as the Children’s Charter.
- This imposed severe punishments for neglecting or treating children cruelly. It was made illegal to sell cigarettes to children or send them out begging. Separate juvenile courts were set up, which sent children convicted of a crime to borstals.
- Borstals in the UK, a place of detention for young male offenders. They were introduced in 1908, and are now replaced by ‘young offender institutions’, instead of prison.
- **Free school meals (1906)** Local councils were given the power to provide free meals for children from the poorest families. These meals were to be paid for from the local rates. By 1914, over 158,000 children were having free meals once a day, every day.
- **School medical inspections (1907)** Doctors and nurses went into schools to give pupils compulsory medical checks and recommend any treatment they thought necessary. These checks were free, but until 1912, parents had to pay for any treatment required.
- **School clinics (1912)** A network of school clinics was set up that provided free medical treatment for children. This was necessary because some parents could not afford the treatment that doctors wanted to give their children as a result of discovering something wrong during their medical inspection.
- **The Children’s Act (1908)** This Act, sometimes called the Children’s Charter, did several things to help children:
  - Children became ‘protected persons’, which meant that their parents could be prosecuted for cruelty against them.
  - Poor law authorities were made responsible for visiting and supervising children who had suffered cruelty or neglect.
  - All children’s homes were to be registered and inspected.
  - Children under the age of 14 who had broken the law could no longer be sent to adult prisons.
  - Juvenile courts were set up to try children accused of a crime.
  - Children who had committed a crime were sent to Borstals that were specially built and equipped to cope with young offenders.
  - Children under 14 were not allowed into pubs.
  - Shopkeepers could not sell cigarettes to children under 16.

Sick and Unemployed

- **The Labour Exchanges Act (1909)** A national string of state labour exchanges was set up. This meant that unemployed workers could go to a labour exchange to look for a job instead of having to tramp from workplace to workplace to find work. This was much more efficient both for those looking for work and those offering it.
- **The National Insurance Act (1911)** This set up an insurance scheme that aimed to prevent poverty resulting from illness. Workers could insure
themselves against sickness and draw money from the scheme if they fell ill and could not work.

- All manual workers and people in low-paid white-collar jobs had to join.
- Workers paid 4d for insurance stamps, which they stuck on a special card.
- Employers contributed 3d for each worker in the scheme.
- The Government contributed 2d for each worker in the scheme.
- If a worker in the scheme fell ill, they got sick pay of 10s a week for 13 weeks and then 5s for a further 13 weeks in any one year.
- Workers in the scheme could get free medical treatment and maternity care. In the beginning, around ten million men and four million women were covered by National Insurance.

• **The National Insurance Act, Part II (1912)** This part of the Act aimed to prevent poverty resulting from unemployment by insuring workers against periods when they were out of work.
  - The scheme was open, at the start, to people (mainly men) who worked in trades like shipbuilding and engineering, where there was a great deal of seasonal unemployment.
  - Workers, employers and the Government each paid 2d a week for insurance stamps for every worker in the scheme.
  - Workers could, when unemployed, be paid 7s 6d a week for up to 15 weeks in any one year.

• **The Pensions Act (1908)** This gave weekly pensions from government funds to the elderly. The promise to introduce pensions was made in the 1908 budget and became law the following year.
  - Everyone over the age of 70 was eligible for a state pension.
  - A single person received 5s a week and a married couple 7s 6d (later increased to 10s).

---

**The 1909 People’s Budget**

- The 1909 People’s Budget was a product of then British Prime Minister H. H. Asquith’s Liberal government, introducing many unprecedented taxes on the wealthy and radical social welfare programmes to Britain’s political life.
- It was championed by Chancellor of the Exchequer David Lloyd George and his strong ally Winston Churchill, who was then President of the Board of Trade; the duo was called the “Terrible Twins” by contemporaries.
- It was a key issue of contention between the Liberal government and the Conservative-dominated House of Lords, ultimately leading to two general elections in 1910 and the enactment of the Parliament Act 1911.
- The Budget was introduced in the British Parliament by David Lloyd George on 29 April 1909. Lloyd George argued that the People’s Budget would eliminate poverty, and commended it thus:
  * The budget included several proposed tax increases to fund the Liberal government’s welfare reforms. Income tax was held at nine old pence in the pound (9d, or 3.75%) for incomes less than £2,000, which was equivalent to £154,524 in today’s money but a higher rate of one shilling (12d, or 5%) was proposed for incomes greater than £2,000, and an additional surcharge or
“super tax” of 6d (a further 2.5%) was proposed on the amount by which incomes of £5,000 (£386,309 today[4]) or more exceeded £3,000 (£231,786 today[4]). An increase was also proposed in inheritance tax and naval rearmament.

- More controversially, the Budget also included a proposal for the introduction of a land tax based on the ideas of the American tax reformer Henry George. This would have had a major effect on large landowners, and the Conservative-Unionist opposition, which consisted mostly of large landowners, had a large majority in the Lords.

- Furthermore, the Conservatives believed that money should be raised through the introduction of tariffs on imports, which was claimed to benefit British industry and to raise revenue for social reforms at the same time (protectionism). Interestingly, according to economic theory, such tariffs would have been very beneficial for land owners, especially in agricultural produce.

- The Liberals countered by making their proposals to reduce the power of the Lords the main issue of the general election in January 1910. The Unionists won more votes than the Liberals but not more seats, and the outcome was a hung parliament, with the Liberals relying on Labour and the Irish Nationalists for their majority.

- The Lords accepted the Budget on 29 April 1910—a year to the day after its introduction—when the land tax proposal was dropped, but contention between the government and the Lords continued until the second general election in December 1910, which resulted again in the Unionists gaining more votes than the Liberals but producing another hung parliament, with the Liberals again relying on Labour and the Irish Party. Nonetheless, the Lords passed the Parliament Act 1911.

**How effective were the Liberal Government reforms?**

- A traditional way of looking at the Liberal Government welfare reforms is to say that they represented a break with the past. No longer did the authorities believe that if people were poor, then it was somehow their own fault. The Liberal Government had made a start on attacking the causes of poverty and were helping the poorest people to lead decent lives. But was this enough?

**Did the Liberal reforms help all poor people?** They most certainly did not, and they were not intended to. The two major Liberal reforms, old age pensions and national insurance, were quite limited. Remember that the total population of Britain was around 45 million people.

1 **Pensions** Only around half a million elderly people qualified for state old-age pensions. This was because the pensions were only for people who:
   - were over 70 years old
   - had an income of below £21 a year (on a sliding scale up to an income of £31 2s a year after which there was no pension at all)
   - were British citizens who had been living in Britain for more than 20 years
- had not been in prison during the ten years before claiming their pension
- had not ‘habitually failed to work according to their ability, opportunity and need’.

2 National Insurance National Insurance against sickness initially covered ten million men and four million women. It was only for people who:
- were on low incomes (less than £160 a year)
- made the contributions. It did not cover their dependants.
- National Insurance against unemployment initially covered around 2.25 million workers, most of them skilled men. It was restricted to:
- trades where seasonal unemployment was common, including building, shipbuilding and engineering.

3 The Poor Law In 1909, the Liberal Government had a chance to reform the Poor Law when the Royal Commission (set up in 1905) finally reported. The Commission produced two reports. The first recommended reforming the Poor Law, the second abolishing it. The Government did nothing, and the Poor Law remained for another 20 years.

**How were the reforms put into action?**

- The responsibility for carrying out many of the Government’s reforms fell on local councils, for example, the central government made it possible for local government to implement reforms such as free school meals. By 1914 over 14 million free school meals per year were being cooked for around 158,000 children. Similarly, although local councils were not forced to set up clinics, by 1914 most were providing some free medical treatment for children.

**More reforms passed during this period:**

- 1906 - The Trades Disputes Act ruled that unions were not liable for damages because of strikes.
- 1906 - The Workers Compensation Act granted compensation for injury at work.
- 1907 - School medical inspections.
- 1908 - eight-hour day for miners.
- 1910 - half-day a week off for shop workers.
- A Merchant Shipping Act improved conditions for sailors.
- From 1911, MPs were paid. This gave working men the opportunity to stand for election.

**Mixed effects on people’s welfare**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Free school meals**
By 1914, 150,000 children were getting one good meal a day. Not compulsory - some councils did not provide free meals

**Pensions**
Kept many old people out of the workhouse. Was refused to people who had never worked during their life.

**Labour exchanges**
By 1914, 1 million people were being employed through the labour exchange. Most of these jobs were temporary or part-time; the government did not do anything to increase the number of jobs available.

**National Insurance**
A vital safety net to tide people over hard times. Poor people had to pay the contributions out of their wages; dole and sickness pay only lasted for a limited time; and **7s 6d** was not enough to live on - a family of five needed **£1 a week**.

**Free medical treatment**
Literally, a life-saver. Only for the wage-earner - it was not available to their wife or children.

---

**Opposition to the reforms**

- These reforms, especially pensions, had to be paid for. To do this, David Lloyd George, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced a **budget in 1909** which taxed the rich and the landowners.
- At first, the **House of Lords**, which was full of and owners, opposed the budget.
- Many people still believed that everyone should look after themselves and their families. They thought it was wrong for the State to step in and help people as this might encourage them to be lazy. It would make them dependent and less able to stand on their own two feet.
- However, after a general election in January 1910, which the Liberals won, the House of Lords had to agree to the budget.

**Rise of the Labour Party**

In 1924 Ramsey MacDonald became the first Labour party Prime Minister. How did a movement, which was started less than three decades earlier to support working-class people and values, evolve into a mainstream political party?  

**Labour Party chronology - the basics**

- **1893** - Keir Hardie, a Scottish miner who had been elected MP for West Ham, set up the **Independent Labour Party** - a socialist propaganda society.
- **1900** - The Trades Union Congress set up the **Labour Representation Committee** (LRC) - with Ramsey MacDonald as secretary - to support working-class candidates in elections.
- **1903** - The LRC agreed with the Liberal Party that only one candidate (Liberal or Labour) should stand in each seat against the Conservatives in the next election.
- **1906** - 29 LRC-sponsored candidates **won seats** in the election and set up as a separate party in Parliament. They called themselves **The Labour Party**. One Labour MP - John Burns - was invited by the Liberal government to join the Cabinet the first Labour minister.
1910 - 42 Labour MPs were elected, and the Liberal government needed the Labour Party to support it.

1914-1918 - during the war, the Party struggled, because Labour members disagreed about whether to oppose or support the war.

1918 - The Party reorganised itself, adopted a new constitution and published a manifesto - Labour and the New Social Order - which advocated nationalisation of industry and the redistribution of wealth. The Labour Party won 63 seats in the 1918 election.

1918 - The Party reorganised itself, adopted a new constitution and published a manifesto - Labour and the New Social Order - which advocated nationalisation of industry and the redistribution of wealth. The Labour Party won 63 seats in the 1918 election.

1922 - The Labour Party won 142 seats in the election.

1924 - In the election the Conservatives won 258 seats, Labour 191 and the Liberals 158. Labour and the Liberals formed a coalition government with Ramsey MacDonald as the first Labour prime minister.

Why did the Labour Party come to power in 1924?

• The LRC [LRC: Labour Representation Committee ](1900) campaigned for Labour candidates in election. After 1913, the Trade Unions were allowed to fund Labour candidates, and this allowed the LRC to finance election campaigns.

• Payment of MPs (1911) allowed working men to stand for Parliament.

• Labour and the New Social Order, the Party's manifesto (1918) - advocating nationalisation of industry and the redistribution of wealth appealed to working people.

• The Representation of the People Act of 1918 gave the vote to more working-class people, who looked for a 'worker's party' to represent them.

• After 1916, the Liberals were split between those who supported Asquith, and those who supported Lloyd George. This weakened the Liberal Party. Then Lloyd George fell from power after he agreed to the Irish Free State in 1921 there was a second split in the Liberal Party that ruined it forever.

• The Conservatives - who took over the government in 1922 - were also weakened when they failed to deal with a trade depression in 1923.
How to use skills and knowledge to analyse the sources (Part One)

When writing answers for paper two you need to know that you are expected to:

1) Respond to the argument in the question
2) Exam the content of the sources (Content)
3) Analyse the source for key skills (provenance)
   a. Purpose
   b. Motive
   c. Tone
   d. Language
   e. Reliability
   f. Cross-reference
4) Provide supporting knowledge that helps you understand and put the source in its context (Knowledge)

Practice Questions

Question 1 (June 2013)

Study source B. Why did the newspaper publish the Labour MP’s letter? Use details of the source and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

SOURCE B

Dear Mr Lloyd George

I thought that I might bring to your attention the verdict of a jury in a coroner’s inquest into the death of one of my constituents, Edward Heath, who died last month aged 85.

The jury found that he died from poverty. They also called on the government to supervise old age pensioners who are single and have no other income apart from their pension, and to provide these pensioners with extra support if they need it. They called upon you, Mr Lloyd George, to make changes to the Pension Act to make these measures law.

I thought that you might not have heard about this event and I wanted to bring it to your attention.

From a letter written by a Labour MP to David Lloyd George in 1909.
The letter was published in a newspaper which supported the Labour Party.

Constituents = people who live in an area represented by an MP.
Why
Think about motive or purpose for publishing it

Think about tone and language used

Think about what knowledge you have that would help explain it

What the mark scheme is looking for…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Focus on context of source with no valid comment on message or purpose (Answers effectively use the source as a stimulus to demonstrate contextual knowledge about pensions. May well be quite detailed but will fail to address the impact the newspaper was hoping to have with the letter.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Argues that purpose is to provide information to Lloyd George (Argues that the newspaper wanted Lloyd George to know what the jury had said but does not explain why)</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Argues that the letter was published to show inadequacy of pensions (Understands that letter was sent for a purpose other than to inform Lloyd George but fails to identify or explain a purpose)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Argues that the letter was published to get improvements to pensions (Understands motivation of newspaper and/or MP but fails to see political motivation)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td><strong>Identifies political purpose of source</strong> (to embarrass Lloyd George/Liberals or to promote Labour)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td><strong>Explains political purpose of source</strong> (to embarrass Lloyd George/Liberals or to promote Labour)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: The newspaper published this letter to try and embarrass the government by showing a pensioner dying from poverty. It supported the views of the Labour MP. Because he is a Labour MP he wants to make Lloyd George look bad so he uses the words of the jury to show that they blamed Lloyd George for his death. Labour did criticise the old age pensions for being too small.
Comparing sources

You will get two or three questions that ask you to compare two sources. It will either ask you to think about

- how they are similar or different
- how far one source is better than another for answering a question
- how far one source explains another

It is your job to respond to the question and remember your skills (Content/Provenance/knowledge)

Q4 June 2013

Study sources D and E. How similar are these two sources. Use details of the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

**SOURCE D**

**Question:** In your opinion has the Children Act benefited the children in your area?

**Answer:** In my opinion the Act has not helped children overall. Police Constables in my district report that few parents know or care about the Act and it is quite the usual thing for women to leave their children at home while they go out drinking. Constables also report that now the Act bans children from entering licensed premises this results in children getting into mischief while they are left outside leading to more crime. Some constables also believe that the Act has exposed children to dangers such as being run over.

Many constables believe they should not involve themselves in matters concerning families and children. They are most uncomfortable in bringing prosecutions against parents in matters relating to their children. Constables believe that their time is wasted in prosecuting shopkeepers and publicans for minor offences relating to children when they should be tackling more serious crimes.

A response to a survey question sent out by the government to chief police officers in 1910.

This response was from one chief police officer in a district of London.

Licensed premises = pubs

**SOURCE E**

It has been claimed by MPs from other parties and in some newspapers that the Children Act is failing to protect children. This is simply not the case. This year there have been 39 prosecutions in London alone against shopkeepers selling cigarettes to children. A publican in Liverpool was fined only last week for allowing children into his premises. There have also been numerous prosecutions of neglectful parents. I do not think it is necessary to interfere with the Children Act, which appears to be working satisfactorily.

Winston Churchill speaking in Parliament in 1911. Churchill was a senior minister in the government and was head of the department which was responsible for the Children Act.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIMILAR</th>
<th>DIFFERENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT THAT IS SIMILAR</td>
<td>CONTENT THAT IS DIFFERENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVENANCE THAT IS SIMILAR (motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
<td>PROVENANCE THAT IS DIFFERENT (motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN SIMILARITY</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARE THEY MORE SIMILAR OR MORE DIFFERENT AND **WHY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undeveloped comments</strong> based on provenance or nature of source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Answers are simply pointing to the fact that they are written by different people or that they arise from different circumstances)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selects matching or contrasting details with no explanatory comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Candidates pick out extracts from each source which may well indicate similarity or difference but this is not spelled out)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compares points or details which <strong>agree OR disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Answers must select from each source and explain whether they are similar or different)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example: In some ways the two sources are similar. In Source D the policemen do say they are bringing prosecutions against parents. In Source E Churchill also talks about prosecutions against parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example: The two sources are not similar at all. The police report says the Act has not helped children whereas Churchill says that the people who say the Act does not help children are wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example: The sources are similar because they both say that the Children Act is not being enforced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compares points or details which <strong>agree AND disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Answers must select from each source and explain whether they are similar or different)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example: In some ways the two sources are similar. In Source D the policemen do say they are bringing prosecutions against parents. In Source E Churchill also talks about prosecutions against parents. On the other hand in some ways the two sources are not similar at all. The police report says the Act has not helped children whereas Churchill says that the people who say the Act does not help children are wrong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argues the sources are different by identifying differing attitudes towards Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source D shows clear dislike of the Act while Source E is clearly enthusiastic about it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example: I do not think these sources are similar at all. In Source D the police are obviously hostile to the Act. In contrast, Churchill in Source E is very positive about the Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argues the sources are different by explaining differing attitudes towards Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source D shows dislike of the Act because it creates more work for police and they don’t like getting involved in families, while Source E is clearly enthusiastic about it because Churchill was one of the politicians who brought the measure in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example: I do not think these sources are similar at all. In Source D the police are obviously hostile to the Act and they do not like it. This is because it causes more crime when children are left outside pubs. In contrast, Churchill in Source E is very positive about the Act and thinks that the Act has been a great success. This is because he is a Liberal minister and his government brought the measure in and he is answering his critics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops L6 answer using <strong>purpose</strong> of one or both sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposes: Churchill wants people to believe the Act is working and keep it unaltered, whereas the police want to amend or get rid of Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example: I do not think these sources are similar at all. In Source D the police are obviously hostile to the Act. They want to get rid of the Act or at least stop having to interfere in family issues. In contrast, Churchill in Source E is very positive about the Act and thinks that the Act has been a great success. He wants people to believe the Act has been a success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5 June 2013
Study sources F and G. How far does source F make source G surprising. Use details of the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

SOURCE F

A poster about the introduction of National Insurance published by the Liberal Party in 1911. The word on the lifebelt is ‘Benefits’.

SOURCE G

All employed persons in this country are affected by the National Insurance Bill. Are they all treated equally? I think they are not. Self-employed men such as small traders, bootmakers and window cleaners will not benefit.

I am not at all certain that women under the Bill are going to benefit as much as men. I am inclined to think the Bill will make the position of women much less secure than men.

A Conservative MP speaking in Parliament about the National Insurance Bill in 1911.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source F makes Source G really surprising.</th>
<th>Source F does not make Source G surprising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>CONTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVENANCE THAT IS SIMILAR</td>
<td>PROVENANCE THAT IS DIFFERENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
<td>(motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN SIMILARITY</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW FAR does source F make source G surprising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>General assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: No, because they are about different things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Undeveloped comparison of provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Answers point out different authors or source type but no more)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Level 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Source G with no valid reference to Source F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: No because Source F was published by the Liberals whereas Source G was by a Conservative MP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: I am not surprised. G is a Conservative MP and he would be on the side of the employers. They did not like having to make contributions to the NI Act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Argues yes OR no based on similarities or differences between sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Candidates need to interpret the cartoon in order to make a case that F makes G surprising)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Source F makes Source G really surprising. Source G is really negative about the NI Act whereas Source F clearly shows it will help working men.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Source F does not make Source G surprising at all. Source F is really about men who work in factories or mines but Source G is about self employed men and women. So they are talking about different things, so they are not surprising.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Argues yes AND no based on similarities or differences between sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Candidates need to interpret the cartoon in order to make a case that F makes G surprising)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: In some ways Source F makes G surprising because F shows men being rescued by the NI Act but Source G says it will not help them. On the other hand it is not that surprising because G is actually talking about different groups so F may be right about the men it is talking about, but G is not talking about those men.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Argues yes OR no based on evaluation of one source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Evaluation could be based on purpose / intent or contextual knowledge or cross reference to other sources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Source F does not make G surprising. Source F was propaganda published by the Liberal Party to try and gain credit for passing the Act and claim that the Liberals were the friends of working men. It exaggerates how much help the Act is. It would not convince someone like the Conservative MP who was opposed to the Liberals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Argues yes OR no based on evaluation of both sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Source F does not make G surprising. Source F was propaganda published by the Liberal Party to try and gain credit for passing the Act and claim that the Liberals were the friends of working men. It exaggerates how much help the Act is. It would not convince someone like the Conservative MP who was opposed to the Liberals. The Conservative MP is trying to embarrass the Liberal government by pointing out groups who will not benefit from the Act. It is not surprising that he has a different view from Source F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homework

Study Source C

Was this source published by the Liberal party or the Conservative party? Use details of the source and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

A poster published in 1909. The man at the top of the hill is David Lloyd George.
Views of women in the 19th century

In the 19th century women from different classes had different experiences.

For working class women:
- Most girls did not go to school and it was not compulsory until 1880 when girls between the ages of 5-10 had to attend. By 1900 97% of all children could read and write.
- Most had to go out to work because they needed the money
- One in three went in to domestic service at some point in their lives
- Many worked from home or small workshops on: sewing, making matchboxes or candles and textile factories
- New industries appeared including typists, telephone operators, shop work.

For Middle and Upper Class women
- Usually educated at home by a governess but the aim of the education was to make them good housekeepers and to attract a husband
- Some middle class girls at the very end of the century were given more freedom and many did attend school
- It was very difficult to go to University or in to a profession such as medicine or law
- Sophia Jex-Blake (in 1870) completed a course to become a doctor at Edinburgh University but they refused to give her a degree.
- New employment opened up for middle-class women such as teaching, nursing or clerical work but women were expected to give this up when they got married.

Marriage
- When they married their property was passed to their husbands. Husbands could rape and batter their wives and it was practically impossible for women to get a divorce. But by 1900 there were some changes:
  - Women could bring divorce cases
  - Women were allowed to keep their property after they married
  - A woman no longer had to stay in her husband’s home against her will

There were important developments in the 1890’s:
1889: The Women’s Franchise League takes up the rights of married women and campaigns for equality for women in divorce, inheritance and the custody of their children
1894: Parish Councils Act permits propertied women and ratepayers to serve on Urban and Parish district councils
1896: Factory Act bans employment of children under the age of 11 in factories. Women are not be employed for four weeks after having a child
1897: NUWSS formed

What were the arguments For and Against Women getting the vote?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women are equal before God.</td>
<td>A woman’s place is in the home; going out into the rough world of politics will change her caring nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women already have the vote in local elections.</td>
<td>Many women do not want the vote, and would not use it if they got it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women pay taxes.</td>
<td>Women do not fight in wars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some women (e.g. doctors and mayors) are far better than some men (e.g. convicts and lunatics) who have the vote.</td>
<td>The vast mass of women are too ignorant of politics to be able to use their vote properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries have given women the vote.</td>
<td>If women are given the vote, it will not be the gentle intelligent women who will stand for Parliament, but the violent Suffragettes. Parliament will be ruined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arguments for

Why the vote – because many felt it was the only way they would be able to put enough pressure on Parliament to bring changes on other laws. Parliament was full of men and votes by men so only interested in men’s issues. Laws could be passed that protected women; working rights, equal pay, rights within marriage, equal rights in divorce.

Falling behind other countries – By 1914 many other countries had given women the vote, New Zealand, parts of Australia and some states in America.

Destruction of ‘separate spheres’ – women were becoming doctors, getting involved in political causes such as Annie Besant (1888) who led a women match-makers strike for better pay and conditions. This seemed to prove the old idea of spate spheres was no longer valid.

Arguments Against
Politics – the majority of women were happy to be involved in the domestic sphere and had little interest or understanding of politics. Many men worried if they were given the vote they would vote for silly things in an uninformed way.

Science – scientific theory at the time was that there were physical and psychological differences between men and women. It was believed that women were guided by the womb not the brain. They were seen as childish, fickle and bad-tempered and therefore lacked the logical power to be involved in politics.

Active citizens – many believed that women could be involved in their community without the vote through charities and working on things like the Poor Law board and that this was a better extension of their domestic role.

Earned it – some believed that people had to earn the right to vote by being willing to fight for their country and as women could not fight in the army or navy they did not deserve the vote.

The campaign

Votes for women were part of a gradual improvement in women’s rights that had been going on throughout the 19th century. The movement also campaigned for the right to divorce a husband, the right to education, and the right to have a job such as a doctor. Many women, however, saw the vote as the vital achievement that would give them a say in the laws affecting their lives.

Suffragists

- The National Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies - the Suffragists - was formed in 1897 and led by Millicent Fawcett. The group was made up of mainly middle-class women and campaigned peacefully. The organisation built up supporters in Parliament, but private members’ bills to give women the vote all failed.
- Tactics - The NUWSS held public meetings, organised petitions, wrote letters to politicians, published newspapers and distributed free literature. The main demand was for the vote on the same terms “as it is, or may be” granted to men.
- Millicent Fawcett believed that it was important that the NUWSS campaigned for a wide variety of causes. This included helping Josephine Butler in her campaign against the white slave traffic. The NUWSS also gave support to Clementina Black and her attempts to persuade the government to help protect low paid women workers.
- Fawcett’s progress was very slow. She converted some of the members of the Labour Representation Committee (soon to be the Labour Party) but most men in Parliament believed that women simply would not understand how Parliament worked and therefore should not take part in the electoral process. The WSPU came out of the NUWSS led by Emmeline Pankhurst frustrated by the lack of success of the movement.
Millicent Fawcett, like other members of the NUWSS, feared that the militant actions of the WSPU would alienate potential supporters of women's suffrage. However, Fawcett and other leaders of the NUWSS admired the courage of the suffragettes and at first were unwilling to criticize members of the WSPU.

After the 1906 General Election the Liberal Party formed a new government. On 19th May, the Prime Minister, Henry Campbell-Bannerman, met a delegation from the NUWSS that were led by Emily Davies. At the meeting Campbell-Bannerman admitted he was sympathetic to their cause but was unable to make any promises about introducing legislation on parliamentary reform.

The NUWSS believed that after the Liberal Party victory in 1906 women would now be granted equal rights with men. However, this did not happen and Millicent Fawcett became increasingly angry at the party's unwillingness to give full support to women's suffrage.

Some leaders of the Labour Party, such as Keir Hardie and Philip Snowden, supported the demands of the NUWSS.

The NUWSS organized its first large-scale demonstration on 9th February 1907 (OFTEN KNOWN AS THE MUD MARCH). Over 3,000 women attended a meeting at Hyde Park to hear speeches by Millicent Fawcett and Frances Balfour. In May 1907 the NUWSS sponsored Bertrand Russell, as an unofficial Liberal Party candidate at the Wimbledon by-election.

Herbert Asquith became Prime Minister in 1908. Unlike other leading members of the Liberal Party, Asquith was a strong opponent of votes for women. However, after a meeting with Winston Churchill, the new president of the Board of Trade, the NUWSS came away thinking that he was prepared to persuade his cabinet colleagues to introduce legislation to give women the vote.

During the January 1910 General Election the NUWSS organised the signing petitions in 290 constituencies. They managed to obtain 280,000 signatures and this was presented to the House of Commons in March 1910. With the support of 36 MPs a new suffrage bill was discussed in Parliament. The WSPU suspended all militant activities and on 23rd July they joined forces with the NUWSS to hold a grand rally in London. When the House of Commons refused to pass the new suffrage bill, the WSPU broke its truce on what became known as Black Friday on 18th November, 1910, when its members clashed with the police in Parliament Square.

Although the NUWSS campaign had ended in failure, the extra publicity it had received increased membership from 13,429 in 1909 to 21,571 to 1910. It now had 207 societies and its income had reached £14,000. It was decided to restructure the NUWSS into federations.

By 1911 the NUWSS now had 16 federations and 26,000 members. The NUWSS now had enough funds to appoint Catherine Marshall and Kathleen Courtney to full-time posts at national headquarters.

Herbert Asquith and his Liberal Party government still refused to support legislation. At its annual party conference in January 1912, the Labour Party passed a resolution committing itself to supporting women's suffrage. This was reflected in the fact that all Labour MPs voted for the measure at a debate in the House of Commons on 28th March.

In April 1912, the NUWSS announced that it intended to support Labour Party candidates in parliamentary by-elections.
In 1913 the NUWSS had nearly had 100,000 members. Katherine Harley, a senior figure in the NUWSS, suggested holding a Woman's Suffrage Pilgrimage in order to show Parliament how many women wanted the vote.

Members of the NUWSS publicized the Woman's Suffrage Pilgrimage in local newspapers. An estimated 50,000 women reached Hyde Park in London on 26th July. As The Times newspaper pointed out, the march was part of a campaign against the violent methods being used by the Women Social & Political Union.

By 1914 the NUWSS had over 600 societies and an estimated 100,000 members. After the disastrous arson campaign, the WSPU had seen a rapid decline in membership. Some of the WSPU wealthier supporters also switched back to the NUWSS. Elizabeth Crawford has calculated the NUWSS spent over £45,000 in 1914.

In July 1914 the NUWSS argued that Asquith's government should do everything possible to avoid a European war. Two days after the British government declared war on Germany on 4th August 1914, Millicent Fawcett declared that it was suspending all political activity until the conflict was over. Although the NUWSS supported the war effort, it did not follow the WSPU strategy of becoming involved in persuading young men to join the armed forces.

Despite pressure from members of the NUWSS, Fawcett refused to argue against the First World War.

After a stormy executive meeting in Buxton all the officers of the NUWSS (except the Treasurer) and ten members of the National Executive resigned over the decision not to support the Women's Peace Congress at The Hague.

On 28th March, 1917, the House of Commons voted 341 to 62 that women over the age of 30 who were householders, the wives of householders, occupiers of property with an annual rent of £5 or graduates of British universities. After the passing of the Qualification of Women Act the first opportunity for women to vote was in the General Election in December, 1918. Several of the women involved in the suffrage campaign stood for Parliament. Only one, Constance Markiewicz, standing for Sinn Fein, was elected. However, as a member of Sinn Fein, she refused to take her seat in the House of Commons. Later that year, Nancy Astor became the first woman in England to become a MP when she won Sutton, Plymouth in a by-election.

**Suffragettes**

Frustrated by the lack of success of the NUWSS in 1903 the Women's Social and Political Union was founded by Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughters Christabel and Sylvia. They wanted women to have the right to vote and they were not prepared to wait. The Union became better known as the Suffragettes. Members of the Suffragettes were prepared to use violence to get what they wanted.

The WSPU was often accused of being an organisation that existed to serve the middle and upper classes.

Annie Kenney was one of the organizations few working class members, when the WSPU decided to open a branch in the East End of London, she was asked to leave the mill and become a full-time worker for the organisation. Annie joined Sylvia Pankhurst in London and they gradually began to persuade working-class women to join the WSPU.

By 1905 the media had lost interest in the struggle for women's rights. Newspapers rarely reported meetings and usually refused to publish articles and letters written by
supporters of women's suffrage. In 1905 the WSPU decided to use different methods to obtain the publicity they thought would be needed in order to obtain the vote.

- On 13th October 1905, Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenney attended a meeting in London to hear Sir Edward Grey, a minister in the British government. When Grey was talking, the two women constantly shouted out, "Will the Liberal Government give votes to women?" When the women refused to stop shouting the police were called to evict them from the meeting. Pankhurst and Kenney refused to leave and during the struggle a policeman claimed the two women kicked and spat at him. Pankhurst and Kenney were arrested and charged with assault.

- Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenney were found guilty of assault and fined five shillings each. When the women refused to pay the fine they were sent to prison. The case shocked the nation.

- On 9th March, 1906, Flora Drummond and Annie Kenney, led a demonstration to Downing Street, repeatedly knocking on the door of the Prime Minister, Henry Campbell-Bannerman. Drummond and Kenney were arrested but Campbell-Bannerman refused to press charges and they were released.

- Christabel Pankhurst obtained her degree in 1907 but her gender prevented her from developing a career as a barrister. Christabel decided to leave Manchester and join the suffragette campaign in London.

- She disagreed with the way the campaign was being run. The initial strategy of the WSPU had been to recruit the support of working class women. Christabel advocated a campaign that would appeal to the more prosperous members of society. Whereas Sylvia Pankhurst and Charlotte Despard argued for the vote for all adults, Christabel favoured limited suffrage, a system that would only give the vote to women with money and property. Christabel pointed out that the WSPU relied heavily on the money supplied by wealthy women.

- During the summer of 1908 the WSPU introduced the tactic of breaking the windows of government buildings. On 30th June suffragettes marched into Downing Street and began throwing small stones through the windows of the Prime Minister's house. As a result of this demonstration, twenty-seven women were arrested and sent to Holloway Prison.

- Hunger Strikes. On 25th June 1909 Marion Wallace-Dunlop was charged "with wilfully damaging the stone work of St. Stephen's Hall, House of Commons, by stamping it with an indelible rubber stamp, doing damage to the value of 10s." Wallace-Dunlop was found guilty of wilful damage and when she refused to pay a fine she was sent to prison for a month. Marion Wallace-Dunlop refused to eat for several days. Afraid that she might die and become a martyr, it was decided to release her after fasting for 91 hours. Soon afterwards a group of suffragettes in Holloway Prison who had been convicted of breaking windows, adopted the same strategy. After six days they were also released.

- On 22nd September 1909 Charlotte Marsh, Rona Robinson, Laura Ainsworth and Mary Leigh were arrested while disrupting a public meeting being held by Herbert Asquith." They immediately decided to go on hunger-strike, a strategy developed by Marion Wallace-Dunlop a few weeks earlier. Wallace-Dunlop had been immediately released
when she had tried this in Holloway Prison, but the governor of Winson Green Prison, was willing to feed the women by force.

- The WSPU was often accused of being an organisation that existed to serve the middle and upper classes.
- Annie Kenney was one of the organizations few working class members, when the WSPU decided to open a branch in the East End of London, she was asked to leave the mill and become a full-time worker for the organisation. Annie joined Sylvia Pankhurst in London and they gradually began to persuade working-class women to join the WSPU.
- On 5th September, 1909, Elsie Howey, Vera Wentworth and Jessie Kenney assaulted Herbert Asquith and Herbert Gladstone while they were playing golf. Asquith was also attacked as he left Lympne Church that Sunday. In November 1909, Theresa Garnett accosted Winston Churchill with a whip. She was arrested for assault but was found guilty of disturbing the peace. Garnett was found guilty and was sentenced to a month's imprisonment in Horfield Prison. Garnett went on hunger-strike while in Horfield Prison. This time, instead of being released, she was forcibly fed. As a protest against this treatment, she set fire to her cell and was then placed in solitary confinement for 11 of the 15 remaining days of her sentence. After being found unconscious, she spent the rest of her sentence in a hospital ward.
- The WSPU still had a group of wealthy women who helped pay for their campaigns.
- During the 1910 General Election the NUWSS organised the signing petitions in 290 constituencies. They managed to obtain 280,000 signatures and this was presented to the House of Commons in March 1910. With the support of 36 MPs a new suffrage bill was discussed in Parliament. The WSPU suspended all militant activities and on 23rd July they joined forces with the NUWSS to hold a grand rally in London. When the House of Commons refused to pass the new suffrage bill, the WSPU broke its truce on what became known as Black Friday on 18th November, 1910, when its members clashed with the police in Parliament Square.
- After the violent demonstrations in 1912 the British government made it clear that they intended to seize the assets of the WSPU. Christabel Pankhurst now ran operations in France in order to avoid arrest. Annie Kenney was put in charge of the WSPU in London.
- In October, 1912, George Lansbury decided to draw attention to the plight of WSPU prisoners by resigning his seat in the House of Commons and fighting a by-election in favour of votes for women. Lansbury discovered that a large number of males were still opposed to equal rights for women and he was defeated by 731 votes. The following year he was imprisoned for making speeches in favour of suffragettes who were involved in illegal activities. While in Pentonville he went on hunger strike and was eventually released under the Cat and Mouse Act.
- In 1912 the WSPU began a campaign to destroy the contents of pillar-boxes. By December, the government claimed that over 5,000 letters had been damaged by the WSPU.
- Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the Labour Party, had argued for many years that women's suffrage that was a necessary part of a socialist programme. He was therefore able to negotiate an agreement with the NUWSS for joint action in by-elections. In October, 1912, it was claimed that £800 of suffragist money had been spent on Labour candidatures.
- The summer of 1913 saw a further escalation of WSPU violence. In July attempts were made by suffragettes to burn down the houses of two members of the government who opposed women having the vote. These attempts failed but soon afterwards, a house
being built for David Lloyd George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was badly damaged by suffragettes. This was followed by cricket pavilions, racecourse stands and golf clubhouses being set on fire.

- In 1913 the WSPU increased its campaign to destroy public and private property. The women responsible were often caught and once in prison they went on hunger-strike. Determined to avoid these women becoming martyrs, the government introduced the **Prisoner’s Temporary Discharge of Ill Health Act**. Suffragettes were now allowed to go on hunger strike but as soon as they became ill they were released. Once the women had recovered, the police re-arrested them and returned them to prison where they completed their sentences. This successful means of dealing with hunger strikes became known as the **Cat and Mouse Act**.

- In June, 1913, at the most important race of the year, the Derby, **Emily Davison** ran out on the course and attempted to grab the bridle of Anmer, a horse owned by King George V. The horse hit Emily and the impact fractured her skull and she died without regaining consciousness. Although many suffragettes endangered their lives by hunger strikes, Emily Davison was the only one who deliberately risked death. However, her actions did not have the desired impact on the general public. They appeared to be more concerned with the health of the horse and jockey and Davison was condemned as a mentally ill fanatic.

- On 30th April 1913, Rachel Barrett and other members of staff were arrested while printing **The Suffragette newspaper**. Found guilty of conspiracy she was sentenced to nine months imprisonment.

- By the summer of 1914 over 1,000 suffragettes had been imprisoned for destroying public property. All the leading members of the WSPU were in prison, in very poor health or were living in exile. The number of active members of the organisation in a position to commit acts of violence was now very small.

**Government response**

- Private member’s bills were presented every year after 1900. They were either talked out, or passed to a Committee of the Whole House, where nothing was decided. In 1904 MPs talked for hours about tail-lights on cars, so that there would not be time for the next Bill – on women’s suffrage.

- By 1908, however, most MPs, including most of the Cabinet, openly supported women’s suffrage. Asquith, the Prime Minister (who, however, did NOT agree with women’s suffrage) said that the government would bring a Bill to Parliament. In 1910 and 1911, therefore, Conciliation Bills (so-called because they only asked for the vote for one million women, so as not to annoy the opposition) were passed with large majorities. But the Bills did not become law – they were again passed to a Committee of the Whole House.

- The campaign for women’s suffrage got bogged down in politics. Some MPs opposed the Conciliation Bills because they did not want ANY women to get the vote. Some pro-suffrage MPs opposed the Bills because they were too narrow.

- Many Liberals opposed the Bills because they thought the 1 million rich women who would get the vote would vote Conservative. After 1910, the government was faced by other crises (especially trouble in Ireland) and many MPs thought there were more important things to worry about. Many Irish MPs (there were 100
of them) voted against the Bills because they wanted more time for the Irish Question.

- When a third Conciliation Bill was debated in the Commons in 1912, it lost by a majority of 14 votes. Then, in 1914, the First World War started, and the women’s leaders promised to stop campaigning for the vote and to help the war.

How political parties reacted to women's suffrage: the Liberal Party

The Liberals were in government after 1906 and it was because of their unwillingness to respond positively to demands for women’s suffrage that the WSPU’s militant campaign escalated. The government’s reaction to women’s suffrage campaigns was negative despite there being several sympathisers in the cabinet. Throughout the period 1903 to 1914, the suffragists never managed to convince the government that it should set aside sufficient parliamentary time to ensure the passage of a women’s suffrage bill.

None of the three political parties completely supported women’s suffrage and divisions over the cause went across the political divide. The decision of the Labour Party in 1912 to include women’s suffrage as part of its political programme represented a long-term strategy. Arguments over the principle of women’s suffrage, combined with concerns about its impact on the political and electoral system, the activities of the militants and prevailing political concerns made it difficult for parties to support women’s suffrage unconditionally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General position</th>
<th>Most of the Liberal Party did support some form of women’s suffrage. They recognised it to be part of their historical commitment to democracy and the extension of liberty. They understood that the vote traditionally had embodied the symbol of full citizenship. Since women had the duties and responsibilities of citizens, they should also have a citizen’s rights. Fairness also dictated that women should have the vote, since the laws passed by Parliament affected women as much as men. Most importantly, the well being of the nation demanded women’s involvement in political affairs. Women, these Liberal concluded, had proved their responsibility and worth in raising families and managing the home. It was there a matter of justice that they should be given the vote.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What were the attitudes of the Liberal government?</td>
<td>The aims of the Liberal government on the question of women’s suffrage are far from clear. Some senior politicians hoped that, by ignoring the issue, it would go away. This may explain Asquith’s refusal to meet suffragist. However, there is evidence suggesting that the campaign did make some impact on the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The government was forced to make concessions, or at least the promise of concessions that raised women’s hopes – as in June 1908. That Asquith, an anti-suffragist was prepared to promise a women’s suffrage amendment, if certain conditions were met, shows that the suffrage campaign was making an impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In addition, since the WSPU’s militant campaign involved breaking the law, the government was obliged to respond or allow the rule of law to break down. Some historians, notably Martha Vicinus and Susan Kingsley Kent have suggested that the use of force against suffragette demonstrators, for example on Black Friday was excessive and included sexual harassment. Virtually all Liberals were offended by the actions of the militants warning the WSPU that it was alienating public opinion and thus delaying achievement of its goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Those who were less supportive of the women’s campaign treated the behaviour of the militants as evidence that women might not be fit for the vote. Following an attack on Asquith on 23rd November 1910, the <em>Yorkshire Evening News</em> launched a hysterical attack on the suffragettes. It called them “maniac women”, “lunatic females” and the “shrieking sisterhood” and ended by saying, “They should be put into a home and kept there until they have learned to forget the ways of the brute and have approximated to some degree of civilisation”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It can be argued that the government’s reaction was more than a simple attempt to maintain law and order. It was an attempt to <em>put women in their place</em>, an automatic reaction of a male dominated society that felt itself under threat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The appointment of Henry Asquith as prime minister in April 1908 represented a setback for the suffrage movement. His predecessor, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was not unsympathetic to the cause and said that the campaigners should keep ‘pestering’ the government. In 1906, the Cabinet contained a large majority of supporters of women’s suffrage; by 1912, changes had left it evenly divided.

### Positive reaction

The Liberal Party, like the other parties, was divided on the issue of women’s suffrage. However, there is good evidence showing that the women’s suffrage campaigns made an important impact in the period 1903-1914. Support for women’s suffrage was strongest among Liberal women.

- By 1903, the Women’s Liberal Federation had passed a resolution in support of women’s suffrage. In the twenty by-elections between May 1904 and November 1905, the Federation demanded pro-suffrage pledges from Liberal candidates and refused to work for those who refused. It worked closely with the NUWSS in rallies, demonstrations and educational activities. After the 1906 election, the majority of the Executive Committee of the Federation viewed the WSPU tactics with distaste and clung to the hope that the Liberal government would honour its obligation to loyal women party workers.
- Within two years, disappointment at the lack of progress led to several members of the Executive Committee to resign their position and share platforms with the WSPU.
- What began as a trickle of resignations became more significant after 1912 with sixty-eight branches of the Federation collapsing between 1912 and 1914. The objective of the new Liberal Women’s Suffrage Union was to persuade the Liberal Party to adopt women’s suffrage as part of its programme and to promote this goal the Union would only support pro-suffrage candidates. With the women increasingly adopting the familiar tactics of Liberal pressure groups, it would be increasingly difficult to keep women’s suffrage as an open question. Lloyd George was warned that this policy could “lead, as surely to disruption and disaster as did the similar policy of the Unionist (Conservative) Party on Tariff Reform”.
- Many of the women left to join the Labour Party, seeing it as a better prospect for progress on women’s suffrage. The reaction of many Liberal suffragists to the failure of the suffrage campaign to achieve its goals under a Liberal government was to leave the Liberal Party. The suffrage campaign raised their hopes and then provoked disillusion in their party.

### Negative reaction

However, there was considerable opposition to women’s suffrage among Liberals. The main arguments put forward by Liberals (though not exclusively) were:

- These Liberals claimed either that the majority of women did not want the vote or that such an experiment, whose results were difficult to predict, should not take place unless the nation (that is the male electorate) were properly consulted and approved.
- A second line of argument was that each sex had its own proper sphere and politics was the sphere of men.
- Nor, the opponents argued, was a limited extension of the franchise possible. Once the principle of women’s suffrage was admitted, there was no logical stopping point short of universal suffrage with a female majority of the electorate.

How political parties reacted to women's suffrage: the Conservative Party
General position

The prospect and subsequent arrival of women's suffrage prompted many Conservatives (Tories) to lament the uncertainty of future politics. There was remarkable agreement in the party about the existence of a specifically female political agenda. Conservatives of both sexes generally assumed that women favoured ‘domestic’ political issues (separate spheres) with a particular emphasis on matters affecting women and children and on social reform. Whatever the attitude of Conservatives to female involvement in the party, their enthusiasm was tempered by a sense of its irrelevance while women lacked the vote. Henry Bottomley reminded canvassers in 1912: “Don’t be satisfied with seeing the wife. She may talk, but remember the husband is the voter. See him.”

Conservative attitudes to women’s suffrage were mixed between 1880 and 1914 and support came only when it was widely believed that women voters would support the party. Every Conservative leader from Disraeli onwards expressed some sympathy for women’s suffrage but the value of their support was diminished by their reluctance to take up the question while actually in office.

Negative reaction

It is important to understand that the Conservatives who opposed women’s suffrage often did so because they feared it would lead to universal suffrage. Lady Salisbury was convinced that even limited women’s suffrage would inevitably lead to the universal suffrage and that this would disadvantage the Conservative Party as more poor working class people would get the vote and probably support Labour.

There were always more Liberals than Conservatives in favour of giving women the vote. While backbench Conservative hostility has probably been exaggerated, there is no doubt that many Conservatives figured in the lists of the anti-suffrage movement. Both Lord Cromer and Lord Curzon were leading opponents of the Anti-Suffrage League (Anti’s).

Positive reaction

Upper class women and Conservative Party supporters were also supporters of the women’s suffrage movement or active in the movement. Lady Dorothy Nevill, Lady Frances Balfour, Lady Betty Balfour, Lady Selborne, Lady Londonderry and many others were active in the campaigns for women’s suffrage. These women were part of the political establishment and important members of the Primrose League.

As in so many areas, Conservative women tended, at first at least, to work in the background. Rather than forming their own suffrage organisations or getting involved with existing organisations, they generally preferred to talk to their husbands, brothers and relatives and try to convince them of the need to give women the vote. Some of them, like Lady Constance Lytton, a militant and Lady Betty Balfour, a suffragist, even managed to get themselves arrested. It was not until 1908 that Lady Selborne formed the Conservative and Unionist Women’s Suffrage Association. The organisation started The Conservative and Unionist Women’s Franchise Review to promote their ideas. They argued that giving certain “qualified” women (based on existing property qualifications) the vote would help avoid the catastrophe of universal male suffrage.

- Soon after its foundation, the Conservative and Unionist Women’s Suffrage Association joined the NUWSS and here an obvious conflict developed. The NUWSS was, in principle, a non-party organisation. The problem was that the Labour Party, unlike the other two, was officially committed to giving women the vote. As a result, the NUWSS supported more Labour candidates than those from the other two parties, a relationship that grew closed in 1912-13.
- Many people warned Balfour and Bonar Law about the dangers of allowing the Labour Party to take over the women’s suffrage question, as they feared that women would become embittered against the Tories.
- The Conservative and Unionist Women’s Suffrage Association was devoted to constitutional methods and did not believe in the same methods as the WSPU. This did not mean that they were unsympathetic to the militants though few went as far as Lady Constance Lytton. The general hostility of the Conservative suffragists to the WSPU did not prevent them from being in touch with the Pankhursts and, on occasions, co-ordinating policy with them.
- The crux of the problem was that women’s suffrage would divide the Conservative Party. That is why no party leader dared to take up the question until after the First World War, when hostility to women’s suffrage and, more importantly universal manhood suffrage, had declined.
- An examination of the voting records on all the women’s suffrage bills presented to Parliament shows that Conservatives passed through three distinct phases. From 1867 to 1883, Conservatives consistently voted against suffrage bills by a margin of three or four to one. However, the following period, from 1884 to 1908, showed a reversal of this trend and, with one exception, the suffragists were in the majority. This growing support for women’s suffrage owed a great deal to the efforts of the Primrose League and the National Union approved suffrage resolutions in 1887, 1889, 1891, 1894, 1907, 1908 and 1910. After 1909, the results became less clear. A majority voted against suffrage bills on five out of seven occasions. This occurred because women’s suffrage was mixed up with adult suffrage and many Conservatives were only in favour of limited female suffrage. Their votes on these bills tell us more about their attitude to democracy than to women.

The pre-war period was a time of fierce hostility between the Conservative and Liberal Parties. Women’s suffrage played only a small part in that drama. Far more important were the issues of the powers of the
How political parties reacted to women's suffrage: the Labour Party

**General position 1903-14**

It might have been expected that the Labour Party and the women's suffrage movement would have been natural allies. However, this was not the case. The only group within the party to support and promote women's suffrage was the ILP. As the women's question grew more acute, Labour's approach to it repeated that of the Conservative and Liberal parties.

There were similar displays of male prejudice, a reluctance to divide the party by giving priority to women and similar calculations of political advantage. Martin Pugh recognises that the Labour Party was less divided than the other parties were over the issue and he points out that a small group of Labour MPs consistently voted for women's suffrage as a group.

**Negative reaction**

Some leading members of the early Labour Party were hostile to suffragists because suffragettes were campaigning for the ‘equal franchise’ (the vote on the same basis as men) rather than the ‘universal franchise’ (votes for all).

Socialists who did not believe in property qualifications were suspicious of a campaign that was led by middle class women, who had little in common with (and little apparent interest in) working class men. Indeed, some suffragists argued that they should have the vote because they were superior to members of the working class.

Some individuals were particularly hostile to women's suffrage. Pugh cites the comments made by John Bruce Glasier in his diaries and that Ramsay MacDonald, a lukewarm suffragist, was alienated by the WSPU's militant campaign.

Not just individuals were alienated by WSPU militancy. The Women's Cooperative Guild was formed in 1883. It supported women's suffrage and argued that women should have full equal rights with men. In 1909, the Women's Cooperative Guild changed its demand for women's suffrage to a demand for universal adult suffrage because it disliked the WSPU approach. The Guild also played an important role in the campaign for the Maternity Insurance Benefit. Many leading women trade unionists such as Margaret Bondfield and Mary Macarthur were active in the organisation. It also carried out research to obtain information that would support its campaigns. For example, Dr. Armand Routh provided evidence that working class women were much more likely to suffer still-births than non-working women. By 1910, the Women's Co-operative Guild had 32,000 members.

Ramsay MacDonald (1866-1937), one of the leading members of the Labour Party, had been a supporter of women's suffrage since the 1890s.

- His mature position was outlined in detail in *Socialism and Government* (1909 edition) in which he argued that women's suffrage was a necessary part of a socialist programme. If the sole function of the state had still been to protect its citizens from attack, he accepted, the classical objections to female enfranchisement might still be valid. In fact, the state was increasingly assuming the functions of the family. The family was not an exclusively masculine institution, and the socialist state could not be exclusively masculine either. Women's suffrage was desirable because it would benefit the state, not because it would benefit women. It would benefit the state, not because women had the same rights as men, but because they performed different duties.

- This position was by no means identical with that of even the more moderate suffragists of the NUWSS but it was sympathetic enough to allow for a degree of cooperation between them. The WSPU was a different matter and MacDonald opposed the militant methods they used for the same reason that he opposed violence in trade union or international relations: because in his eyes, it was irrational and did more harm than good. He said, in the *Leicester Pioneer* (9 March 1912), “I have no objection to revolution, if it is necessary, but I have the very strongest objection to childishness masquerading as revolution, and all one can say about these window-breaking expeditions is that they are simply silly and provocative. I wish the working women of the country who really care about the vote...would come to London and tell these pettifogging middle class damsels who are going out with little hammers in their muff's that if they do no go home they will get their heads broken.”

- The essence of MacDonald's argument was that women deserved the vote because of the unique role they played in the family. When the suffragettes appeared on the scene, it became less
plausible to argue that the reason for giving women the vote lay in their role as guardians of the hearth and home. MacDonald’s opposition to the WSPU hardened as their campaign developed because their violent methods were merely the outward and visible sign of their revolt against precisely the conception of women in which MacDonald believed.

### Positive reaction

Other leading members of the Labour Party were close supporters of the suffragists and reacted positively to the militancy of the WSPU. Keir Hardie, for example, was close to the Pankhurs and supported the militant campaign. The Labour MP, George Lansbury was an enthusiastic supporter of the WSPU. When the Conciliation Bill was defeated in early 1912, he was called upon by the Speaker to withdraw from the Commons following an altercation with Asquith in which he shook his fist at the prime minister and accused him of torturing innocent women. In October 1912, he circulated a memorandum to all Labour Party branches and affiliated organisations calling on all Labour MPs to vote against all government legislation until women were given the vote. He was condemned for disloyalty by the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party but this only made matters worse. In November 1912, he resigned his seat at Bow and Bromley and fought a by-election on the suffrage issue. Despite, or because of, the support of the NUWSS and WSPU, he lost.

In 1912, two significant developments suggest that the party as a whole was becoming more inclined to give priority to women’s suffrage.

1. At the annual conference in January, Arthur Henderson’s proposal that the Labour Party should only support an Adult Suffrage Bill if it included women’s suffrage was passed.
2. The NUWSS dropped its non-party stance and made an electoral pact with the Labour Party establishing an Election Fighting Fund (EFF) to support Labour candidates in elections. Ironically, Ramsay MacDonald played a major role in working out the agreement for joint action in the spring and summer of 1912. By October 1912, Catherine Marshall, one of the suffragist leaders was able to claim, in a letter to MacDonald that £800 of suffragist money had been spent on Labour candidates. The NUWSS leadership believed that joint campaigning with the Labour Party represented the most effective pressure suffragists could exert on the Liberal government. The purpose of EFF activity was twofold; first, to embarrass anti-suffragist cabinet ministers by ensuring they were challenged by Labour at future elections; and secondly, to strengthen the number of Labour MPs in the House of Commons.

This policy caused friction within the NUWSS and between it and Liberal suffrage opinion. The subsequent formation of the Liberal Women’s Suffrage Union (LWSU) in early 1914 was an attempt to hold the loyalty of Liberal women who were also committed suffragists but who had difficulty in supporting an electoral alliance with Labour. The LWSU hoped to convince the NUWSS that it should restrict its EFF campaigning to anti-suffragist Cabinet ministers and not all anti-suffragist Liberal MPs and constantly argued against greater involvement in Labour politics. Initially, the NUWSS remained deaf to these pleas and relations between the two groups deteriorated rapidly after March 1914. A meeting between the two groups on 27th July 1914 proved inconclusive but its record suggests the growing influence of the LWSU in Liberal circles, the strength of the NUWSS’s commitment to its alliance with the Labour Party and the polarisation among women suffragists that was developing with the approach of the general election.

Keir Hardie (1856-1915) was ardently committed to women’s suffrage: indeed, he depended partly on the financial support of women members of the Weavers’ Union in the early twentieth century. The Cockeremouth by-election in mid-1906 found Hardie under pressure from his party because he had shown a singular lack of direction in the campaign in support of Bob Smillie, the Labour candidate. This arose from the failure of the Labour party to force an alliance with the suffragettes in the constituency. Indeed, the eventual eve-of-poll advice from the WSPU to the Cockeremouth electorate was to vote Conservative. Since Hardie himself was so intimately involved with the suffragette leaders, and so often championed their cause, the odium of the suffragettes’ decision fell, rather unfairly, on him.

Hardie had always been an uncompromising supporter of women’s rights. Votes for women had figured in his election addresses at Mid-Lanark and West Ham in the 1890s, and he had long established his reputation as one of the most determined and dependable advocates of women’s suffrage. His personal secretary, Mrs Margaret Travers Symons, the daughter of a wealthy Welsh architect, was a militant suffragette.

- Hardie claimed to link women’s rights with socialism: “the sex problem is at bottom the labour problem.” His support was based on broad democratic arguments that there were no political or moral grounds for discriminating between men and women.
- Apart from his special interest in women’s trade union, Hardie had no particular Labour or socialist slant to the arguments he used. He saw the granting of the franchise to all adult women, in parliamentary and local elections, as an essential key to a wider emancipation. Without the right to share in the exercise of power, women would always remain a subordinate and subject section of the community, without rights, status or security.
- He had a personal reason for promoting rights for women in 1906, namely his close friendship with
the Pankhurst family. He had been in touch with them since Richard and Emmeline Pankhurst became leading figures in the Manchester ILP in the early 1890s. He was closely in touch with Emmeline when she founded the WSPU in 1903. His attachment to Sylvia Pankhurst was of a different character and he drew closer to her in 1907 when she was imprisoned in Holloway. The significance of the affair between Sylvia and Hardie lent a powerful personal dimension to Hardie’s advocacy of women’s suffrage and massively reinforced the pressure that the women’s movement was bringing to bear on the Labour Party.

However, there was a growing rift between the Labour Party and the WSPU coinciding with increasing dissatisfaction with Hardie’s leadership of the party. At the beginning of 1906, it was natural that the Labour Party should champion the cause of women. The ILP had several prominent women on its Executive Committee including Margaret Macmillan, Emmeline Pankhurst and Margaret Bondfield. The trade union movement regarded itself as the champion of women’s social rights. There was, initially, no protest when Hardie championed the cause in the House of Commons. However, by the summer of 1906, Hardie was absorbed, almost to the point of obsession, with the women’s suffrage question. No other Labour MP was so uninhibited in championing the women’s cause. Only Philip Snowden was so ardent in the cause, and he was soon to attack Hardie’s preoccupation with the women’s question.

The potential division between Labour and the WSPU came in the summer of 1906 over the Cockermouth by-election. Instead of urging voters to support Labour, the WSPU concentrated on the campaign to turn out the Liberal candidate: in practice, that usually meant urging the electors to vote Conservative. After the by-election, Hardie was urged to devote more time to leading the Labour Party, and less to his contacts with the Pankhursts. He appears, very reluctantly, to have accepted that the Labour Party would have to cut itself adrift from the WSPU. The problem of his position as both party leader and spokesman for women’s rights came into the open at Labour annual conference in Belfast in January 1907.

When the sensitive issue of the Women’s Enfranchisement Bill, recently introduced by the Liberal MP, W. H. Dickinson came up, a motion was carried against the executive’s advice to endorse the immediate and total enfranchisement of all women. Hardie’s reaction was to state that party conferences could not bind the party in Parliament and that MPs should be able to vote according to their ‘conscience’.

In 1907 and 1908, Hardie upheld in the press the WSPU’s tactics of demanding votes for women on the same terms as those enjoyed by men. He pressed for the release of Christabel Pankhurst from prison and in 1909, joined a deputation to the Home Secretary, Herbert Gladstone, demanding an inquiry into the conditions of suffragettes detailed in gaol. The forcible feeding instituted under the ‘Cat and Mouse’ Act in 1911 roused Hardie to a new fury on behalf of women’s equality.

However, by 1909, Hardie was realistic enough to sense that women’s rights were a double-edged sword, especially in view of the disruptive tactics of the WSPU itself. The Labour Party was deriving little direct benefit from its involvement in the suffragette cause. He and Snowden continued to agitate on behalf of the women’s grievances in the Commons but even so, there was a gradual withdrawal by Hardie from the major involvement in the women’s causes that so dominated his life between 1906 and 1908. He now feared that the growing militancy of the WSPU would result in it becoming a small, sectarian and disruptive rump. Hardie was personally embarrassed in October 1908 by the actions of his personal secretary who used her position to interrupt a debate in the House with cries of ‘Votes for Women’ and in December 1911, she was convicted for obstruction during a stone-throwing demonstration.

In 1912, Hardie emerged as the champion of George Lansbury, a passionate defender of women’s suffrage and critic of the Labour Party’s failure to oppose the government sufficiently over forced-feeding. The National Executive ruled that Lansbury could not be officially supported by the party when he resigned his seat in November 1912 to fight a by-election. Hardie defied the official party line, along with Snowden and campaigned for Lansbury. He argued that Labour should vote against the government’s Franchise Bill if female suffrage was not included. Lansbury lost and the whole affair was deeply saddening for Hardie. His attitude over the Franchise Bill strained relations with his Labour colleagues. He no longer captured the allegiance of the suffragettes either. Despite, his proven record of support for women’s suffrage, Hardie now found himself often heckled by women when he made speeches. They regarded him as a “man of words, not deed”, whose gradualism and constitutionalism had produced no tangible results.
First World War

- On 4th August, 1914, England declared war on Germany. Two days later the NUWSS announced that it was suspending all political activity until the war was over. The leadership of the WSPU began negotiating with the British government. On the 10th August the government announced it was releasing all suffragettes from prison. In return, the WSPU agreed to end their militant activities and help the war effort.
- After receiving a £2,000 grant from the government, the WSPU organised a demonstration in London. Members carried banners with slogans such as "We Demand the Right to Serve", "For Men Must Fight and Women Must work" and "Let None Be Kaiser's Cat's Paws". At the meeting, attended by 30,000 people, Emmeline Pankhurst called on trade unions to let women work in those industries traditionally dominated by men.
- In October 1915, the WSPU changed its newspaper's name from The Suffragette to Britannia. Emmeline’s patriotic view of the war was reflected in the paper's new slogan: "For King, For Country, for Freedom". In the newspaper anti-war activists such as Ramsay MacDonald were attacked as being "more German than the Germans".
- On 28th March, 1917, the House of Commons voted 341 to 62 that women over the age of 30 who were householders, the wives of householders, occupiers of property with an annual rent of £5 or graduates of British universities.

The Anti-Suffrage

- Women and men opposed the suffrage movement for a variety of reasons and by various means. Numerous opinion polls throughout the suffrage campaign continued to find the majority of women not wanting a vote.
- Some women’s commitment to this belief led to their active involvement in anti-suffrage campaigning, though others were hampered by their very belief in women’s separate sphere of influence from a direct involvement in a political campaign and therefore relative passivity in support of their cause.
- ‘Antis’ tended to see women’s role as concentrating on womanly duty, a maternal role and the exercise influence and reform through other means – through the example of her behaviour, service and gentle influence on men for the good.
- Often anti-suffrage campaigners combined an involvement in social action with their anti-suffrage views, their actions based on a belief in women’s distinctive role in doing good works and helping the disadvantaged.
- Despite this reluctance to involve themselves in politics the anti-suffragists did become organised.
- Key dates include:
• 1889: Launch of the ‘Appeal Against Female Suffrage’ with 104 signatories, led by Mary Ward, which when published in Nineteenth Century gathered 2,000 more signatures to ‘Female Suffrage: A Women’s Protest’
• 1908 Launch of the Women’s National Anti-Suffrage League. Over the next ten years, establishment of over 100 branches
• 1910 Merger with the Men’s League for Opposing Women’s Suffrage
• The movement launched the Anti-Suffrage Review which denounced the behaviour of the suffragettes for their unfemininity, violence, sexual deviance, hysteria, unnaturalness and threat to other women she represented as exposing women to ridicule and insult.

The Anti-Suffrage League

• In the summer of 1908 the famous author, Mary Humphry Ward, was approached by Lord Curzon and William Cremer and asked to become the first president of the Anti-Suffrage League. Ward agreed and the first meeting took place on 12th July at the Westminster Palace Hotel.
• Humphrey Ward argued the case against women’s suffrage at debates at Newnham College and Girton College. Once a role model for educated young women, Humphrey Ward received a hostile reception from the students.

East London Federation ELF

• In 1913, Sylvia, with the help other influential men and women established the East London Federation of Suffragettes (ELF). An organisation that combined socialism with a demand for women's suffrage it worked closely with the Independent Labour Party. She also began production of a weekly paper for working-class women called The Women's Dreadnought.
• As June Hannam has pointed out: "The ELF was successful in gaining support from working women and also from dock workers. The ELF organized suffrage demonstrations and its members carried out acts of militancy. Between February 1913 and August 1914 Sylvia was arrested eight times..."
• Sylvia Pankhurst was a pacifist and disagreed with the WSPU's strong support for the war.
• In 1915 she joined with other women to form the Women's Peace Army, an organisation that demanded a negotiated peace.
• During the war Sylvia joined with Dr. Barbara Tchaykovsky to open four mother-and-baby clinics in London. In 1915 nearly 1,000 mothers and their babies were seen at Sylvia's clinics. Local politicians such as George Lansbury helped to raise funds for the organisation that's milk bill alone was over £1,000 a year.
• In March 1916 Pankhurst renamed the East London Federation of Suffragettes, the Workers' Suffrage Federation (WSF). The newspaper was renamed the Workers' Dreadnought and continued to campaign against the war and gave strong support to organizations such as the Non-Conscription Fellowship. The newspaper also published the famous anti-war statement in July, 1917, by Siegfried Sassoon.
Why did women get the vote?

**The Suffragettes**

At the time, the Suffragettes caused a lot of anger and it has been argued that they lost support for the cause. Certainly, women had not been given the vote by 1914, even after a lot of Suffragette violence. However, some historians argue that, although they could not be seen to give in to Suffragette violence, politicians could not face a return to Suffragette violence after the war, and that is why they gave women the vote.

**The War**

During the war, women served the nation and did men's work in many ways. When they were given the vote in 1918, almost every person who supported the motion in Parliament said that they deserved it because of their conduct during the war - they had proved that they could go to war' with the men. The problem with this argument is that only women who were householders over the age of 30 (6 million women) got the vote in 1918; women over 21 did not get the vote until 1928. Yet the 1918 Representation of the People Act gave the vote to all men over the age of 21 so the war did not bring women equality.

**Sylvia Pankhurst**

In June 1914, she famously took a delegation of working class women to lobby Prime Minister Asquith who did not think that working class women were intelligent enough to have the vote. This proved to Asquith that working class women were intelligent enough to vote.

**The Suffragists**

Some historians argue that the long-term persuasion of the Suffragists won the vote. In 1916, Lloyd George, who supported women's suffrage, replaced Asquith as prime minister, and many pro-suffrage MPs who had been young men before 1914 now held influential places in the government. So the women won by patient persuasion, after all.
What you need to know

1. Why did women want the vote e.g. conditions in 19th century England for women
2. The Suffragist campaign
3. The Suffragette campaign
4. Other voices e.g. Anti-Suffrage movement and ELF
5. The Liberal Governments response to the call for women to get the vote
6. Other political parties views of the vote
7. The role of women in WW1
8. Why did women get the vote in 1919?

Our focus today is going to be on how to manage the 12 mark question and ensure you get the maximum number of marks in the quickest time possible

Advice

- In the exam you should start by reading Q6 and being sure what it is asking.
- The as you go through each question you should put a table somewhere on the paper that identifies which side of the debate each sources goes into.
- Remember a source can go in to both agree and disagree.

Question

Study all the sources, A–G.

‘Women wanted the vote to improve their pay and working conditions.’

How far do the sources in this paper support this statement? Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use. [12]
**What does this say about why women wanted the vote?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any reasons about pay and conditions</th>
<th>Any other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Can you trust this source? (why)

2. Why was the poster published?

3. Anything important about tone and language?

4. Can you think of any knowledge that would enhance the source?
### SOURCE B

Some 29,000 of us have signed this petition to you, our MPs. Women do not have the vote and in our opinion this is unjust and bad for the country. In the home, our standing is lowered. In the factory, we are not represented. Rates of pay, laws and regulations are in the hands of men alone. Sometimes these men are our fellow workers, but sometimes they are rivals for the same jobs we want to do. We want the vote so we can improve our wages and conditions of work for ourselves.

*From a petition to Parliament by women workers in Lancashire cotton mills in 1901.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What does this say about why women wanted the vote?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any reasons about pay and conditions</td>
<td>Any other reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Can you trust this source? (why)

2. Why was the poster published?

3. Anything important about tone and language?

4. Can you think of any knowledge that would enhance the source?
SOURCE C

“What is our campaign about?”

Firstly, women need the vote for protection under the law. They are excluded from the better-paid jobs in the Civil Service. The laws on divorce, children and many other issues are all unfair to women. These examples show that a section of the population which does not have the vote is not treated fairly by Parliament.

In the second place, the women’s point of view is not given enough importance in laws which Parliament passes. Better housing, protection of children, the purification of food and many other questions do not get the attention they deserve because it is women who care most about these things and they do not have the power to force them to the front.

From the suffragette journal Votes for Women, 1913.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What does this say about why women wanted the vote?</th>
<th>Any reasons about pay and conditions</th>
<th>Any other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Can you trust this source? (why)

2. Why was the poster published?

3. Anything important about tone and language?

4. Can you think of any knowledge that would enhance the source?
The Citizenship of Women
A Plea for Women's Suffrage
By Keir Hardie, M.P.
PUBLISHED BY THE LABOUR PARTY

The 'Half angel, half idiot,' period is over in the woman's world and she is nearly man's equal. She is fighting her way into every kind of human activity. She is competing effectively with men in nearly every kind of work and even taking on new types of work which men have never done. In the professions she is forcing herself to the front by sheer determination and intelligence in a way that will not be denied.

Sooner or later men will be forced to accept her as a fellow worker. They should also accept her right to be a fellow voter. Votes for women is not a party political question. There are supporters and opponents in all the parties. It is a question of what is right, so let us decide this issue rightly and fairly, NOW.

From a booklet by the Labour MP Keir Hardie published in 1906.

Professions = jobs such as doctors, lawyers, teachers, civil servants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What does this say about why women wanted the vote?</th>
<th>Any reasons about pay and conditions</th>
<th>Any other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Can you trust this source? (why)

2. Why was the poster published?

3. Anything important about tone and language?

4. Can you think of any knowledge that would enhance the source?

**SOURCE F**

The development of the Women's Movement is a very great menace to us in the Labour Party and to society as a whole. Women members in one of our local branches have called for a new law which will allow men and women to divorce quickly if they are not getting along too well and fancy a change!

We the Labour Party are the ones who truly represent working people. We work to improve their pay and conditions whether they are men or women. Yet we are losing women members to these suffrage societies because of the appeal of their parades and banners, music and fancy magazines. These stunts are all very hateful and unclean.

If we had just one woman member in each branch who could think intelligently and critically we would be perfectly safe. But women act as they feel, without thinking. The suffrage societies turn their heads with talk of equal representation, equal marriage and equal rights as parents. These things are not achievable or desirable.

*Labour Party leader James Ramsay MacDonald in a private letter to Katherine Glasier, a leading Labour activist, 1914.*

What does this say about why women wanted the vote?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any reasons about pay and conditions</th>
<th>Any other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Can you trust this source? (why)

2. Why was the poster published?

3. Anything important about tone and language?

4. Can you think of any knowledge that would enhance the source?

SOURCE G

Many worthy individuals and organisations have exposed the evils of sweated labour for women. But the government has done nothing. Men who work in coal mines get an eight hour day. Women working far longer hours in sweated trades work are simply ignored. Why? Because those coal miners have the vote. Women should have political freedom so that something will be done to help women workers win decent treatment in their working lives and a wage which allows them to live a decent and moral life.

From a pamphlet called ‘The Importance of the Vote’ written by Emmeline Pankhurst in 1908.

Sweated labour = low paid work, often done in workers’ own homes.

What does this say about why women wanted the vote?

| Any reasons about pay and conditions | Any other reasons |
1. Can you trust this source? (why)

2. Why was the poster published?

3. Anything important about tone and language?

4. Can you think of any knowledge that would enhance the source?

By this point you should know which ones agree with the question and which ones disagree and which ones do a bit of both. You should have thought about trust, purpose, tone and language and knowledge as well as content.

Now plot on the diagram below which sources agree and which disagree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing frame for Q6 (12 marks)

**Introduction**
Tell me how you are grouping the sources e.g. which agree and which disagree. Do you have more sources that agree or more that disagree?
**Agree paragraph**
Tell me about two sources that say the same thing or agree in the same way and give me evidence from both to prove it (cross-reference) E.g. *Sources A and C suggest that pay and working conditions are more important “…A” and “C” they both agree because...*

**Disagree paragraph**
Tell me about two sources that say the same thing or agree in the same way and give me evidence from both to prove it (cross-reference). E.g. Sources A and C suggest that ?? is more important “…A” and “C” they both disagree because...

Now tell me about one source's **purpose or tone and language**, does this make it **strong** or **weak** (provenance and judgement)

Now tell me about one or two sources and link them to some knowledge
Now tell me about one source’s purpose or tone and language, does this make it strong or weak (provenance)

Now tell me about one or two sources and link them to some knowledge

**Conclusion**
1) Do more sources agree or disagree with the statement
2) Are the larger group of source strong or weak e.g. are they all propaganda or trying to convince people
3) In the end which source is the strongest for answering the question and why
Revision 10: Liberals and the First World War

What to focus on

1. How women contributed to the war effort.
2. How civilians were affected by the war.
3. How effective government propaganda was during the war.
4. To what extent people’s lives were affected by the war.
5. To what extent women’s lives were changed by the war.

The First World War was the first ‘total war’ - the whole nation had to be mobilised to fight. Men joined the army while women took over their jobs, but was this change lasting or a temporary effect of total war?

The population at home - the basics

People in Britain were affected by six main ways:

1. Recruitment - there was a huge poster campaign to get people to join up, and the government had to introduce conscription in 1916. Conscientious objectors could be imprisoned. Women were recruited into the armed forces as nurses, drivers, cooks and telephonists.
2. The Defence of the Realm Act (DORA) - this was passed in August 1914. DORA allowed the government to take over the coal mines, railways and shipping. Lloyd George became Minister of Munitions and set up state-run munitions factories. The government worked with the trade unions to prevent strikes.
3. Reduced workforce - there were fewer workers because so many men left to join the army.
4. Rationing - a fixed allowance for sugar, meat, butter, jam and tea was introduced in 1918. British Summer Time was also introduced to give more daylight working hours.
5. Propaganda - newspaper and soldiers' letters were censored. "The Tribunal" (a pacifist newspaper) was shut down, and lies were made up about German atrocities. Posters encouraged morale. The film "The Somme" was a semi-successful attempt at using film for propaganda because the graphic nature of actually seeing the men die upset many viewers.
6. Civilian casualties - 57 zeppelin bombing raids after 1915, and the German navy shelled Hartlepool, Whitby and Scarborough.

Recruitment

- On the outbreak of war in August 1914, Britain had 247,432 regular troops. About 120,000 of these were in the British Expeditionary Army and the rest were stationed abroad. It was clear that more soldiers would be needed to defeat the German Army.
- On 7th August, 1914, Lord Kitchener, the war minister, immediately began a recruiting campaign by calling for men aged between 19 and 30 to join the British Army. At first this was very successful with an average of 33,000 men joining every day. Three weeks later Kitchener raised the recruiting age to 35 and by the middle of September over 500,000 men had volunteered their services.
At the beginning of the war the army had strict specifications about who could become soldiers. Men joining the army had to be at least 5ft 6in tall and a chest measurement of 35 inches. By May 1915 soldiers only had to be 5ft 3in and the age limit was raised to 40. In July the army agreed to the formation of ‘Bantam’ battalions, composed of men between 5ft and 5ft 3in in height.

DORA

On 8th August 1914, the House of Commons passed the Defence of the Realm Act (DORA) without debate. The legislation gave the government executive powers to suppress published criticism, imprison without trial and to commandeering economic resources for the war effort.

The Defence of the Realm Act (DORA) of 1914 governed all lives in Britain during World War One. The Defence of the Realm Act was added to as the war progressed and it listed everything that people were not allowed to do in time of war. As World War One evolved, so DORA evolved. The first version of the Defence of the Realm Act was introduced on August 8th 1914. This stated that:

- no-one was allowed to talk about naval or military matters in public places
- no-one was allowed to spread rumours about military matters
- no-one was allowed to buy binoculars
- no-one was allowed to trespass on railway lines or bridges
- no-one was allowed to melt down gold or silver
- no-one was allowed to light bonfires or fireworks
- no-one was allowed to give bread to horses, horses or chickens
- no-one was allowed to use invisible ink when writing abroad
- no-one was allowed to buy brandy or whisky in a railway refreshment room
- no-one was allowed to ring church bells
- the government could take over any factory or workshop
- the government could try any civilian breaking these laws
- the government could take over any land it wanted to
- the government could censor newspapers

As the war continued and evolved, the government introduced more acts to DORA.

- the government introduced British Summer Time to give more daylight for extra work
- opening hours in pubs were cut
- beer was watered down
- customers in pubs were not allowed to buy a round of drinks

DORA was also used to control civilian behaviour. This including regulating alcohol consumption and food supplies.

In October 1915 the British government announced several measures they believed would reduce alcohol consumption.

A ‘No Treating Order’ laid down that people could not buy alcoholic drinks for other people.

Public House opening times were also reduced to 12.00 noon to 2.30 pm and 6.30 to 9.30 pm. Before the law was changed, public houses could open from 5 am in the morning to 12.30 pm at night.

In 1916 the Clyde Workers’ Committee journal, The Worker, was prosecuted under the Defence of the Realm Act for an article criticizing the war. William Gallacher
and John Muir, the editor were both found guilty and sent to prison. Gallacher for six months and Muir for a year.

- The Clyde Workers' Committee was formed to campaign against the Munitions Act, which forbade engineers from leaving the works where they were employed. On 25th March 1916, David Kirkwood and other members of the Clyde Workers' Committee were arrested by the authorities under the Defence of the Realm Act. Then men were court-martialled and sentenced to be deported from Glasgow.
- The growing disillusionment with the war was reflected in the novels that were written at the time. A. T. Fitzroy's Despised and Rejected was published in April 1918. A thousand copies were sold before the book was banned and its publisher, C. W. Daniel, was successfully prosecuted for sedition. Another novel, What Not: A Prophetic Comedy by Rose Macaulay was due to be published in the autumn of 1918. When the censors discovered that the book ridiculed wartime bureaucracy, its publication was stopped and did not appear until after the Armistice.

Rationing

- Soon after the outbreak of the First World War the German Navy attempted to halt the flow of imports to Britain by introducing unrestricted submarine warfare.
- By the end of 1916, U-German boats were on average destroying about 300,000 tons of shipping a month. In February 1917, the German Navy sank 230 ships bringing food and other supplies to Britain. The following month a record 507,001 tons of shipping was lost as a result of the U-boat campaign.
- However, Britain was successful at increasing food production and the wheat harvest of 1917 was the best in our history.
- Potatoes were often in short-supply and sugar was often difficult to get. Whereas the weekly consumption of sugar was 1.49 lb in 1914, it fell to 0.93 lb in 1918. The consumption of butchers' meat also dropped from an average of 2.36 to 1.53 lb a week during this period.
- At the end of 1917 people began to fear that the country was running out of food.
- Panic buying led to shortages and so in January 1918, the Ministry of Food decided to introduce rationing.
- Sugar was the first to be rationed and this was later followed by butchers' meat.
- The idea of rationing food was to guarantee supplies, not to reduce consumption. This was successful and official figures show that the intake of calories almost kept up to the pre-war level.

Civilian Casualties

- In January 1915, two Zeppelin naval airships 190 metres long, flew over the east coast of England and bombed great Yarmouth and King's Lynn. The first Zeppelin raid on London took place on 31st May 1915. The raid killed 28 people and injured 60 more.
- Many places suffered from Zeppelin raids included Edinburgh, Gravesend, Sunderland, the Midlands and the Home Counties. By the end of May 1916 at least 550 British civilians had been killed by German Zeppelins.
Zeppelins could deliver successful long-range bombing attacks, but were extremely vulnerable to attack and bad weather. British fighter pilots and anti-aircraft gunners became very good at bringing down Zeppelins. A total of 115 Zeppelins were used by the German military, of which, 77 were either destroyed or so damaged they could not be used again. In June 1917 the German military stopped using Zeppelins for bombing raids over Britain.

At first Germany used Zeppelins to bomb Britain. However, these were fairly easy to shoot down so in June 1917 Germany began sending the long-range bomber, the Gotha G-V, to Britain.

The Gotha, with its giant wingspan (24 metres), was easy to identify and at first created considerable panic in those towns under attack. In the first raid over Folkestone, the Gotha bombing raid killed 95 people and wounded 195 more. This raid caused more casualties than any of the Zeppelin attacks that had taken place in the early stages of the war.

The British used searchlights, anti-aircraft guns and fighter aircraft and balloon barrages against the Gotha attacks. By the middle of 1918 a 51 mile long (82 km) balloon barrage was established around London. The balloons were arranged in groups of three which were interconnected by means of steel cable from which a number of light cables of about 1,000 ft (300 metres) length hung vertically. This net barrage was mounted so high that enemy aircraft arriving to attack would have difficulties in flying above it.

A total of 61 Gotha G-V aircraft were lost over Britain between September 1917 and May 1918. Germany decided to abandon the policy of bombing Britain and for the rest of the war the Gotha G-V was used over the Western Front.

**Propaganda - what did it do?**

- Propaganda was not just about finding recruits; it was designed to make people believe in certain ideas and viewpoints and to think in certain ways. The posters shown below are examples of propaganda used by the government to encourage men to join the army.

- In 1914 David Lloyd George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was given the task of setting up a British War Propaganda Bureau (WPB). Lloyd George, appointed the successful writer and fellow Liberal MP, Charles Masterman as head of the organization. The WPB arranged for journalists like Bottomley to visit the Western Front.

- It has been calculated that Horatio Bottomley addressed twenty recruiting meetings and 340 "patriotic war lectures". Although he had been highly critical of the government, at the meetings he always stated: "When the country is at war, it is the duty of every patriot to say: My country right or wrong; My government good or bad."

- During the first few months of the war the War Propaganda Bureau published pamphlets such as the Report on Alleged German Outrages, that gave credence to the idea that the German Army had systematically tortured Belgian civilians. Other pamphlets published by the WPB that helped with recruitment included To Arms! (Arthur Conan Doyle), The Barbarism in Berlin (G. K. Chesterton), The New Army (Rudyard Kipling) and Liberty, A Statement of the British Case (Arnold Bennett).
The British government also began a successful poster campaign. Artists such as Saville Lumley, Alfred Leete, Frank Brangwyn and Norman Lindsay, produced a series of posters urging men to join the British Army. The desire to fight continued into 1915 and by the end of that year some two million men had volunteered their services.

Propaganda was used in World War One as in any war - and the truth suffered. Propaganda ensured that the people only got to know what their governments wanted them to know. In World War One, the lengths to which governments would go to in an effort to blacken the enemy’s name reached a new level.

To ensure that everybody thought in the way the government wanted, all forms of information were controlled. Newspapers were expected to print what the government wanted the reader to read. In fact, though this would appear to be a form of censorship, the newspapers of Britain, effectively controlled by the media barons of the time, were happy to play ball. They printed headlines that were designed to stir up emotions regardless of whether they were accurate or not. The most infamous headlines included:

- “Belgium child’s hands cut off by Germans”
- “Germans crucify Canadian officer”

These were designed to develop and strengthen the current of hatred that was already engendered in Britain. The same thing was done in Germany – untrue headlines were tolerated and even encouraged by the German authorities. Some headlines were:

- “French doctors infect German wells with plague germs”
- “German prisoners blinded by Allied captors”

One of the most infamous stories that went around was adapted the further it got from the Western Front. The story went from monks in Antwerp being forced to ring bells to celebrate the Germans occupation of the city to the monks refusing to do this and being tied to the clappers of the bells and being used as human clappers – and being killed. It was all nonsense but to the minds of the British, where the story all but ended, it seemed to encapsulate the evil of the Germans and justify why the fight was going on. The one thing that suffered in the war was the truth. There were numerous stories in Britain of German soldiers parading round Belgium towns with babies on their bayonets.

However, the media was used for other purposes. British newspapers published casualty figures that were acceptable to the government but less than accurate. British success in battles was emphasised as opposed to the minimal gains actually made. All countries were guilty of this. Parisians did not know about the danger Verdun was in during the initial stages of the German attack despite being just 150 miles from the city. The French authorities simply clamped down on the truth. Anybody caught spreading the truth regarding Verdun was liable for arrest as an agent provocateur.

No British newspaper described the scenes at Victoria Station when carriages of wounded soldiers arrived back in London - but very late at night or in the early hours of the morning in an effort to blot out the sheer numbers lost in battle - be it Ypres or the Somme.
In Britain the Defence of the Realm Act listed things that correspondents could write about but more important, could not write about. What they could not write about included
  - the number of British troops and where they were in a particular part of the war front
  - plans for any future action
  - movement of ships
  - information about munitions

Conscientious objectors

Conscientious objectors were people who simply did not want to fight in World War One. Conscientious objectors became known as ‘conscies’ or C.O’s and they were a sign that not everybody was as enthusiastic about the war as the government would have liked.

Battles such as Ypres and the Somme had cost Britain a vast number of casualties. By 1916, volunteers to join the British Army were starting to dry up. In response to this, the government introduced conscription in 1916 - where the law stated that you had to serve your country in the military for a certain period of time. A ‘conscience clause’ was added whereby those who had a “conscientious objection to bearing arms” were freed from military service.

There were several types of conscientious objector.

1. Some were pacifists who were against war in general.
2. Some were political objectors who did not consider the government of Germany to be their enemy
3. Some were religious objectors who believed that war and fighting was against their religion. Groups in this section were the Quakers and Jehovah Witnesses.
4. A combination of any of the above groups.

Some conscientious objectors did not want to fight but were keen to ‘do their bit’. These people were willing to help in weapons factories and some went to the trenches to become stretcher bearers etc., though not to fight. Other C.O’s refused to do anything that involved the war - these were known as ‘absolutists’.

By the end of 1915, the British Army had lost 528,227 killed, wounded or missing presumed dead. Volunteers to ‘Kitchener’s Army’ had dried up and conscription was introduced. The whole issue of conscription was a thorny issue even in the army.

In 1916 the Military Service Act was introduced - this was soon nicknamed the "Batchelor's Bill" as to start with conscription only included unmarried men between 18 and 41. But it was widened in May 1916 to include married men as well. By April 1918, it had been expanded to include men up to 51.

However, the act also included a ‘conscience clause’ which allowed people the right to refuse to join up if it went against their beliefs. Those who claimed to be conscientious objectors had to face a tribunal to argue their case as to why they should not be called up to join the army. However, even this clause was not enough for some who wanted the act withdrawn in full. The No-Conscription Fellowship was founded as early as 1914.
The No-Conscription Fellowship was an organisation made up by members of the Socialist Independent Labour Party and the Quakers. The men who signed the above leaflet were Clifford Allen, Edward Grubb, A Fenner Brockway, W J Chamberlain, W H Ayles, Morgan Jones, A Barratt Brown, John Fletcher, C H Norman and Rev. Leyton Richards. All charged under the Defence of the Realm Act. They were all fined; those who decided not to pay the fine were sent to prison.

The Shell Crisis of 1915

- The Shell Crisis of 1915 was a shortage of artillery shells on the front lines of World War I that led to a political crisis in Britain.
- Lack of shells had been a serious problem since autumn 1914, and the British Commander-in-Chief Field Marshal Sir John French gave an interview to The Times (27 March) calling for more ammunition. Lord Northcliffe, the owner of The Times and the Daily Mail, blamed Kitchener (Secretary of State for War) for the recent death in action of his nephew. On the basis of an assurance from Kitchener, Asquith stated in a speech at Newcastle (20 April) that the army had sufficient ammunition.
- The Times headline (14 May 1915) was: "Need for shells: British attacks checked: Limited supply the cause: A Lesson from France". It commented "We had not sufficient high explosives to lower the enemy's parapets to the ground ... The want of an unlimited supply of high explosives was a fatal bar to our success". This clearly pointed the finger of blame at the government.
- The shortage was widely publicized in the press. The Times, in cooperation with David Lloyd George and Lord Northcliffe sought to force Parliament to adopt a national munitions policy with a strong leader at the head.
- The upshot was a coalition government with Lloyd George as Minister of Munitions. In 1916 the long-term effects included the fall of the Asquith government and his replacement by Lloyd George in December 1916.

Minister of Munitions

- Following the creation of the Ministry of Munitions, new munitions factories began to be built across the country for the large scale production of munitions needed on the Front line.
- However, the construction of these factories took time and in order to ensure that there was no delay in the production of munitions to deal with the Shell Crisis, the Government turned to the Railway Companies of Great Britain to manufacture materials of war. Railway companies were well placed to manufacture munitions and other war materials, with their large Locomotive and Carriage works and skilled labourers, and by the end of 1915 collectively the railway companies were producing between 1,000 and 5,000 6-in. H.E. Shells per week.
- The Munitions of War Act 1915 prevented the resignation of munitions workers without their employer's consent. It was a recognition that the whole economy would have to be geared for war if the Allies were to prevail on the Western Front.
How did women help the war effort?

1. Recruitment - women were recruited as nurses into the Voluntary Aid Detachments (VADs) or First Aid Nursing Yeomanry (FANY), and as drivers, cooks and telephonists into the WAAC, WRNS and WRAF.
2. DORA - many women ‘munitionettes’ worked in the government’s munitions factories.
3. Reduced workforce - women took on traditional men’s jobs and became firemen, coalmen and bus conductors.
4. Rationing - the main burden of coping fell on mothers. The Women’s Land Army helped with agricultural production.

Women and the First World War

- On 4th August, 1914, Britain declared war on Germany.
- Two days later the NUWSS announced that it was suspending all political activity until the war was over.
- The leadership of the WSPU began negotiating with the British government. On the 10th August the government announced it was releasing all suffragettes from prison. In return, the WSPU agreed to end their militant activities and help the war effort. The Women's Freedom League disagreed and continued with its campaign for the vote.
- As men left jobs to fight overseas, they were replaced by women. Octavia Wilberforce and Louisa Martindale from Brighton worked as doctors treating wounded British soldiers.
- Women filled many jobs brought into existence by wartime needs. As a result the number of women employed increased from 3,224,600 in July, 1914 to 4,814,600 in January 1918.
- Nearly 200,000 women were employed in government departments. Half a million became clerical workers in private offices. Women worked as conductors on trams and buses.
- A quarter of a million worked on the land. The greatest increase of women workers was in engineering.
- Over 700,000 of these women worked in the highly dangerous munitions industry. Industries that had previously excluded women now welcomed them.
- There was a particular demand for women to do heavy work such as unloading coal, stoking furnaces and building ships.

- By 1914 nearly 5.09 million out of the 23.8 million women in Britain were working. Thousands worked in munitions factories, offices and large hangars used to build aircraft. Women were also involved in knitting socks for the soldiers on the front, as well as other voluntary work, but as a matter of survival women had to work for paid employment for the sake of their families. Many women worked as volunteers serving at the Red Cross, encouraged the sale of war bonds or planted “victory gardens”.
- Not only did women have to keep “the home fires burning” but they took on voluntary and paid employment that was diverse in scope and showed that women were highly capable in diverse fields of endeavour. There is little doubt this
expanded the view of the role of women in society and changed the outlook of what women could do and their place in the workforce.

- Although women were still paid less than men in the workforce, women's equality were starting to arise as women were now getting paid two-thirds of the typical pay for men.

**Working Women**

- During World War I; many women were able to participate on the home front supporting the men who had gone out to fight. They were given the opportunity to help as nurses, teachers, textiles makers, coal miners and clothing, but the largest area in which the women worked was in the munitions factories.

- Munitions factories were there to produce supplies for the men on the front including tailoring, metal trades, chemical and explosives, food trades, hosiery and woollen and worsted industries.

- The reason for so many women joining the munitions factories and other parts of the war effort was mixed between the sense of patriotism felt for working and helping their fathers, brothers and husbands fighting, or they joined because the wages received were doubled of what they had previously made (although was still less than that of a man’s).

- The women working in these munitions factories were called **Munitionettes** and the work in which these women did was long, tiring and exhausting as well as dangerous and hazardous to their health.

- The women working in munitions factories were from mainly lower-class families and were between the ages of 18 to 30 years old. A lot of the work these women did consisted of making gun shells, explosives, aircraft and other materials that supplied the war at the front which was dangerous and repetitive work because they were constantly around and encased in toxic fumes as well has handling dangerous machinery and explosives. They were to handle these explosives and chemicals with little training, yet expected to make them quickly and efficiently so the weapons could be shipped off to the men at war.

- There were different groups in which were essential to the production of getting the weaponry out to the men. Each group was important in the making of munitions as each had their own particular job such as putting the cordite into the shells, another group was to put together the fuses and so on. This was very repetitive work and it was important to be very careful when handling these because explosions and unexpected gun fire was at all times possible putting themselves and others at risk.

- Not only was the work stressful and dangerous but the amount in which the women worked contributed to the difficulty of their jobs. The women would work long twelve hour shifts, six or seven days a week and at times would be expected to work over night. These long days in the factories were difficult on the lives of the women because it affected their home lives, especially those with children at home and were expected fulfill their wifely duties. This could be considered double work as they would work all day, to go home and maintain the house, this was exhausting and the women got very little sleep and were worked very hard. The lack of sleep was supplementary to the harms of the chemicals of the factories took a toll on the health of the women.
The factories all over Britain in which women worked were often unheated, deafeningly noisy, and full of noxious fumes and other dangers, therefore the conditions in which they worked under were not exactly benefiting their health. The factories also had very little ventilation for the chemicals and fumes to escape from trapping all of the chemicals in and creating a very toxic environment.

Explosives and guns rely on chemical reactions to work, therefore if the women because dealing with many chemicals and hazardous materials in order to create these weapons being exposed to the harshness of these chemicals without being properly protected increased the chances of illness.

Being enclosed in the chemicals some of the common diseases and illness which occurred were drowsiness, headaches, eczema, loss of appetite, cyanosis, shortness of breath, vomiting, anaemia, palpitation, bile stained urine, constipation, rapid weak pules, pains in the limbs and jaundice and mercury poisoning. Jaundice was caused from working with sulphur which was used in the making of explosives because it is found in TNT and other such explosives. Jaundice with along with other affects makes the skin turn into a yellowish hue, this yellowing of the skin created the term canary girls.

**Canary girls** were a popular name for the women working in munitions factories because many had yellow skin as a result of jaundice. Another discoloration of the skin found from working in the factories is cyanosis; this is the ashen gray and livid color of the lips.

Although the women were at a high risk of getting diseases and illnesses, the women would go home at night to their children and would have these chemicals on them and attached to them carrying them home and putting their families at risk of health problems as well, especially to those women who were either pregnant or breast feeding their babies.

Along with health issues there were many obvious dangers of working in munitions factories such as the shells exploding or the fire-arms shooting when they were not supposed to, this was dangerous and many women had died from such instances.

**Women's Military service**

- Nursing became almost the only area of female contribution that involved being at the front and experiencing the war.
- **Queen Alexandra's Royal Army Nursing Corps**
- **First Aid Nursing Yeomanry** - The British army wanted nothing to do with them, so they drove ambulances and ran hospitals and casualty clearing stations for the Belgian and French armies. By the Armistice, they had been awarded many decorations for bravery, including 17 Military Medals, 1 Legion d'Honneur and 27 Croix de Guerre.
- **Voluntary Aid Detachment** - The organisation was founded in 1909 with the help of the Red Cross and Order of St. John. By the summer of 1914 there were over 2,500 Voluntary Aid Detachments in Britain. Each individual volunteer was called a detachment, or simply a VAD. Of the 74,000 VADs in 1914, two-thirds were women.
and girls. At the outbreak of the First World War VADs eagerly offered their service to the war effort. The British Red Cross was reluctant to allow civilian women a role in overseas hospitals: most VADs were of the middle and upper classes and unaccustomed to hardship and traditional hospital discipline. Military authorities would not accept VADs at the front line.

- Katharine Furse took two VADs to France in October 1914, restricting them to serve as canteen workers and cooks. Caught under fire in a sudden battle the VADs were pressed into emergency hospital service and acquitted themselves well. The growing shortage of trained nurses opened the door for VADs in overseas military hospitals. Furse was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the VAD and restrictions were removed. Female volunteers over the age of twenty-three and with more than three months' hospital experience were accepted for overseas service.
- VADs were an uneasy addition to military hospitals' rank and order. They lacked the advanced skill and discipline of professional trained nurses and were often critical of the nursing profession. Relations improved as the war stretched on: VADs increased their skill and efficiency and trained nurses were more accepting of the VADs' contributions. During four years of war 38,000 VADs worked in hospitals and served as ambulance drivers and cooks. VADs served near the Western Front and in Mesopotamia and Gallipoli. VAD hospitals were also opened in most large towns in Britain.
- Later, VADs were also sent to the Eastern Front. They provided an invaluable source of bedside aid in the war effort. Many were decorated for distinguished service.
- More than 12,000 women enlisted in the United States Navy and Marine Corps during the First World War. About 400 of them died in that war.

**Land Army**

- The Women's Land Army was first created during World War One. This was an era when a great deal of farm work was done by men. With so many young men called up for the armed services, there was a real gap in farm workers.
- The women in the WLA did all the jobs that were required to make a farm function normally - threshing, ploughing, tractor driving, reclaiming land, drainage etc. Their wages were set by the Agricultural Wages Board. The wage for someone in the WLA over the age of 18 was £1 12 pence a week after deductions had been made for lodgings and food. There was an agreed maximum working week - 50 hours in the summer and 48 hours in the winter.
- A normal week would consist of five and a half days working with Saturday afternoon and Sunday off. Along with their weekly pay, all members of the WLA who was posted more than 20 miles from their home would receive a free rail warrant for a visit home every six months.
- However, their pay came from the farmers themselves and there is evidence that WLA members were paid less than the accepted rate by some farmers who tended to overcharge for accommodation and food. Also during harvest time, many WLA members worked from dawn to dusk and easily eclipsed their 50 hour week.
Women and the Vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSPU</th>
<th>NUWSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Surprisingly the Suffragettes and the Government worked well together to encourage women to go out to work.</td>
<td>• Millicent Fawcett supported the war effort. But she opposed conscription and the giving of white feathers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Britain in 1915 was very short of workers and there was a desperate shortage in factories and on farms</td>
<td>• The NUWSS set up an employment register in 1915 to help recruit women into the work place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The WSPU funds and organisation was used to help the government. In 1915 they organised the ‘Women’s Right to Serve’ march.</td>
<td>• It ran training schools to train women e.g. in Notting Hill they trained women to be welders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They became very patriotic and renamed their paper Britannia</td>
<td>• It organised hospital units on the front lines – these units employed all female teams of doctors, nurses and ambulance drivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUT not all suffragettes agreed with this approach. Sylvia Pankhurst was a pacifists and she formed a breakaway group which criticised the war. BUT meetings were still held and petitions signed and this ensured that the pressure was kept on Parliament.

After the war, men took back their jobs and most women returned to the family. However, the War did bring about political and social changes: 

- **Political** - women over 30 years old got the vote in 1918. Women over 21 years old got the vote in 1928. Women were also allowed to stand for election as MPs, but there were only eight women MPs in 1923.

- **Social** - women became more liberated. Short skirts and short hair became fashionable and many women smoked in public.

- World War One played a significant part in developing women’s political rights - so it is frequently assumed. However, World War One may well have stymied the drive by women to gain political rights or its part may have been overstated.

- On June 19th 1917, the House of Commons voted by 385 to 55 to accept the **Representation of the People Bill’s** women’s suffrage clause. Suffragists were astonished by the margin of support given to them by the still all-male Commons. There had been no guarantee that the bill would be passed, as government whips were not used in the vote. To try to ensure that the bill was passed, Suffragists were encouraged to contact their MP’s to support the bill. On the day that the vote was taken in the House of Commons, members of the NUWSS made sure that known supporters of the bill did not leave the House until the vote had been taken. Clearly, the strategies used by the Suffragists were important when the size of the support given to the bill is taken into account. The huge majority of 330 was to play an important part when it came to the bill moving to the House of Lords.
Why did women get the vote?

- It is generally assumed that the House of Commons was in favour of supporting the bill, as they were very appreciative of the work done by women in the First World War. The work done by women during the war was vital but its importance to the passing of the bill may have been overstated. Historians such as Martin Pugh believe that the vote in favour of female suffrage was simply a continuation of the way the issue had been moving before the war had started in 1914.

- In 1911 there had been a similar vote to the one in 1917. Of the 194 MP’s who voted for the bills in both 1911 and 1917, only 22 had changed their stance: 14 had changed to being in favour of female suffrage and 4 changed from being for female suffrage in 1911 to being against it in 1917. This leaves a difference of only 14 - a long way off of the 330 majority of 1917.

- Therefore, it seems likely that the direction Parliament seemed to be moving in before August 1914 was a significant factor in the 1918 Representation of the People Act. The activities of the Suffragists and Suffragettes pre-1914, therefore, may well have been more important at a political level than the work done by women in the war. As an example, in France, women did important war work in industry and agriculture, but they did not get any form of political suffrage after the war. However, in France there was no history of a women’s movement for political rights before the war.

- It is also possible that Parliament was very conscious of the fact that the militancy pre-1914 might return after the war had ended in 1918. What would be the public reaction to the arrest of women who had done important work for the nation during the war simply for wanting political rights after it? Would those women who had not supported the Suffragettes or Suffragists before the war, be driven into their corner after 1918 if Parliament did not recognise the importance of political rights for women? Along with this was the fear of social and political upheaval as seen in Russia with the overthrow of the tsar in February 1917 followed by the Bolshevik take-over of Russia in October 1917. Could Parliament even vaguely risk such unrest in Britain?

- Therefore, while the work of women in the war should not be understated (if only that it got some men on their side), other reasons are also important in explaining why the 1918 Act was passed. A continuation of the way things were going pre-1914 is an important factor as was the fear of social and political unrest in the aftermath of what had happened in Russia.

- Ironically, while the war is credited by some as being the factor in pushing Parliament to introducing the 1918 Act, it may well have hindered the progress of female suffrage.
From 1910 to 1913, two issues dominated British politics: the clash between the Lords and the House of Commons and the continuing rise of militancy by the Suffragettes. The death of Emily Wilding Davison at the Derby in 1913 seemed to many to show that the very fabric of society was at risk as this was seen as a direct attack on the royal family. With churches and politicians attacked, a bomb being placed in Westminster Abbey etc. many feared that the violence of the Suffragettes would get worse.

Alongside this, however, was the work done by the Suffragists. They did not approve of the violence that was seemingly commonplace in Britain then. Movements such as the NUWSS and the ELFS had won support among a large number of MP’s who supported their stance. Famous MP’s such as Sir John Simon and David Lloyd George seemed to offer their support. The Prime Minister, Herbert Asquith, had met members of the NUWSS and the ELFS. There seems to have been a climate developing post – 1910 that was reasonably positive towards the Suffragists, if not the Suffragettes. It is possible that there would have been some form of female political representation before it actually happened in 1918, but the war took over. However, there had been seemingly positive negotiations between the Suffragists and the government before which had come to nothing.

All the government’s and country’s efforts were absorbed by the war. Emmeline Pankhurst told her supporters to support the war effort and the violence of the Suffragettes disappeared.
What you need to know

1) Why did the Government need to encourage men to join?
2) How did the government deal with shortages?
3) Why was there a split between the Liberals during the war?
4) What role did Lloyd-George play as Minister for Munitions and the Prime Minister?
5) How did the government deal with people who did not want to fight?
6) How did women contribute to the war effort?
7) To what extent was the war the reason women got the vote?

When writing answers for paper two you need to know that you are expected to:

5) Respond to the argument in the question
6) Exam the content of the sources (Content)
7) Analyse the source for key skills (provenance)
   a. Purpose
   b. Motive
   c. Tone
   d. Language
   e. Reliability
   f. Cross-reference
8) Provide supporting knowledge that helps you understand and put the source in its context (Knowledge)
Mark Scheme

Level 2
Focus on context of source with no valid comment on message or purpose 2 marks
  Example: The government published the poster because in 1915 there was no conscription.

Level 3
Secondary message or partial main message of source OR Treats the message as information or argues that purpose is to provide information 3-4 marks
  Example: The poster is saying you should feel guilty if you are not in the army. OR The government published the poster to show all different types of people were helping out with the war effort in 1915.

Level 4
Main message of source - that all of the British people are needed for the war effort 5 marks
  Example: The government is saying that the whole population should join in the war effort.

Level 5
Identifies or explains partial purpose – mobilising one section of society into military service or war work 6 marks
  Example: The government published this poster in order to get women to work in munitions factories. OR The government published this poster to get men to join the army.

Level 6
Explains purpose – mobilising all of society into military service or war work 7 marks
  Example: The government published this poster to get the whole population to join in the war effort.

Level 7
Explains purpose in specific context of 1915 8 marks
  (Must explain purpose as L6 but then use relevant context of 1915 eg either munitions crisis or recruitment situation to explain why poster specifically published in 1915)
  Example: The government published this poster to get the whole population to join in the war effort. The First World War was a total war and it needed the whole population to win it. In 1915 the country had a munitions crisis and was short of shells. Posters like this were designed to get people to join munitions factories.
Question 2 January 2013
Study Sources B and C. Which of these sources do you trust more about the attitudes of British people at this time? Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

SOURCE B

Many difficulties facing the recruitment drive have been tackled and I judge that on the whole the campaign has been a success overall. But we have not achieved the numbers we wanted. It may be that some compulsion is the only answer, however unpleasant that may be.

The chief difficulty in getting volunteers has been the question of who should and should not join up. Parents and relations cannot understand why their sons, husbands, or brothers should join while other young men hold back and gain well-paid jobs at home.

It is not lack of courage or belief in our cause that is stopping men joining up. The country as a whole is determined to support you, our Prime Minister, in your promise to defeat Germany. There is plenty of evidence that the country is determined to see the war through to a successful end. The country will, in my judgement, accept the introduction of conscription under these circumstances.

A report written by Lord Derby to other ministers in the government in December 1915. Lord Derby was the government minister in charge of recruiting.

SOURCE C

Dear Sir

We understand that next Tuesday, Parliament may discuss the issue of conscription as a result of the failure of Lord Derby’s recent recruiting campaign to gain enough recruits for the Army.

We feel we must point out that any system of conscription for the purpose of carrying on war is against our religious and conscientious beliefs. We will not take part in the slaughter of our fellow men. Nor can we undertake any alternative form of service. We will remain true to our conviction whatever Parliament decides on this immensely controversial issue.

We must also warn you that there is much concern in the country against conscription and you will face considerable opposition.

A letter from the No Conscription Fellowship to the government written in December 1915.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRUST</th>
<th>CAN’T TRUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT THAT SHOWS CAN TRUST (CROSS-REFERENCE THEM)</td>
<td>CONTENT THAT PROVES CAN’T TRUST (CROSS-REFERENCE THEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B AND C COULD BE TRUSTED BECAUSE...</td>
<td>B AND C COULD NOT BE TRUSTED BECAUSE...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVENANCE HELPS EXPLAIN TRUST (motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
<td>PROVENANCE HELPS EXPLAIN CAN’T TRUST (motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEN EXAMINING THE PROVENANCE OF THE SOURCES ONE CAN TRUST B AND C BECAUSE...</td>
<td>WHEN EXAMINING THE PROVENANCE OF THE SOURCES ONE CANNOT TRUST B AND C BECAUSE...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN TRUST THIS IS SUPPORTED BY.... (DATE/AUTHOR/EVENTS)</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN TRUST THIS IS SUPPORTED BY.... (DATE/AUTHOR/EVENTS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level 2
Selects details and asserts that these can be trusted (or not) OR Undeveloped generalised comments about provenance 2 MARKS
Example: I trust Source B more because I know parents did question why some men went and others didn’t. OR I trust Source C more because it is a letter from the time and people would have known what their own attitudes were.

Level 3
Undeveloped provenance specific to Sources B or C 3 MARKS
Example: I trust Source B because it was from the minister who was in charge of recruiting so he would know what people’s attitudes were like.

Level 4
Internal testing of content of B or C 4 MARKS
Example: I do not really trust Source B because he contradicts himself. He says that on the whole the voluntary campaign has been successful but at the same time he says there needs to be compulsion. OR I trust Source C because it says that Lord Derby’s recruitment campaign failed and even Lord Derby in B says he hasn’t got enough recruits.

Level 5
Uses cross reference to other sources (ie other than B or C) or context to test details in source 5 MARKS
Example: Source B tells us that the recruitment drive was successful on the whole. I do not trust this as I know that by January 1916 they had to bring in conscription because there were not enough volunteers. OR I do trust Source C because some people were pacifists. Source D tells us about a pacifist meeting in Wales in 1916.

Level 6
Uses cross reference to other sources or context to test what source(s) say about attitudes 6-7 MARKS
Example: I trust Source B more about what people thought. When the war broke out there were huge demonstrations supporting the war and thousands of young men volunteered to join up. So when Source B says people support the Prime Minister he is right.

Level 7
Uses purpose of source(s) to argue that one source represents attitudes in Britain more 8 MARKS
Example: I trust Source B because Source C is unreliable. Source C claims that there is much concern in the country but this is from a pacifist organisation which is opposed to conscription so they will be trying to intimidate the government.
Study Source D
How far are you surprised by this source? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surprising.</th>
<th>Not Surprising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVENANCE THAT IS SIMILAR (motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
<td>PROVENANCE THAT IS DIFFERENT (motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN SIMILARITY</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SOURCE D**

PACIFIST CONFERENCE BROKEN UP IN SOUTH WALES STORMING OF MEETING HALL.
(From Our Special Correspondent.)

Cardiff has been the site of a famous victory for patriotism over disloyal pacifists. It was won in a fair fight by the working people of Cardiff and Cardiff is very proud of the result.

Yesterday afternoon the peacemongers assembled together to pressure the government to take actions which would harm the vital interests of their country. A great mass of loyal citizens was unable to contain their rage and stormed the hall where the pacifists were meeting. For the most part, the police only looked on as spectators. The city put to fight the traitors and at the same time secured its own fair fame as the great industrial and loyal capital of Wales.

*From a newspaper report published in Britain in 1916.*
Study Sources E and F. 
How far does Source E prove that Source F is wrong? Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

A Cartoon published in 1916

SOURCE F

MAINTAINING COAL PRODUCTION

There have been major obstacles in maintaining production under war conditions. There have been difficulties in finding enough men to work in the mines as well as disputes between miners and their employers.

Another difficulty is absenteeism. Absenteeism generally tends to increase when wages rise and so men take days off work. Appeals to the patriotism of miners and other workers have helped to some extent. Nevertheless, there is still a regrettable amount of absenteeism. Up to 20% of working days are lost in some mines.

In these difficult circumstances it is regrettable that coal prices have risen and there have been shortages, but it cannot be avoided.

From a report by the Minister of Labour in 1916.

Absenteeism = taking time off work without a good reason.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source E does prove that Source F is wrong</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source E does not prove that Source F is wrong</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>CONTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVENANCE THAT DOES PROVE (motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
<td>PROVENANCE THAT DOES NOT PROVE (motive/purpose/tone/language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN F WRONG</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE THAT HELPS EXPLAIN F NOT WRONG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW FAR DOES Source E prove that Source F is wrong…
Study Source G
What is the message of the cartoonist? Use details of the source and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

A cartoon published in a British magazine in 1917. The Iron Cross was an award given to German soldiers for serving their country well.

MESSAGE

REFERENCE

CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE
Question 6 Study all the sources, A-G.
‘The people of Britain supported the war effort 1914-18.’
How far do the sources in this paper support this statement? Use details from the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing frame for Q6 (12 marks)

Introduction
Tell me how you are grouping the sources e.g. which agree and which disagree. Do you have more sources that agree or more that disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about two sources that say the same thing or agree in the same way and give me evidence from both to prove it (cross-reference) E.g. Sources A and C suggest that the British supported the war effort because... “...A” and “C” they both agree because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now tell me about one sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree paragraph</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now tell me about one sources</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now tell me about one or two sources and link them to some knowledge

---

**Conclusion**

4) Do more sources agree or disagree with the statement  
5) Are the larger group of source strong or weak e.g. are they all propaganda or trying to convince people  
6) In the end which source is the strongest for answering the question and why
How to Tackle the 16 Marker

Advice from the exam board

‘Women were respected in the period 1890-1918.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use your knowledge of British society 1890–1918 and the sources to explain your answer.

1) This question is asking candidates how far they agree with the interpretation, rather than how far the sources support it. This means the candidates should base their answer primarily on knowledge and understanding, and should develop their own arguments.

2) Candidates should try to explain both examples that women were respected and examples that they were not respected.

3) It is still necessary to use the sources in the question paper. They should be used to support the arguments being made.

4) Candidates should reach a conclusion based on analysis and evidence.

Level 6 (14–16 marks)

Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the position of women in the period 1890–1918 to produce a fully developed response that evaluates effectively the interpretation. They make sophisticated use of a range of sources to support their response and demonstrate thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.

I partially agree with this interpretation, however at the beginning of the period, women were not really respected. Very few were properly educated and they did the mostly mundane and low paid jobs. This is why the women in Source A wanted the vote to improve their pay and conditions. Many people believed in ‘separate spheres’, where women should not bother themselves with politics or important issues. Their job was to look after the family. It was believed that women were more prone to hysteria and acting childishly, and were incapable of logical thought. Politicians openly stated this in Parliament, Asquith used this in his reasons for not giving women the vote before 1914. Later, when Suffragettes started their campaign, many of these views of women were reinforced. When Suffragettes burnt down buildings or smashed windows, this was regarded as proof that they were irrational. Men argued that there was no point giving them the vote if they were incapable of understanding political issues as shown in Source C. Even within women’s groups there were many who were disgusted by these actions including the Suffragists and Anti-Suffrage League.

Many of these attitudes changed during the First World War. Both the Suffragettes and the Suffragists stopped their campaign and instead helped the country in the war effort. Women worked in munitions factories as shown in Source D, although we must be careful with this source as it is from a British Newspaper and may be part of the Government’s drive to encourage more women to work in Factories. Source F tells us that women were leaping out of bed at 5:15 in the morning because they were so keen to contribute to the war effort. Some women joined the Women’s Land Army and helped to produce food for the country, while others worked as nurses, mechanics and drivers. Many men were really impressed by women’s contribution to the war effort. They had shown themselves to be sensible and hardworking and capable of doing jobs that previously had been thought of as only jobs that men could do. This earned women a lot of respect and explains why they gained the vote in 1918.

Overall, women were far more respected at the end of the period than at the beginning and so the interpretation is only partially correct. However while this change in attitudes towards women had been quite significant the fact that the vote was not extended to all women, only those over 30 suggests that some negative attitudes towards women did remain.
I partially agree with this interpretation that women were respected. Some of the time they were respected, but some of the time women were not respected. Many women did not get equal opportunities in work or in the law generally, which shows they were not respected. Married women did not have the same rights as their husbands. This was one of the things which the women in Source B were complaining about when they talk about laws on marriage and divorce being unfair. Most of the workers in sweated trades were women. Women were also second class citizens, obviously, because they could not vote for almost all of this period so clearly that was a lack of respect. And when the Suffragettes campaigned for the vote, the newspapers and cartoons treated them with very little respect. They were often shown as ugly women who were only making a fuss because they could not get a husband.

On the other hand women did get some respect. They could vote in local elections and could serve on school boards. Some people even admired the Suffragettes. For example when Emily Davidson was killed she got criticised but her funeral was such an impressive spectacle that one newspaper, The Times, did say how impressed it was. More importantly, women got respect for their work during the First World War. We can see this in Source D. The cartoonist obviously approves of the woman who is just getting on with her work and not asking for the vote. So overall I partially agree with the statement because we can find evidence of women being respected and not respected.
SOURCE E

Unemployment is a national scandal. Over one million ordinary men and women battle daily with the threat of starving. We call for the following measures to be made law immediately:

- Where a workman has registered as unemployed, it shall be the duty of the local unemployment authority to provide work for him, or to provide funds to feed and clothe that person and those depending on him.
- Unemployment authorities shall keep a register of unemployed workers and, as far as possible, offer them work which is best suited to each individual.
- Unemployment authorities should be able to help an unemployed person and any of his dependants to move to another area for work.

Proposals to help the unemployed, published by the Labour Party in 1907.

SOURCE F

CONFIDENTIAL – FOR THE CABINET ONLY

Only a rascal is permanently without a job. But large numbers are unemployed for short periods. At the moment there is inadequate information about where workers are needed and where jobs are available.

Some employers take advantage of this situation. They keep a larger number of workers than they need hanging around their gates. Then they take men on sometimes for only a few hours at a time at starvation level wages.

A system like this smashes households like egg-shells. The worker feels helpless and often turns to drink. If we do not address this issue then the working man will no longer support us.

From a secret report by Winston Churchill, a member of the Liberal government, in 1908. The Cabinet is the name given to the group of senior ministers who run the government.