“BY DINT OF MILD MILITANCY AND UNENDING PUSH”

SELF ACTUALISATION IN THE FIRST WORLD WAR EXPERIENCES OF LOUISA GARRETT ANDERSON AND FLORA MURRAY

by

AMANDA LOUISE MARKWELL

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY BY RESEARCH

School of History and Cultures

College of Arts and Law

University of Birmingham

June 2019

Abstract

Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson and her partner Dr. Flora Murray spent the weeks following the declaration of the First World War calling on their feminist networks for help in forming their own hospital organisation. Tuesday 15th September 1914 found the uniformed women of the newly named Women's Hospital Corps (WHC) at Victoria Station. Here amongst a crowd of friends and well-wishers they awaited embarkation to France. They believed that women had a part to play in defence of their country and that their profession and their experience of the women's suffrage movement had given them the training needed to do so.

This thesis argues that for some women the First World War was a time of self - actualisation. It seeks to challenge the standard approaches to women and the war, suggesting that women proactively shaped their own war and positioned themselves as integral parts of the larger whole rather than passively waiting for the impact of war to reach them. By complicating some of the myths of women and the war it will show that experiences of women led communities and ideas of selfhood had a fundamental impact on the way some women understood and responded to the war.

Dedication

For Lindsey, For Everything.

Acknowledgements

As with everything I do, the writing of this thesis was only achievable due to the love, support and belief from my wife, Lindsey. It's a lot to ask of a person to share their life with two other women for such a long period of time. She has done so with humour, and grace, listening to my ideas and worries, and always reassuring me when I was certain the end would never be in sight. Now that it is, I cannot thank her enough for always being by my side.

I would also like to thank Dr. Mo Moulton for coming with me on this unexpected (for them) project! Their advice has been greatly appreciated and invaluable at times.

Thank you to the Women's Library @LSE and Suffolk Record Office for the accessibility of your archives. Although online documents and archives have made access to some history easier, and this thesis is no exception, there is nothing like holding something your subjects made, or touched to make you feel like you are walking alongside them.

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations

Abbreviations

LSMW	London School of Medicine for Women (also known as the New Hospital)
MRC	Medical Research Council
NUWSS	National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies
RAMC	Royal Army Medical Corps
SWH	Scottish Women's Hospital's
US	United Suffragists
VAD	Voluntary Aid Detachment
WFL	Women's Freedom League
WHC	Women's Hospital Corps
WSPU	Women's Social and Political Union
WTRL	Women's Tax Resistance League

Figure 1: Flora Murray and Louisa Garrett Anderson. Courtesy of the Wellcome Collection.

Introduction

> I am afraid I have not written often enough since I left you on Monday, but the amount of organisation required by our small hospital unit is extraordinary and Dr Murray and I have done it practically by ourselves. We have been working at it continuously for 10 days since the French Red Cross accepted our offer of help and it is lucky we did otherwise it would have been impossible to start on Tuesday.[1]
>
> I was not able to see anything of you my very dear one in the crowd this morning. We are a very gay young party except for Dr M and me and we feel we have a great chance which is a reason for joy. You all gave us a fine send-off…This is just what you would have done at my age. I hope I shall be able to do it half as well as you would have done.[2]

When Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson wrote these words to her mother in September 1914, she and her partner, Dr. Flora Murray, had spent the weeks since the declaration of war calling on their feminist networks for help in forming their own hospital organisation. Tuesday 15th September 1914 found the uniformed women of the newly named Women's Hospital Corps (WHC) at Victoria Station. Here amongst a crowd of friends and well-wishers they awaited embarkation to France to work under the auspices of the French Red Cross. For both Anderson and Murray, it was inconceivable that women doctors would not be needed in this time of crisis. However, as militant suffragists their experience of dealing with the British authorities meant that they had offered their services directly to the French. They believed that women had a part to play in defence of their country and that their profession and their experience of the women's suffrage movement had given them the training needed to do so.

[1] WL 7LGA/2/1/02.Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, c. Sept 1914.
[2] WL 7LGA/2/1/04. Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 15th September 1914.

This thesis seeks to demonstrate that for some women the First World War was a time of self-actualisation and continuity rather than one of disruption and change. It will consider how Anderson and Murray understood and responded to the war. In doing so it aims to suggest that by widening our view and taking women's life experiences into account we can find reasons for women's participation in war. Rather than viewing this period as an isolated historical moment, the continuities we find here widen our understanding of this period. They move us further from the idea of war as change in women's lives, contributing to the expanding scholarship of women during the First World War.

Louisa Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray

Anderson was born into a women's movement dynasty.[3] This small woman, "quick and energetic in her movements" grew up in an atmosphere of hard-won fights with causes still to be won, a world where trading political news with her family whilst on holiday was the norm.[4] Writing from Switzerland at the end of the nineteenth century, Anderson spoke of her discussions with companion Katherine on Joseph Chamberlain and Irish Home Rule, stating that "…I really think Mr. Chamberlains speech almost converted me."[5] Anderson also grew up in and was nurtured by women led communities. Whether it was her time at St Leonard's school in Scotland, her medical training at the London School of Medicine for Women (LSMW), the women's suffrage movement, or the WHC, these atmospheres shaped Anderson

[3] Anderson was the daughter of Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, England's first female doctor and the niece of Millicent Garrett Fawcett, leader of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies. Much of the Garrett family were progressive and moved into public life. According to Jenifer Glynn the Garrett sisters and cousins naturally and amicably evolved into their chosen spheres of work for the women's movement. See J. Glynn, *The Pioneering Garretts: Breaking the Barriers for Women*, (London, 2008), p.114. A book that barely mentions Louisa Garrett Anderson only using her memoir of her mother to move the story along.

[4] State Library of Queensland, OM81-130, Eleanor Elizabeth Bourne Papers, Reminiscence, p.3 accessed www.slq.qld.gov.au 1/11/2017.

[5] SRO I: HA436/1/3/6 part. Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson. c April 1894.

and gave her the confidence to live a life dedicated to furthering women's opportunities, whether they be professional, political or personal.

According to the author of her obituary, she once said that it was almost inevitable that she should accept the vocation that seemed to be prepared for her.[6] After training to be a doctor at the LSMW, Anderson became involved with a number of suffrage societies, most prominently the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU). She took part in suffrage processions, hosted the first meeting of the Women's Tax Resistance League (WTRL), chaired the inaugural meeting of the London Graduates Union for Women's Suffrage and became a vice president of the United Suffragists (US).[7] She often spoke at suffrage rallies and meetings, and as we will see, she even went to prison for her militant actions.[8] What's more the ideas of the WSPU played a substantial role in Anderson's life during the First World War. It is no surprise therefore that her close friend Evelyn Sharp remarked that she "…was one of the great persons of the so-called women's movement."[9]

In Flora Murray, Anderson found a partner with whom she shared not only her views on politics but also an important part of her life. They appear to have met through the suffrage movement in around 1907. According to their fellow suffragist Elizabeth Robins, Murray's mission in life "was to provide the world with a great object lesson."[10] Murray believed that although some thought the world had changed

[6] Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson, *The Manchester Guardian*, 16 November 1943, p.3.
[7] WL 2WTR/1/1, Minutes and papers 1909; *The Saturday Review*, 20 November 1909, p.631; J. Geddes, 'Deeds and Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street' *Medical History*, 61, 2007, p.82.
[8] For example see *Dover Express*, 5 February 1909; *Sussex Agricultural Express*, 11 June 1909; *Hastings and St Leonards Observer*, 6 March 1909.
[9] Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson, *The Manchester Guardian*, 16 November 1943, p.3.
[10] Dr. Flora Murray, Reminiscences of her War Work by Elizabeth Robins, *The Observer*, 5 August 1923, p.3.

women, it was in fact women who were changing the world. These changes grew out of "a demand on the part of women for intellectual and moral liberty, for freedom of choice, for open and equal opportunities in the world of effort."[11] This world of effort was embodied by Murray's work in the women's movement culminating in that of the WHC.

This "…tall, fair woman, very well known in London medical circles…" came to London in 1905 after finishing her medical training and working in both Scotland and Durham.[12] She was a member of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) before she joined the WSPU in 1908.[13] During her time with the WSPU Murray gave speeches, took part in marches, and provided first aid for any casualties that arose from violent demonstrations. In addition, Murray was the personal doctor of WSPU leader and founder, Emmeline Pankhurst.[14] Her major contribution was her crusade against the forcible feeding of suffrage prisoners. After her early death in 1923, those who wrote in remembrance of her believed that her name would stand out for the devoted service she had given to "the advancement of women in every walk of life."[15]

At the outbreak of war, Anderson and Murray had been doctors for around 14 years. They had held posts in the hospitals that allowed women medical staff and together they had founded the Women's Hospital for Children in Harrow Road, London in

[11] The Position of Women in Medicine and Surgery by Dr. Flora Murray, M.D, B.S, D.P.H. *The New Statesman,* 1st November 1913, p. xvi
[12] *Dundee Courier*, 18 November 1920; J. Geddes, 'Flora Murray (1869-1923)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford university Press, Sept 2015, http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.library.ucs.ac.uk/view/article/5634, accessed 17 Feb 2016.
[13] Geddes, 'Deeds *and* Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street', p.82.
[14] M. Pugh, *The Pankhursts*, (London, 2002), p.423; *Sunderland Daily Echo and Shipping Gazette*, 27 May 1913.
[15] Dr. Flora Murray, *The Vote*, 10th August 1923, p.1.

1912.[16] This hospital offered opportunities for its doctors to gain clinical experience, since few hospitals at the time offered resident jobs for women.[17] In August 1914 Anderson and Murray were determined that medical women who desired to serve their country should not be excluded from the opportunity to do so, since "their training and their sympathies fitted them for such work; they knew they could trust their own capacity; but they had yet to make their opportunity."[18]

They made their opportunity with the WHC. The women successfully ran two military hospitals in Paris and Wimereux, on the French coast, during the autumn and winter of 1914. When casualties began to be evacuated to England in early 1915, the favourable reports that the War Office received about their achievements resulted in Anderson and Murray being invited to run a large military hospital back in London. Clearly defined as a suffrage enterprise run by feminists the work of the WHC garnered admiration and recognition from all corners of society.

Visions of war

As both Dan Todman and Ana Carden-Coyne have suggested, the overriding public image of the war is the enduring vision of futility and sacrifice, the mud and trenches of tragic waste.[19] This view does not seem to have changed throughout the centenary commemorations, which for all the recent scholarship on furthering understandings of gender, sexuality, race and imperialism during this period, have

[16] Women Doctors for Children, *Votes for Women*, 29th November 1912, p.12.
[17] J. Geddes, 'Flora Murray (1869-1923)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford university Press, Sept 205 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.login.library.ucs.ac.uk/view/article/5634, accessed 17 Feb 2016].
[18] F. Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons, Being the History of the Women's Hospital Corps in Paris, Wimereux and Endell Street*, (London, 1920), p.4.
[19] D. Todman, *The Great War: Myth and Memory* (London, 2005), p. XII; A. Carden-Coyne, 'Masculinity and the Wounds of the First World War: A Centenary Reflection', *French Journal of British Studies*, 20, 1, 2015, p.6.

been marked by a preoccupation with the cost of war, the waste of male lives.[20] This has manifested itself in films, books, theatre, art and performance pieces.[21] As Adrian Gregory points out, the verdict of the British is that the war was stupid, tragic and futile.[22] In parallel to a disproportionate fascination with a "lost generation" of men, women seem to have their own entrenched narratives; myths that have developed to ease communication about this enormous historical event.[23]

Rather than discuss the messy complexity of women's lives, women are often evoked as a homogenous group with a concentration on the changes brought about by the war. Over twenty years ago Penny Summerfield commented that it would be reductive to ask what difference the war made to "men", but the debate about women insists on such generalisation.[24] Laura Doan sarcastically but also truthfully suggests that studies of the war rarely have chapters entitled "Men and War".[25] Here we also find Karen Hunt and June Hannam who suggest that we need to be wary of writing parallel histories that overly "compartmentalize the different elements of women and men's lives."[26] It is striking that in a subject often described as Total War, women have been subject to so much compartmentalization and generalisation. In a few cases, this generalisation goes deeper with some of those

[20] Just some of the many commemorations with a focus on this narrative are, "Blood Swept Lands and Seas of Red", an installation at the Tower of London of 888,246 ceramic poppies to remember the dead. "We're here because we're here" Jeremy Deller's Somme tribute and Peter Jackson's colourised and slowed down film of the Western Front *They Shall Not Grow Old.* More information about the centenary commemorations can be found at www.1418now.org.uk
[21] S. Grayzel, 'Belonging to the Imperial Nation: Rethinking the History of the First World War in Britain and its Empire', *The Journal of Modern History*, 90, 2018, p.384.
[22] A. Gregory, *The Last Great War: British Society and the First World War*, (Cambridge, 2008), p.3.
[23] Todman, *The Great War: Myth and Memory*, p. XIII
[24] P. Summerfield, 'Women and War in the Twentieth Century', in J. Purvis (ed.), *Women's History: Britain, 1850-1945: an Introduction* (London, 1995), p. 307.
[25] L. Doan, 'A Challenge to 'Change'? New Perspectives on Women and the Great War', *Women's History Review*, 15, 2, 2006, p.338
[26] K. Hunt and J. Hannam, 'Towards an Archaeology of Interwar Women's Politics: The Local and the Everyday' in J. Gottlieb and R. Toye (eds.), *The Aftermath of Suffrage, Women, Gender, and Politics in Britain, 1918-1945* (Basingstoke, 2013), p. 126.

who have written about the WHC conflating Louisa Garrett Anderson and her mother.[27]

Theoretical approach

The historiography of the First World War is multi-dimensional and vast, but when it comes to women it inevitably circles back to asking the question of whether the war was good or bad. Intersecting medical, military, gender, suffrage, feminist and queer history with cultural history this work seeks to unearth new perspectives and insights into women's experience of the war. It is not seeking to suggest the war was good or bad but rather to consider how these individuals regarded this experience. It will show that involvement with existing women led communities and ideas of selfhood had a fundamental impact upon the way some women understood and responded to the war.

Scholarship on women and the First World War has been largely divided into that which sees the war as a disruptive watershed of social change for women and that which argues that any impact the war had on women's lives was temporary, limiting and overshadowed by a backlash at the end of the conflict. This work seeks to challenge standard approaches to women and the war moving away from these well-worn ideas of disruption, deviance and the impact. In their place I hope to suggest that women shaped their own war and positioned themselves as integral parts of the larger whole. In its overarching theme this work sits alongside the arguments of Gail

[27] Even Christabel Pankhurst in her memoir of the Suffrage movement *Unshackled* when speaking of women's war service cannot differentiate, stating that "The two women doctors, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray who had devoted themselves to the suffrage prisoners of war…" C. Pankhurst, *Unshackled, The Story Of How We Won The Vote* (London, 1959), p.291. See also, A. Marwick, *Women at War, 1914-1918* (Fontana, 1977), p.149.

Braybon and Cheryl Law, who both highlight that in writing about women's experiences during the war there is an apparent desire to find change or difference rather than see signs of continuity.[28] Law in particular suggests that this view undermines the comprehension of women's struggles as a continuous process.[29] This thesis also owes a debt to the idea from Robert Gerwath and Erez Manela's *Empires at War* which posits that examining the war "within a frame that is both longer and wider" allows us to further understand experiences of the war.[30] Although Gerwath and Manela are talking about global empires the same could be said about the experiences of women during the war.

Furthermore, and most importantly, by examining Anderson and Murray's experiences within this longer and wider frame this work draws inspiration from that of Jennian Geddes. Geddes has done much to highlight the "forgotten surgeons" of the WHC in her articles.[31] As a former doctor herself, much of Geddes' work has its focus on Anderson and Murray's contribution to medical history. Although Geddes suggests the importance of the involvement in the suffrage movement to women such as Anderson and Murray, she also is clear to point out, that how that involvement may have influenced the work some women subsequently did during the war needs more exploration.[32] Therefore, this thesis aims to build on this notion to explore Anderson and Murray's responses to the First World War, demonstrating

[28] G. Braybon, 'Winners and Losers: Women's Symbolic Role in the War Story', in G. Braybon, (ed.) *Evidence, History and the Great War, Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, 2003), p.104; C. Law, *Suffrage and Power: The Women's Movement, 1918-1928* (London, 1997), p.2.
[29] Law, *Suffrage and Power*, p.2.
[30] R. Gerwath and E. Manela, 'Introduction', in R. Gerwath and E. Manela (eds.), *Empires at War 1911-1923* (Oxford, 2014), pp.2-3.
[31] Geddes, 'Deeds and Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street'; J. Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson (1873-1943), surgeon and suffragette', *Journal of Medical Biography*, 16, 2008, pp.205-214; J. Geddes, 'The Women's Hospital Corps: forgotten surgeons of the First Word War', *Journal of Medical Biography*, 14, 2, 2006, pp. 109-117; J. F. Geddes, 'The Doctor's Dilemma: Medical Women and the British Suffrage Movement', *Women's History Review*, 18, 2, 2009, pp.203-218.
[32] Geddes, 'Deeds and Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street', p.80.

that the reasons for these responses can be found in the continuities and communities in their lives.

In order to explore these responses and continuities each chapter will examine a different narrative of women and the First World War. As Marc Calvini-Lefebvre points out, this war occupies a special place in feminist history. He states there are a collection of iconic images, celebrated victories and devastating defeats which congregate around four images associated with the war.[33] Although not using the same images as Lefebvre, this research finds itself within a similar space with its focus on four well known "icons" of this period; Suffrage, Sexuality, Gender, and Feminism. Each of these has in some way been seen to be a cause for concern in the story of women and the war, a myth that has been knitted into the social fabric of understandings of the conflict. Myths reduce the complex events and experiences of the past into an easily understood set of symbols.[34] In these popular perceptions of women's experiences, suffrage activity ends at the outbreak of war, while women's sexuality is frowned upon as the public begin to know about "deviant" sexualities. Additionally, by trespassing into male spaces some women appear to disrupt gender boundaries, and finally feminism is defeated by the war. However, this thesis will demonstrate that the lives of Anderson and Murray challenge some of the story we think we know about the experiences of women during the First World War.

[33] M. Calvini-Lefebrve, 'The Great War in the History of British Feminism: Debates and Controversies, 1914 to the Present', *French Journal of British Studies*, 20, 1, 2015, p. 2. In this article the icons are The Vote, The Home Front, The Fall (of Feminism) and The Hague Peace Conference.
[34] Todman, *The Great War Myth and Memory,* p.XIII.

Through an examination of sources such as Anderson's personal papers, Murray's memoir of the WHC, suffrage and national newspapers, alongside articles written about the WHC this thesis will discuss how for some women the war was a time of self-actualisation. Here I am using psychologist Abraham Maslow's definition of self-actualisation, one of a person's desire to use all their abilities to achieve and realise their true potential.[35] Maslow used a hierarchy of needs, which when met, would show how one could achieve self-actualisation; Safety, Love, Belonging, and Esteem.[36] Although Maslow developed this theory in his 1943 paper *A Theory of Human Motivation* its status as a foundational tool to understand how drive and motivation are correlated when discussing human behaviour means it is perfectly placed for exploring women's lives in the early twentieth century.[37] As Sheila Rowbotham suggests, the early feminist movement inspired some women to resist injustice and inequality, and in doing so effect change in social and economic life. This movement carried with it an "internal promise of self-actualisation and human dignity, encouraging efforts to alter personal ways of being."[38] As Uriel Abulof states we cannot explain social actions and changes without first understanding human motivations.[39] Therefore, this exploration of the experiences and motivations of Anderson and Murray will show them meeting these needs and achieving this self-actualisation in the service of self and others during the First World War.

Barbara Caine suggests that detailed analysis of individual lives offers one of the best ways to explore questions about the importance of experience and

[35] J. D'Souza and M. Gurin, 'The Universal Significance of Maslow's concept of Self-Actualisation', *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 44, 2, 2016, p. 210. Maslow believed that humans are capable of pursuing the highest values and aspirations
[36] A. Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York, 1968), p. vi.
[37] U. Abulof, 'Introduction: Why We Need Maslow in The Twenty-First Century', *Society*, 54, 6, 2017, p.508.
[38] S. Rowbotham, *Dreamers of a New Day, Women who Invented the Twentieth Century* (London, 2010), p. 2.
[39] Abulof, 'Introduction', p.508.

representation.[40] Indeed, June Purvis shows there has been a proliferation of work on individual feminists over the last two decades, although with a focus on mainly white middle class women.[41] This research makes no apologies for adding to this number, it aims to sit within work such as that of Carol Dyhouse, Claire Brock and Zoe Thomas, with their focus on differing opportunities for middle class women.[42] Individuals can be used as ciphers to explore culture and power, they can disrupt assumptions about processes of social change and show how people shape society.[43]

One of the more important tools to analyse these individual lives during this period is gender history. In 1986 Joan Scott made a forceful case for the usefulness of this category, as it provided ways to show how understandings of gender are used to create and enforce power relations, leading to a more complex understanding of politics and power.[44] Understood as a culturally constructed, historically changing and often unstable system of differences the gender history of the First World War, as Grayzel and Proctor suggest, began during the war itself.[45] Here gendered perceptions of what a man or a woman could or should be shaped not only public perception but also self-perception. As Purvis notes, gender analysis has meant the opportunity to reassess such male centred narratives as war and citizenship, main objectives of this thesis.[46] This thesis will use the understanding that categories such

[40] B. Caine, *Biography and History* (Basingstoke, 2010), p.3.
[41] J. Purvis, "A Glass Half Full'? Women's history in the UK', *Women's History Review*, 27, 1, 2018, p.93.
[42] C. Dyhouse, 'Driving Ambitions: Women in pursuit of a medical education, 1890-1939', *Women's History Review*, 7, 3, 1998, pp. 321-343; C. Brock, *British Women Surgeons and their Patients, 1860-1918* (Cambridge, 2017); Z. Thomas, 'At Home with the Women's Guild of Arts: gender and professional identity in London studios, c.1880-1925', *Women's History Review,* 24, 6, 2015, pp. 938-964.
[43] https://mbsbham.wordpress.com/2018/07/26/stories-about-individual-lives-or-intimate-histories/ accessed 12th January 2019.
[44] J. Scott, 'Rewriting History', in M.Randolph Higonnet, S. Michel, J. Jenson & M. Collins Weitz (eds.), *Behind the Lines, Gender and the Two World Wars* (Yale, 1987), p.22.
[45] T. Meade and M. Wiesner-Hanks, 'Introduction', in T. Meade and M. Wiesner-Hanks (eds.), *A Companion to Gender History* (Maldon, 2004), p.2; S. Grayzel and T. Proctor, 'The Scholarship of the First World War', in S. Grayzel and T. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War* (Oxford, 2017), p.251.
[46] Purvis, "A Glass Half Full'? Women's history in the UK', p. 91.

as male and female are constructed in and through culture and language, to foreground these individual lives and their experiences of communities, in order to examine some of the most entrenched narratives regarding women and the war.

Historiographical survey

Although each chapter of this thesis will explore the historiography of its "icon" in depth, here it is perhaps pertinent to survey the general historiography of women and the First World War. Foremost scholar of women and the war, Gail Braybon highlighted the persistence of the view of the war as a watershed moment for women.[47] This argument that the "watershed" of massive challenges, changes and disruptions of total war helped to modernise society is characterised by women undertaking new occupations and skills capped with the ultimate award of partial enfranchisement.[48] Stemming from the work of Arthur Marwick and what has been termed the modernization thesis this narrative can still be seen even in recent general works on the war such as the one line women's experiences warrant in Margaret MacMillan's *The War that Ended Peace* where women "were abandoning their traditional roles as wives and mothers."[49]

This "watershed" narrative has been poured over and argued against ever since, not least since the growth of feminist history during the 1960s.[50] As June Purvis has

[47] Braybon, 'Winners or Losers: Women's Symbolic role in the War Story', p. 104.
[48] Braybon, 'Winners or Losers: Women's Symbolic role in the War Story', p. 89. For work that conforms to this narrative see P. Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford, 1975); E. Leed, *No Man's Land: Combat and Identity in World War One* (Cambridge, 1979); S. Hynes, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (New York, 1991).
[49] A. Marwick, *The Deluge: British Society and the First World War* (London, 1965); Marwick, *Women at War, 1914-1918*; M. MacMillan, *The War that Ended Peace*: *How Europe Abandoned Peace for the First World War* (London, 2014), p.244.
[50] For just a small example of works that see women and the war as a watershed see, Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory*; Leed, *No Man's Land* ; N. Ferguson*, The Pity of War* (London, 1998); S. Gilbert, 'Soldiers Heart: Literary Men, Literary Women and the Great War' in M. Randolph Higonnet, S. Michel, J. Jenson & M. Collins Weitz (eds.), *Behind the Lines, Gender and the Two World Wars,* (Yale, 1987); alongside the watershed argument is the one where women barely feature at all, H. Strachan, *The First World War* (London, 2003) is just one of a long list.

suggested Rowbotham's 1973 text *Hidden from History* was the key jumping off point for this kind of analysis.[51] Feminist history began to critique the modernization thesis positing the idea that any changes to women's lives during this period were limited and "for the duration" only. Work such as that of Braybon and Deborah Thom's study of women's wartime industrial work demonstrated the limitations of this watershed thesis.[52] Much of this new critique stemmed from using women's work to show these limitations with a focus on the women who took on new jobs within industrial settings. Lucy Noakes states that many women experienced their wartime jobs as a brief moment of liberation before returning back to the home. [53] Although Noakes' argument is from recent scholarship it echoes Susan Kingsley Kent's *Making Peace.*[54] Here Kent suggested that the war reinforced the idea of home as a women's place. Although over twenty years old Kent's often cited arguments suggest that the experience of war led some feminists to shift their position and resolve that reverting to separate spheres provided the best hope for women.[55] This pessimistic view of women's experiences joins with those who view women in their new roles, especially if they were wearing a militarised uniform, as deviant and in some way trespassing gender boundaries, be those boundaries, work, sexual or military.[56] Kent and those who have followed her line of argument,

[51] Purvis, "A Glass Half Full'? Women's History in the UK', p.89; Shelia Rowbotham, *Hidden from History* (London, 1973), p.111.
[52] G. Braybon, *Women Workers in the First World War: The British Experience* (London, 1981); D. Thom, *Nice Girls and Rude Girls: Women Workers in World War One* (London, 1998).
[53] L. Noakes: Women's Mobilization for War (Great Britain and Ireland), in 1914-1918-online. International Encyclopaedia of the First World War, ed. by Ute Daniel, Peter Gatrell, Oliver Janz, Heather Jones, Jennifer Keene, Alan Kramer, and Bill Nasson, issued by Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin 2014-10-08. **DOI**: 10.15463/ie1418.10277. accessed 10th June 2018.
[54] S. Kingsley Kent, *Making Peace, The Reconstruction of Gender in Interwar Britain* (Princeton, 1993.).
[55] Kent, *Making Peace*, p.6.
[56] L. Noakes, "Playing at Being Soldiers?' British Women and Military Uniform in the First World War' in J. Meyer (ed.), British *Popular Culture and the First World War* (Leiden, 2008); J. Gould, 'Women's Military Services in First World War Britain', in M. Randolph Higonnet, S. Michel, J. Jenson & M. Collins Weitz (eds.), *Behind the Lines, Gender and the Two World Wars* (Yale, 1987); Sharon Ouditt, *Fighting Forces, Writing Women* (London, 1994) to name just three.

lead us back to Jenny Gould's understated suggestion that women's involvement in the war was "not popular."[57]

These approaches to the war are being increasingly qualified with recent research showing, as David Monger points out, that it is difficult to suggest there was one kind of experience of the war.[58] Gregory draws our attention to the idea that early twentieth century British society, "complex, subtle and nuanced", would seem unlikely to have had a uniform response to war.[59] Doan has also argued that a preoccupation with change has limited our understanding of how people experienced war by restricting the kinds of questions historians have been able to pose.[60] However new work that seeks to stretch and expand our understanding of this nuanced society can be found within that such as Nicolletta Gullace's pivotal work on what she has termed the renegotiation of citizenship and Janet Watson's endeavour to distinguish between lived experience and memory.[61] These works number amongst those which aim to expand and rework women's histories of the war. With their focus on how participants tried to make sense of this cataclysmic event and by taking issue with a number of assumptions, they occupy a space within which this work aspires to sit.

[57] Gould, 'Women's Military Services in First World War Britain', p.117.
[58] D. Monger, 'Nothing Special? Propaganda and Women's Roles in Late First World War Britain', *Women's History Review*, 23, 4, 2014, p.519.
[59] A. Gregory, 'British 'War Enthusiasm' in 1914: A Reassessment' in G. Braybon (ed.), *Evidence, History and the Great War, Historians and the Impact of 1914-18,* (New York, 2003), p.68.
[60] L. Doan, 'A Challenge to 'Change'? New Perspectives on Women and the Great War', *Women's History Review*, 15, 2, 2006, p.338.
[61] N. Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons, Men, Women and the Renegotiation of British Citizenship During the Great War*, (New York, 2002); J. S. K. Watson, *Fighting Different Wars: Experience Memory and the First World War in Britain*, (Cambridge, 2004).

Chapter structure

Chapter One has as its focus the importance of the women's suffrage movement to the war experience of Anderson and Murray. This exploration of Anderson and Murray's participation in the militant suffrage movement and their use of ideas, learnt throughout this time, in their work with the WHC will show that by the outbreak of war the ideas of the community were more important than the leadership. This chapter will demonstrate that Anderson and Murray understood the strong military rhetoric of the militants was linked to an historically legitimate idea of heroic masculinity and citizenship. Rather than rearticulating citizenship as Nicoletta Gullace has suggested, it will demonstrate that these women already had ideas of what it meant to be a citizen allowing them to fully participate in the war.[62] Some have suggested that those who continued to campaign for suffrage found themselves swimming against a tide that viewed this as against the national interest.[63] However as this chapter will illustrate the work of the WHC was clearly seen by the public, its patients, its visitors and its staff as "the Suffragette hospital."[64] Although their medical training suited them for the work, Anderson and Murray were clear that the training they had during the campaigning days played a large part in the success of the WHC. The WHC had been the culmination of this training, the embodiment of their ideas of citizenship.

The First World War is often depicted as the major moral watershed in British attitudes to sexual behaviour. However, it is often a contradictory period where women's sexuality is concerned with barely any space for the experiences of non-

[62] Gullace, *The Blood of our Sons,* p.2.
[63] Smith, *Suffrage Discourse,* p.93; L. E. Nym Mayhall, *Militant Suffrage Movement: Citizenship and Resistance in Britain, 1860-1930,* (Oxford, 2003), p.211.
[64] *The Tatler,* 9th July 1916 in WL 7LGA/3.

heterosexual women. Chapter Two will foreground individual experiences in order to show that Anderson and Murray did not wait for an emergence of lesbian identity during or after the First World War to understand themselves. Those who have written about Anderson and Murray have managed to skirt around what their relationship might have been by using terms such as "lifelong friend", "her medical partner", "a formidably competent couple" drawing attention to their "intimate companionship" without analysing what this relationship brought to their lives and work.[65] By assessing Anderson's experiences growing up and the feminist networks and communities that both Anderson and Murray were part of, this chapter finds itself within the work of Anna Clark. Her suggestion that some were able to construct a notion of themselves using "their own personalities, material circumstances and the cultural discourses available to them." anchor this chapter. [66] Drawing on the useful analysis of queer history this chapter will suggest that there was a narrative of sexual understanding for those who chose to look for it and in the case of Murray's memoir this was directed at a chosen knowledgeable audience. Rather than suggesting their subjects identified as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender (LGBT), many deploy queer as a critical lens when investigating lives that seem to challenge normative modes of sexuality and or gender.[67] As Brian Lewis posits, queer history does not assume that an individual's sexuality in the past is knowable.[68] However, this thesis will argue that the evidence of Anderson and Murray's lives allows us to see an expression of difference. Arriving at, in the words

[65] For example, A. Oakley, 'Women, Peace and Welfare: A Supressed History of Social Reform, 1880-1920', *Policy Press, 2018*, p.210-211; J. Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson (1873-1943), surgeon and suffragette', *Journal of Medical Biography*, 16, 2008, pp.205-214; Gullace, *"The Blood of Our Sons"*, p. 155.
[66] A. Clark, *Alternative Histories of the Self: A Cultural History of Sexuality and Secrets, 1780-1917*, (London, 2017), p.5.
[67] R. Kunzel, 'The Power of Queer History', *American Historical Review*, 123, 5, 2018, p.1565.
[68] B. Lewis, 'Introduction', in B. Lewis (ed.), *British Queer History: New Approaches and Perspectives* (Manchester, 2013), p.7.

of Mo Moulton, “a richer understanding of life outside the convention of heteronormativity.”[69]

Chapter Three takes a close look at how Anderson and Murray as uniformed, militarised women were portrayed, not only through the discourse in the newspapers, but also by the women themselves and those they encountered. According to the gender ideals of the early twentieth century military service was seen as the ultimate expression of male patriotism. The language of patriotism was expressed in gendered terms where men were imbued with concepts such as bravery, adventure, sacrifice, heroism and duty. Women were expected to be passive, to inspire men’s sacrifice and heroism, whilst maintaining the home and family. Those women who did not keep to these ideals, who did not subscribe to the existing gender boundaries, who wore uniforms to carry out their war work, have been seen to be deviants, trespassing onto male space.[70] This chapter will suggest that for some women the established narrative that has deviant women “playing at being soldiers.” did not apply and that these women were able to move into male spaces. It will explore the many positive column inches regarding the WHC positing the idea that not all uniformed women were criticised during wartime. This chapter will also demonstrate the way Anderson and Murray used their understanding of gender and gendered language to occupy male spaces. This idea is clearly shown in the letters Anderson wrote home to her family and the memoir Murray wrote after the war. Within her letters Anderson was able to create a masculine space in which she could portray herself as a full participant in the war, drawing comparisons with

[69] M. Moulton, ‘Bricks and Flowers: unconventionality and queerness in Katherine Everett’s life writing’, in B. Lewis (ed.), *British Queer History: New Approaches and Perspectives* (Manchester, 2013), p.63.
[70] Noakes, “Playing at Being Soldiers?’; Gould, ‘Women’s Military Services in First World War Britain’.

soldiers. In the way she distanced herself and her Corps from the men in her memoir, portraying many of them as feminine and childlike, Murray created a space for women embodying the masculine values of soldiers. These women had confidence in their abilities and in their right to carry out their duty. Showing that some women were clearly able to cast themselves as military actors, not "playing as soldiers" but "travelling as soldiers", participating in the war as themselves.[71]

The First World War is often portrayed as limiting for those women who had been caught up in the pre-war feminist campaigns. The final chapter will have as its focus the work of Anderson and Murray whilst they were based at the Endell Street Military hospital in London. It will show that their work with the WHC had at its core a goal to further women's opportunities in public life. It will suggest that they took advantage of the opportunity to be the first women to entirely run a military hospital, using this opportunity to pursue a feminist campaign aiming to secure an equality with medical men in the Royal Army Medical Corp (RAMC). This success was acknowledged not only by their feminist networks but also by the countless positive reports and articles found in newspapers and magazines. Although sometimes only grudgingly accepted by those in the military, they had their champions. This chapter demonstrates that we find these women within Gullace's notion that the war provided a context in which long standing feminist claims became persuasive.[72] It will suggest that these women were conscious of their legacy and the place they had created for themselves in feminist history. This look at Anderson and Murray's work will show that there was space to articulate a feminism that did not belong to pacifists and peace campaigners.

[71] Noakes, "Playing at Soldiers?' title of chapter; Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.16.
[72] Gullace, *The Blood of our Sons*, p.6.

In this thesis I am concerned with the stories of the individual. Its scope is the experience of two middle class, professional, non-heterosexual women. As Judith Bennett suggests, these kinds of questions have things at stake behind them, making them more than a "mere academic exercise".[73] Rachel Moss argues that the best kind of history owns its subjectivity, embracing the ways in which our own pasts and presents have brought us to a place where we feel a connection with our subjects.[74] A place where we should admit that our interest in the past is always born of present concerns.[75] Perhaps this place can answer Michael Roper when he asks, what kind of relationship with those of the past is possible when we cannot observe their daily lives.[76] A historian should be objective, but it is clear that history is a relationship where emotional attachments to subjects form often and easily. Roper suggests that emotions play a more central role in research than is recognised particularly if it is a history of personal lives.[77] The sources we draw on, are used to invest the past with meaning. Here is where I find myself and these individual lives, and how this research came into being. What follows is how I have experienced, understood and responded to the lives of Louisa Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray.

[73] J. Bennett, "Lesbian Like" and the Social History of Lesbianism', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 9, 1, 2000, p.4.
[74] https://rachelemoss.com/2014/03/07/the-messy-intimacy-of-writing-history/ accessed 19th January 2019.
[75] V. A. Kolve quoted in Bennett, "Lesbian Like", p.4.
[76] M. Roper. 'The Unconscious Work of History', *Cultural and Social History,* 11, 2, 2014, p.171.
[77] Roper, 'The Unconscious Work of History', p.171.

Chapter One

"Somehow or other we always get around to that subject again and again" The importance of the Women's Suffrage movement to the war experiences of Louisa Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray.

> Each regiment used to go into action with two colours – The Kings and the regimental. The Suffragist has her regimental colour too and enthusiastic as she may be about the Union Jack, she is not (if she chances to be a United Suffragist) going to put the purple, white and orange into cold storage for the period of the war.[78]

> At this stage a very kind old gentleman-not in uniform…inquired how we were getting on…he showed a friendly interest in the plans for the hospital. He had two daughters who were both suffragists. 'one' he said 'belongs to a most respectable society,' then dropping his voice, 'but the other- she goes with Mrs Pankhurst's lot.' Perhaps his hearers, who had also gone with 'Mrs Pankhurst's lot' in the suffrage days did not look as shocked as he expected; for he added kindly: 'I daresay you may not have heard of Mrs Pankhurst.'[79]

Louisa Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray were militant suffragists. Amongst involvement in many societies they were members of the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU), joining this organisation between 1907 and 1908. They had been heavily involved in the campaign for women's enfranchisement for many years before the "kind old gentleman" presumed on the kind of women they were. These words show that for some, women doctors were respectable and would not have been caught up in the militant side of a movement that sought to challenge the patriarchal structure of early twentieth century society. The sixty-year struggle for the enfranchisement of women has given rise to a vast historiography. The process of reappraising and rewriting the history of the suffrage movement has ebbed and flowed over the twentieth century. It is a complex story and feminist scholarship has challenged many of the old assumptions about the movement. However, one assumption that appears enduring to popular memory is that the suffrage movement came to an end at the start of the First World War.

[78] The Longest War, *Votes for Women,* 21st August 1914, p.705.
[79] F. Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons, being the history of the Women's Hospital Corps in Paris, Wimereux and Endell Street, September 1914-October 1919,* (London, 1920), p.134.

Despite Nicoletta Gullace's pivotal work on women's renegotiation of citizenship during the war along with work on organisations such as, The United Suffragists and the East London Federation of Suffragettes which has shown that women did not abandon their quest for votes, it almost seems impossible from a certain historiographical perspective for the suffrage movement not to end in August 1914.[80] Braybon asserts that, in the historiography of the suffrage movement and the First World War there is "an apparent desire to find change or difference rather than seek signs of continuity."[81] Perhaps the problem here is the fact that it is sometimes difficult to separate suffrage and feminism when writing about women in early twentieth century Britain. During this period feminism was a much-contested term. Lucy Delap suggests that this term was recognised as significantly more radical than suffragism, but that as a relatively new term it was open to a multitude of interpretations.[82] Often defined as signifying a commitment to equality and inclusion, feminism was focused on broader concerns than the primary political demand of suffragism. However, the movement was informed and molded by feminist women who sought to transform women's lives. It was made up of various strands, and the vote was not the core aim for many of those involved, as we shall see in a future chapter.[83] Members of the WSPU, like Anderson and Murray, believed that in order to effect this change women needed to be recognised as citizens first and other change would follow. Therefore, this chapter's focus is on how Anderson and Murray used ideas of citizenship gained from their involvement

[80]Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons*; K. Cowman, 'A Party between Revolution and peaceful persuasion: a fresh look at the United Suffragists', in M. Joannou & J. Purvis (eds.), *The Women's Suffrage Movement: New Feminist Perspectives*, (Manchester, 1998), K. Jenson, 'Gender and Citizenship', in S. Grayzel & T. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War*, (Manchester, 2017), p.10.
[81] Braybon, 'Winners or Losers: Women's Symbolic Role in the War Story', p.104.
[82] L. Delap, "Philosophical Vacuity and Political Ineptitude': The Freewoman's Critique of the Suffrage Movement', *Women's History Review,* 11, 2, 2002, p.614; L. Delap, 'The Superwoman Theories of Gender and Genius in Edwardian Britain', *The Historical Journal*, 47, 1, 2004, p.101.
[83] Chapter 4.

in what they saw as historically legitimate campaigning to construct a space for themselves as citizens in a time of war.

The desire to discover change in women's lives appears to be the case even in works that have to some extent become referred to as reliable sources of the impact of the First World War on suffrage campaigning. Angela Smith's work on suffrage and the war posits a new study of the relationship between these campaigns. Yet even she still claims that the "militant activities of the WSPU were suspended during the war…"[84] Another example of this is Susan Kingsley Kent's *Making Peace*. Although over twenty years old Kent's work is still used by many who write general histories about the War, allowing them to bolster their theories of a watershed for women.[85] Although she is arguing for a new view on feminist war experience Kent cannot help but state in the introduction that the outbreak of war "brought a halt to the activities of both militant and constitutional suffragists in their efforts for the vote."[86] The use of Kent within these general accounts leaves no real way to integrate the complexities of women's experiences into such an entrenched narrative as war as watershed. Here women in August 1914 passively put down their banners and refocused their efforts as presumably they could not work for both votes and country.

It is also pertinent to wonder how much the end of suffrage viewpoint is due to what Laura Mayhall calls the stranglehold of the WSPU on the historical imagination.[87]

[84] A. K. Smith, *Suffrage Discourse in Britain during the First World War*, (Taylor and Francis, 2005), p.21.
[85] Braybon suggests this rather beautifully in her chapter, Braybon, 'Winners or Losers: Women's Symbolic Role in the War Story', p.103.
[86] Kent, *Making Peace*, p.3.
[87] L. E. Nym Mayhall, "Creating the 'Suffragette Spirit': British Feminism and the Historical imagination', *Women's History Review*, 4, 3, 1995, p.334.

Running parallel to this notion is the view of Liz Stanley, who suggests that in writing the history of the militant movement the conventional view is often to assume that, "for Pankhursts read WSPU and for WSPU read Pankhursts."[88] If we follow this thread then we end at Samuel Hynes' view that the immediate effect of the war was to weaken and fragment the movement and "generally subordinate women's rights to the needs of the war."[89] Amongst others, Hynes is joined in this view by Martin Pugh who early on in his writing on the suffrage movement argued that the movement virtually disappeared during the war.[90] To some degree Pugh continued this line throughout his work on the Suffrage movement.[91] He is not the only eminent historian of the movement to fall into line with this view. It appears therefore that the view that any significant suffrage work disappeared during the war is an entrenched one in the public narrative of the suffrage movement. A narrative that unfortunately did not completely disappear during the recent centenary commemorations for *Vote100.*[92]

Views such as these suggest that we need to go further than Mayhall and suggest that it is the stranglehold of the Pankhurst leadership on the historical imagination that allows this narrative to persist. This watershed view of the suffrage movement does not allow space for any exploration of the significance of the movement to those women who participated in the war, and even less the importance of their involvement in the campaign to their ideas of themselves as citizens. The focus on

[88] L. Stanley with A. Morley, *The Life and Death of Emily Wilding Davison,* (London, 1988), p.153.
[89] S. Hynes, *The War Imagined: The first World War and English Culture,* (London, 1990), p.87.
[90] M. Pugh, *Electoral Reform in War and Peace, 1906-1918,* (London, 1978), p.137.
[91] For example see M. Pugh, *Women and the Women's Movement in Britain,* (London, 2000 [1st edition, 1992]), p.7 and M. Pugh, *The Pankhursts* (London, 2001), p.301.
[92] https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/electionsvoting/womenvote/overview/suffragetteswartime/ accessed 4th March 2019. On the page on Suffrage and Wartime the opening quote here states "At the outbreak of the First World War, Emmeline Pankhurst suspended the activities of the Women's Social and Political Union and concentrated her efforts on helping the government recruit women into war work."

the leadership of one group of women that by 1914 had perhaps become led by ideas rather than people, does not permit an explanation of the way some women continued their work for emancipation as the war raged around them. We are often left with Pugh's idea that the war had women "focused increasingly on work in support of the war effort rather than on campaigning for the vote."[93] Pugh does seem incapable of seeing grey area in the lives of women, and here he links back to Braybon's assertion of the desire to find change rather than continuity.[94] Gullace argues that the basis for citizenship was recast during the war as patriotism. However, women such as Anderson and Murray were involved in a movement that already had clear ideas of what it meant to be a citizen and were able to actualize these during the war. Anderson and Murray continued their activism through their WHC, using their understanding gained from the suffrage movement that citizenship was based on duty, rights and responsibilities.

Militant suffragists had drawn on strong ideas of military symbolism throughout the years of campaigning. None more so than "Mrs. Pankhurst's lot', the WSPU. This chapter will show that by the outbreak of war the WSPU existed through and was led by ideas. Ideas that allowed Anderson and Murray to participate in a war as themselves, as citizens. This ideology was steeped in militarized language and warlike imagery that some have suggested was an attempt to justify their militancy as collective and altruistic, a holy cause.[95] However, an exploration of Anderson and Murray's participation in the suffrage movement, focused on their time as part of the WSPU and their work with the Women's Hospital Corps (WHC) will show a use of

[93] M. Pugh, *The March of the Women: A Revisionist Analysis of the Campaign for Women's Suffrage* (Oxford, 2000), p.2.
[94]Braybon, 'Winners or Losers: Women's Symbolic Role in the War Story', p.104.
[95] C. Earp- Jorgensen, *The Transfiguring Sword: The just war of the Women's Social and Political Union* (University of Alabama, 2015) p.116.

this language and imagery within an understanding of heroic masculinity and citizenship. It will argue that the confidence and practical experience within the public sphere gained during the campaign fostered a sense of belonging and esteem which meant that some women did not question their ability to carry out procedures with which they could not have been familiar, in spaces that would have been alien to them just the year before. Additionally, it will show that campaigning for suffrage during the war was not always seen as against the national interest.

Although often seen as a straight battle between Suffragettes and Suffragists, the movement was complex and intertwined. Anderson and Murray spent most of their suffrage campaigning with the "suffragettes" of the WSPU but referred to themselves as suffragists. Therefore, I have chosen to use the phrase militant suffragists when describing these women. Their experiences allow us to move away from the idea that the only kind of suffragism during the First World War was pacifist suffragism. Using Anderson's personal papers, suffrage newspapers, newspapers and Murray's memoir this chapter will focus on the idea that some women used their experience of the suffrage movement to construct a space for themselves, a patriotic suffragism proclaiming their already understood citizenship within a time of war.

Campaigning for citizenship.

Since the beginning of the active campaign for women's suffrage in 1867 an important argument against enfranchisement had been the physical force argument. This was linked to the notion that men and women had differing qualities that they brought to society. The physical force argument was an important point for those in

the anti-suffrage movement who used it to justify why women could not be enfranchised. If called upon at times of war, then women could not be relied upon to defend king and country and therefore did not deserve the full rights of citizenship.[96] This argument is seen in an article in *The Spectator* in 1910. After the failure of the first Conciliation bill in the House of Commons, the article stated that although suffragists had a right to complain about the government's incompetency, the fact that the idea of women's suffrage was "awake in the country" surely made it even more of an imperative that the "sovereignty of that state" was kept in the "hands of one sex, and that sex which is endowed by nature with physical force."[97] This argument was of course raging throughout the campaign, with even *The Observer* publishing a strongly worded article suggesting that

> Equal rights of voting for women without anything like equal responsibility-or aptitude for maintaining the very existence of the State and of civilization-would be an assertion of formal equality, but a mockery of real equality and a violation of sense and justice. How can women reasonably claim the same rights without anything like the same responsibilities?[98]

With its headline of "Women's War", the sub editor of *The Observer* agreed with the view of the militant suffragists of the WSPU who believed themselves, long before the conflict of 1914, to be fighting a war. Indeed, in a speech given by Emmeline Pankhurst she states that the women involved in the campaign have "felt the joy of battle and the exultation of victory…and so we are glad we have had the fighting experience."[99]

[96] Smith, *Suffrage Discourse*, p.25; Law, *Suffrage and Power*, p.15.
[97] *The Spectator,* 25th June 1910, p.1053. The Conciliation Bill would have enfranchised female heads of household and occupiers of property worth ten pounds annually.
[98] The Women's War, *The Observer,* 31st March 1912, p.8.
[99] Why We are Militant, *The Suffragette,* 14th November 1913, p.99.

Since their inception in 1903 the WSPU had invigorated the cause, refuting the physical force argument. Many women had become bound up in the ideas that emanated from the WSPU motto "Deeds not Words." Anderson and Murray were to be caught up in this ideology. Coming from a family so bound up in ideas of female emancipation it seems inevitable that on her return from medical training in America, Anderson threw herself into campaigning for women's suffrage. According to Elizabeth Crawford, Anderson could be found chairing a meeting of the Fulham branch of the Central Society for Women's Suffrage in 1903. This organisation was a member of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS), whose leader was Andersons aunt, Millicent Garrett Fawcett.[100]

The NUWSS is generally characterized as the constitutional, non-militant suffrage body. It was formed in 1897 and campaigned through parliamentary means and lobbying techniques.[101] However, Anderson became impatient with the lack of progress her aunt's organization was making on the subject of suffrage and so by 1907 she had joined the WSPU.[102] We can see her frustration with the NUWSS in a letter she sent to her aunt in June 1908 imploring her to do something different. In this letter she argued that unless the constitutionalists that her "Dear Aunt Millie" had led for many years could continue to protest "…constitutionally and effectively…" then "…I think it is the duty of everyone who is able to do it to join them (the WSPU) - to do nothing at the present juncture is really too feeble."[103] Anderson was remarking on the lack of effect that the enormous suffrage

[100] E. Crawford, *The Women's Suffrage Movement, a Reference Guide*, 1866-1928, (Routledge, 2003), p.13.
[101] https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/electionsvoting/womenvote/overview/earlysuffragist/ accessed 10th January 2019.
[102] E. Crawford, *The Women's Suffrage Movement*, p.13.
[103] Louisa Garrett Anderson to Millicent Garrett Fawcett, 25th June 1908, quoted in J. Marlow (ed.), *Votes For Women, The Virago Book of Suffragettes,* (London, 2001), pp. 67-68.

demonstration held in Hyde Park on June 21st had had on the Prime Minister, Herbert Asquith. As *The Manchester Guardian* pointed out "As an affair of passing resolutions it was negligible; as a way of sharpening up the fight and bringing the cry out into the open it was splendid."[104] It certainly appears to have brought Anderson's cry out into the open. In this letter we can see the force with which the militant campaign swept up Anderson. This attack on her aunt's constitutional methods continued when in November 1908 the London Society for Women's Suffrage held their annual meeting at the Caxton Hall.[105]

The Manchester Guardian described the meeting as having an "…unusually interesting character…" highlighted when:

> Miss Flora Murray proposed and Miss L. Garrett Anderson seconded…recommending an alteration in the rules of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies to ensure that no person should be eligible for the Executive Committee…who was not pledged to put the interests of suffrage before party considerations.[106]

This resolution shows not only had Anderson begun to have a different understanding of political activism than the constitutionalist campaign that members of her family favoured, but it also shows her moving in the same circles as Murray. The fact that she is now a member of both the WSPU and the NUWSS highlights the complexity of the suffrage movement. The involvement at this meeting demonstrates Anderson and Murray embracing the force of the WSPU's rhetoric in contrast to the more timid NUWSS. As professional women who are moving into a form of more active campaigning both Anderson and Murray relate to June Purvis's argument that the early feminists largely confined themselves to carving out a

[104] Woman Suffrage: A Great Demonstration in London, *The Manchester Guardian*, 22 June 1908, p.7.
[105] Women Suffragists and Militant Tactics, Vote for Legal Methods, *The Manchester Guardian*, 11 November 1908, p.4.
[106] Women Suffragists and militant Tactics, Vote for Legal Methods, *The Manchester Guardian*, 11 November 1908, p.4.

separate sphere whereas the WSPU insisted on the prerogative of women to enter the public male world and to participate as equal citizens.[107] This idea must have been enticing to women like Anderson and Murray carving out their careers and becoming independent members of society, and links to ideas from the hierarchy of needs regarding self-esteem.

It is not as easy to discover the trajectory of Flora Murray's suffrage career. As we have seen, she too was bound up in the complexities of the movement, seemingly being a member of both the NUWSS and the WSPU. Murray was at the forefront of the campaign against the forcible feeding of suffrage prisoners. She organised and presented to Prime Minister Herbert Asquith a memorial signed by 117 doctors, protesting against this act.[108] Murray also sent a memorandum to Home Secretary McKenna in which she passionately stated that the "Forcible Feeding as practiced in H.M. Gaols is not the artificial feeding of hospitals."[109] By drawing comparison with the techniques applied in asylum environments, the government framed the procedure as lifesaving and health preserving.[110] This links with notions of the dominant ideology where men protected powerless women.[111] However, a medical woman such as Murray would not be so willing to accept this explanation, not when she saw firsthand what happened on women's release from prison. The evidence that women were suffering from this procedure was becoming overwhelming. Murray went further in her memorandum stating that unlike an asylum where the

[107] J. Purvis, "Deeds not Words', Daily Lives of Militant Suffragettes in Edwardian Britain', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 18, 2, 1995, p.92.
[108] F. Moxon, *What Forcible Feeding Means*, (London, 1914), p.2.
[109] F. Murray to R. Mckenna, Memorandum to the Home Secretary, nd, quoted in J. Marlow (ed.), *Votes For Women, The Virago Book of Suffragettes,* (London, 2001), p.223.
[110] Moxon, *What Forcible Feeding Means*, p.11.
[111] S. Kingsley Kent, *Sex and Suffrage in Britain, 1860-1914*, (London, 1987), p.5.

practice was performed in cases of obstruction, unconsciousness and insanity, “in H. M. Prisons the operation is performed upon sane people *without their consent*.”[112]

In addition to Murray’s involvement, Anderson sent her views to *The British Medical Journal.* The consent argument featured here with Anderson pointing to the fact that these women prisoners had refused their consent to imprisonment by undertaking a hunger strike. She stated that the reason they did so was political not pathological, that these women were resisting on principle and the appropriate treatment was “statesmanship not a stomach tube.”[113] The hunger strike is such a powerful suffrage image that even though we have no evidence that either of these women undertook this action; Anderson’s prison notes state clearly that she was not forcibly fed, and Murray did not go to prison, at least two women who worked with them during the War were clear that, “both bore the mark of hunger strikes on their face.”[114]

Although both women were doctors, they were involved in this campaign for another more central reason. Many have suggested that the suffrage hunger strike and the forcible feeding that followed was the embodiment of the suffrage resistance, a way to create community and feminist spectacle.[115] It was also, as Kevin Grant suggests, fundamentally constitutional.[116] Undertaking hunger strikes was part of the

[112] Murray to Mckenna as quoted in Marlow (ed.), *Votes For Women*, p.223.
[113] Forcible Feeding, *The British Medical Journal,* 6th July 1912.
[114] WL 7NLA//02b, Nina Last papers referring to work at Endell Street Military Hospital, nd; State Library of Queensland, OM81-130, Eleanor Elizabeth Bourne Papers, Reminiscence, p.2 accessed www.slq.qld.gov.au 1/11/2017; TNA HO144/1193/220196 (1-233), 162, 18th March 1912.
[115] Mayhall, *Militant Suffrage Movement,* p.154.
[116] K. Grant, ‘British Suffragettes and the Russian Method of Hunger Strike’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 53, 1, 2011, p.117.

campaign to have suffragist's in prison recognised as political prisoners by the authorities.[117] We can see this if we return to the first suffragist to undertake a hunger strike, Marion Wallace Dunlop. Dunlop was sentenced after stenciling an excerpt from the 1689 Bill of Rights on the wall of St Stephen's Hall, in the Palace of Westminster.[118] The Bill of Rights established not only the principles of frequent parliaments and free elections but also the rights of citizens. For members of the WSPU the most important of these would have been the right to petition and the just treatment of people by courts.[119] Dunlop's use of these particular words connects the militant movement with the long tradition of radical protest for citizenship, one which members of the WSPU were adept at using.[120] These arguments of consent and resistance were important to militant suffragists such as Anderson and Murray. They were bound up in historical notions of citizenship embodied in the military rhetoric of the WSPU. These notions then allowed women to understand themselves not as men or women but as citizens, and as the First World War approached, citizens able to take their place in the seemingly masculine space of war.

Historical legitimacy

Throughout their campaign militant suffragists had struggled with the legacies of liberal political revolutions. They demanded access to a body politic viewed as male and used notions of campaigns for male enfranchisement in order to gain that access.[121] In a great deal of WSPU rhetoric the historical ideas of political reform

[117] Kent, *Sex and Suffrage*, p.198.
[118] Kent, *Sex and Suffrage*, p.198.
[119] https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/parliamentaryauthority/revolution/collections1/collections-glorious-revolution/billofrights/ accessed 20th September 2019.
[120] Mayhall, *Militant Suffrage Movement,* p.3.
[121] Mayhall, *Militant Suffrage Movement*, p.154.

and the violence that accompanied those campaigns for reform was drawn on extensively. In a speech Emmeline Pankhurst gave to an audience in New York the links between the early campaigns and the fight for female enfranchisement are clearly stated, "The extensions of the franchise to the men of my country have been proceeded by very great violence."[122] This fight for freedom was often invoked through certain historical examples of action. Favourite amongst members of the WSPU seems to have been the campaign surrounding the 1832 Great Reform Bill.[123]

At a meeting held at the Queens Hall in 1909, Murray made it clear that in campaigning for suffrage, women were asking for a restitution of their ancient rights. In referring back to the Great Reform Act of 1832, Murray was linking to the understanding that women wanted and needed to be seen as citizens before they could hope for any kind of social change. Women were not asking for "…votes as a favour, but as a constitutional right. It was not until 1832 that sex came into the franchise question."[124] Linking to this was membership of the Women's Tax Resistance League (WTRL). The WTRL was established with the aim of organizing female resistance to taxation without any corresponding representation through the parliamentary vote. This was, as Jill Liddington points out, another link with past campaigns; refusals to pay ship tax, radical Quaker traditions and nonconformist passive resistance.[125] As a founding member of the WTRL, an organisation that was claiming perhaps the most fundamental political right in democracy's history, "no

[122] E. Pankhurst, 'Why We are Militant', *The Suffragette*, 14th November 1913, p.99.
[123] Mayhall, *Militant Suffrage Movement*, p.154.
[124] *Sussex Agricultural Express*, 11 June 1909; The Great Reform Act of 1832 laid down for the first time that the franchise was for "male persons". M. Ramelson, *Petticoat Rebellion*, (London, 1976 [first edition 1967]).
[125] J. Liddington and E. Crawford, *Vanishing for the Vote, Suffrage, Citizenship and the Battle for the Census,* (Manchester, 2014), p. 66.

taxation without representation", Anderson shows that her ideas of citizenship are based on rights and responsibilities, disrupting Angela Woollacott's argument that feminists based their claim for rights on women's moral authority.[126] Her involvement with this organization shows the importance of historical legitimacy to the rhetoric of militant suffragists and links to the understanding of themselves as citizens.

However, it wasn't just those women involved in the campaign for female enfranchisement that used the rhetoric of historical formal campaigns for reform. At a meeting for anti-suffragists in Bristol, Charles Hobhouse MP suggested that because there had not been the same kind of popular uprising and violence that happened during the campaigns for reform in 1832 and 1867, there wasn't the same need for political reform.[127] Hobhouse's words were returned to him after some women, including Anderson, took part in a window smashing raid in March 1912. Appearing before Westminster police court, Anderson was charged with "throwing missiles to the common danger and willfully breaking glass."[128]

This action landed Anderson with a six-week sentence with hard labour in Holloway prison.[129] Although she had inadvertently targeted the wrong building, she was completely clear as to why she had taken part in the action:

> It was done as a political protest, and in reply largely to a speech made by Mr Hobhouse some time ago in which he said he did not consider that the suffrage agitation was

[126] A. Woollacott, 'From Moral to Professional Authority: Secularism, Social Work and Middle-Class Women's Self-Construction in World War I Britain', *Journal of Women's History,* 10, 2, 1998, p.102.
[127] Pankhurst, *Unshackled*, p.198.
[128] WL 7LGA/1/1 press cutting from *The Daily Telegraph* 6th March 1912, "Hard Labour for Suffragettes."
[129] WL 7LGA/1/1 press cutting from *The Daily Telegraph* 6th March 1912, "Hard Labour for Suffragettes."

> supported by popular feeling because women were not doing the damage to property similar to that committed by men in 1832 in the reform riots.[130]

When the magistrate stated that he was not going to go into what happened in 1832, Anderson continued to forcefully state her case that women must look back to that time as they were fighting the same battle as was fought then. She believed that if it was the kind of argument that was understood by the country then the women were "obliged to use it."[131] Although the magistrate could not seem to see any similarity between these arguments, he was able to sentence the women in a similar way to a man he had dealt with earlier, who had broken a window, as "I cannot see any difference between him and you and it will be six weeks with hard labour."[132] The thinking of the magistrate shows the struggle that these women faced to be recognised as political prisoners. Resistance was crucial in this fight, with Anderson's illicit letters to her mother from Holloway, yet another form of this.

In their insistence on full political prisoner status, suffrage prisoners repeatedly petitioned the Home Office for pen and paper, largely in vain. Rule 243a only included official paper for a fortnightly letter.[133] Illicit letters therefore are evidence of suffrage prisoners responding to the control of the criminal justice system by making their experiences visible.[134] Anderson's smuggled letters to her mother perhaps give us her true feelings about finding herself in a situation "…of sadness and hopelessness; of joy and conviction and hope."[135] Within these letters we find

[130] WL 7LGA/1/1 press cutting from *The Daily Telegraph* 6th March 1912, "Hard Labour for Suffragettes."
[131] WL 7LGA/1/1 press cutting from *The Daily Telegraph* 6th March 1912, "Hard Labour for Suffragettes."
[132] In the police courts: sentences of hard labour, *The Manchester Guardian,* 6th March 1912, p.4.
[133] Rule 243a awarded certain privileges to second division prisoners such as food parcels and books. However women sentenced to hard labour such as Garrett Anderson were in theory not meant to benefit from these privileges. A. Schwan, "Bless the Gods for my Pencils and Paper': Katie Gliddon's Prison Diary, Percy Bysshe Shelley and the Suffragettes at Holloway', *Women's History Review*, 22, 1, 2013, p.150.
[134] A. Schwan, 'Bless the Gods for my Pencils and Paper', p.150; on the top of a letter dated 26 March from Louisa Garrett Anderson to her mother are the words "Please do not mention my letters if you write." A clear indication that these are illicit. WL 7LGA/ Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 26th March 1912.
[135] WL 7LGA/1/2/4, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, c. March 1912.

a woman clear about the reasons for taking part in the window smashing raid and the motives behind it. There are several letters where she appears to be trying to help her mother understand the importance of the militant action she has been a part of. “It seems just a bit of good luck to come to Holloway to fight against conditions of life which are so hard for women…I never knew so clearly before why I was a suffragist.”[136]

There are also clear links in her mind of the similarities of their campaign and previous fights for reform. She shows an understanding of the historical precedent and her actions are legitimized by this precedent, “It is enormous luck to be alive just now and in this thing, really in the centre of it.”[137] The pride she takes in this knowledge of being part of something that could change the world rings loud and clear, “I think it extraordinary that a common place, quiet person like me should have the chance of being in this great movement-shd have gone to prison for reform.”[138] What comes across in these letters is the understanding of the idioms that militant suffragists used to negotiate claims for citizenship; that common place people are the ones who carry out agitation for reform and that there is an understanding of citizenship that is defined by the freedom to act. This links here to the argument that suffrage rhetoric emphasized the rights, duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

This concept suggested that participation in the public sphere was ennobling and that the citizen was made virtuous through participation in self-government.[139] Anderson’s actions here were not the actions of a hysterical suffragette but a self-

[136] WL 7LGA/1/2/4, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, c. March 1912; WL 7LGA/1/2/7, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 26th March 1912.
[137] WL 7LGA/1/2/2, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 14th March 1912.
[138] WL 7LGA/1/2/2, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 14th March 1912.
[139] Mayhall, *Militant Suffrage Movement*, p174.

governed, calmly considered political action embodying the liberal traditions of citizenship. As she said herself "If one enters a rebellion one does it deliberately and shd be ready to face the consequences calmly… After all I went in for this after a great deal of thought…"[140]

The importance of these ideas and actions to women of the WSPU connects to Holton's idea that members of the WSPU were influenced by social critic, Thomas Carlyle's notion that history was a "sequence of disruptive actions creating new worlds."[141] These new worlds would be created by the fight for political reform and be places where women could fully participate as citizens rather than as a woman in her separate sphere. Ten days into the War, *Votes for Women* gave over a whole page to an article on the Peterloo massacre. This demonstration for democratic reform from almost one hundred years before, involved both men and women.[142] Publishing this article on the fight for reform at this time of war, perhaps the most disruptive of actions, cements their beliefs in the historical and legitimate fight for citizenship.

Nineteenth century ideals of citizenship suggested that how and where rights were exercised depended on the physical characteristics of the body. Many feminists believed that the English fighting spirit transcended gender.[143] Nancy Martin suggests that during the destruction and chaos of war, boundaries between

[140] WL 7LGA/1/2/2, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 14th March 1912; WL 7LGA/1/2/1, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 6th March 1912.
[141] S. S. Holton, 'In Sorrowful Wrath: Suffrage Militancy and the Romantic Feminism of Emmeline Pankhurst', in Harold L. Smith (ed.), *British Feminism in the Twentieth Century,* (Amherst, 1990), p.21-22.
[142] The Peterloo Massacre, *Votes for Women*, 14th August 1914, p.591. The Peterloo Massacre took place at St Peter's Field, Manchester, England, on 16 August 1819, when cavalry charged into a crowd of 60,000–80,000 who had gathered to demand the reform of parliamentary representation. http://www.peterloomassacre.org/history.html, accessed 4th March 2019.
[143] Earp- Jorgensen*, The Transfiguring Sword*, p.49.

masculine and feminine are often erased, leading one to negotiate a new identity.[144] If we link this to both the WSPU's view of their campaign and Carlyle's disruptive actions, perhaps we can suggest that women such as Anderson and Murray had, from their involvement in the suffrage campaign an understanding of the construction of gender identity and an ability to use it. These ideas point to a gender fluidity within the movement which allowed women to value their masculine side.

Fighting for rights

Along with their heritage of revolt we also find examples of military rhetoric within the letters Anderson wrote from her cell in Holloway and a speech she gave after her release. Women who identified as militant suffragists understood that their campaign was a war and used this military rhetoric to claim their place within masculine space. Just a day after her sentencing Anderson states she is proud and glad to have carried out her political action as although it might sound ridiculous to some, "I believe that this kind of fighting, in addition to every other form of pressure by constitutional means, is necessary to win our Cause."[145] The fact that Anderson has highlighted her "kind of fighting" here suggests that for her this type of campaign is different. The WSPU campaign is a fight, a war. When describing the women she has met in prison Anderson draws attention to the fact that although "we are all fellow prisoners…" not all prisoners are equal and there are those who are "…here as victims…" while those who are taking part in the WSPU campaign are "…prisoners of war."[146]

[144] N. Martin, "The Rose of No Man's Land': Femininity, Female Identity and Women on the Western Front', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 13, 6, 2012, p.7.
[145] WL 7LGA/1/2/1, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 6th March 1912.
[146] WL 7LGA/1/2/6, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 26th March 1912.

The term prisoners of war was also used as the title for the speech Anderson gave at the Steinway Hall, London, after her release. This speech was scathing in its views on the treatment of women in prison, and Anderson revealed that due to her family name she was treated differently than other prisoners. Its main point was that she was part of a campaign where it was "our good fortune to be prisoners of war" and that they should be recognized in the same way as those "men who have committed offences for political motives."[147] Again we can see the understanding that in fighting for citizenship rights, some women used their understanding of gender roles and the confidence of their legitimacy in campaigns of political reform to position themselves in political discourse, as citizens.

Before the outbreak of war, Anderson became a member of the United Suffragists (US).[148] This breakaway organization was formed in February 1914 by former members of the WSPU who had become disenchanted with the direction it was taking as militancy began to be equated with arson and bombing rather than resistance.[149] This organization was open to all, militant, non-militant, women and men. Here we can again see links with previous campaigns for reform, such as the Chartists, and abolitionists where men and women worked together. This group of "men and women of brilliant and tested reputation in the suffrage movement" was clear that campaigning for women's suffrage should carry on throughout the war.[150] Its main means of doing so was through the paper, *Votes for Women.*

[147] Prisoners of War, *Votes for Women,* 26th April 1912, p.467.
[148] Anderson can be found on the list of Vice Presidents of the organisation in the 21st August 1914 issue of *Votes for Women*, p.704.
[149] A. John, 'Behind the locked door': Evelyn Sharp, suffragette and rebel journalist', *Women's History Review*, 12, 1, 2003, p.7.
[150] Cowman, 'A Party between Revolution and peaceful persuasion', p.77; Speech by Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, *Votes for Women,* 10th July 1914.

This newspaper had been the voice of the WSPU until its owners, Emmeline and Frederick Pethick Lawrence were dismissed from the organization by the Pankhursts.[151] Although obviously a very different animal than the autocratic beast the WSPU had become, the US does seem to have also understood the campaign as a war, which is not surprising given the pasts of its founding members.[152] Military rhetoric was clearly seen throughout the issues of the newspaper produced during the war. There was a focus on keeping the suffrage flag flying and a campaign for "recruits" to work alongside "Captains" selling what they called "The War Paper for Women."[153] The use of this kind of rhetoric by other suffrage organisations shows that for many women the leadership of the WSPU had by this point become an irrelevance, it was the ideas this community had fostered that were important. Arguably Anderson and Murray had left the organization in a physical sense. Nevertheless, they retained an involvement not only within their feminist community but with their work during the First World War, an involvement with the ideas of this life affirming movement.

Suffrage and War

> After years of unpopularity over the suffrage it is very exhilarating to be on top of the wave, helped and approved by everyone, except perhaps the English War Office! While all the time we are still doing suffrage work- or women's work-in another form[154]

Smith has suggested that by the outbreak of war, even the memory of their involvement in militant strategies had become harder to accept by some women.[155]

[151] Pugh, *The Pankhursts,* p.248.
[152] According to the first edition of the US version of *Votes for Women* the founders included former WSPU members, Emmeline and Frederick Pethick Lawrence, Evelyn Sharp and Anderson, United Suffragists, *Votes for Women*, p.638.
[153] For example, see issue 11th December 1914, where this phrase is emblazoned across the top of the front page.
[154] WL 7LGA/2/1/9, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 27th September 1914.
[155] Smith, *Suffrage Discourse*, p.93.

However militancy was not seen as violence by the vast majority of women who had been involved in it.[156] It seems clear that for Anderson and Murray, suffrage militancy was a historically recognised means to achieve citizenship. To undertake this "suffrage work" in August 1914, shows these women prepared and confident to continue their campaign of trying to achieve political recognition for their claims to that citizenship. Alongside the military rhetoric of the WSPU was their motto "deeds not words." This carried an explicitly gendered meaning where deeds were active and words passive. This idea circles back not only to an active citizenship of rights, duties and responsibilities but also ideas of gender fluidity within this movement.[157]

When war broke out the two women were clear that they would contribute their medical services to the forces. With their understanding of citizenship as one of rights and duties it was evidently their responsibility to do so. The masculine attributes of deeds figure strongly in the work of Anderson and Murray. In her memoir of this time Murray discussed how the long years of struggle for enfranchisement,

> had done much to educate women in citizenship and public duty. The militant movement had taught them discipline and organisation; it had shown them new possibilities in themselves and had inspired them with confidence in each other.[158]

Their experience in the suffrage movement had trained them not only to believe in themselves but also in the bureaucracy of the English. The War Office refused to countenance the idea of women doctors serving with the forces.[159] Therefore, the

[156] Stanley and Morley, *The Life and Death of Emily Wilding Davison*, p.153.
[157] In 1912 Anderson and Murray opened a hospital for women and children in the Harrow Rd. This hospital also had as its motto "Deeds Not Words". They carried on their involvement with this hospital throughout the war.
[158] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.3.
[159] I. Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War* (Pen and Sword, 2013), p.107; L. Leneman, 'Medical Women in The First World War: Ranking Nowhere', *British Medical Journal*, 307, 6919, 1993, p.1592.

newly formed WHC went directly to the French Authorities who "gratefully accepted the offer of a complete hospital unit made by English women doctors."[160]

The WHC began their work in Paris in the Hotel Claridge, a gorgeous marble and gilt shell of a building at the time but made habitable within two days of the Corps' arrival by "dint of mild militancy…"[161] Later with the approval of the authorities they opened a second front at Wimereux on the coast of France. With its importance to the British campaign due to its proximity to the south coast of England, that the WHC were based here and part of some of the largest medical centres, was a major milestone for women in military medicine.[162] By 1915 their work had proved so successful that the War Office gave them responsibility for a large military hospital in London. Above the proscenium of the new Endell Street Military hospital was proudly mounted the phrase, "Deeds not Words."[163]

As we shall see in chapter three the WHC wore a khaki uniform. Adorning this masculine attire were badges declaring their suffrage allegiance. The purple white and green of the WSPU was worn by both Murray and Anderson. Alongside showing their suffrage work has not ended because war has started, the wearing of the badges ties back to the idea of the militarization of the WSPU. Along with the prominent display of the WSPU motto taken as their own, it suggests the ideas of the WSPU remained at the forefront of their work. The WHC also took inspiration from the WSPU when it commissioned a medal to commemorate their

[160] *Votes for Women,* 11th September 1914, p.727; WL 7LGA/2/2/3, M. Brasier du Thuy to The Secretary, St Johns Ambulance Association, 31st August 1914.
[161] WL 7LGA/2/1/06, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 17th September 1914.
[162] M. Harrison, *The Medical War: British Military Medicine in the First World War* (Oxford, 2010), p.44.
[163] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.139.

achievement.[164] Here there are echoes not only of the medals awarded to those women of the WSPU who undertook a hunger strike but also soldiers after a campaign.

Many wrote to the suffrage newspapers on the outbreak of war suggesting that it was imperative to keep the suffrage flag flying during this time. H. Hare from Ladbroke Grove suggested that those women taking part should "wear the colours or badge of their suffrage organisation."[165] Another correspondent thought that the new spirit of women that had been created during the last decade "must shine through all their labours and illuminate all their actions."[166] Much of the suffrage newspapers within the first weeks of the war were saturated with the militarized rhetoric that would have been understood by those women who had been involved with the WSPU. Nina Boyle of the Women's Freedom League (WFL), itself an organization originally made up of former WSPU members, used militarized language to propose suffragists should, "stand to their guns and man their own forts and not to let themselves be drawn out of their movement for any purpose whatsoever."[167] These words further suggest the importance of the ideas of the suffrage movement rather than the leadership, to some women. It points to the importance of community, with its living out of values and beliefs. We return here to the ideas Anderson and Murray held of an active citizenship of rights, duties and responsibilities, when looking at communities as places of belonging that create new societies where self-interest is yielded for the sake of the common good.[168]

[164] WL 7LGA/6/20 Photograph of Women's Hospital Corps medal. Front of medal: metal and enamel, white background, green wreath, inscription '1914, Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite'; back of medal: metal, inscription 'Women's Hospital Corps'. This is the only known example of this medal remaining, in the possession of the family of one of the original Women's Hospital Corps doctors. Medal from c. 1914.
[165] Show your Colours! *Votes for Women,* 14th August 1914, p.698.
[166] Women must never return to subordination, *Votes for Women,* 7th August 1914, p.678.
[167] The Crimes of Statecraft, *The Vote,* 7th August 1914, p.268.
[168] J. Kavanagh, *The World is Our Cloister* (O Books, 2007), pp. 79-80.

Therefore at this time of war it seems inevitable that women such as Anderson and Murray would be involved in the common good. Throughout her memoir, Murray is at pains to point out that although the motto “deeds not words” was chosen for the WHC, they never attempted propaganda even with their colleagues. Nevertheless, the work of the WHC, whether it is in Murray’s memoir, Anderson’s letters or articles of the time, is overwhelmingly laced with suffrage.[169]

Carol Dyhouse suggests that those involved in the suffrage movement saw women doctors as key components of women’s claims to citizenship and relished their performance of their capacities in the workplace.[170] Many of those in Murray and Anderson’s circle certainly understood how important it was that they had offered their services in the time of war. None more so than perhaps Anderson’s mother, England’s first woman doctor, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson. She had been invited to come up to London to see the WHC off to war.[171] As portrayed in Murray’s memoir the elder Anderson was keen to hear the details saying, “if you go and you succeed, you will put your cause forward a hundred years.”[172] Accompanied by the chairman of her own New Hospital, Mr. Pollock, she saw her daughter and her Corps embark from Victoria Station. Years later Pollock would claim that at the station Anderson’s mother stated “if only I were younger how I should love to be going with them.”[173] This moment is often mentioned in works on the war as mother talking directly to daughter.[174] Although Anderson was clear that she was not able to see her mother

[169] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.55-56.
[170] C. Dyhouse, ‘Driving Ambitions: women in pursuit of a medical education, 1890-1939’, *Women’s History Review*, 7, 3, 1998, p.322.
[171] WL 7LGA/2/1/3, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 12th September 1914.
[172] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.12.
[173] A. G. Pollock, MS Draft for a speech 30 June 1925, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Hospital.
[174] For example, see K. Adie, *Fighting on the Home Front: The Legacy of Women in World War One,* (London, 2014), p.113.

at the station due to the large crowds, this image has its echo in Anderson's actual words found in a letter to her mother " this is just what you would have done at my age. I hope I will be able to do it half as well as you would have done."[175] Having her mother witness the WHC departure to war underscores Anderson's sense of historic legitimacy. The struggle for access to train as a doctor undertaken by Elizabeth Garrett Anderson has some connection with the notion of history made by a series of disruptive actions. Actions that create new worlds allowing women to participate in the professions and public life. The new world that Murray and Anderson were embarking into was this idea coming full circle, created by their understanding of disruptive actions as militant suffragists.

According to Mayhall women who worked for enfranchisement during the war found themselves having to struggle against a discourse that defined campaigning as being against the national interest.[176] However, the WHC were very clearly defined by many as a suffragette organisation. There was an understanding of the ideas and views of the women in charge. One visitor to the hospital in Paris asked some of the men she had been speaking to if they would be inclined to give women the vote after being there. One patient told her "If it rested with me I would give them 16."[177] After their return to London, *The Tatler* was just one paper that drew its readers attention to the noble ladies who manage "the Suffragette hospital in Endell Street."[178] Another patient had his letter published in *The Daily Telegraph,* where he told how wonderful the care was he had received at Endell Street, "The whole hospital is a triumph for women and incidentally it is a triumph for suffragettes."[179]

[175] WL 7LGA/1/2/4, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 15th September 1914.
[176] Mayhall, *Militant Suffrage Movement,* p.211.
[177] WL 7LGA/2/1/19, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Ivy Anderson, 18th October 1914.
[178] *The Tatler,* 19th July 1916; WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook.
[179] The What Ho Corps, *The Daily Telegraph,* November 19th 1915, WL 7LGA/3 Endell Street Military Scrapbook.

The satisfaction this recognition must have given these women is shown in letters Anderson wrote home, where she often draws attention to what a new experience it is to be so popular.[180] This recognition of the work of those involved with the WHC as suffrage demonstrates their patriotic ability to make the same sort of willing sacrifice for the war effort as men who volunteered. It suggests that they were succeeding in their right to have their claims for citizenship publicly recognised. Here Anderson and Murray also disrupt the popular misconception that the suffrage campaign lay dormant throughout the war.

Those who had not grasped the suffrage essence of the WHC were soon corrected. After decorating the wards for Christmas with Union Jacks and the word "Freedom" the men who had undertaken this were subject to the disapproval of Murray who stated, "Freedom! There is no freedom for women under that flag."[181] After puzzling over her disappointment, and an explanation from a lady visitor, they changed the words to read "England" making sure that when Murray made her rounds the next time she was greeted with cries of "We are all for Votes for Women, Doctor."[182] Many of their official visitors were quickly given a lesson in the ethos behind the WHC. One visitor who disparaged the badge they were wearing, was led into a suffrage discussion. He began by calling those involved in the movement, "Horrid Women".[183] Appearing to be shocked that this man was not in favour of women's suffrage Murray's description of this discussion is tempered with the amusement that men seem to be so easily flattered, "Somehow I thought *you* would be…you

[180] WL 7LGA/2/1/9, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 27th September 1914; WL 7LGA/2/1/12, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 4th October 1914.
[181] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.104.
[182] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.104.
[183] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p. 56.

are not a stupid man, and you have been about the world a lot. You seemed to me to be unusually open minded."[184] After this Murray states that the argument that followed was amplified by "facts and reasons" that would have opened any mind.

This ability to draw people around to their way of thinking with not only their deeds but also their words shows their strong belief in themselves and their fight to be recognised politically as citizens. This viewpoint was expanded on when the WHC was visited by some French female doctors. According to Murray the women complained about having few opportunities and were perhaps a little bitter that while British women doctors were in established control of hospitals under the French Red Cross, they were serving as dressers or night orderlies.[185] There was little sympathy from the two British doctors to their plight, and they pointed out that women must make their own opportunities and take advantage of societies and movements as women in England had done.[186]

Comrades in arms

Many of the women who worked alongside Anderson and Murray in senior roles were comrades from the suffrage movement. Dr. Amy Shepherd had been a member of the WTRL, former militant Beatrice Harraden was the librarian at Endell Street, and former WSPU member Bessie Hatton oversaw amusements, to name but a few. As well as working alongside suffrage comrades the WHC was also visited by them. They were graced by the presence of Emmeline Pankhurst whilst in France and *The British Journal of Nursing* drew attention to the fact that the

[184] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.56.
[185] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.71.
[186] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.71.

flowers in the wards on the day of their journalist's visit to Endell Street had been donated by Mrs. Pankhurst and Miss Annie Kenney.[187] This is interesting in the light of the idea that Anderson and Murray had physically left the WSPU, and perhaps shows that the bonds forged in the heat of the suffrage battle could not be completely broken.[188]

Sylvia Pankhurst also visited the WHC in France, writing about her experiences. Her description of visiting Claridge's is curious considering her views during the war. Pankhurst suggested that war work was nothing more than capitulating to the argument of physical force, and the whole point of democracy was that the government no longer rested on brute force but on the consent of the governed.[189] However she was clear to state that, former WSPU physician Murray, who had "come to my bedside in the days of the Cat and Mouse Act" after Pankhurst had been forcibly fed and released from prison, had simply by being herself and with her confidence in her work, "overborne many a seemingly cast iron Army tradition."[190] In addition to this Pankhurst's antiwar newspaper *The Woman's Dreadnought* stated in an editorial just after the opening of Endell Street, that it was pleased that the British government had come to its senses, put aside its prejudices and had agreed "to make use of the valuable services of these eminent doctors."[191] These ongoing connections demonstrate that any broad categorization of divisions in the

[187] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p. 58; The Military Hospital, Endell Street, W.C., *The British Journal of Nursing,* 12th June 1915, p. 502.
[188] According to a letter published in *The Times* by the Assistant Secretary of the National League for Opposing Suffrage, Murray was still a paid-up member of "Mrs Pankhurst's society" contributing £10 towards militant funds for the year. A Criticism, *The Times*, 10th July 1914, p.13.
[189] J. M. Byles, 'Women's Experience of World War One: Suffragists, Pacifists and Poets', *Women's Studies International Forum,* 8, 5, 1985, p.476.
[190] E. S Pankhurst, *The Home Front,* (London, 1987), p.118.
[191] *The Woman's Dreadnought,* 3rd April 1915, p.223.

suffrage movement are complicated by a reality in which strong networks existed and seemingly contradictory behaviour happened.[192]

Another former WSPU colleague and current US comrade to visit the WHC was the novelist and journalist Evelyn Sharp. Close friends with Anderson for many years she documented her time visiting the Corps in *Votes for Women,* drawing attention to the many mentions of suffrage knowledge amongst the patients.[193] The amount of information on the war and the work of suffragists to be found within the suffrage newspapers would have given those who read them a clear understanding of what was happening, perhaps in some cases more so than ordinary newspapers. Portraying the importance of the work and how it was integral to the masculine war effort within a suffrage arena was another form of militancy, one that had moved away from violence. We can also understand these suffrage networks as sites for the articulation of militant practice. Militant practice that was revealed as women doctors successfully practicing medicine on male patients in war arenas for the military.

The novelist Elizabeth Robins, who became an assistant at the library in the Endell Street hospital, stated that Anderson attributed the success of the WHC to the training they had received from being involved in the Suffrage movement. [194] It seems that they wanted to pass this training onto their junior staff. In a speech to medical students at the London School of Medicine for Women in 1917, Anderson stated, "By virtue of her training, it is our duty to lead other women."[195] Arguably this

[192] *The Women's Dreadnought* was advertised in the 19th March 1915 edition of *Votes for Women* highlighting the complexity of these women's relationships.
[193] 'Another Milestone! Women Doctors Recognised by War Office', *Votes for* Women, 11th December 1915, p.85.
[194] Papers of Elizabeth Robins, Diary 10th May 1915, quoted in Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson (1873-1943), p.213.
[195] *Magazine of the London School of Medicine for Women*, November 1917, 12, 60, p.80.

quote is multifaceted, referring to suffrage as well as medical training. With former suffrage comrades' involvement with the WHC, Anderson and Murray seemed to have saved the more intense proselytizing to the younger staff that worked alongside them.

It was clearly spelled out to the women who worked under them that not only did they have to do a good job, they had to do a superior job. Very soon after her arrival at the WHC from Australia, Vera Scantlebury wrote to her parents in mock alarm that she was in the "midst of the very militant suffragettes."[196] Her letters home show that suffrage issues were widely discussed, "…somehow we always get around to that subject again and again."[197] With the clear and strong suffrage ethos and the network of suffrage comrades surrounding the work of the WHC, it does not seem surprising that despite Murray's protests there was a great deal of proselytizing.

Murray and Anderson discussed the suffrage movement with those staff who had arrived from Australia in an imperialistic way almost forgetting that women in Australia had been enfranchised by the Commonwealth Franchise act of 1902.[198] Eleanor Bourne who had been invited by Murray to join the Endell Street staff, portrays Murray and Anderson as regarding the Australians as rather luke warm in the suffrage cause, questioning what they had done in the years since acquiring it. "They would say 'but you have had the vote for 15 years!"[199] It appears that Murray

[196] University of Melbourne, Vera Scantlebury Brown Archive, Letter Diaries from England, Vol A2, p.61, quoted in J. Geddes, 'Deeds *and* Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street', *Medical History*, 51, 2007, p.90.
[197] University of Melbourne, Vera Scantlebury Brown Archive, Letter Diaries from England, Vol A3, p.4, quoted in H. Sheard, "They will both go to heaven and have crowns and golden harps': Dr Vera Scantlebury Brown and Female Leadership in a First World War Military Hospital', *Scholarship Research Centre, The University of Melbourne,* 2011, p.96.
[198] B. Caine, 'Australian Feminism and the British Militant Suffragettes', paper presented as a lecture in the Department of the Senate Occasional Lecture Series at Parliament House on 31 October 2003, p.1.
[199] State Library of Queensland, OM81-130, Eleanor Elizabeth Bourne Papers, Reminiscence, p.2 accessed www.slq.qld.gov.au 1/11/2017

did not think Australian women had done enough as she held regular educational meetings on "educating their future citizenesses."[200] Here Murray portrays herself as what Julia Bush describes as an Imperial feminist, with a duty to change the world, contributing to patriotic endeavours, and educating her inferiors, showing again that some women already thought of themselves as citizens, of not only Britain but also her Empire.[201] Furthermore, if we return to the idea of historical legitimacy, we can perhaps see the need for these women to believe that Britain, the home of democracy and in the words of radical MP John Bright, "the mother of parliaments", needed to be the place where the correct kind of female citizenship occurred having been achieved like many other democratic milestones, in the fight for reform.

Votes for (some) women

In what was to become the last year of the war, The Representation of the People Act 1918 was passed on February 6th, 1918.[202] This gave property owning women over 30 the opportunity to vote in a parliamentary election. That morning Murray was on the steps of her office early to make known her desire to "have the flags run up" to mark this auspicious occasion.[203] The young women of the staff viewed the celebration with some amusement, "quite untouched by their possible share in it." After all the discussions they had had and the work they had done, no doubt this must have been a little galling for Murray and Anderson. However, for Murray and Anderson, the vote wasn't important, rather it was a symbolic recognition of

[200] Vera Scantlebury Brown, Volume A10, p.35 quoted in Geddes, 'Deeds *and* Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street', p.90.
[201] J. Bush, *Edwardian Ladies and Imperial Power*, (Bloomsbury, 2000), p.179.
[202] https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/electionsvoting/womenvote/case-study-the-right-to-vote/the-right-to-vote/birmingham-and-the-equal-franchise/1918-representation-of-the-people-act/ accessed 6th July 2018
[203] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.206.

something they already knew; it was public recognition of their already deeply held citizenship.

Conclusion

This exploration of Anderson and Murray's participation in the militant suffrage movement and their use of ideas, learnt throughout this time, in their work with the WHC has shown that by the outbreak of war the ideas were more important than the leadership. This chapter has demonstrated the importance of the suffrage campaign to Anderson and Murray who understood the strong military rhetoric of the militants was linked to not only historically legitimate political protest, but also ideas of heroic military masculinity. The community and networks of the movement gave Anderson and Murray the safety and belonging to explore ideas of gender fluidity inherent here in their understanding of liberal citizenship. Thus, allowing them to fully participate in the war.

Although some have suggested that those who continued to campaign for suffrage found themselves swimming against a tide that viewed this as against the national interest, the work of the WHC was clearly seen by the public, its patients, its visitors and its staff as "the Suffragette hospital" allowing a clear view of a patriotic suffragism.[204] Anderson and Murray themselves were clear that the success of the WHC was down to the training they had had during the campaigning days. The WHC had been the culmination of this training, the embodiment of their ideas of citizenship. "No one came there without being sensible of the spirit of the place, and no one left without being touched by it."[205]

[204] *The Tatler,* 9th July 1916 in WL 7LGA/3.
[205] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.208.

Chapter Two

"My Loving Comrade." Love's cultural codes in the experiences and lives of Louisa Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray.

> I give one of my eight diamond rings to each of the following: - … my "nieces in love" (viz the nieces of Dr. Flora Murray).[206]
>
> One knows for certain that she rejoiced all the time in the loveliness of her surroundings which were her earthly home, made still more gracious for her by a rare friendship."[207]

Like many of their contemporaries, records of Flora Murray's and Louisa Garrett Anderson's personal lives are sparse. However, by piecing together the fragments that remain, life emerges. Although we can never really know the depth of feeling between two people, wills and documents such as obituaries can indicate familial relationships. These public documents lay a person's private life, loves and beliefs bare.[208] The wording of Anderson's will, written some twenty years after the death of Murray, is clearly designed as a recognition of their relationship. The naming of her "nieces in love" as Murray's family is striking and certainly indicates familial relationships with its echo of "in-law". Similarly, the author of Murray's obituary refers to her home being made "more gracious" by a "rare friendship". In the context of the time calling their relationship a friendship was to proclaim its intimacy.[209] In addition to these fragments and the knowledge that the two women lived and worked together for a number of years, Murray and Anderson are remembered together in a churchyard near their home in Penn, Buckinghamshire, under the words "we have been gloriously happy".[210] In light of this information I argue that this relationship is best understood as a romantic one.

[206] Will of Louisa Garrett Anderson, 15th November 1943. WL 7LGA/5.
[207] Dr. Flora Murray, *The Vote* 10th August 1923, p.250.
[208] E. Hamer, *Britannia's Glory, A History of Twentieth Century Lesbians* (London, 1996), p.1.
[209] S. Marcus, *Between Women, Friendship, Desire and Marriage in Victorian Britain* (New Jersey, 2007), p.51.
[210] Holy Trinity Churchyard, Penn, Buckinghamshire.

Despite the type of evidence above, a denial and in some cases a removal of sexuality from women's lives has been an ongoing problem amongst the historiography of women of the early twentieth century. As demonstrated in the previous chapter Anderson and Murray's ability to understand themselves as citizens playing a full role in the First World War had its roots in the movement for women's enfranchisement. This movement challenged sexual norms and gave space to women to understand themselves. A more fully rounded view of women's lives during the First World War cannot ignore sexuality, especially when discourse around female sexuality was a major topic during the conflict. The fact that this often focusses on heterosexuality has allowed many who write about the women's movement during this period to shy away from tackling the differing gender and sexual identities of the women involved. In some cases, they have gone out of their way to deny the homosexuality of certain women.[211] Alongside this is the sad reality that many who write feminist history also feel reluctant to place lesbians within this early period of the women's movement.[212]

Sandra Holton for example argues that women involved in the suffrage movement upheld the notion of sexually specific natures in men and women and accepted much of the existing stereotyping.[213] Within a chapter dedicated to understanding views of sexuality within a movement which was the embodiment of challenge to patriarchy, Holton does not mention any women who may not have been heterosexual. In Angela Smith's *Suffrage Discourse in Britain During the First World*

[211] For a small example see, M. Pugh, *The Pankhursts*, (London, 2001); T. Lloyd, *Suffragettes International: The World Wide Campaign for Women's Rights*, (London, 1971); G. Lewis, *Eva Gore Booth and Esther Roper: A Biography*, (London, 1988).
[212] R. Collis, *Portraits to the Wall, Historic Lesbian Lives Unveiled,* (London, 1994), p. x.
[213] S. S. Holton, *Feminism and Democracy: Women's Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain 1900-1918,* (Cambridge, 1986), p.20.

War, her chapter on suffragists and war work concentrates on women known to have shared their lives with other women without mentioning this at all or what this might have meant for their work.[214] Sonja Tiernan terms these kind of views as "homophobic embarrassment" rather than a simple oversight.[215] Sexuality may not always be of primary importance for a biographical study, but in trying to have a wider understanding of women's lives it should be considered. These studies here link to the ideas of Laura E. Nym Mayhall who suggests that feminist histories need scrutinising for the ways in which feminists construct meaning for themselves that simultaneously silence others.[216] In addition to this Rose Collis points to the fact that as women have been omitted from many male accounts of history, so have lesbians been sifted out of many female versions.[217]

The problem with defining lesbianism is one that has troubled lesbian history. According to Rebecca Jennings this has preoccupied historical study, with debates that have centered on the significance of sexual activity and what women called themselves.[218] Terry Castle asked, "Why is it so difficult to see the lesbian-even when she is there, quite plainly, in front of us?"[219] One answer to this could be found in Sheila Jeffreys wonderfully named article, *Does It Matter If They Did It?* This argued that if evidence of sexual activity is required before anyone is included in lesbian history then it is quite possible to end up with no lesbian history at all.[220] A

[214] Smith, *Suffragist Discourse*, pp. 71-93.
[215] S. Tiernan, 'Challenging Presumptions of Heterosexuality: Eva Gore Booth, A Biographical Case Study', *Historical Reflections*, 37, 2, 2011, p.59.
[216] L. E. Nym Mayhall, 'Creating the 'Suffragette Spirit': British Feminism and the Historical imagination', *Women's History Review*, 4, 3, 1995, p.334.
[217] Collis, *Portraits to the Wall*, p. x.
[218] Jennings, *A Lesbian History of Britain*, p. xv.
[219] T. Castle, *The Apparitional Lesbian: Female Homosexuality and Modern Culture*, (New York, 1993), p.4.
[220] S. Jeffreys, 'Does It Matter If They Did It?', in Lesbian History Group (ed.), *Not a Passing Phase, Reclaiming Lesbians in History 1840-1985*, (London, 1989), p.22.

first hand testimony of sex is rare even when searching for relationships which are clearly heterosexual. Nevertheless as Sharon Marcus points out, although men and women have been equally reticent about sexual activity, a double standard has been created.[221] In addition she suggests that women who consummated a mutual love were less likely to leave a record of their lives.[222] This chimes with Laura Doan's view that "private papers disclosing their innermost thoughts about their romantic entanglements or their sexual desires, preferences or inclinations" are almost impossible to come across when researching women's lives that we might suggest were queer.[223] With a lack of explicit evidence it appears that it has become enough to recognize women's contribution to history, and in doing so, sacrificing their sexual life for their political agency.[224]

The need for evidence of sexual activity is closely linked with the idea that it is wrong to apply contemporary terms to women who may have experienced their love differently than in the present day.[225] This perhaps stems from Jeffreys' original thesis that suggested sexology created a stereotypically deviant woman that many shied away from.[226] Along with Lillian Faderman's pioneering study of what she termed "romantic friendship's", this is perhaps the original impetus of researching lesbian history, to retrieve women who had been ignored or undetected.[227] However, Lesley Hall has discussed how many have now complicated these views surrounding the construction of identities and the extent of the influence sexology

[221] Marcus, *Between Women*, p.43.
[222] Marcus, *Between Women*, p.49.
[223] L. Doan, *Disturbing Practices, History, Sexuality, and Women's Experience of Modern War* (Chicago, 2013), p.5.
[224] Tiernan, 'Challenging Presumptions of Heterosexuality', p.67.
[225] Lesbian History Group, 'Introduction', in Lesbian History Group (ed.), *Not a Passing Phase, Reclaiming Lesbians in History 1840-1985* (London, 1989), p.14.
[226] S. Jeffreys, *The Spinster and her Enemies, Feminism and Sexuality 1880-1930* (London, 1997), p.113.
[227] L. Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men, Romantic Friendship and Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (London, 1985), p.18.

had.[228] One of the ways this has happened has been the use of Queer as a lens with which to view women's lives of this period. Doan sees scope here to understand aspects of the sexual past that resist explanation in the context of identity history.[229] This troubling of sexual identity and as Regina Kunzel states "its ability to expose taken for granted assumptions, institutions and arrangements" suggests that Queer is indeed a useful category of analysis, when looking at lives, such as those of the women found within this thesis that have an expression of difference.[230]

Doan draws attention to the problematic and "very modern urge" to define sexuality in the past as "knowable", suggesting that while it is a pleasurable experience to imagine a lesbian past, it is too difficult to read cultural codes "from the distance of the present."[231] However, as Emma Donoghue states if we "stamp out that spark of imaginative identification, that prickling sense of some fellow feeling between "us and the dead "them"", then where is the pleasure in researching the past.[232] This chapter therefore will attempt to show we can read some of these cultural codes if we move away from the idea of identities and arrive at Moulton's richer understanding of life outside of heteronormativity.[233]

Doan has stated that the idea of sexual identity came about "as a result of the forces that took place after the First World War."[234] Along with Carden-Coyne, she suggests that it would have been utterly confounding to people who lived through

[228] L. Hall, "Sentimental Follies' or 'Instruments of Tremendous Uplift'? reconsidering women's same-sex relationships in interwar Britain', *Women's History Review,* 25, 1, 2016, p.125.
[229] Doan, *Disturbing Practices*, p.4.
[230] Kunzel, 'The Power of Queer History', p.1565.
[231] A. Carden-Coyne & L. Doan, 'Gender and Sexuality', in S. Grayzel and T. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War* (Oxford, 2017), p.97.
[232] E. Donoghue, 'Doing Lesbian History, Then and Now', *Historical Reflections*, 33, 1, 2007, p.20.
[233] Moulton, 'Bricks and Flowers', p.63.
[234] Carden-Coyne & Doan, 'Gender and Sexuality', p.95.

the war to have determined their sexual identity.[235] In contrast Deborah Cohler suggests that a discourse of "xenophobic nationalism and ideological affiliations with homosexual male figures.." along with cultural anxieties surrounding female heterosexuality, during the war allowed lesbian identities to emerge.[236] The questions raised by Doan and Cohler examine how discourse shapes and constitutes emergent sexual identities. Cohler, Carden-Coyne and Doan propose that "ordinary" people did not have the information the "elites" had access to about sexuality, and therefore we cannot suggest that there was a coherent narrative of female homosexuality.[237] However, this research is focused on middle class women doctors. They may have been seen as elite by some but seen themselves as ordinary. Indeed, as we saw in the previous chapter Anderson called herself "a common place person."[238] They would have had access to the research that sought to modernize sexual knowledge. However, as this chapter will show they appear to sit outside of this discourse of sexology constructing a notion of themselves using, as Anna Clark suggests, "the cultural discourses available to them."[239] Anchoring women's statements about their relationships, as Marcus suggests, needs to be done in the context of their lives.[240]

A lack of a coherent narrative need not signal a lack of understanding of sexuality rather it may indicate multiple, fluid and emergent forms of female desire. By foregrounding the intricacies of individual experiences, I seek to discover their

[235] Carden-Coyne & Doan, 'Gender and Sexuality', p.95.
[236] D. Cohler, 'Sapphism and Sedition: Producing Female Homosexuality in Great War Britain', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 16, 1, 2007, p.68.
[237] D. Cohler, *Citizen, Invert, Queer: Lesbianism and War in Early Twentieth Century Britain*, (University of Minnesota Press, 2010), p.112; Carden-Coyne & Doan, 'Gender and Sexuality', p.97.
[238] WL 7LGA/1/2/2, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 14th March 1912.
[239] Clark, *Alternative Histories of the Self*, p.5.
[240] Marcus, *Between Women*, p.44.

cultural codes. J Dowd Hall argues that competing theories of homosexuality are in danger of returning to the historical denial they have been attempting to move us away from.[241] Indeed, both Donoghue and Valerie Traub worry that these have the unfortunate effect of making the past so remote that it no long feels like it has anything to do with us.[242] Anderson and Murray are aptly described by Ann Ferguson's definition of a lesbian as "a woman who has sexual and erotic-emotional ties primarily with women"[243] However rather than an identity, this lesbianism is visible in the way they lived. Emily Hamer suggests lesbianism is not and has not been a separate part of women's lives that needs a concrete definition, but an inalienable part of the fabric of their experiences and their choices.[244] Seth Koven posits the importance of love for understandings of female friendship and same sex desire.[245]

Within these ideas I place my arguments about Anderson and Murray's lives; shifting focus from what Traub has called the "tired binaries" of acts vs. identities and aspiring to sit alongside Susan Lanser's proposal of looking at the sexuality of history rather than undertaking another search for the history of sexuality.[246] With this look at Anderson's and to a lesser extent Murray's lives we can use these ideas to understand the cultural codes they used to actualize their lives during the First World War. Their relationships presence is in the choices they made and the opportunities they created. Martha Vicinus draws our attention to the idea that

[241] J. Dowd Hall, "To Widen the Reach of Our Love": Autobiography, history and desire', *Feminist Studies,* 26, 1, 2000, p.234.
[242] Donoghue, 'Doing Lesbian History, Then and Now', p.20; V. Traub, *The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England*, (Cambridge, 2002), p.32.
[243] Quoted in M. Jackson, *The Real Facts of Life, Feminism and the Politics of Sexuality 1850-1940*, (London, 1994), p.17.
[244] Hamer, *Britannia's Glory*, p.10.
[245] S. Koven, *The Match Girl and the Heiress,* (Oxford, 2014), p.19.
[246] Traub, *The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England*, p.357; S. Lanser, 'Mapping Sapphic Modernity', in J. Hayes, M. R. Higgonnet & W. J. Spurkis (eds.), *Comparatively Queer: Interrogating Identities Across Time and Cultures*, (New York, 2010), p.72.

although we cannot fully answer the question of how sexually aware women were, "surely some were, while some were not."[247] Maybe it really is that simple.

According to Sylvia Pankhurst's *The Suffragette Movement* Anderson and Murray knew each other from 1909.[248] It appears to be generally accepted that they met after both had joined the WSPU. However, as we saw in the previous chapter, they had both been members of the NUWSS in 1907 and would possibly have known each other then.[249] They appear to have quickly become closely involved with one another. Geddes suggests that members of the WSPU were committed to ideas of sexual purity as central to the eventual transformation of women's position in society. She points to the idea that for some middle-class women of the time the idea of a career was incompatible with a "heterosexual relationship", therefore a personal life had to further her professional life, leading in many cases to professional women spending their lives together. [250] However, Anderson and Murray seem to have spent their lives in relationships with other women and together for reasons beyond professional and political ambitions.

The First World War is often depicted as the major moral watershed in British attitudes to sexual behaviour. A culture of complex radical changes alongside a need to find and reestablish stability; a place where women were seen as heterosexually voracious on one hand, whilst they were simultaneously being pushed back into their traditional roles.[251] Hall discusses how the upheaval of the

[247] M. Vicinus, *Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1850-1920*, p.158.
[248] Quoted in E. Hamer, 'Keeping their Fingers on the Pulse: Lesbian Doctors in Britain, 1890-1950', in G. Hekma, F. Eder and L. A. Hall (eds.), *Sexual Cultures in Europe: Themes in Sexuality*, (Manchester, 1999), p. 155.
[249] See chapter 1.
[250] Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson (1873-1943), p. 211.
[251]J. Medd, *Lesbian Scandal and the Culture of Modernism,* (Cambridge, 2012), p. 8.

war has hidden the ferment of radical ideas before 1914.[252] Whilst Doan suggests that sexuality during this period is generally addressed in the context of "marriage, motherhood, abortion, birth control, illegitimacy, prostitution and venereal disease."[253] These narratives leave little space for discussion around alternative or queer relationships and how Anderson and Murray were able to live as a couple during a time of supposed sexual anxiety. Drawing on Anderson's personal papers, Garrett family papers, suffrage newspapers, newspapers and Murray's memoir this chapter will focus on the idea that these women did not wait for an emergence of lesbian identity during or after the First World War to understand themselves. Rather it will suggest that their experiences growing up and the feminist networks they were part of gave these women the confidence to self-actualize and live their lives openly. This chapter will explore the idea that these women appear to have lived as a couple during a period of sexual anxiety, with the respect of their peers and public. To do so this chapter uses Vicinus' useful phrase "unnamed but not unknown" as an over-arching theme in order to shed light on two women's experiences.[254] Here I paraphrase Koven: I do not know for sure how their contemporaries perceived their relationship, but I do know that Louisa Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray loved one another.[255]

[252] L. Hall, 'Hauling Down the Double Standard: Feminism, Social Purity and Sexual Science in Late Nineteenth Century Britain', *Gender and History,* 16, 1, 2004, p.50.
[253] Doan, *Disturbing Practices*, pp. 20-21.
[254] M. Vicinus, *Intimate Friends, Women Who Loved Women, 1778-1928*, (London, 2004), p. xx.
[255] Koven, *The Match Girl and the Heiress,* p.1.

Growing up in love

> Louie says you need not be at all afraid of her marrying a cousin…she is however certainly not disposed to think too well of any of her male relatives…she is a fastidious creature and I shall be rather surprised if she marries anyone.[256]

When Elizabeth Garrett Anderson wrote these words to her own mother in 1897, her daughter was 24 years old. The younger Anderson had been ensconced in female communities, studying at the London School of Medicine for Women (LSMW) for five years and before that had been a boarder at St Leonards school in St Andrews since she was 13.[257] Although her early years were typical of growing up in a prosperous middle-class family in the 1870s and 1880s, the fact that both her parents were working, and her wider family was involved in the struggle for female emancipation put her in a different position than those middle class daughters whose lives could generate a strong sense of frustration. Here Anderson links to Carol Dyhouse's view that women who sought to study medicine had to admit to a desire for knowledge, and for power and control over their lives.[258] We can also see Anderson in Vicinus' discussion of middle and upper class girls who had grown up in a very homosocial way, moving in circles of young women with a strong reforming ethos. Anderson certainly found this at the school her mother had a hand in founding: St Leonards.

For the young Anderson her arrival at the school was "one of the most delightfully unhappy days I have ever had" but she was soon making the most of her time surrounded by girls from families keen to give their daughters access to

[256] SRO I: HA436/16831 part, nd.
[257] E. Crawford, *Enterprising Women: The Garretts and their Circle* (London, 2002), p.163.
[258] Dyhouse, 'Driving Ambitions, p.324.

opportunities they themselves had created.[259] Dyhouse suggests that the new opportunities gave these women a confidence which had not been there for their mothers.[260] However the school was closely associated with the pioneering women who had themselves been educated at Girton College Cambridge. As we saw in the previous chapter, the historical legitimacy of their cause in the fight for female emancipation was important. Perhaps we can also see it here in the idea that for these second-generation women there was a sense of historic legitimacy with what they were setting out to achieve.

Women's achievements were certainly celebrated at the school. When Anderson's cousin Phillipa Fawcett became the first woman to achieve the top score in the mathematical tripos at Cambridge, she breathlessly wrote home how wonderful the news was, "School was assembled in the middle of the morning and three cheers for Phillipa was proposed and given most heartily. Then Miss Dove said that there would be no more school for the rest of the morning."[261] When Anderson's mother came to the 1889 prizegiving she remarked that she was particularly keen on the character development that was "inculcated by living in a community."[262] Vicinus suggests that the space women occupied was changed into a more public domain when greater autonomy and individualism were encouraged.[263] At St Leonards, the first headmistress Louisa Lumsden laid down an ethos of physical fitness and public duties. It was a place where a girl was expected to take responsibility for her actions

[259] SRO I: HA436/1/3/2 part, nd.
[260] C. Dyhouse, *Girl Trouble, Panic and Progress in the History of Young Women*, (London, 2013), p.45.
[261] SRO I: HA436/1/3/2 part, 8th May 1890.
[262] Quoted in Crawford, *Enterprising Women*, p.164.
[263] M. Vicinus, 'Distance and Desire: English Boarding School Friendships 1870-1920', in M. Duberman, M. Vicinus & G. Chauncey Jr (eds.), *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past,* (London, 1990), p.214.

and to recognise the consequences for others, no doubt making these schools a wonderful training ground for those girls who wanted more from life like Anderson.[264]

This homosocial community living was nurturing and the focus on self-development allowed for the creation of intense friendships. These friendships were an important step in growing up and developing independence, along with a sense of self-esteem and belonging. This would have held special importance perhaps for this next generation of female pioneers, in their attempts to forge independence from dominant family members. Anderson decided to pursue a medical career from the time she had arrived at St Leonards.[265] However forging independence from her mother, the first female doctor, would perhaps have been a daunting prospect. Although in a letter to *The Times* Elizabeth Garrett Anderson suggested that "young women living away from their parents enjoy life much more and are more respected if they have a profession…"[266] she herself also had close ties with the school, perhaps making this a confusing time for the younger Anderson. We can see her attempting to assert independence and the difficulty she had doing so within the letters she wrote home, especially after her mother wanted to rush to the school after discovering she had been ill, "…I do wish Miss Dove would not write to you about me".[267]

Intense friendships could also spill over into romantic ones. Anderson may have been caught up in the atmosphere surrounding the romantic relationships of many

[264] Vicinus, 'Distance and Desire', p.214.
[265] Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p.205.
[266] Unmarried Daughters, *The Times,* 29 November 1909, p.13.
[267] SROI: HA436/1/3/2, part, 7 March 1891.

of her fellow pupils and teachers.[268] Alongside the educational inspiration perhaps there would also have been some subconscious modelling of sexuality and relationships. Vicinus suggests that such friendships also taught intimacy leading to warnings against close friendships.[269] Hall also points to these friendships becoming perceived as sinister and morbid.[270] Writing later, former boarding school girl, Dr. Mary Scharlieb warned that adolescent girls were apt to form overwhelming and unhealthy attachments that could sometimes be "carried beyond the bounds of sanity."[271] This is shown in the excited letter from Anderson, reassuring her mother that after the death of a girl at school that she herself has not been weighing up the "pros and cons of committing suicide."[272] Although Anderson had not been carried beyond the bounds of sanity, her letters home show that she seems to have become very close to a girl named Katherine.

Although her surname appears to be lost to posterity, Katherine became extremely important to Anderson. This friendship continued after they left St Leonards and she and Anderson moved onto the next phase of their careers. Anderson attended Bedford College to study for the London Preliminary Scientific exam for entry into medical school.[273] In autumn 1892 she began her first year at the London School of Medicine for Women (LSMW). Not long into her studies Anderson and Katherine travelled to Switzerland. This holiday appears to have been a gift from Anderson's parents, with Anderson still attempting to assert her independence, "*Of course* I will

[268] The first headmistress of St Leonards, Louisa Lumsden had an affair with teacher Constance Maynard, whilst they were both at the school. Although they had moved on by the time Anderson arrived, I suspect the atmosphere may not have changed very much.
[269] Vicinus, *Independent Women*, p.188.
[270] Hall, "Sentimental Follies' or 'Instruments of Tremendous Uplift'?', p.131.
[271] M. Scharlieb, Adolescent Girlhood under Modern Conditions, with Special Reference to Motherhood, *Eugenics Review*, April 1909, pp.175-176.
[272] SRO I: HA436/1/3/2 part, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 20th July 1890.
[273] SRO I: HA436/1/2/3 part, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson to Louisa Garrett, 10th October 1891.

travel with Katherine, there can be no question about that."[274] The two young women seem to have had a wonderful time travelling, with Anderson exclaiming "I have a nice room next to K's with a door inbetween. It is too delightful to be here."[275]

Throughout her blossoming career Katherine's name still features prominently in Anderson's letters. Whilst working at the Camberwell Infirmary in London, Anderson occasionally mentions visitors, such as the Vicar of Camberwell and various older acquaintances of her parents who want to almost chaperone her whilst away from her family.[276] However unlike many of these people, Katherine is always mentioned by name, and the two of them spend a lot of time in each other's company, "Katherine came here yesterday afternoon"; "I am going down to Katherine's unless she has arranged to come after her work at the settlement."[277]

The importance of Katherine in Anderson's life seeps into her mother's letters to family. What Elizabeth Garrett Anderson thought of her daughter's friendship we do not know except for a telling remark in early 1900. Katherine seems to be trying her hand at writing plays with Anderson in a starring role.[278] They were holding a dress rehearsal at the Anderson house in Upper Berkley street in London, "...Louie thinks so much of her that I am always surprised I cannot share her view more cordially than I do."[279] The fact that Katherine is so well known within the family that her role doesn't need explanation shows the importance of her to Andersons life. If we are searching for expressions of difference, then the idea that Andersons mother is

[274] SROI: HA436/1/3/2, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson and James Skelton Anderson, April 1894
[275] SRO I: HA436/1/3/5, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson and James Skelton Anderson, July 1894.
[276] SROI: HA436/1/3/6 part, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 8th September 1899; SRO I: HA436/1/3/6 part, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 24th September 1899.
[277] SROI: HA436/1/3/6 part, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 15th September 1899; HA436/1/3/6 part, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 8th September 1899.
[278] SROI: HA436/16831 part, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson to Louisa Garrett, 26th February 1900.
[279] SROI: HA436/16831 part, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson to Louisa Garrett, 9th March 1900.

concerned as to why she cannot see in her what her daughter does is perhaps recognisable to lesbians today. Additionally, here with Anderson's intense friendship perhaps we can see queer history and its ability to expose those taken for granted assumptions.

Elizabeth Garrett Anderson's medical background meant she perhaps had a different view of sexual and gender nonconformity than many Victorian parents. Indeed she was fond of mentioning her friend, a Mrs Grote "who strove through life to be like the sex she belonged to physiologically but not mentally" and the elder Anderson believed that willingness to face these kind of facts would remove much prejudice and individual hardship.[280] She had perhaps learned from her own daughter, for she had seen early on that "…she knows very well what she likes for herself."[281] The significance of a relationship is difficult to determine from the kinds of material historians are left with.[282] Maslow described personal growth as needing love, courage, and self-confidence to self-actualise a person's potential.[283] From these scant letters, Elizabeth Garrett Anderson appears to have understood that her daughter may not marry and accepted her daughter's intense friendship. This coupled with the information that she believed that wide variations of masculinity and femininity must be accepted as normal fact, along with the openness with which she wrote about this to family members including her own mother must have allowed her daughter to grow up in an atmosphere of acceptance and love, giving her courage and self-confidence.[284] Here Anderson also complicates Doan's view that

[280] Quoted in J. Manton, *Elizabeth Garrett Anderson* (London, 1965), p.323. E. G. Anderson contributed articles to the Encyclopaedia Medica about these subjects.
[281] Elizabeth Garrett Anderson to James Skelton Anderson, 5th June 1879, quoted in L. G. Anderson, *Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 1836-1917,* (Cambridge, 1939), p. 202.
[282] L. Stanley, 'Romantic Friendship? Some Issues in Researching Lesbian History and Biography', *Women's History Review*, 1, 2, 1992, p.197.
[283] Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being*, p.98.
[284] Quoted in J. Manton, *Elizabeth Garrett Anderson* (London, 1965), p.323.

class based ideals of the early twentieth century of self-control and moral standards policed sexual ideas through guilt and shame so as not to let down ones family or lose respectability.[285] There certainly does not appear to be any guilt or shame from Anderson's family related to the person she was becoming.

Community and belonging.

By 1907 Anderson had left the NUWSS and joined the more militant WSPU. The militant campaign swept Anderson along into another female community which gave her the space to explore life and ideas. Just one year before another woman who was to become important to Anderson had gone through a similar political awakening; Evelyn Sharp. Sharp was a professional woman, making a career as a journalist. She had also been a school boarder who had admiration and love for other girls.[286] Sharp was similarly forging independence from a dominant figure in her family, in her case her brother Cecil.[287] She had also joined the WSPU after testing the water with the NUWSS.[288] She and Anderson appeared to have much in common. They were both members of the Kensington branch of the WSPU, one of the largest and strongest London branches, where they became close friends.[289]

The experiences the two women had in common would have helped forge this friendship but perhaps Sharp's "Italian Madonna face" and her sparkling wit were

[285] Doan, *Disturbing Practices*, p.158.
[286] E. Sharp, *Unfinished Adventure* (Bodley Head, 1933), p.32-33.
[287] John, Angela V. "Sharp [married name Nevinson], Evelyn Jane (1869–1955), children's writer and suffragette." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. October 08, 2009. Oxford University Press. Date of access 15 Sep. 2018, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-37950. Cecil Sharp was a founding father of the folk song movement.
[288] John, Angela V. "Sharp [married name Nevinson], Evelyn Jane (1869–1955), children's writer and suffragette." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. October 08, 2009. Oxford University Press. Date of access 15 Sep. 2018, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-37950.
[289] Platform 18, *Votes for Women,* 18th June 1908, p.254; Crawford, *The Women's Suffrage Movement*, p.321.

also attractive to Anderson.[290] They spent summer holidays together in 1910 and 1911 at Anderson's mother's cottage in Newtonmore where they "had great times together climbing the easier mountains."[291] Anderson rushed to visit and comfort Sharp's mother after Sharp was imprisoned as part of a suffrage protest later that same year. After being imprisoned for a second time in 1913 "Evelyn spent a couple of days in bed, tended by Louisa Garrett Anderson."[292] Anderson wrote passionate letters regarding Sharp's "courage and single heartedness and clear sight" and her love for her.[293] Sharp later wrote of Anderson's "considerable personal charm" and "gracious and beautiful appearance.", writing in her diary that she had "always felt a great love for her."[294] Although Sharp's biographer, Angela John suggests that it is difficult to discern her feelings for Anderson, perhaps we might suggest that this is not true. In a footnote, Geddes draws our attention to personal correspondence she had received from Professor John in which she states that she has found no evidence that the two women were more than close friends.[295] However what we can argue is happening here again is the hunt for evidence of sexual activity. Using the lens of queer to analyse this correspondence suggests there is plenty of evidence here to propose that Anderson and Sharp cared deeply for each other. Indeed, even though she states there is no proof of this, John goes on to state that on Anderson's part she cared passionately.[296] However, the demand for proof of sexual activity in order to render a relationship real allows for those writing about

[290] A. John, *Evelyn Sharp, Rebel Woman, 1869-1955*, (Manchester, 2009), p.54.
[291] Sharp, *Unfinished Adventure*, p. 124.
[292] John, *Evelyn Sharp*, p.72.
[293] ESNP, MSS. ENG. Misc. d277, nd [1912], quoted in J. Alberti, *Beyond Suffrage, Feminists in War and Peace 1914-1928*, (Hampshire, 1989), p.115.
[294] *Manchester Guardian*, 17th November 1943; MSS.Eng.misc.e.635, vol III, E. Sharp diary, 1, 2 November 1943, quoted in Alberti, *Beyond Suffrage*, p.115.
[295] Taken from a footnote in Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p. 213.
[296] John, *Evelyn Sharp*, p.74.

relationships between women, in the wonderful phrase of Johanna Alberti, to "veil the intensity" of women's relationships.[297]

As we have seen in the previous chapter Anderson became more involved in the militant methods of protesting, including the fight against the forcible feeding of suffrage prisoners after she had met Murray. Writing in her diary in the 1940s after hearing that Anderson was ill, Evelyn Sharp remembered that "Flora Murray came between us all those years ago, just before the last war and our friendship seemed broken."[298] Not only do these words show us the breakdown in a relationship they also affirm the feelings the two women had for each other. Highlighting the importance of listening carefully to what these women say about their own lives.

Unfortunately, Murray's formative relationship experiences are not so available. According to Jennings and Hamer, Murray had her first serious relationship with her fellow doctor, Elsie Inglis.[299] They both suggest that the women were living together in Edinburgh after Murray had completed her medical training. However, Murray's entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (ONDB) states that she undertook most of her training in England entering the London School of Medicine for Women in 1897, traveling north to Durham in 1900 and only returning to Scotland after qualifying in 1903.[300] She appears to have only stayed there for a year before returning to work in London. In addition to this Inglis' own ONDB entry clearly has her in Scotland when Murray is in London.[301] Where the information that Jennings

[297] Alberti, *Beyond Suffrage*, p.116.
[298] MSS.Eng.misc.e.635, vol III, E. Sharp diary, 1 November 1943, quoted in Alberti, *Beyond Suffrage*, p.115.
[299] Jennings, *A Lesbian History of Britain*, p.101; Hamer, *Britannia's Glory*, p.55.
[300] Murray, Flora (and 1869-1923), Jennian Geddes, https://doi.org/10.093/ref:odnb/56304 accessed 17 February 2016. The census of 1891 and 1901 has Murray in London Inglis in Scotland.
[301] Inglis, Elsie Maud (1864-1917), Leah Leneman https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/34101 accessed 15th September 2018.

and Hamer posit comes from is intriguing. Jennings footnote leads us back to Hamer who has no citation. Nevertheless the belief that there was a relationship adds drama and tension to the story that when Murray and Anderson were organising the WHC Inglis applied to work with them but was turned down as they were "fully staffed."[302] Inglis went on to found the Scottish Women's Hospitals, with money raised by the NUWSS.[303] If we believe that Inglis and Murray had been in a relationship then we can perhaps imagine Anderson's jealousy at working with her partner's ex-lover adding light and shade to women we can never really know, making them more fully rounded and not just names on dusty pieces of paper.

When Anderson and Murray became more involved in each other's lives is difficult to pinpoint. The suffrage movement created great networks and community feeling where women would have spent intense periods together. The women's involvement in the speaking engagements around the south coast and their close work in the campaign against forcible feeding may have brought them together.[304] When Anderson went to prison for her suffrage demonstration in March 1912, she petitioned the Home Office to be allowed to see Murray. Within her petition she states she needs to see Murray as "She is replacing me professionally during my absence."[305] This document is important, for having been imprisoned under rule 243a prisoners like Anderson would have known that visitors would not be

[302] Smith, *Suffrage Discourse*, p.81. Whatever the truth behind this is, Murray's memoir has a complimentary paragraph regarding Inglis and her approach to the Corps where her "suggestion to join it was regrettably declined.", Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.69.
[303] Smith, *Suffrage Discourse*, p.83.
[304] The reports in the newspapers seem to suggest they had a kind of speaking circuit on the south coast. For example, see *Dover Express*, 5 February 1909; *Sussex Agricultural Express*, 11 June 1909; *Hastings and St Leonards Observer*, 6 March 1909.
[305] TNA, HO144/1193/220196(1-233), 162, Disturbances: Suffragettes' demonstration. Imprisonment. Forcible feeding, p.1.

allowed.[306] Indeed the person replying to Anderson's petition states that "these prisoners must have known they would have been arrested and they had every opportunity of arranging their professional or business affairs beforehand."[307] As we can see from the letters Anderson wrote to her mother from prison, she "went in for this after a great deal of thought."[308] Additionally the prison authorities state that they had already refused a request from Murray to see Anderson, suggesting perhaps that they just wanted to see each other, a view expanded on when in a letter to her mother she says that although she understands her mother is hurt by her actions, "other people are hurt more, ever so much more…"[309]

Although no other letters exist to tell us that here she means Murray, in a further letter regarding her release from prison she makes arrangements to see her mother but "I think I must go to the cottage for the following Sunday."[310] Perhaps here she is referring to the cottage in the Buckinghamshire village of Penn which at some point Anderson and Murray built and jointly owned.[311] It is interesting to think they may have done so by 1912. Domestic arrangements are indicative of a person's emotional focus.[312] If these sentences are read alongside the official petition, we can surmise that by this point they have come to mean a great deal to each other.

[306] Rule 243a meant that prisoners in the second division had no access to reading or writing materials and were only allowed visitors or letters after a month. Militants argued that they were political prisoners and should be in the first division. Schwan, "Bless the Gods for my Pencils and Paper', p. 150.
[307] TNA, HO144/1193/220196(1-233), 162, Disturbances: Suffragettes' demonstration. Imprisonment. Forcible feeding, p.2.
[308] WL 7LGA/1/2/1, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 6th March 1912.
[309] TNA, HO144/1193/220196(1-233), 162, Disturbances: Suffragettes' demonstration. Imprisonment. Forcible feeding, p.2; WL 7LGA/1/2/6, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 26th March 1912.
[310] WL 7LGA/1/2/3, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 19th March 1912.
[311] Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p.211.
[312] By 1913 they were also living together at 60 Bedford Gardens, W8. This was the address that supporters of the WHC should send their donations to, A Women's Unit for War, *Votes for Women*, 11th September 1914, p.727; They are also shown living here on the 1913 Electoral Register for the Parliamentary Borough of Chelsea. Ancestry.com, London, Electoral Registers, 1832-1965, accessed 22nd April 2017.

The intimacy of many women in the suffrage movement has been used to denigrate their lives and the importance of the cause in a great deal of suffrage and feminist historiography.[313] However, communities such as this and all those discussed so far, nourished and were nourished by the friendships and relationships of women.[314] The life Anderson shared with Murray gave them both reasons for campaigning. Here they link to Adrienne Rich's notion, which articulated lesbianism as a practice of transformation. Within this transformation is the creation of new relationships, communities, social and political bonds which are a means to a future difference for women.[315]

Cultural rhetoric

Although Deborah Cohler suggests that women's involvement in the masculine public sphere enabled a new rhetoric of female homosexuality to emerge during the First World War, these women led communities show there was a rhetoric available for those who chose to look for it. Arguably a kind of rhetoric had already emerged during the height of the suffrage campaign. Many sought to paint the campaigners "…as mannish, unsexed and physically unattractive.", leading some suffrage campaigners to use feminine clothing to suggest sexual purity, which in turn asserted normative gender and sexual identities.[316] We can see the other side of this narrative in a series of articles and letters written to the feminist magazine *The*

[313] This kind of view can be traced all the way back to George Dangerfield and his *The Strange Death of Liberal England* (London, 1935). For other examples see, D. Mitchell, *Queen Christabel* (London, 1977); A. Rosen, *Rise Up Women! The Militant Campaign of the Women's Social and Political Union* (Oxford, 1974); T. Lloyd, *Suffragettes International: The World Wide Campaign for Women's Rights* (London, 1971); G. Lewis, *Eva Gore Booth and Esther Roper: A* Biography (London, 1988);M. Pugh *The Pankhursts* (London, 2001); J. Purvis, 'Gendering the Historiography of the Suffragette Movement in Edwardian Britain: Some Reflections', *Women's History Review*, 22, 4, 2013, pp. 576-590;
[314] Vicinus, *Independent Women,* p.158.
[315] A. Rich, 'Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence', *Signs*, 5, 4, 1980, pp.648-649.
[316] C. Hirshfield, 'Actresses' Franchise League and the Campaign for Women's Suffrage 1908-1914', *Theatre Research International*, 10, 2, 1985, p.130; Cohler, *Citizen, Invert, Queer*, p.52.

Freewoman.[317] A long running discussion about homosexuality occurred over several issues.[318] This discussed the idea that some people were attracted, perhaps sexually, to members of their own sex and that these people were at large in society if only society cared to look. The following quote would have had resonance to some in the suffrage movement,

> It has apparently never occurred to them that a number of these women find their ultimate destiny, as it were, among members of their own sex, working for the good of each other, forming romantic-nay, sometimes passionate- attachments with each other. It is splendid that these women…should suddenly find their destiny in thus working together for the freedom of their sex.[319]

We can also see traces of Rich's notion of a future difference for women if we return to the view from the previous chapter that both Anderson and Murray saw the suffrage campaign as a historically legitimate series of disruptions that created new worlds. Connecting to the creation of new worlds is the use of the work of the poet Walt Whitman in the kind of radical circles embodied by the suffrage movement. *The Westminster Review* published an article on "The New Sex Psychology" that was aghast that Whitman was "widely read and quoted amongst modern socialists and feminists…[320] According to Liz Stanley, Whitman's *Leaves of Grass,* lent itself to interpretations that stressed not only its socialist message but also its promotion of comrade love both of the spirit and of the flesh.[321] Whitman influenced those who wished to combine messages of socialism, democracy and sexual individuality.[322]

[317] The Freewoman was first published in 1911 and styled itself as "A Weekly Feminist review". L. Delap, ''Philosophical Vacuity and Political Ineptitude': The Freewoman's Critique of the Suffrage Movement', *Women's History Review*, 11, 4, 2002, p. 617.
[318] The discussion under the title "Uranians" was covered in the editions dated, 4th January 1912, 25th January 1912, 22nd February 1912, 29th February 1912.
[319] "Uranians.", *The Freewoman*, 4th January 1912, pp.127-128.
[320] The New Sex Psychology, *The Westminster Review*, 172, 5, Nov 1909, p.506.
[321] Stanley, 'Romantic Friendship', p.201.
[322] Clark, *Alternative Histories of the Self*, p.25.

One of the poems within *Leaves of Grass* was *The Dear Love of Comrades,* which contains the line "I hear it is charged against me that I seek to destroy institutions."[323]

Whitman's prose was important to Anderson and Murray.[324] At a celebration of the New Hospital's jubilee during the war, Anderson bade her hearers to remember the words of Whitman, "Pioneers O'Pioneers."[325] More importantly though, not only does the headstone of their grave boldly state at the top, "To the memory of the Dear Love of Comrades." the dedication of Flora Murray's memoir of their work during the First World War reads "To Louisa Garrett Anderson. 'Bold, cautious, true and my loving comrade."[326]

Many at the time read Whitman's work as a public acknowledgement and celebration of physical love between people of the same sex.[327] In particular Whitman's poem became associated with Edward Carpenter's promotion of it and his own English paeon to comradeship, *Towards Democracy*, published in 1883.[328] For many, 'comradeship' and the 'dear love of comrades' thus became a coded way of talking and writing about 'same-sex love'.[329] To paraphrase Stanley in her work about the relationships of suffragette Emily Wilding Davison, Anderson and Murray could not have been unaware of the connotations of Whitman's work.[330] They were too well read and the circles they were closely involved in showed little interest in

[323] www.poetrynook.com/poem/dear-love-comrades accessed 12th October 2018.
[324] In Elizabeth Crawford's work on the Garrett family she has a short paragraph regarding the importance of Whitmans words to the family. However, the only two she mentions by name are Louisa and her relative, Rhoda, a woman known to have had relationships with women. Crawford, *Enterprising Women,* p.267.
[325] WL 7LGA/3 Endell Street Scrap Book, p.78.
[326] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p. v.
[327] Stanley, 'Romantic Friendship', p.201.
[328] Stanley, 'Romantic Friendship', p.201.
[329] Stanley, Romantic Friendship, p. 201. This seems to have seeped into lesbian popular culture. Whitman and Carpenter are used by the protagonist Nan and her new love Florence, a socialist, as an aide to their lovemaking in Sarah Waters seminal novel *Tipping the Velvet* (Virago, 1998).
[330] Morley and Stanley, *The Life and Death of Emily Wilding Davison*, p.134.

men but a great deal in other women. We return here to the ideas of Doan and Cohler and how discourse shapes and constitutes emergent sexual identities, connecting to Anna Clark's notion that many who may have felt constrained by social forces reshaped cultural materials available to them to construct a notion of themselves.[331]

All's fair in love and war

A section of wartime propaganda portrayed women as a reward for the men who had answered its call. David Monger suggests that within this type of propaganda women were either objects of romantic or sexual adventure or they were the reward for peace and the return to the domestic comforts of home.[332] Where do women like Anderson and Murray fit into these ideas of future happiness? They were unlikely to be rewards for soldiers. It appears that they sit in a kind of no man's land between virginal nurses having their first sexual contact with wounded men and women at home enflamed with Khaki fever.[333] As Koven suggests love allows a glimpse of the possibility of remaking the world.[334] With their ideas of masculinity, femininity and citizenship forged from their time in the suffrage movement, their formative experiences, uniform and relationship we can imagine that as Anderson and Murray waited at Victoria Station they may have seen themselves in a similar role to those propaganda answering tommies.

[331] Clark, *Alternative Histories of the Self*, p.5.
[332] Monger, 'Nothing Special?', p.521.
[333] A. Woollacott, "Khaki Fever' and its Control: Gender, Class, Age and Sexual Morality on the British Home Front in the First World War', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 29, 2, 1994, pp.325-347.
[334] Koven, *The Match Girl and the Heiress*, p.1.

Susan Grayzel proposes that it is tremendously difficult to get at the private experience of sexuality.[335] Here then we have to turn to the public expression of that private experience. The memoir of the work undertaken by Anderson and Murray and the WHC during the First World War is this experience writ large. Angela Smith draws our attention to the idea that some autobiographical theorists doubt that it is possible to write an objective factual life story.[336] This is because of the ambiguities of memory and point of view. With Murray's memoir we know that she and Anderson were keen to write about their wartime experiences. Perhaps again we can see the importance of the historical legitimacy to this continued fight, not only of the war but of the emancipation of women. In a letter home to her sister in law, Anderson encloses some notes she has made about her excursion out to the front at Braisne, asking her, "Please not to lose them-but to send them on to Miss Burdett to keep for us."[337] These women understood the importance of the work they were doing and who they were writing for. The story of how the WHC acquired their Quartermaster is told in detail in *The Common Cause,* during the war, only to be repeated almost word for word in Murray's memoir.[338] It appears that Anderson and Murray knew that there was an important opportunity to tell the story they wanted of their experience, and the factualness would lend the book the weight needed to be taken seriously.

Women doctors were seen by many feminists as trailblazers for their movement. Many feminists had intense relationships with other women and Anderson and

[335] S. Grayzel, 'Liberating Women? Examining Gender, Morality and Sexuality in First World War Britain and France', in G. Braybon (ed.), *Evidence, History and the Great War, Historians and the Impact of 1914-18,* (Oxford, 2005), p.115.
[336] A. K. Smith, *Women's Writing of the First World War*, (Manchester, 2000), p.5.
[337] WL 7LGA/2/1/18, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Ivy Anderson, 4th October 1914. The expedition to Braisne covers several pages in Murray's memoir and is discussed further in Chapter 3.
[338] The Woman Army Doctor, *The Common Cause*, 12th May 1916, p. 59.

Murray had friendships with or knew many of them through their suffrage networks. Dyhouse suggests that there is a sense of unease about gender and sexuality present in almost all the accounts of women doctor's lives, but that life histories are "inevitably reticent or discreet." [339] However, Murray's memoir fits into Jennings' description of the idea that some women did articulate same sex desire but did so selectively directing the performance to a chosen knowledgeable audience.[340]

Their audience would have been able to understand Murray's frustration with men who believed it was acceptable to say "in a semi jocular way…" to a professional woman "I don't know much about women doctors. Do you bite."[341] Anderson and Murray spent a great deal of time showing senior British Army officers the extent of their work, "passing the conversational ball from one to the other" while taking comments such as this in their stride. Anderson and Murray also portray a clear sense of self when speaking with these officers,

> "Has Sloggett been to see you? Asked one Brass Hat, referring to the Director of Medical Services…
> No he has not been here.
> I wonder at that. Great man with the ladies, Sloggett.
> I suspect we are not his kind of ladies…[342]

Within this memoir readers who knew where to look would also have been able to see the almost erotic way that Murray describes some of the women under her command. There are the "sunburnt, muscular schoolgirls." who found great pleasure in conveying stores all over the hospital, alongside the orderlies who gave the hospitals their distinctive character and were "beautiful and all of them looked

[339] Dyhouse, 'Driving Ambition', p.330.
[340] R. Jennings, 'From Woman loving Woman to Queer, Historiographical Perspectives on Twentieth Century British Lesbian History, *History Compass,* 5, 6, 2007, p.1914.
[341] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p. 57.
[342] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p. 55.

charming in their uniform, with their fine physique, their shining hair and their look of freedom and determination."[343] Murray could be describing a soldier in his uniform, but by placing women in this role this disruption of norms gives us a glimpse of an expression of difference, a queer view.

The knowledgeable audience can also be found in some of Anderson's letters to her mother and her sister in law. Describing how "Every evening, Dr. M and I try to go out for a stroll, Paris is looking wonderful, especially at night…" there is a romance to her description of walking "along the river last night, past the Grand Palais and the Chambre des Deputes (*sic*) and we came back very refreshed.", while the searchlights sweep the city, suggesting that although "I feel this to be quite a different Paris to the one I have known before." its spirit as a place for lovers had remained.[344]

Humourless women?

Doctor Vera Scantlebury who arrived from Australia to work with the WHC when it was based at the Endell Street Military Hospital in London, documented life there as part of a community with themes of radical feminism and female fraternity.[345] When writing about her time at Endell Street Scantlebury often commented on Anderson and Murray's way of life. When she wrote that Murray had advised her strongly to be beware of men, Scantlebury added about Anderson and Murray,

[343] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, pp.199 & 251.
[344] WL 7LGA/2/1/09, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 27th September 1914; WL 7LGA/2/1/06, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 17th September 1914.
[345] S. J. Neuhaus & S. M. Dane, *Not for Glory: A century of service by medical women to the Australian army and its Allies* (Boolarony press, 2004), p.29.

"I do wish they had a sense of humour."[346] Scantlebury saw Anderson and Murray as formidable austere women.[347] Endell Street nurse, Nina Last also describes the two doctors in this manner, "Dr. Murray was a dour Scot and Dr. G Anderson was severe…my sister and I were truly terrified of them."[348] Nevertheless both these women's accounts of their time with the WHC are full of admiration for their leaders. Last states that although the women didn't suffer fools, those who worked under them longed for times when a word of praise was forthcoming, leading them to feel "uplifted for days."[349] There is a curious symmetry here with the world of the boarding school and the respect and admiration fostered and nurtured. It appears that the WHC became yet another all-female community inhabited by Anderson and Murray. We can also perhaps see here the idea of the severe humourless feminist often seen in anti-suffrage cartoons.

Scantlebury wrote to her family regarding what she felt to be anti-male sentiments and feminist evangelising. In an article about Scantlebury, Heather Sheard repeats Geddes assertion that as members of the WSPU Anderson and Murray espoused their commitment to avoid heterosexuality and marriage. In order to show this, both Geddes and Sheard use Scantlebury's quote regarding the time that a Canadian doctor, Evelyn Windsor told her WHC colleagues she was to be married.

> Dr A rushed across and took Windsor by the hand "Well- well- you poor girl. I am sorry for you." Whearat we all shrieked with delight. Then I rushed into the office and asked Dr. Murray if we could go. She consented hesitatingly and told us she could hardly approve and hoped it would not become infectious!!![350]

[346] Vera Scantlebury 24 May 1917, University of Melbourne, Vera Scantlebury Brown Archive, Letter Diaries from England, Vol A2, quoted in Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p.210.
[347] H. Sheard, 'They will both go to heaven and have crowns and golden harps': Dr. Vera Scantlebury Brown and Female Leadership in a First World War Military Hospital', *Scholarship Research Centre, The University of Melbourne,* 2011, p.95.
[348] WL 7NLA/1/02b, papers of Nina Last, referring to work at Endell Street Military Hospital, nd.
[349] WL 7NLA/1/02b, papers of Nina Last, referring to work at Endell Street Military Hospital, nd.
[350] Sheard, 'They will both go to heaven and have crowns and golden harps', p. 96; Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p.211.

Although both Sheard and Geddes use this quote to show Anderson and Murray's disapproval of marriage and men, another way to read this would be to notice the sarcasm and teasing, the expression of difference. Scantlebury and Last's observations of these two women without a sense of humour does not appear to stand up in the evidence. There is a great deal of humour to be found throughout the sources of Anderson and Murray's lives. Murray's dry wit can be found throughout *Women as Army Surgeons*, with a review in the *Aberdeen Press and Journal* highlighting the "touch of humour" to be found within.[351] In Murray's obituary in *The Vote*, Beatrice Harriden highlights her "light-hearted boyish side…ready for fun and mischief." Additionally, Anderson's letters home often have an amusing anecdote, and her "Courage, integrity and humour" were remembered in an obituary.[352] To not put this type of quote into the space it inhabits is to misread and ignore what it is telling us. Alison Oram points to the idea that humour creates a sanctioned public space to light heartedly explore what otherwise might be difficult, such as sexuality.[353] It doesn't appear that Anderson and Murray hid their relationship from their staff. They worked closely with them and a great deal of communication between partners is nonverbal. The staff were aware they lived together at Endell Street.[354] They even dressed up as a Col and Mrs Dugout "one exuberant in kilt and plaid with fierce red whiskers; the other clinging and elegant"

[351] Women as Army Surgeons, *Aberdeen Press and Journal,* 27th December 1920, p. 5.
[352] For example, "One of our doctors was told her night nurse spoke French fluently and being diffident herself asked the nurse to question a newly arrived French patient. The nurse plunged in at once with 'avez-vous le pain', which wasn't a great success." WL 7LGA/2/1/12, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 4th October 1914; Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson, *The Lancet*, 4th December 1943, p.719.
[353] A. Oram, *Her Husband Was A Woman!: Women's Gender-Crossing in Modern British Popular Culture*, (Taylor and Francis, 2013), p.22.
[354] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p. 251.

to attend fancy-dress parties held at the hospital.[355] This cross dressing as a couple was another way that humour can dissipate unease around behaviours and relationships whilst retaining a narrative about this potentially disruptive behaviour.[356] It perhaps also shows the security Anderson and Murray had in themselves and ideas of gender fluidity within the communities they inhabited.

Family portraits

Alongside humour, pets were also a way of representing a marital bond.[357] Anderson and Murray owned two dogs and their importance is shown not only in the several pages they occupy in Murray's memoir but also in the fact that they accompanied the two women when they went to received their CBE's from Buckingham palace in 1917.[358] In a report about a pantomime staged at the Endell Street Military Hospital in 1916 a special mention was made in *The Evening Standard* how Murray's dog was "scarcely less popular" than Murray herself.[359] In Murray's memoir William and Garrett are described lovingly, almost as children with different personalities with William as everyone's friend alongside Garrett upset by "the long hours that his family spent in the operating theatre."[360] The choice of the word family is clearly designed to show a bond describing Anderson and Murray's family to all who read the memoir.

[355] University of Melbourne, Vera Scantlebury Brown Archive, Letter Diaries from England, Vol A14, p.85-86, quoted in Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p.211.
[356] Oram, *Her Husband Was A Woman!* p.22. It was not the first time Anderson had cross dressed for entertainment. In December 1896 she was playing Sir Anthony Absolute in *The Rivals* at the Royal Free Hospital. SRO I: HA436/16831 part. Elizabeth Garrett Anderson to Louisa Garrett, c. December 1896.
[357] Marcus, *Between Women*, p.52.
[358] Pictures of the Party at the investiture including the dogs can be found in, *The Sphere,* 6th October 1917; *The Sketch,* 3rd October 1917; *The Daily Mirror,* 28th September 1917.
[359] Endell Street Makes Merry, *The Evening Standard* in WL 7LGA/3 Endell Street Scrapbook, p.83, c.1916.
[360] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.228.

The relationship was clear outside of the hospital too. The staff of the WHC were offered the opportunity to stay at the cottage in Penn owned by Murray and Anderson if they needed a rest. Scantlebury was one of these fortunate ones and described a cottage that was a home, loved and cared for, nothing was out of bounds "just a gem."[361] As Matt Cook points out, homes are saturated not only with emotion but are also places infused with markers of happiness, pleasure, security and comfort.[362] Here a relationship is shown within the four walls of a home, for all to see whilst they visit. Marcus' suggestion that sexual relationships were acceptable when its nature was couched in terms of domesticity such as cohabitation, fidelity and middle-class norms of respectability, can be seen in Anderson and Murray's life together.[363] Their cottage in Penn is yet another expression of their relationship that we can read from the present.

Geddes states that neither Anderson nor Murray approved of marriage but then contradicts herself by suggesting that "their friendship was effectively a marriage…they wore identical diamond rings."[364] She then complicates matters further by stating that Anderson, like other women doctors of her generation, remained single. Perhaps it is difficult for Geddes to reconcile this relationship as "no diaries or correspondence between them has survived."[365] As we have seen, in the search for lesbian history, a great deal of time is wasted looking for words spoken in private but miraculously remembered and written down. Here historians of lesbian lives are searching for their own historical legitimacy. However, as

[361] Quoted in Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p. 210.
[362] M. Cook, *Queer Domesticities: Homosexuality and Home Life in Twentieth Century London*, (Palgrave, 2014), pp.9-10.
[363] Marcus, *Between Women*, p.49.
[364] Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p. 211.
[365] Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p.211.

Marcus points out, women who consummated a mutual love and consolidated it by forming a conjugal household were less likely to leave a record of their deeds and words then those women whose love was unrequited.[366] It appears easier to suggest they were humourless man haters rather than attempting to analyse what words and experiences they did leave. Yet Anderson did leave a written record of her feelings for Murray within letters home from France to her sister in law, Ivy. Here she is writing about the fact that the WHC now have two bases, with Murray in Paris and herself in Wimereux on the coast. Murray has returned to Paris to take advantage of the city becoming the main hospital base which Anderson believes will be positive for the WHC but "on the other hand, we hate being apart."[367] In just those eight words we can see evidence that they loved each other.

Conclusion

By foregrounding individual experiences this chapter has explored Anderson's experiences growing up and the feminist networks and communities that both she and Murray were part of allowing us to view lives that we might term queer. Rather than searching for an identity history this chapter has attempted a search for expressions of difference. It has been suggested that there was a narrative of sexual understanding for those who chose to look for it and in the case of Murray's memoir this was directed at a chosen knowledgeable audience. Anderson and Murray show that they gained confidence from their experiences, friendships and networks to self-actualise and allow us to arrive at a richer understanding of women's lives during this period.

[366] Marcus, *Between Women*, p.49.
[367] WL 7LGA/2/1/22, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Ivy Anderson, 17th November 1914.

This examination of Anderson and Murray's experiences complicates views that it is difficult to read cultural codes of sexuality from the distance of the present. Perhaps Anderson and Murray's lives suggest it is not sexuality, but love's cultural codes that we can read from the distance of the present. Rather than searching for evidence of sexual activity and "self-naming", historians of women should be more aware of the implications of love for understanding same sex desire and have the courage to recognise those cultural codes left for us in the sources. Anderson and Murray portrayed themselves as a couple, with pets to show a family bond, they built and shared a home, they wore matching rings, they drew attention to their relationship, they share a gravestone. They have named themselves in the choices they made and the opportunities they created; we can understand their queerness. The cultural codes of their love embodied in Vicinus' phrase "unnamed but not unknown."

Chapter Three

"Travelling as Soldiers": The Women's Hospital Corps and masculine spaces

> Large numbers of men doctors have gone to the front and are rightly volunteering for active service in the army. Only under very exceptional circumstances should women doctors follow their example. Rather, let them stay at their accustomed posts…it may be more exciting and thrilling to try and get on the staff of a field hospital, but this is more especially men's work…[368]
>
> We are engaged in the organisation and equipment of a women's hospital unit, which has been accepted by the French Red Cross Society, and has been asked to be ready to start for France, to take charge of a hospital in ten days' time…[369]

The quote that opens this chapter is taken from a letter written by Anderson's aunt, Millicent Garrett Fawcett and published in *The Manchester Guardian* at the outbreak of war. Fawcett's views appear to represent those who believed that although women could be part of the war effort, the best way for them to do so was to support and fill the gaps left behind by men. However, in the adjacent column we find a letter signed by amongst others, Anderson and Murray explaining that they are engaged in the organisation and equipping of a women's hospital unit that was to take charge of a hospital in France in ten days. In contrast to Fawcett's letter urging women doctors to stay in their "accustomed posts" the doctors of this second letter "earnestly beg all women interested in this work to assist us in completing the fund without delay."[370] These letters show the division the ideas of roles for women during wartime caused; even within families that had spent the best part of fifty years fighting for a change in the view of women in society.

[368] Mrs. Fawcett on the Means of Service, *The Manchester Guardian*, 4th September 1914, p.10.
[369] British Red Cross Unit for France, *The Manchester Guardian*, 4th September 1914, p.10.
[370] British Red Cross Unit for France, *The Manchester Guardian*, 4th September 1914, p.10.

The world with which the First World War collided has often been seen as one where ideas of national strength and citizenship were bound up in constructions of gender. A world in which everyone "knew what Glory was, and what honour meant."[371] Although Britain had no mandatory military service for men, schools, universities and organizations encouraged voluntary training.[372] Within this culture the male soldier became imbued with patriotic concepts such as adventure, bravery, sacrifice, heroism and duty. These ideals served to promote ideals of masculinity, promoting a social hierarchy where your place was determined not only by your class but also your gender. Here a manly character depended on the honest and upright performance of individual duty.[373] According to the ideals of early twentieth century gender the only ones who could perform this duty were men. However, as Catriona Pennell has highlighted, men volunteered to fight for a myriad of reasons. She suggests that patriotic reasons should be seen as a considered, reflective obligation of duty.[374] This would have also been true for those women who chose to participate in the war effort. Anderson had been educated in a school that followed the same ethos as the best boy's schools. Additionally, both women were part of networks and communities that not only did not view gender in quite such binary terms, also saw their actions as self-governed and calmly considered duties, embodying the liberal traditions of citizenship.

One of the dominant strands of scholarship on women and the First World War is the idea that it radically altered women's experience of themselves through gender

[371] Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, p.21.
[372] S. R. Grayzel & T. M. Proctor, 'Introduction' in S. R. Grayzel & T. M. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War* (Oxford, 2017), p.5.
[373] I.R. Bet-El, 'Men and Soldiers: British Conscripts, Concepts of Masculinity and the Great War', in B. Melman, *Borderlines: Genders and Identities in War and Peace, 1870-1930* (London, 1998), p.79.
[374] Pennell, *A Kingdom United*, p. 159.

role reversals.[375] The idea that during this time women adopted roles and occupied forms of employment recently vacated by men therefore gaining unheard of power is still a core narrative of women's experience of the war. Sandra Gilbert's essay on women and the war is still considered influential in some general histories of the conflict, with its focus on the temporary power women gained from replacing men, without analysing what power a woman might have already had. Both Grayzel and Braybon suggest that the idea that the war radically altered women's view of themselves because of "stunning gender role reversals" belies the complexity of women's lives during this period.[376] This sharp disjuncture between pre-war, war and post war constructions of gender identity return us to Braybon's assertion of the desire to find change rather than continuity in the story of women and the war.[377]

This transgression into male space with its focus on women who took new jobs in munitions factories or in industrial roles leaves little space for discussing those women who had their own careers, such as Anderson and Murray. According to Deborah Thom the war raised profound questions of gender by celebrating masculine values and women's separateness.[378] Although Kimberley Jenson agrees that the war reinforced the links between masculinity and military service she also suggests that it was able to offer "marginalised men and women of various communities" the opportunity to undertake patriotic service.[379] Gullace argues that during the war loyal, patriotic service came to be more important than masculinity in the struggle for citizenship. She states that the public understood women's war

[375] Grayzel, 'Liberating Women?', p.113.
[376] Braybon, 'Winners or Losers', p.104; S. Grayzel, 'Liberating Women?', p.113.
[377] Braybon, 'Winners or Losers', p.104.
[378] D. Thom, Gender and Work', in S. R. Grayzel & T. M. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War*, (Oxford, 2017), p.48.
[379] K. Jensen, 'Gender and Citizenship', in S. R. Grayzel & T. M. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War*, (Oxford, 2017), p.10.

service as an "irrefutable" claim to citizenship.[380] Although Gullace posits this as women re-articulating their demands for citizenship as demonstrative loyalty, arguably women such as Anderson and Murray who were WSPU members may have believed there was no need to re articulate their claims. As we saw previously one of the reasons women's patriotism was seen in a passive context was the idea that citizenship was defined by the capacity to bear arms in the defence of the state.[381] Nevertheless, this physical force argument had been fought against by members of the WSPU who believed long before August 1914 that they were fighting a war in which they held a historical and legitimate claim to citizenship. Therefore, it is no surprise that less than six weeks after the start of the war, the uniformed women of the WHC were the first women's unit to go into service having "accepted her duty and her responsibility."[382]

The gender traditionally defined through the responsibility of a military uniform was masculine. Jenny Gould's frequently cited 1987 study of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps emphasised the idea that women performing service in a military uniform was "both disturbing and offensive to many people.[383] Since then this narrative appears to have become the standard notion when discussing the women of the First World War. Lucy Noakes suggests that by wearing such a powerful and codified signaller of male authority and status women were seen to "threaten existing gender boundaries" as they trespassed on male space.[384] Janet Watson also emphasises the public distrust of women in uniform.[385] However, Anderson and

[380] Gullace, *The Blood of our Sons*, p.119.
[381] Law, *Suffrage and Power*, p.15.
[382] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.3.
[383] Gould, 'Women's Military Services in First World War Britain', p.117.
[384] Noakes, "Playing at being Soldiers?', p.125.
[385] J. K. Watson, "Khaki Girls, VADs and Tommy's Sisters: Gender and Class in First World War Britain', *International History Review*, 19, 1, 1997, p.51.

Murray whose lives suggest that they did not subscribe to existing gender boundaries may have looked on this notion differently. Here they link to Grayzel's suggestion that women claimed their right to wear a uniform, using it as an emblem to show their sacrifice and service.[386] However Grayzel then goes on to say that by wearing a uniform, women had to then defend themselves against charges of political motivation.[387] As we have seen the WHC's political motivations were not hidden and do not appear to have been criticised suggesting they were legitimately occupying a public masculine space.[388]

Nevertheless, there have been many claims that women in militarized uniforms were censured. Jonathan Rayner draws our attention to the idea that women in uniform were subject to criticism because of the insult they represented to the men.[389] Additionally Watson has claimed that uniformed women provoked fears of a sexual challenge, joined somewhat by Grayzel who suggests that many drew unconscious or conscious links between these masculine uniformed women and lesbianism, an argument that again returns us to that of Gould and has some resonance for the women under discussion here.[390] Despite these forms of censure, as Doan and Carden Coyne point out, women all over Europe at this time "yearned to be militarised in many ways" including wearing uniforms.[391]

[386] S. Grayzel, *Women's Identities at War; Gender, Motherhood, and Politics in Britain and France during the First World War*, (North Carolina, 1998), p.195.
[387] Grayzel, *Women's Identities at War*, p.195.
[388] See chapter 1 of this dissertation.
[389] J. Rayner, 'The Carer, the Combatant and the Clandestine: images of women in the First World War in War Illustrated magazine', *Women's History Review*, 2017, p.10.
[390] Gould's original point has been used by Grayzel and Cohler to suggest reasons behind the criticism of uniformed women. Gould, 'Women's Military Services in First World War Britain', p.121.
[391] Carden-Coyne & Doan, 'Gender and Sexuality', p.101.

A close look at the life and work of Anderson and Murray allows further exploration of how these uniformed, militarised women who moved into what some might suggest were male spaces were portrayed during wartime. Newspaper and magazine articles of the time, alongside Anderson's personal letters to her family, reminiscences and Murray's memoir of the WHC are used to analyse not only the public discourse but also the views of the women themselves alongside those they encountered. By doing so this chapter shows that Anderson and Murray sit outside the well-established narrative of early twentieth century gender roles that had deviant women "playing at being soldiers" and trespassing into male spaces. Rather we find them within Pennell's notion that the reasons for being part of the war effort were rooted in the social makeup of the communities people were part of.[392] In moving away from stressing the disruptive potential of women during war time this chapter will resume the theme of this dissertation in suggesting that for some women the war was a time of actualisation. With an understanding that categories of female and male are culturally constructed, it will go on to suggest that Anderson and Murray understood how to use gendered language to portray themselves as military actors. Furthermore, it will show that cultural constructions of early twentieth century gender ideals appear to be more fluid than has been previously suggested, allowing Anderson and Murray to participate in male spaces.

Answering the call

The reaction to the idea of women doctors offering their services to the British War Office and the RAMC is almost folklore in the story of women and the First World

[392] Pennell, *A Kingdom United*, p.162.

War. Dr. Elsie Inglis, herself a suffragist, was told in no uncertain terms "My good lady, go home and sit still."[393] George Robb is just one of many who point to the idea that women undertaking unconventional war work might unsex women and lead to a further breakdown of the patriarchal society.[394] According to Watson, women doctors faced a difficult battle for acceptance during wartime.[395] They were frequently seen as inappropriate practioners of military medicine. This viewpoint is expanded upon by Elizabeth Shipton, who states that as by 1914 male doctors in the RAMC had only just secured their own positions within the British Army, any applications from women doctors hit upon a sensitive area.[396] In addition Watson states that the high level of education of female doctors compounded this battle of acceptance as they were seen as socially disturbing.[397] However an article in *The Daily Herald* in the month before the war suggests this is not the entire truth. In this article regarding the Women's Hospital in Harrow Road, it suggests that the public's view of surgical and medical work by women is that, "it is as well and efficiently carried out as by men."[398] In the face of this opposition from the War Office medical women established their own voluntary organisations. As Whitehead points out, women's opportunity to serve the war effort usually came amongst Britain's allies.[399] Anderson and Murray's uniformed WHC took their letters of acceptance from the French Red Cross and arrived at Victoria Railway Station "travelling like soldiers."[400]

[393] L. Inglis, 'Elsie Inglis, The Suffragette Physician', *The Lancet*, 8-14th November 2014, 384, pp.1664-1665. This story is found in many works on the war. For example, Gullace, *The Blood of our Sons*, p.151; Adie, *Fighting on the Home Front*, p.180; A. K. Smith, *The Second Battlefield, Women, Modernism and the First World War* (Manchester, 2000), p.51.
[394] G. Robb, *British Culture and the First World War*, (Palgrave, 2002), p.65.
[395] J.S.K. Watson, 'War in the Wards: The Social Construction of Medical Work in first World War Britain', *Journal of British Studies*, 41,4, 2002, p.488.
[396] E. Shipton, *Female Tommies: The Frontline Women of the First World War,* (Gloucestershire, 2014), p.88.
[397] J.S.K. Watson, 'War in the Wards', p.487.
[398] The Women's Hospital, *The Daily Herald,* 22nd July 1914.
[399] I. Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War*, p. 108.
[400] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.16; WL 7LGA/2/2/1-5 Letters from the French Red Cross, August & September 1914.

Railway stations had become places to carry out complex demonstrations of patriotism, necessity, duty and tearful goodbyes.[401] The popular image of the idealistic young man who, having joined up straight away, is marching off with his new comrades to the train certainly existed but as both Pennell and Gregory describe, the reality created space for many differing emotions, and forms of patriotism.[402] The uniformed female group waiting at Victoria Station comprised five doctors, eight nurses and three orderlies. A large crowd of well-wishers that "comprised all the leading suffragists of the advanced societies" along with other friends and family, thronged around them on the railway platform. There were so many that Anderson was not able to see anything of her mother within the crowd.[403] However, in a letter written on the train from Victoria to Folkstone, Anderson happily reports to her that "you all gave us a fine send off."[404]

Gregory highlights that enthusiasm surrounding those leaving for France was the desire to give these newly mobilised troops a good send off.[405] This public manifestation of solidarity was grounded in views of the national cause which in turn were rooted in the social communities the troops were part of.[406] There appears to be little difference here if we suggest that the suffrage networks of the women leaving for France are that social community. Here the women of the WHC are inhabiting a male space because of those self-same ideas of patriotism and duty. They were like many of their acquaintance who believed that though men may have

[401] Pennell, *A Kingdom United*, pp.159-161.
[402] Pennell, *A Kingdom United,* p.61; Gregory, 'British 'War Enthusiasm' in 1914', pp. 78-79.
[403] Women Doctors for our Allies, *Votes for Women*, 18 September 1914, p.739; WL 7LGA/2/1/04, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 15th September 1914.
[404] WL 7LGA/2/1/04, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 15th September 1914.
[405] Gregory, 'British 'War Enthusiasm' in 1914', p.79.
[406] Pennell, *A Kingdom United*, p. 162.

been responsible for the war, “the business of it concerned men and women equally.”[407]

In her memoir of the WHC Murray describes the departure from Victoria Station in a similar style to those mothers, sweethearts and wives waving their loved ones off to war drawing attention to the “…tokens of affection…” the many well-wishers had given them as they arrived at the station.[408] There is also an almost misty eyed recollection of the figure of Elizabeth Garrett Anderson on the platform, “…her eyes were tender and wistful as she watched her daughter in uniform directing the party and calling the roll of the corps”, which can’t help but be seen in a similar light to the thousands of mothers proudly saying goodbye to their uniformed sons on a chilly railway platform.[409] Mothers like that of Rifleman Norman Demuth, who when they were “seeing us off at Waterloo you could see an enormous sense of pride on their faces.”[410] They also link here to the words of Vera Brittain, who as she saw her brother Edward off at the railway station, equated her work with his.[411] However, we know from Anderson’s letters that the group of women could not see her mother’s wistful eyes.[412] Here Murray is using gendered language to portray the women leaving in a masculine way as soldiers. The women of the WHC themselves and those who came to wish them well, appear to enjoy and understand the similarities of their departure to Tommies off to war.

[407] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.3.
[408] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.13-16.
[409] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.14.
[410] Rifleman Norman Demuth, quoted in M. Arthur, *Forgotten Voices of the Great War*, (London, 2002), p.22.
[411] Quoted in Kent, *Making Peace*, p.64.
[412] WL 7LGA/2/1/04, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 15th September 1914.

Uniformed

This party of uniformed women must have been quite a spectacle. During the war women could be seen in every kind of uniform. Yet as Doan says response to women in uniform was mixed.[413] Noakes suggests that uniforms held a strong appeal for women, allowing women to signify their patriotic involvement in the war effort.[414] However Watson argues that women in uniforms were "generally criticised" because they called into question the gender divisions male soldiers were fighting to maintain.[415] Yet both Noakes and Watson suggest that the wartime conceptions of military service that led to women donning uniform were more intricate than the "familiar ideas of male patriotism, honour and sacrifice."[416] Nevertheless, the WHC were proud of their uniform and use the culturally constructed ideas of gender to portray it as part of their military identity.

Murray claimed that the Women's Hospital Corps had chosen their uniform "carefully".[417] She goes to great length to describe the uniform, drawing our attention to the design and of course the colour,

> It consisted of a short skirt with a loose, well-buttoned-up tunic, and was made of covert coating of a greenish-grey colour. The material was light and durable, and stood wear and weather well. The medical officers had red shoulder straps with the Corps initials, 'W.H.C.' worked on them in white, and the orderlies had white collars and shoulder straps with red letters.[418]

The military flourishes are highlighted along with the understanding that being "durable and stood wear" would make it suitable for the service they were about to

[413] L. Doan, *Fashioning Sapphism, The Origins of a Modern English Lesbian Culture*, (New York, 2001), p.65.
[414] Noakes, "Playing at being Soldiers?', p.124.
[415] Watson, *Fighting Different Wars,* p.8.
[416] Watson, *Fighting Different Wars,* p.20; Noakes, 'Playing at being Soldiers?', p.132.
[417] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.10.
[418] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.10.

undertake. They also understood the standing that a uniform gave them. Nina Last, who worked for the WHC at the military hospital in Endell Street, called her uniform distinguished.[419] She is very clear in her memories of the time that in wearing it "One felt one could hold one's own with the best of them wherever one went."[420] Murray herself said the uniform was "invaluable as an introduction to the character of the Corps."[421]

By naming themselves The Women's Hospital Corps, they put themselves into a masculine military space. Here they differ from perhaps the more well-known wartime women's medical establishment, the Scottish Women's Hospital (SWH).[422] Angela Smith suggests that just the name of the SWH places overt emphasis on the participants rather than the politics of that particular organisation.[423] Arguably then, the WHC wanted the emphasis to be on the military links to what they were doing and the fact that they saw themselves as a military organisation with no difference to those men organising for war. A uniform would have been a simple way to portray their military ideals.

Allied to this is the idea that clothing has a central role in the production and acting of masculinity and femininity. Arguably an understanding of how clothing can be used in the construction of gender would have been needed by the women here. We can see this when Murray describes the uniform as "a passport which admitted the women who wore it to offices, bureaus, stations, canteens, wherever their work

[419] WL 7NLA/1/02b, papers of Nina Last, referring to work at Endell Street Military Hospital, nd.
[420] WL 7NLA/1/02b, papers of Nina Last, referring to work at Endell Street Military Hospital, nd.
[421] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.11.
[422] The Scottish Women's Hospital was founded by Dr. Elsie Inglis with funds raised via the NUWSS. A bigger enterprise than the WHC, it eventually comprised fourteen units and over a thousand women.
[423] Smith, *Suffrage Discourse*, p.83.

took them."[424] It allowed them to enter these masculine spaces and operate as a legitimate military organisation, were they spent "…weary hours with one incompetent official after another, each contradicting what the last one said…"[425] This shows they understood a uniform gave those who wore it a powerful sense of confidence in what they were doing. This idea of confidence links to the masculine values that wearing a uniform embodied, showing again that Anderson and Murray's experiences had perhaps given them an understanding of gender construction that allowed their movement into a masculine space.

Here the WHC would have understood the argument of Katherine Furse, the commandant of the Voluntary Aid Detachment (VAD). Furse was clear that women who shared "in the honour of our men in facing danger." should claim parity of service with soldiers.[426] Furse and a deputation of Red Cross women visited the WHC in November 1916 when it was based back in London in Endell Street. Ostensibly Furse was there to discuss the work done by women with a view to form a new section of VAD's. However, within her memoir Murray is more interested in the fact that the uniform of the WHC was "highly approved of by the deputation."[427] So much so that when Furse enquired as to the name of the maker Murray thought it prudent to request that it wasn't too closely copied. The pride felt in the uniform of the WHC seeps from Murray's writing not least when she quotes a paragraph from Furse's letter where she states how wrong it would be to copy the uniform when "it is very much respected by all of us here."[428] The women in the conversation have put themselves into a masculine arena by virtue of the cultural connotations of

[424] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.11.
[425] WL 7LGA/2/1/02, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, September 1914
[426] IWM/WWC, BRC 10 2/14
[427] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.231.
[428] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.232.

wearing a uniform. Here the uniform is a talking point, not because of women playing at being soldiers, or blurring lines, but because it is respected, as a man's uniform would be.

Uniforms in public discourse

Many who write about women in uniform use letters to newspapers to show that a woman in uniform was seen as deviant in the public discourse. The correspondence that appeared in *The Morning Post* in July and August of 1915 seems to stand for the entire view of uniformed women in the First World War.[429] However at the same time as this discussion in *The Morning Post* was raging back and forth, *The Times* was providing another side to this story. In an article titled "Women in Khaki" it stated that although the number of women in uniform of various kinds had been drawing a great deal of attention the women themselves who wore that colour uniform were not doing so out of any desire to "play at soldiers", but quite ordinarily because "…khaki was dirt defying and much of the work they had to do was in the atmosphere of dirt."[430] Further down the page the uniform of the WHC is mentioned specifically. It is noted that it was Khaki long before the War Office gave recognition to the Corps and those "…men who are back from the front and know what these corps have done …All France are said to pay the tribute of a salute to all ladies in Khaki." When writing to her mother Anderson describes these acts of respect; an old man saluting her on the way back from tending some troops outside of Paris,

[429] Works such as, Kristina Roberts, "All That is Best of the Modern Woman"? Representations of Female Military Auxiliaries in British Popular Culture, 1914-1919; Noakes, "Playing at Soldiers?' and Gould, 'Women's Military Services in First World War Britain', are just three who use the *Morning Post* correspondence.
[430] Women in Khaki, *The Times,* 20 July 1915.

the Corps being saluted on the way to church. “It is quite a new experience to be so popular.”[431]

Articles regarding the WHC often mentioned the fact that they wore a uniform but seem more interested in the fact that they are all women. Indeed, by October 1914 the WHC appeared on the front cover of the popular tabloid, *The Daily Mirror* for two weeks in a row. The *Mirror* does not seem to be concerned with the reasons why the women are wearing uniform. The front cover of the Saturday 12th October issue has a small picture of four of the women doctors pictured including Anderson, all in uniform.[432] There is no mention here of what some had called the “ridiculous masquerades of women in Khaki.”[433] The next week’s issue went further and devoted its entire front page to “An All Women Staff at a British Hospital in Paris : Splendid treatment for the Wounded Soldiers.”[434] Front and centre we again find Anderson in her WHC uniform. The fact that these women might wear uniform to carry out this work does not appear to be of concern. The “skilful doctors” that adorn the front of *The Daily Mirror* are praised as part of the war effort.

This is echoed in the front cover of *The Daily Sketch* in 1916. Again, the cover is devoted to the work of the WHC. It is keen to point out that although the wounded are being treated by feminine tender hands, the work they are doing “is one of the most striking examples of the share which women of Britain are taking in the war.”[435]

[431] WL 7LGA/2/1/06, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 17th September 1914; WL 7LGA/2/1/12, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 4th October 1914.
[432] Women Doctors’ Hospital, *The Daily Mirror,* 12th October 1914, Front page.
[433] Another Woman, *The Morning Post* 19th July 1915, Quoted in Gould, ‘Women’s Military Services in First World War Britain’, p.118.
[434] An All-Woman Staff at a British Hospital in Paris: Splendid Treatment for the Wounded Soldiers, *The Daily Mirror,* 22nd October 1914, Front page.
[435] Our Wounded Heroes in Woman’s Tender Hands, *The Daily Sketch,* 6th July 1916; WL 7LGA/3, Loose page in Endell Street Military Hospital scrap book.

These front covers show uniformed women in a different light. They are not seen to be "aping men", in the phrase that the Marchioness of Londonderry suggested was a favourite term of abuse. Nor do the women seem to be making the newspapers highly suspicious of any militaristic tendencies that some claimed to see in sections of the female populations they felt were trespassing on a male space.[436] In fact the *Daily Mirror* clearly links the idea of uniform and responsibilities to those of both sexes who wore them, "Everybody knows how men and women in uniform become imbued with a sense of responsibility, the honour, and the moral strength of the cause which their uniform stands for.[437]

Other newspapers and journals were also portraying a uniform as an item for both sexes. *The Sphere,* in August 1914 gave over whole pages to informing its readers that it was "…desirable and obviously necessary to have all uniforms correctly made."[438] It went on to describe regulation patterns and where a reader could purchase the items. Many of the larger department stores stocked items for women. "Messers. Debenham and Freebody, Messers. Marshall and Snelgrove and many others among our big firms…" made uniform accessible for those women who needed it, suggesting that women in uniform were seen as general customers, as workers who needed the correct clothes, not deviants playing at soldiers.[439] Returning to the correspondence on women in uniform found in *The Morning Post,* Gould suggests that letters to the newspapers reflected popular prejudices.[440]

[436] The Marchioness of Londonderry, *Retrospect* (London, 1938), p.112, quoted in J. Gould, 'Women's Military Services in First World War Britain', in M. Randolph Higonnet, S. Michel, J. Jenson & M. Collins Weitz (eds.), *Behind the Lines, Gender and the Two World Wars*, (Yale, 1987), p.118.
[437] The Girl in the Overall, *The Graphic,* 14th August 1915, p.214.
[438] The Question of Uniform, *The Sphere,* 22nd August 1914, p.212.
[439] Women's Sphere in War Time, *The Sphere,* 29th August 1914, p.234.
[440] Gould, 'Women's Military Services in First World War Britain', p.118.

However Braybon points us to the fact that editors and journalists usually wrote what they thought their readers wanted to see.[441] The newspaper front covers with their coverage of the uniformed WHC on them shines a different light on the perception of women in uniform. No paper could afford to be too much out of step with its readership and so the fact that uniformed women appear on a front cover featuring praise for their work and nothing else seems to further suggest that for some the idea of women in uniform was not as disturbing as has perhaps been portrayed.

School and patriotism

Anderson's younger brother Alan did not depart for war in uniform. According to Angela Woollacott a middle-class woman's relationship with her brother was the most secure and often the most affective bond she shared with a man. She suggests that middle class women grew up with the understanding that their worth was less than their brothers.[442] However coming from the Garrett Anderson family, this was not the case for these siblings, who would not have believed that only brothers could play the heroic role in war time. Deborah Goram points to the idea that masculine values were entrenched by the public school system.[443] Alongside this is Anthony Fletcher's suggestion that public schools' ideology was based on a relationship between "physical effort, physical courage and moral worth."[444] Noakes joins in this suggestion by pointing to the idea that Victorian schoolboys and soldiers alike were urged to "play up , play up! And play the game."[445] We can see these ideals in a

[441] G. Braybon, *Women Workers in the First World War*, (Routledge, 1981), p.154.
[442] A. Woollacott, 'Sisters and Brothers in Arms: Family, Class and Gendering in World War One Britain', in M. Cooke and A. Woollacott (eds.), *Gendering War Talk* (Princeton, 2014), p132.
[443] Quoted in A. Woollacott, 'Sisters and Brothers in Arms', p.133.
[444] A. Fletcher, 'Patriotism, the Great War and the Decline of Victorian Manliness', *The Journal of the Historical Association*, 2014, p.42.
[445] L. Noakes, *Women in the British Army: War and the Gentle Sex 1907-1948,* (Routledge, 2006), p.6.

letter from Alan to his sister written when he was at school. In this letter from Eton College Alan describes how "…I shall be spending tomorrow afternoon marching about and drilling in college field."[446] However those same values would have been echoed by some girls' schools of the time, including St Leonards in Scotland where Anderson spent her formative years. As we saw previously, St Leonards' educational ethos was modelled on what the graduates of Girton women's college who taught there believed was the best kind of education; that of a boys' public school.[447] Indeed its first prospectus claimed that the school was founded to give girls the education that their brothers have.[448] Elizabeth Garrett Anderson believed for both her children that they needed, "a healthy and active life, with much open air, exercise, plenty of good food and plenty of occupation."[449] Schools such as these would have led "Efemera", writing in *The Bystander* in August 1914 to draw their readers' attention to the idea that "the romance of militarism is inbred in women from childhood."[450]

Letters from the front

Within her family Anderson filled the masculine role of going off to war in uniform, carrying out her patriotic duty and writing letters home from the front. Letters to and from the home front were a vital aspect of the British serviceman's war experience, an important emotional outlet.[451] There is no reason to suggest that this would not be the same for a woman away from home. Jessica Meyer suggests that within the letters men wrote from the war they found a space in which they could present

[446] SRO I: HA436/1/4/7, Alan Garrett Anderson to Louisa Garrett Anderson, 25th July 1893.
[447] E. Crawford, *Enterprising Women, The Garretts and their Circle, (*London, 2002), p.163.
[448] Quoted by M. I G in *St Felix School Southwold*, p.9, quoted in Crawford, *Enterprising Women*, p.163.
[449] Quoted in Manton, *Elizabeth Garrett Anderson,* p.323.
[450] Schoolgirl Hero Worship, *The Bystander,* 12th August 1914, p.394.
[451] M. Roper, *The Secret Battle: Emotional Survival in the Great War* (Manchester, 2009).

themselves to their families as soldiers.[452] Arguably here Anderson is claiming the male space as within these letters she is the one in the midst of the war. She may not have been in the trenches or on the battlefields, but she was dealing with the aftermath of those who had, and her experience of the war was different to that of other members of her family. This experience appears in her letters immediately as the group arrived in France when "we thought we saw aeroplanes in the sky as we approached Paris and the huge search lights swept over the sky…"[453]

Her war experience is also shown when Anderson ventured out by car to Braisne to arrange transport of the wounded. The scene she found there was never to be forgotten, and she "…could tell by the stench in which buildings the wounded lay."[454] Within this scene of wretchedness, where wounded men in ragged khaki lay on a church floor covered in straw, there is no denying Anderson found herself in a masculine military space. The young RAMC officer in charge there had turned to her, a uniformed professional woman for help. The men, and not only those who were wounded, in this situation appear to be helpless. They need saving and Anderson arriving in a car to do so, muddles the wartime vocabulary of men as the protectors and women as those who required protecting.[455] Anderson writes about this experience to both her mother and brother, suggesting the impact it had on her. Interestingly she seems to spare her mother many of the details her brother receives, linking to the masculine notion of protecting women from awful news.[456]

[452] J. Meyer, *Men of War: Masculinity and the First World War in Britain* (Palgrave, 2008), p.45.
[453] WL 7LGA/2/1/05, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 16th September 1914.
[454] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.45.
[455] Gullace, *The Blood of our Sons*, p.43.
[456] WL 7LGA/2/1/10, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 28th September 1914; WL 7LGA/2/1/17, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Alan Garrett Anderson, 27th September 1914, for example in the letter to her mother the conditions are bad and there is "no provision for attending…" to the men. However, in the letter to her brother this has become "the field ambulances…deposit them in the church (a sight not to be forgotten) …and the ones who aren't dying are carted on again after 12-24-48 hrs delay…they lie on the stone floor…they are simply tragic."

Braisne was about 5 miles from the front line, and they passed through villages where the houses had been fired, roads with shallow trenches and barricades and as they turned off towards Braisne, the "smoke of the German guns firing on Soissons was visible."[457] Contrary to some military ideas of women and their proximity to the front line the WHC ventured out often close to danger to find wounded men to tend, "Dr. Murray has been out all day motoring round…but failing to bring back any wounded men."[458] During the visit to Braisne, Anderson was in situations that would have been unthinkable for her before the war, and she recorded that "I saw more of actual war than I ever expected to see as we drove over the battlefield of Meaux and through villages in which there had been a lot of fighting."[459] When the WHC opened another base at Wimereux, Boulogne, "The women felt strangely near the front" due to the speed with which men arrived. Here both Anderson and Murray dismantle Kriztina Roberts suggestion that British women "could enter this world only in soldiers thoughts and dreams."[460] The fact that the WHC had two ambulances "starting for the fighting line tomorrow at 6am as part of a convoy under the charge of the aide de camp of Gen. Fevrier…" shows they had entered this world in reality.[461]

Meyer suggests that experiences of warfare, such as danger, discomfort, grief, excitement and even pleasure had the power to transcend differences of class, religion and role.[462] All these experiences can be found within the letters Anderson

[457] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.45.
[458] WL 7LGA/2/1/14, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 11th October 1914; WL 7LGA/2/1/10, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 28th September 1914.
[459] WL 7LGA/2/1/10, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 28th September 1914.
[460] K. Robert, 'Constructions of "Home", "Front", and Women's Military Employment in First World War Britain: A Spatial Interpretation', *History and Theory*, 52, 2013, p.328.
[461] WL 7LGA/2/1/16, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 14th October 1914.
[462] Meyer, *Men of War*, p.11.

wrote home to her family. As experiences they also have the ability to transcend sex. Alongside creating identities for men in wartime, these experiences allowed women to use cultural understandings of gender to move into traditional male spaces where they were able to actualise their legitimate claims to citizenship.

In addition to portraying herself within a masculine space, the letters Anderson wrote home to her family while she was in France, appear to portray her brother in the feminine, domestic role of looking after the home and family. Many questions are asked about home and the family that strike a similar chord with letters written by men to their wives and families from the trenches, "I hope everything is going well with all my beloveds at Aldeburgh…", "Tell me about (Anderson's nephew) Colin when you write."[463] The letters here show a complete reversal of what Woollacott describes when talking about the roles of sisters and brothers during the First World War.[464] She suggests that an early twentieth century middle-class woman had a dependence on her brother which stemmed from social conventions. Here she describes sisters left behind at home as "…correspondents, senders of packages and objective reasons to return home on leave."[465] However, this idea can be seen throughout Anderson's letters home from the front, and within the language she uses when writing to her brother, "If we really need more help -I will let you know- but at present my dear hold yr hand…"[466] Packages containing food, clothing and other goods sent to the front provided evidence for many of the appreciation of those

[463] WL 7LGA/2/1/19, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Ivy Anderson, 18th October 1914; WL 7LGA/2/1/20, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Alan Garrett Anderson, 30th October 1914.
[464] Woollacott, 'Sisters and Brothers in Arms.', p.133.
[465] Woollacott, 'Sisters and Brothers in Arms.', p.133.
[466] WL 7LGA/2/1/25, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Alan Garrett Anderson, 12th December 1914.

at home of their efforts and sacrifices.[467] Here Anderson is the one whose war service is full of sacrifice.

Alan's feminization is also present when Anderson is writing to her sister in law, Ivy, in regard to whether Alan should join up, "Alan is so precious that I feel as if he shdn't volunteer…but he & you should decide…Only he can do so much by staying at home."[468] The last line has an echo of the information given to women at the outbreak of the war, where they could be of more use in the home. The masculine space inhabited by Anderson here shows she complicates the views of those such as Jane Marcus who suggests that at the outbreak of war women identified with their brother their own desire to be soldiers themselves.[469] Anderson was able to actualise this desire.

"Proper" Soldiers

Anderson and Murray also move into a male space within articles arising from the discourse surrounding military rank for women. As we shall see in chapter four, women were not able to hold military rank without an act of Parliament.[470] Within these articles they are portrayed differently to some civilian men who achieved high status during the war. As Ugolini, Bibbings and Pattinson have all pointed out, men who were not in uniform were susceptible to having their masculinity questioned.[471] Interestingly Anderson's brother becoming Naval Controller is seen suspiciously by

[467] Meyer, *Men of War*, p.15.
[468] WL 7LGA /2/1/22, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Ivy Anderson, 17th November 1914.
[469] Quoted in Woollacott, 'Sisters and Brothers in Arms', p.133.
[470] Discussed further in Chapter 4.
[471] L. Ugolini, *Civvies, Middle Class Men on the English Home Front* (Manchester, 2013); L. Bibbings, *Telling Tales About Men: Conceptions of Conscientious Objectors to Military Service During the First World War* (Manchester, 2009); L. Pattinson, "Shirkers', 'Scrimjacks' and 'Scrimshanks'? : British Civilian Masculinity and Reserved Occupations, 1914-45', *Gender and History,* 28, 3, 2016, pp.709-727.

The Tatler. Here they state that while he might know all there is to know about transport, he did start life at Eton and Oxford "where they don't bother too much about vulgar things like business."[472] This portrays him as almost a dilettante. Elsewhere his sister's work at "the best hospital in London" where she is described as "one of London's cleverest surgeons" is recognised as professional.[473] We find Alan Anderson within Ugolini's suggestion that if a middle class man had not enlisted, especially those who had attended schools such as Eton where he would have been imbued with a culture of patriotic concepts, then their roles would have been seen as suspicious.[474] Alongside this public disapproval, Aimee Fox-Godden suggests that despite the previous co-operative experience between the civilian and military spheres, it is impossible to disregard the suspicion felt by some senior military figures towards these civilian experts.[475]

This viewpoint was expanded on by *The Sketch* when it suggested that there were some anomalies in the fact that men such as church chaplains and another of Anderson's relatives, Eric Geddes, could hold full commissions whilst women doctors could not.[476] Geddes, who at this time had recently been made the head of the Department of Military Railways, was described by the magazine as a "Major General and a citizen at one and the same time."[477] Again this is seen as a suspicious promotion. The magazine points out indignantly, women doctors who are having to shoulder the responsibilities that attach themselves to high posts

[472] Letters of Eve, *The Tatler,* 15th August 1917, p. 194.
[473] The Women's Military Hospital Endell Street, *The Lady's Pictorial,* 8th January 1916 Endell Street Scrapbook WL 7LGA/3
[474] Ugolini, *Civvies*, p.7.
[475] A. Fox-Godden, *Learning to Fight: military innovation and change in the British Army, 1914-1918* (Cambridge, 2018), p.177.
[476] What's in a Rank, *The Sketch*, 13th June 1917, p.28
[477] Co-ordination of Military Transport work, *The Globe*, 10th January 1917, p.7; What's in a Rank, *The Sketch,* 13th June 1917, p.28

"including control of a large military hospital", are forbidden to use the prefix of their rank before their names.[478] In both these cases the men are still seen as civilians who have not proved their worthiness of the military titles they now hold or indeed their citizenship. Whereas, in the view of the writers of these articles, Anderson and Murray have earned the right to hold the rank of Major and Lieutenant-Colonel respectively. In this occupation of male space, we can see links to ideas of citizenship where people have a duty to play an active role in public life to earn the title of citizen, a core aim of the feminist movement.

It is not only Alan Garrett Anderson who is portrayed as feminine in the words of the WHC. Throughout her memoir Murray depicts some of the men who they encounter in a very feminine way. The *directeur* attached to their hospital in Claridges by the French Red Cross, is described as gossipy, "He seemed to spend several hours a day chatting with anyone who had time to listen to him." Mainly it seems about his grandson and family.[479] He is joined in this feminine space by his clerk who was undertaking secretarial duties being unfit for military service, unlike the woman writing about him. Another clerk M. Roget, gossiping, spreading rumours and moaning about his various medical conditions, all whilst wearing a pinafore, made up this trio of feminine men. Murray seems very keen to make sure her readers understand that she, Anderson and the women of her organisation are not silly gossipy women, but professional, trained and ready to carry out their duty.

The wounded men under their care also have their masculinity stripped away, and in some cases are almost seen as childlike. When describing the many and various

[478] What's in a Rank, *The Sketch*, 13th June 1917, p.28.
[479] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.33.

visitors the WHC had, the patients are described in two ways. There are either the childlike men who "clung to their mothers", at visiting time, or the "helpless" men with staff standing like buffers between them and those visitors who did not understand what they as patients needed.[480] In a speech given by Anderson back in England just before the opening of the Endell Street Military Hospital, she said "if you have found the way to treat children…you have gone a great way to find out how to run a military hospital. My Hospital when complete will have 550 beds-550 large babies requiring a great deal of care…"[481] Although Geddes suggests that here Anderson is describing the WHC in a caring way that was understood as feminine, arguably she is also putting herself and the WHC into the military male space of protecting children and the weak.[482]

Murray's memoir discusses activities provided for the men including that most feminine task of embroidery. One of Anderson's relatives organised a small committee to supervise the needlework.[483] This "fancy work" even warranted coverage in *The Times*, drawing attention to the exhibition and sale of work.[484] The article also described the fact that nearly 1,120 pieces had been made and some men "can accept orders for their work."[485] Embroidery has been shown to help individuals work through trauma.[486] Nevertheless, weak, wounded men, earning money from a quintessentially feminine occupation in an establishment run by women, which was reported on by the press as nothing out of the ordinary is

[480] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.186 & p.173.
[481] Soldiers as Patients: "Large Babies", *Daily Telegraph*, 18th May 1915 in 7LGA/3 Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook.
[482] Geddes, 'Deeds and Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street', p.88.
[483] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.192.
[484] Skilled Needlework by Wounded Soldiers, *The Times*, 16th November 1917; Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.192.
[485] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.192.
[486] E. Brayshaw, How embroidery therapy helped first world war veterans find a common thread, *The Guardian*, 25th April 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/apr/25/how-embroidery-therapy-helped-first-world-war-veterans-find-a-common-thread accessed 27th January 2019.

perhaps more of a gender reversal of the First Word War than professionally trained women carrying out their occupation whilst wearing a uniform.

Much has been written about the crisis of masculinity that feminised and infantilised some soldiers during war. Elaine Showalter's seminal work suggested that this most masculine of enterprises feminised men due to their loss of autonomy and the experience of shell shock characterised as a loss of control.[487] Showalter's thesis has been joined by amongst others, Meyer and Bibbings.[488] Meyer in particular also points to the idea that the inverse of the "proper male soldier" was defined within a narrative of children and women.[489] The experience of the WHC sits within these ideas; they are using this language to differentiate themselves from the men.[490] The WHC are the ones in the masculine space serving, protecting and carrying out the masculine values of duty and honour. They are "sober, disciplined and industrious", as all "proper" soldiers should be.[491]

[487] E. Showalter, *The Female Malady*: *Women, Madness and English Culture* (London, 1987), p.173.
[488] J. Meyer, 'Separating the Men from the Boys: Masculinity and Maturity in Understandings of Shell Shock in Britain', *Twentieth Century British History*, 20, 1, 2009, pp.1-22; L. Bibbings, 'Images of Manliness: The portrayal of Soldiers and Conscientious Objectors in the Great War', *Social and Legal Studies*, 12, 3, 2003, pp.335-358.
[489] Meyer, 'Separating the Men from the Boys', p.4.
[490] Kent, *Making Peace*, p.67.
[491] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.184.

Army Surgeons

> We have a lot of surgery: sometimes I am in the theatre from 2 - 9 or 10 at night and have eight or more operations. The cases come to us very septic and the wounds are terrible. Today we are having an amputn of thigh, 2 head cases perhaps trephine and five smaller ones. We have fitted up quite a satisfactory small operating theatre in the 'Ladies Lavatory' which has tiled floor and walls, good water supply and lighting. I bought a simple operating table in Paris and we have arranged gas rings and fish kettles for sterilisation.[492]

The work of the WHC was relentless, the cases complex and the turnover of patients was high. Nevertheless the women seemed to have enjoyed the variety and the "exceptional opportunity in the field of surgery" that this work gave them.[493] Anderson was the only member of the WHC that had been a surgeon and of the more than 7000 operations that were performed in the theatre at just the Endell Street Military hospital, she performed the majority.[494] Endell Street nurse Nina Last remembered that "the then great surgeon Dr. John Bland Sutton came to watch" Anderson perform operations. He was heard to express admiration over the way "her little hands worked."[495] They were so busy that according to Last's reminiscences Anderson had almost superhumanly "already performed 28,000 operations by 1918." Last also highlights Murray's skill as an anaesthetist and the fact that both women were making a great impression with their work.[496] It wasn't just the practical surgical work that the WHC were involved in. With the collaboration of their bacteriologist, and fellow former suffragist, Helen Chambers, Anderson carried out clinical trials of different treatments, publishing the results in *The Lancet.*[497] A few months before their report was published Anderson had written to

[492] WL 7LGA/2/1/09, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 27th September 1914.
[493] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.160.
[494] Geddes 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p.210.
[495] WL 7NLA/01b, Nina Last papers referring to work at Endell Street Military Hospital, nd.
[496] WL 7NLA/01b, Nina Last papers referring to work at Endell Street Military Hospital, nd.
[497] Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson', p.210.

The Lancet disclosing how eminent surgeon Professor Rutherford Morrison had personally asked them to trial his new Bismuth Iodoform Paraffin (B.I.P) paste.[498] In this correspondence Anderson places their results favourably alongside those obtained at the Northumberland war hospital, showing the legitimacy of this work. This research was carried out at a time when the RAMC's administration was accused by a leading member of the Medical Research Committee (MRC), Sir Almoth Wright, of inadequately meeting its obligation to promote research into the medical problems which had arisen from the war.[499] However Wright's view was in the minority. The MRC and the RAMC had worked together closely to undertake specialist research and compile statistics from which future treatment could be based.[500] Although it is difficult to find any mention of women being involved in this work when reading the latest historiography, the report from Anderson and Chambers states it was reported "to the Medical Research Council".[501] Here these women were occupying another male space.

Published in *The Lancet* in March 1917, Anderson and Chamber's report shows not only the success the women were having with the BIP paste but also unconsciously the success of their work as a military hospital. The report shows the progress of 62 patients but was based on over 400 cases.[502] According to Geddes and Leneman the WHC and the SWH published the first hospital based research papers by

[498] The Treatment of Infected Suppurating War Wounds, *The Lancet*, 2nd September 1916, p.447.
[499] Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War*, p.140.
[500] Harrison, *The Medical War*, p.96.
[501] Neither Whitehead's *Doctors in the Great War* or Harrison's lauded *The Medical War: British Military Medicine in the First World War* have anything about women's involvement in research during the war. In fact, you would be hard pressed to find anything about women in Harrisons work.
[502] The Treatment of Septic Wounds with Bismuth-Idoform-Parrafin Paste by Louisa Garrett Anderson MD Lon. Chief Surgeon, Military Hospital, Endell Street and Helen Chambers MD Lon. Pathologist, Military Hospital, Endell Street, *The Lancet*, 3rd March 1917, pp.331-333.

women during this period.[503] Brock suggests that when considering female participation in wartime surgical activities, the excitement of the performance must be measured against the knowledge of its temporality.[504] However both Anderson and Murray had published research papers before the war. In 1906 whilst the Senior Resident Medical Officer at Belgrave Children's Hospital, Murray had published her work with Dr. William Ewart on Pleuritic Effusion in *The British Medical Journal*.[505] Whilst a year later Anderson, had in her role as Assistant Surgeon at the New Hospital for Women published research in the same journal.[506] The following year alongside her junior colleague Kate Platt, Anderson again had research published, this time in *The Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the British Empire*.[507] Although Geddes states that any women doctor's publications before the war were restricted to case studies, technical reports and small case studies, this pre-war research did consist of hospital based research papers.[508] These papers muddy the waters yet again around the temporality of women's experiences during the war showing that to have a fuller picture of those experiences then we need to look back to understand how they happened. Here, Anderson and Murray were part of yet another community; a community of scientific women, one which Patricia Fara suggests numbered in the thousands by this time.[509]

[503] The Treatment of Septic Wounds with Bismuth-Idoform-Parrafin Paste by Louisa Garrett Anderson MD Lon. Chief Surgeon, Military Hospital, Endell Street and Helen Chambers MD Lon. Pathologist, Military Hospital, Endell Street, *The Lancet*, 3rd March 1917, p.331
[504] Brock, *Women Surgeons and their Patients*, p.181.
[505] Pleuritic Effusion Treated with Adrenalin by the Preliminary Intraserous Injection Method, by William Ewart MD Cantab, FRCP and Miss Flora Murray MD Durham, *The British Medical Journal,* 28th April 1906, pp.973-974.
[506] A Case of Sarcoma of the Small intestine, by Louisa Garrett Anderson, MD, BS Assistant-Surgeon the new Hospital for Women, *The British Medical Journal,* Vol 2, 1907, pp.886-888.
[507] Malignant Disease of the Uterus. A Digest of 265 cases treated in the New Hospital for Women by Louisa Garrett Anderson, BA, MD (Lond) and Kate Platt, MB, BS (Lond), *The Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the British Empire*, Vol XIV, 6, 1908, pp.381-392.
[508] Geddes, 'Deeds and Words', p.86.
[509] P. Fara, *A Lab of One's Own: Science and Suffrage in the First World War* (Oxford, 2018), pp.7-9.

Honoured by the King.

Just before the outbreak of the war, WFL member Nina Boyle sent a letter to King George V to ask why none of the "many noble and public spirited women subjects, who render imperial and social service" throughout the dominion, were mentioned in the New Year's Honours.[510] When the *Daily Mirror* reported this it didn't offer an opinion and seems to have just seen it as yet another Suffragette ruse. However, three years later it was reporting on its front page on the first investitures for women.[511] This wasn't a simple path. During the war it does seem that many suffrage campaigners were incensed by the fact that even though women were rendering valuable service to the country "the Government still fails to give them the smallest reward."[512] One of the women mentioned in this article was "Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson and her Women's Hospital Corps at Wimereux, long last recognised by the War Office."[513] It wasn't only suffrage campaigners who thought the women should be recognised. Surgeon Sir John Hall wrote to Louisa Brooks, secretary of the New Hospital in 1916 about the matter. Hall had spoken "most strongly" to the daughter of former prime minister Herbert Asquith about the way women doctors had been left out of the honours list.[514] Having been, "backed up by other people present" Hall pushed Brooks to act now and to let him know what else he could do as "I feel it is a thing the women doctors can in no way push for themselves."[515]

[510] If Women Got Honours, *The Daily Mirror*, 3rd July 1914, p.4.
[511] The King Honours Women for their Services, *The Daily Mirror,* 28th September 1917, p.1.
[512] For Men Only, *The Vote*, 8th January 1915, p.454.
[513] For Men Only, *The Vote,* 8th January 1915, p.454.
[514] SRO I: 436/1/4/6, Sir John Hall to Louisa Brooks, 8th July 1916.
[515] SRO I: 436/1/4/6, Sir John Hall to Louisa Brooks, 8th July 1916.

Only a year later a uniformed Anderson, Murray, their dogs and a guard of honour had moved into this male space and could be found outside Buckingham Palace after becoming two of the first women to receive the newly created Order of the British Empire.[516] When Anderson and Murray returned from the palace they were loudly cheered by their well-wishers, who had formed a guard of honour of the doctors, nurses, orderlies and patients.[517] The group also presented Anderson and Murray with a cheque for £50 to purchase an operating table for their Children's hospital in Harrow road. They were planning to change the name to The Roll of Honour Hospital in yet another use of a masculine militarised language to describe their work.[518]

As we saw in a previous chapter the WHC had commissioned a medal to commemorate their achievements. In addition to this, all the members of the Corps who had served in France where entitled to receive military medals. As women who had been part of civilian organisations were not eligible to apply for this honour this again puts the members of the WHC into a masculine military space, highlighting the instability of the gender norms of this period.[519] Those women who had worked in Paris and Wimereux were awarded the 1914 Star, The British War Medal and the Victory Medal.[520] The women's medal cards show no distinction between men and women and simply state "Regiment or Corps when Decoration was earned."[521] These medals were awarded to men and women for their military service, and in

[516] *The London Gazette*, 24th August 1917, p.8795.
[517] Honours Conferred on Women, *The Vote*, 5th October 1917, p.381.
[518] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.258.
[519] Organisations such as The Land Army were not eligible for any honours. https://www.womenslandarmy.co.uk/first-world-war-womens-land-army/researching-ww1-land-girls/ accessed 15th February 2019.
[520] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.258.
[521] UK, WWI Service Medal and Award Rolls, 1914-1920, www.ancestrylibrary.com accessed 9th September 2017.

the case of the 1914 Star, “for service under fire”.[522] Here the WHC again complicate notions that women did not venture into theatres of war, when they earned a reward to legitimise their military service to their country.

Conclusion

According to the gender ideals of the early twentieth century military service was the ultimate expression of male patriotism. The language of patriotism was expressed in gendered terms where men were imbued with concepts such as bravery, adventure, sacrifice, heroism and duty. Women were expected to be passive, to inspire men’s sacrifice and heroism, whilst maintaining the home and family. Those women who did not keep to these ideals, who did not subscribe to the existing gender boundaries, who wore uniforms to carry out their war work, have been seen to be deviants, trespassing onto male space. However this close look at the life and work of Anderson and Murray has allowed an exploration of how uniformed, militarised women were portrayed, not only through the discourse in the newspapers, but also by the women themselves and those they encountered. Here cultural constructions of early twentieth century gender ideals appear to have been more fluid than has been previously suggested. Therefore, the established narrative that has deviant women “playing at being soldiers.” did not apply for all and that these women were able to move into what some might have regarded as male spaces. Anderson and Murray received many positive column inches regarding their Corps muddling the idea that uniformed women were criticise during wartime. That

[522] http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/help-with-your-research/research-guides/british-military-campaign-and-service-medals/ accessed 15th February 2019.

much of this came from newspapers of the day, shows that a few letters to one newspaper should not stand for a whole historiographical narrative.[523]

This chapter has also shown the way Anderson and Murray used gendered language to occupy male spaces. This idea is clearly shown in the letters Anderson wrote home to her family and the memoir Murray wrote after the war. Within her letters Anderson was able to create a masculine space in which she could portray herself as a soldier. Here she is not living vicariously through a male relative but embodying the values of service. Murray created a space in the way she distanced herself and her Corps from the men in her memoir, portraying many of them as feminine and childlike surrounded by women embodying the masculine values of soldiers. These women had confidence in their abilities and in their right to carry out their duty, showing us that some women were clearly able to cast themselves as military actors, not "playing as soldiers" but "travelling as soldiers", participating in the war as themselves.[524]

[523] Here I am talking about the correspondence in *The Morning Post* during July 1915 which is used in a great deal of work on women in uniform, discussed in this chapter.
[524] Noakes, "Playing at Soldiers?'; Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.16.

Chapter Four

"…by sheer force of skin and achievement." Louisa Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray's feminist opportunities during the First World War.

> We are very glad to hear that Dr. L Garrett Anderson one of our V.Ps is likely to receive the rank of Major in the R.A.M.C in connection with the large new military hospital which she and Dr. Flora Murray are preparing in the Endell Street workhouse. By their successful work at Claridges in Paris and the Mauricien hospital in Wimereux they have fully established their right to army recognition.[525]
>
> Dr. Flora Murray and Dr. Garrett Anderson made history at Endell Street. Through their initiative, endeavour, and efficiency they opened the doors to further fields of opportunity for women physicians and surgeons and not only for medical women but for all women who are setting out or who have already set out to conquer fresh territory.[526]

Over time women have articulated their complaints, needs, hopes, and fought for their rights and opportunities. Many have chosen to call themselves feminists.[527] At the outbreak of the First World War some feminists had come to see women doctors as the key exponent of women's claims and capacities, not only in the workplace but also in the public sphere. Dyhouse has suggested that this view was helped by the good press that women doctors received from 1916 to 1918 which saw their efforts applauded within a spate of articles that drew attention to the field of widening opportunity many hoped the war would open for them.[528] We can see the achievements that warranted this good press in the work of Anderson and Murray. As militant suffragists with an understanding of citizenship that was defined by the freedom to act, both women were keen to seize the opportunities created for them by war in order to further the feminist cause they had spent much of their lives involved in.

---

[525] *Votes for Women,* 9th April 1915, p.227.
[526] Preface by Beatrice Harraden in Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.vii.
[527] For a quick introduction into Feminism, M. Walters, *Feminism: A Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2005) is useful. The First recorded use of the term in English is found in an American Magazine, *The Debow's Review*, where it is unsurprisingly used as an insult. https://www.bl.uk/sisterhood/articles/what-is-a-feminist accessed 16th February 2019.
[528] Dyhouse, 'Driving Ambitions', pp. 333-334.

Their feminism appears to be embodied by feminist historian and sociologist Olive Banks' description of "any…that have tried to change the position of women, or the ideas about women" a change which made a positive contribution to the development of women's lives.[529] Having been involved in the desire to change women's position they were also aware of the negative connotations associated with feminism as war began. Although "it was inconceivable that in a war of such magnitude women doctors should not join in the care of the sick and wounded…" sadly it was obvious that "…prejudice would stand in the way."[530] Nevertheless, they were used to dealing with disapproving and officious people. Their understanding of the world by this point meant that they were able to apply what they had learnt about society and gender during the campaign for women's suffrage to their own advantage. The WHC was at its core a feminist enterprise. This chapter will show their active feminism was a patriotic feminism, rather than a pacifist one, with ties to their ideas of citizenship, contributing to further understandings of the complexities of women's lives during this time.

The impact of the First World War on the progress of female emancipation has been the subject of a great deal of scholarship. One strand of interpretation has been as Noakes suggests, that the War can be viewed as limiting and containing for the feminists of the pre-war suffrage movement.[531] Much of this idea stems from using women's work to show these limitations. Noakes' argument states that many women experienced their wartime jobs as a moment of liberation. However she also concludes that any consideration of the impact of the war on work opportunities for

[529] O. Banks, *The Biographical Dictionary of British Feminists, Volume 1, 1800-1930* (Brighton, 1985), p.vii.
[530] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p. 4.
[531] Noakes: 'Women's Mobilization for War (Great Britain and Ireland)', p.2.

women would have to conclude that a post-war backlash against working women, combined with the constraints placed on women's work during the war, ensured that any changes were short term, largely "for the duration"[532] It is this idea of "for the duration" that this thesis has sought to move away from.

Perhaps Noakes and others adopt this view of the war as limiting because of a focus on the women who took new jobs in the munition's factories and within industrial settings. These women were subject to the dilution process which made work for those women who moved into jobs previously held by men, limiting and circumscribed.[533] Alongside this is the view that as the war progressed motherhood was increasingly portrayed as woman's most important role. Grayzel and Gullace discuss the centrality of motherhood to ideas of patriotism in Britain and France.[534] They both draw attention to the idea that by offering their sons to the battlefield women were defining their sacred duty, an alternative to military service.[535] Kent used this kind of argument to suggest that a reassertion of separate spheres could be seen very early on in the war "even among feminists."[536] Paul Ward joined her arguing that "even feminists could gender their patriotism." when faced with the realities of war.[537]

However, "even feminists" are not a coherent single group, and indeed the feminist movement was made up of varying different strands, before and throughout the war.

[532] Noakes: 'Women's Mobilization for War (Great Britain and Ireland)', p.8.
[533] Braybon, *Women Workers in the First World War,* p. 165.
[534] Grayzel, *Women's Identities at War*, p.86.
[535] Grayzel, *Women's Identities at War*, p.86; Gullace, *The Blood of our Sons*, p.62.
[536] Kent, *Making Peace*, p.15.
[537] P. Ward, 'Women of Britain Say Go', Women's Patriotism in the First World War', *Twentieth Century British History.* 12, 1, 2001, p.29.

Indeed, in the case of patriotic motherhood, although suffragists had frequently argued that mothers gave their lives for the country, Anderson and Murray, as non-heterosexual women were outside this form of feminism.[538] Braybon scathingly discusses how Kent's work on the renegotiation of gender during and after the war has often been held up, as "a reliable description of the wars impact on British feminism."[539] Vellacott describes Kent's argument that feminism found itself splintered and constrained by the gendered, and sexualized languages used to represent the war as "artificially constructed".[540] Nevertheless this thesis has found its way into many general chapters on women and the war.[541] Fortunately work by Vellacott herself, alongside that of Mo Moulton, Julie Gottlieb and Joanna Alberti has developed a more nuanced interpretation of the feminist movement at this time, a period characterised by Moulton as defying easy interpretation.[542] Gottlieb points to the notion that so much of the scholarship has "adopted the tone of disappointment and grappled with the decline…" of feminism during this period that any successes have been overlooked.[543] Vellacott and Gullace both draw attention to feminist victories during the war, with emphasis on those women who worked for peace and those who served their country respectively.[544]

This look at the experiences of Anderson and Murray will attempt to further demonstrate that women were able to use those languages mentioned by Kent to

[538] Gullace, *The Blood of our Son's*, p. 57.
[539] Braybon, 'Winners or Losers', p.101.
[540] J. Vellacott, '*Making Peace: The Reconstruction of Gender in Interwar Britain* by Susan Kingsley Kent', *The American Historical Review*, 100, 3, 1995, p.904.
[541] Braybon draws attention to the fact that often male historians of the war in their token chapter on women's experiences will use Kent and no one else to suggest that whatever happened to women during the conflict it was only short term.
[542] J. Gottlieb and R. Toye (eds.), *The Aftermath of Suffrage: Women, Gender and Politics in Britain, 1918-1945,* (Basingstoke, 2013); Alberti, *Beyond Suffrage*; M. Moulton, "You Have Votes and Power": Women's Political Engagement with the Irish Question in Britain, 1919-1923', *Journal of British Studies*, 51, 1, 2013, pp. 179-204; J. Vellacott, 'Feminism as if All People Mattered: Working to Remove the Causes of War, 1919-1929', *Contemporary European History*, 10, 3, 2001, pp.375-394.
[543] J. Gottlieb and R. Toye, *Introduction* in Gottlieb and Toye (eds.), *The Aftermath of Suffrage*, p.7.
[544] Vellacott, 'Feminism as if All People Mattered'; Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons.*

expand women's opportunities rather than be constrained by them. As we saw in a previous chapter, it is sometimes difficult to separate suffragism and feminism when writing about women in early twentieth century Britain. The movement was informed and moulded by feminism. However, the vote was not the core aim for many of those involved. Anderson stated as much when she spoke after being released from prison in 1912, "We care about the vote because it is a symbol of equality. What we want is to make men and women understand that a woman is a human being worth as much as any other human being."[545] Therefore this chapter will have as its focus the way Anderson and Murray were able to take advantage of and create opportunities for women's emancipation.

Brock suggests that recognising that some women were fully aware of the need to take advantage of what opportunities the war could offer them is vital.[546] It seems just as vital to recognise Grayzel's suggestion that the assumption that war so fundamentally challenged gender roles that they needed to be reworked, deemphasises any continuities there may have been in the feminist movement.[547] As previously seen the First World War has been depicted as a watershed for the feminist movement, where those women involved in the cause have been portrayed as either militaristic or pacifist. Any nuance is lost here with little room for the intricacies of individual experience and the continuities of enduring feminist networks. Gullace has suggested that patriotic women or even pro war women have been seen as less attractive characters by some who write feminist history, who often have a focus on working for peace movements as being the only kind of

[545] Prisoners of War, *Votes for Women*, 26th April 1912, p.3.
[546] Brock, *British Women Surgeons and their Patients*, p.181
[547] Grayzel, *Women's Identities at War: Gender*, p.5.

feminism on display during the war.[548] One of the main themes of this dissertation is to attempt wider understanding of women's lives during the First World War by emphasizing those continuities mentioned by Grayzel and to foreground those individual experiences, leading to the ultimate suggestion that for Anderson and Murray the war was a time of self-actualization rather than disruption.

There is nothing in their experiences to suggest that Anderson and Murray were pro war, rather previous chapters have shown that they were pro duty. Although these women took up a patriotic cause, the goal of this was to further women's public opportunities. Using the personal papers of Anderson, suffrage newspapers, newspapers, parliamentary papers, medical journals and Murray's memoir this chapter will uncover further evidence that the war was not always limiting and constricting for some women. It will focus on the practical work of the Women's Hospital Corps (WHC), the views this created of their feminism and show that they took advantage of opportunities created by their success to advance the feminist cause forcing "acknowledgement upon the least willing and the most pre-occupied."[549]

Professional women.

Anderson and Murray worked within feminist networks both before and during the war. They and the women they worked with in the WHC no doubt saw their war work differently than those women subject to dilution regulations in industrial work. Indeed, their middle-class status set them apart from the working-class women

[548] N. Gullace, 'White Feathers and Wounded Men: Female Patriotism and the Memory of the Great War', *The Journal of British Studies*, 36, 1997, p.180.
[549] Dr. Flora Murray, Reminiscences of her War Work by Elizabeth Robins, *The Observer,* 3rd August 1923, p.3.

working in munition factories. Perceptions of class and social status played a crucial role in determining how differing types of war work were viewed, especially for women, with contrasting motivations for volunteers and trained professionals.[550] Nevertheless much early scholarship on women and work during the war has a focus on working class women replacing men rather than those women such as Anderson and Murray who had their own careers. Deborah Thom's chapter on Gender and Work in Susan Grayzel and Tammy Proctor's recent edited collection *Gender and the Great War*, still suggests that "women became increasingly recruited to replace them (men) or supplement their work."[551] However, Anderson and Murray were professional, working, middle class women. Demonstrating their training and professional capacity marked them as separate to those women who took on what may have been new types of work. Nevertheless, there still appears to be a need to distance ourselves from the description of the role of a middle-class woman during the war as voluntary, temporary and selfless. Women's sometimes rocky journey to professionalism can be found within work such as Dyhouse's, Brock and Geddes with their focus on the medical profession.[552] This also shows that though many women of Anderson and Murray's generation entered this kind of work to be of use, they also wanted a "career which would pay well."[553] Dyhouse's point that these women had to admit to a desire for power and control over their lives should also be remembered here.[554] As Woollacott stresses, professionalism meant being able to support yourself. This was an important consideration for women like Anderson and Murray who ran their own household. It also allowed for the exercise

[550] Watson, 'Khaki Girls, VADs and Tommy's Sisters', p.33; Watson, 'War in the Wards', p.486.
[551] D. Thom, 'Gender and Work', in S. R. Grayzel & T. M. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War*, (Oxford, 2017), p.46.
[552] Dyhouse, 'Driving Ambitions', pp.321-343; Brock, *British Women Surgeons and their Patients,*; J. Geddes, 'The Doctor's Dilemma: Medical Women and the British Suffrage Movement', *Women's History Review*, 18, 2, 2009, pp. 203-218.
[553] Geddes, 'The Doctor's Dilemma: Medical Women and the British Suffrage Movement', p.205.
[554] Dyhouse, 'Driving Ambitions', p.324.

of what Woollacott calls “legitimate power.”[555] Anderson and Murray used their war opportunities to exercise this power in their cause for female emancipation. The challenge of entering the professions for women has also been highlighted by those such as Fara in her work on scientific women.[556] This work, alongside that of Zoe Thomas and Gillian Sutherland, with their focus on the differing opportunities for middle class women shows that many had professional standing in the world before the war supposedly opened hitherto unforeseen opportunities.[557]

At the outbreak of war Anderson and Murray had been qualified doctors for around 14 years.[558] Their work up to this point was with women and children, however Anderson had some limited training in general surgical procedures.[559] Nevertheless, they clearly understood that undertaking this war work would be “a chance to do the work. It is a great chance. We will get unique surgical experience of every kind.”[560] Here they link to Law’s view that although patriotic duty would have been a motivator, some women were shrewd enough to realise that duty would not only serve their country but also its women.[561] Here again we can see Pennell’s notion that patriotism should be seen as a considered reflective duty.[562] Many saw the war as providing opportunities for women to reshape society after the conflict.[563] An exploration of the experiences of Anderson and Murray places them within Gullace’s notion that some women were able to take control of the discourse, drama and

[555] Woollacott, ‘From Moral to Professional Authority’, p.89.
[556] Fara, *A Lab of One’s Own*.
[557] Z. Thomas, ‘At Home with the Women’s Guild of Arts: gender and professional identity in London studios, c.1880-1925’, *Women’s History Review*, 24, 6, 2015, pp. 938-964; G. Sutherland, *In Search of the New Woman: Middle Class Women and Work in Britain, 1870-94* (Cambridge, 2015).
[558] Lady Doctors and Scholars, *Nottingham Evening Post,* 17th May 1901, p.4; University of Durham, *Durham County Advertiser*, 1st May 1903, p.2.
[559] Geddes, ‘Louisa Garrett Anderson’, p.208.
[560] WL 7LGA/2/1/08, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 22nd September 1914.
[561] Law, *Suffrage and Power*, p.22.
[562] Pennell, *A Kingdom United*, p.159.
[563] Mayhall*, Militant Suffrage Movement*, p.215.

spectacle of war to serve their own ends and further the campaign for female emancipation.[564]

Women doctors who were running their own hospitals were perhaps in a better position to combine their own political agendas with highly visible support for their country's cause as they oversaw their own destiny. As key exponents of women's claims and capacities in the workplace and the public sphere Anderson and Murray knew this. Murray had written in 1913 in *The New Statesman* of the "great impetus." that the women's movement had given to the progress of medical women.[565] Murray's article was part of a special supplement on 'The Awakening of Women', something which contributor Beatrice Webb suggested had to be seen in much broader terms than simply the political struggle for the vote.[566] Within her article Murray drew attention to the idea that although some may have thought that the world had changed women, it was actually women who were "changing the world." These changes represented "a demand on the part of women for intellectual and moral liberty, for freedom of choice, for open and equal opportunities in the world of effort."[567] This world of effort is embodied in the work of the WHC. Other chapters of this dissertation have described the work of the WHC whilst they were stationed in France. This chapter's main focus is on the work this organisation carried out whilst based at the Endell Street Military Hospital in London. There they actualised their ideas by pushing the boundaries for their profession, creating a legacy of their role in the women's movement.

[564] Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons*, p.118.
[565] The Position of Women in Medicine and Surgery by Dr. Flora Murray, M.D, B.S, D.P.H. *The New Statesman,* 1st November 1913, p. xvii.
[566] Rowbotham, *Dreamers of a New Day*, p.210.
[567] The Position of Women in Medicine and Surgery by Dr. Flora Murray, M.D, B.S, D.P.H. *The New Statesman,* 1st November 1913, p. xvi

War Office recognition.

The success of the WHC at their bases in Paris and Wimereux had won the recognition of the War Office.[568] Lord Esher, who had begun his relationship with the WHC as an anonymous "brass hat" barking military questions aggressively at the women, became their champion.[569] He had spent time visiting the two WHC hospitals and personally saw the success of their work.[570] Describing a tour of the hospital to a reporter from *The Weekly Telegraph* he claimed that no higher compliment could be paid to its efficiency and excellence "than those paid by the wounded men themselves."[571] As the war office began to close British hospitals in order to treat casualties back in England he was keen to see that the WHC was not one of those closed and arranged for Anderson and Murray to meet with Sir Alfred Keogh, Director General of the Army Medical Services. In a letter to Anderson Esher states that he has "urged very strongly" on Keogh and the Red Cross Council that "no one has done more splendid work."[572] Another General, only named as W in Murray's memoir, told the two women that the services of the WHC would "certainly be acceptable..." and he was certain they would be able to take the pressure of work to be found in England.[573] This General also sent a dispatch to Keogh about the work of the WHC stating to Murray and Anderson that they "…must not give up military work."[574] Fellow suffragist Beatrice Harriden captured the importance of the success of the work and recognition of the military fraternity of the WHC for the

[568] Another Milestone! *Votes for Women,* 11th December 1914, p. 85.
[569] "Brass hat" appears to be Murray's term for any military visitors the WHC had.
[570] Esher is mentioned in many letters home from Anderson, for example WL 7LGA/2/1/09, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 27th September 1914 & WL 7LGA/2/1/23, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Alan Garrett Anderson, c.28th November 1914.
[571] The Need for Women Doctors, *The Weekly Telegraph*, 13th March 1915, p.10.
[572] WL 7LGA/2/1/28 pt.III, Lord Esher to Louisa Garrett Anderson, 14th January 1915.
[573] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.114.
[574] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.114.

wider feminist cause. They had made, “a contribution of unspeakable value to the women’s movement all the world over.”[575]

The importance of meeting with Keogh back in London was not lost on Murray and Anderson, and it was with “a not unnatural thrill of anticipation” that they entered the War Office.[576] According to Geddes, after the meeting, Keogh immediately offered the women the chance to run a large hospital in London working for the RAMC.[577] She suggests that they accepted with “alacrity” as soon as the offer was made. Although Murray’s memoir does not refer to him actually offering the positions, she suggests it was a finished deal and the women returned to France the following day to begin closing the Corps bases there. Although Keogh held to the view of many that the front was no place for women, the increasing shortage of doctors in England awaiting the return of casualties meant that he recognised the value of the women’s work.[578] Here we can find Keogh, Anderson and Murray within the idea that transferable skills allowed civilian ideas and values to influence the army. Fox-Godden suggests that civilian experts did not have the same preconceptions as professional soldiers, nevertheless they were used to “managing individuals, making decisions and assuming responsibilities.”[579] Describing Anderson and Murray’s work clearly, this notion also returns us somewhat to Martin’s suggestion that during war, the destruction of gender boundaries leads on to negotiate a new identity.[580] Perhaps here we can see not a new identity for Anderson and Murray, but a public recognition- an actualisation- of their identity as professional women.

[575] B. Harraden, ‘The War and Women Doctors’, *The Windsor Magazine*, Dec 1915- May 1916, p.186
[576] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.114.
[577] Geddes, ‘Deeds and Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street’, p.83.
[578] Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War*, p. 111.
[579] Fox-Godden, *Learning to Fight*, p.164.
[580] Martin, ‘The Rose of No Man’s Land’, p.7

For the women themselves the recognition of their work would have had a wider meaning. Angela Smith suggests that works like Murray's memoir were often written with a specific audience or message in mind. The fact that within this memoir Keogh does not seem to question the idea of the WHC running a military hospital links to that idea. For those women who followed the feminist cause, there would have been no doubt that they were asked to do this, Anderson and Murray were women changing the world. Meeting the need of Esteem from the hierarchy of needs, from both the military and their own networks, Murray and Anderson found themselves agreeing to take on the Endell Street project with confidence gained from the respect shown to their work.

Whitehead discusses the idea that the respect for women doctor's work confounded those who had believed that women would not be able to cope with frontline work pressures.[581] We can certainly see this in the above views of the military men who had come into contact with the WHC's work. Although their work in France had proved that these women were equal to the task of military work, many in the RAMC still remained uncomfortable with the idea of employing women within the forces. As Murray herself claimed, the feeling of the Army Medical Department towards women doctors could be gauged by the atmosphere they encountered in the various offices they found themselves in during the preliminary stages of their work for Endell Street, "In one there was disapproval; in another curiosity and amusement; in a third obstinate hostility…"[582] However as militant suffragists it is doubtful that they would have viewed these atmospheres as anything other than the prejudice

[581] Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War,* p. 108.
[582] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.126.

that they were used to facing. Murray had stated: “The fight against sex prejudice and the struggle for equality of opportunity are not yet over.”[583] Nevertheless, these women knew their own worth and what this opportunity meant to the women’s movement.

This fight for equality of opportunity played a large role in accepting Endell Street. It appears that the offer of the hospital was an incredible chance for extending the feminist agenda, one they could not afford to pass up. In a letter from Anderson to her sister-in-law, written a month before she received Esher’s letter, she makes it clear that they are only looking at running the hospitals in France for another two or three months, “then Dr. Murray and I must come home to take up the old threads.”[584] It appears the idea was to make way for other women to take over the running of the Corps, if voluntary hospitals were still to be needed. Anderson states that she did not want to “ raise money to carry on the work beyond March until I know whether other women will run the Corps and if they do whether they will run it well.”[585] Within this letter is the idea that they have begun something important for women, and perhaps that they never intended to be part of the WHC full time. Although this did not happen, we can see here, with their ideas of having other women “willing and able” to take the opportunity to run the Corps, that at its core the WHC was a feminist enterprise run for the cause of women.

[583] The Position of Women in Medicine and Surgery by Dr. Flora Murray, M.D, B.S, D.P.H. *The New Statesman,* 1st November 1913, p. xvii.
[584] WL 7LGA/2/1/24, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Ivy Anderson, c. December 1914.
[585] WL 7LGA/2/1/24, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Ivy Anderson, c. December 1914.

Military Suffragists.

Not surprisingly the news that the WHC were to return to England filled the suffrage newspapers. As Anderson was a vice president of the United Suffragists (US) their paper, *Votes for Women* seemed to publish every little snippet of the progress of opening Endell Street Military Hospital. In early 1915 they were keen to draw attention to the fact that although there were many horrors in the world, when the war was a nightmare of the past, the work done by the women doctors would long be remembered as "one of the few inspiring incidents of this terrible period."[586] The other clear view of the newspaper was the importance of the women's work being recognised by the war office. In all the articles relating to the opening of Endell Street, readers are told that the WHC's work is being carried out under the auspices of the War Office. On the front cover of the 19th March issue under the title "Women into the Breach", were several cartoons showing women working in various professions. Even here with the cartoon of women doctors was the phrase "Military Hospital under War Office.[587] No other type of work on this front cover has its management mentioned. Here we can see the importance of the work of women doctors being taken seriously after the war office had at the outbreak of war refused to countenance the idea of women serving in the military.[588]

Alongside *Votes for Women,* the news of Sir Alfred Keogh's praise for Anderson and Murray was to be found in the newspapers of many other suffrage organisations. *The International Women's Suffrage News* and the *Free Church Suffrage Times* were just two of the less well-known groups that carried the news

[586] Women Doctors and the War, *Votes for Women*, 26th February 1915, p.179.
[587] Women into the Breach, *Votes for Women,* 19th March 1915, front page.
[588] Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War*, p.107.

of this momentous chance for feminists.[589] The NUWSS newspaper *The Common Cause* ran a two-page spread drawing its readers attention to the women's recognition by the war office. Its main article concerned the attendance of Keogh at a meeting to promote the extension of the LSMW.[590] Serendipitously this extension had been made necessary by rapidly increasing numbers of students, an effect of the excellent work carried out by not only the WHC but also organisations such as the NUWSS sponsored SWH. The fact that both organisations are mentioned in this article shows again the intricacy of the women's movement and moves away from the notion of the divisions during the war.

In his speech at the LSMW, Keogh stated that the work of the WHC was beyond all praise, an example "of how this sort of work should be done."[591] However, some in the RAMC questioned the wisdom of Keogh's faith in the ability of Anderson and Murray.[592] A Colonel who visited Endell Street shortly after its opening found the idea of women in a military hospital distasteful. He ended his hour-long speech on why it was a ridiculous and impossible idea by marching off "exclaiming: Oh, good God! What difficulties you will have."[593] Nevertheless this kind of viewpoint did not deter Keogh. Keogh was pleased to be congratulated by those listening, many of whom had been involved in the development of the work of medical women, "upon the wisdom and courage with which he had made himself responsible for an innovation of such magnitude and importance."[594] Although the WHC had actually

[589] Suffragettes at the Front, *International Women's Suffrage News*, 1st March 1915, p. 260; Various Items, *Free Church Times*, 1st March 1915, p.18.
[590] Medical Women in War Time, *The Common Cause*, 26th February 1915, p. 730.
[591] Medical Women in War Time, *The Common Cause*, 26th February 1915, p. 730.
[592] Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War*, p.111.
[593] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.129.
[594] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.119.

been working under the war office with their base at Wimereux since late 1914, it is interesting that this is not often mentioned in the stories about the opening of Endell Street in Suffrage newspapers.[595] The importance of these women doing this recognised military work back in England links to the narrative of England, as the home of democracy and rights, should be the place where women achieve reform ultimately leading to the right kind of citizenship. Thus, showing an understanding of the importance of running Endell Street for the feminist cause.

Feminist patriotism.

The WHC worked under the idea that far from standing aside, they had accepted their patriotic duty and responsibility. Only by "common effort" could this war be won so the opening of the Endell Street hospital brings us back to Pennell's notion that patriotic reasons for war service should be seen as considered and reflective obligations of duty alongside Gullace idea of comparative patriotism.[596] To find stories of this patriotic enterprise within *The Common Cause* when at this point the NUWSS leadership was under pressure from those on the national executive who were pacifists and internationalists again shows the complexities and intricacies of the feminist movement at this time.[597] As the leader of the NUWSS was Anderson's aunt, Millicent Garrett Fawcett, we can also see the complexities of feminist family life too.

[595] WL 7LGA/2/1/20, Louisa Garrett Anderson to Alan Garrett Anderson, 15th November 1914 mentions being "taken over by the war office."
[596] Pennell, *A Kingdom United*, p.159; Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons*, p.129.
[597] Law, *Suffrage and Power*, p.16.

Anderson and Fawcett appear to have disagreed on the most effective way to achieve female emancipation over the years.[598] At a point in their campaigning when Anderson was riding high with her organisation and Fawcett was experiencing difficulties in hers it seems that Fawcett appears to either envy the success Anderson is experiencing or seized an opportunity to show that her methods of campaigning were the most effective after all. Fawcett seemingly taunted her niece regarding her membership of the WSPU and her militant campaigning before the war. With Endell Street open for about a year and receiving excellent praise from many quarters of society including royalty, Fawcett had a letter about women's war work published in *The Times* of the 24th May 1916, and *The Saturday Review* in June. [599] Within this letter Fawcett snidely states, "that some women doctors were finding out that doing good to people was much more effective propaganda than trying to do harm to them."[600] Although somewhat patronising with her words, Fawcett shows she understands that the WHC is a feminist enterprise campaigning for and succeeding in showing the worth of women.

Charming articles.

It wasn't just the suffrage newspapers that were interested in the Endell Street Military Hospital. Even *The Times*, not known for its support of feminist causes, ran more than one story of Keogh's speech at the LSMW meeting and what this meant for the campaign.[601] It made a note that the work of these women had brought

[598] Chapter one of this dissertation highlights Anderson challenging her Aunts organisation in a letter and at a public NUWSS meeting. When Anderson spent time in Holloway, Fawcett exchanged letters with her sister suggesting that she hoped prison would make Anderson see sense.
[599] Royalty, especially Queen Alexandra spent considerable time at Endell Street. There are many cuttings in the scrapbook relating to her visits. The visits were also mentioned in the *British Journal of Nursing* and *The Times.*
[600] Women and War Work, *The Times,* 24th May 1916, p. 9; Women and War Work, *The Saturday Review,* 17th June 1916, p.586.
[601] Women in Medicine, *The Times*, 19th February 1915, p.11.

about discernible change, in that women doctors were no longer looked at with suspicion.[602] Of course newspapers had been interested in the work of the WHC whilst they were in France. Murray herself had drawn attention to this in her memoir pointing out the usefulness in these "charming articles" to raising not only awareness of what they were achieving but also much needed funds.[603] However, throughout 1916 there was seemingly enough newspaper and magazine copy regarding the work being undertaken by the hospital for Flora Murray to keep a scrapbook.[604] Suggesting that in doing so she was creating another form of historical legitimacy and legacy for the feminist movement.

It is understandable that only positive articles regarding Endell Street would have been kept for this record of their work. Nevertheless, the fact that there were positive articles on all manner of goings on at the hospital shows again that some women who worked in what others might suggest was a male field and whilst wearing a military uniform were not seen as deviant. Braybon discusses the fact that positive articles encouraged the idea that women deserved to be praised, that their work was seen as important.[605] This must have fed back to the women themselves, giving them confidence to succeed on their own terms. Grayzel describes that within the context of new understandings of citizenship and patriotism produced by male conscription, women such as those from the WHC were criticised because their patriotism and claims for citizenship had to be in this time of war, distinguished from men's.[606] However many of the articles regarding the WHC do

[602] Women Doctors, *The Times,* 22nd January 1915, p.35.
[603] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.59.
[604] WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook, c.1916.
[605] Braybon, *Women Workers in the First World War*, p. 158.
[606] S. Grayzel, 'The Outward and Visible Sign of Her Patriotism': Women, Uniforms, and National Service During the First World War', *Twentieth Century British History*, 8, 2, 1997, p.148.

not seem to see these women and this work as different from men's participation in the war.

The *Beckenham Advertiser* was clear to point out that the success of the WHC and their work was due to their "foresighted patriotism".[607] As well as recognising the women's patriotic cause the paper also highlighted the importance of their work to the women's movement. It pointed out to its readers that this work proved the justification of women's long and insistent demands for an equal place within surgery and medicine. Not only that but that it also proved "without doubt" that women were equally capable and successful with men "in all branches of their calling."[608] That this was mentioned in a provincial newspaper perhaps shows how mainstream this idea had become. National paper, *The Daily Telegraph* echoed the sentiments when it stated within its review of 1915 *A Years War Work,* that "1915 will take the rank as the year of the conquest of the medical women." It also drew attention specifically to the work of the WHC "…the war office asked women physicians and surgeons to assume the care of a military hospital…"[609] This was echoed by the *Wells Journal* who stated that the opening of Endell Street was "one of the events of the year."[610] *The Daily Chronicle* not only suggested that the work of the WHC was a triumph for women in medicine, but it also drew the links with the feminist movement when it stated it was also a triumph for "women in administration."[611] These positive statements return us to the view that newspapers

[607] A War Hospital Run by Women, *The Beckenham Advertiser,* 17th August 1916, WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook, p.40.
[608] A War Hospital Run by Women, *The Beckenham Advertiser,* 17th August 1916, WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook p.40.
[609] A Years War Work, *The Daily Telegraph*, January 1916. WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook, c.1916.
[610] 1915 A Women's Year, *Wells Journal*, 7th January 1916, p. 3.
[611] The All Women Hospital, *The Daily Chronicle*, 25th April 1916, WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook, p.20.

could not afford to be to out of step with their readers. They also show that Anderson and Murray complicate Watson's notion that military women, including those authorised by the War Office, failed to evoke approval and were usually the subject of "considerable debate and condemnation."[612]

The WHC do seem to have been the subject of considerable debate where although many saw the benefits for the feminist movement from the work of the WHC, there were still traces of the prejudice these women had faced for many years. The previously mentioned article in *The Daily Chronicle* also revealed that those soldiers finding themselves at Endell Street may feel a certain sense of alarm "at the almost aggressively feminine atmosphere of the place."[613] Even within a broadly positive article we can trace links back to the idea that feminist women could be seen as aggressive. An article in *The Lady* pointed out that the war had broken down some of the prejudice shown to women and that the work of the WHC had made "many objectors to women doctors open their eyes."[614] Nevertheless, this article was still clear that "a great deal of vigour remains in the prejudice against them" stating that the women had only got this far due to their "persistency in the face of obstacles."[615] This prejudice is also shown in an article rather wonderfully titled "Use Found for Suffragettes". News of the work carried out by the WHC in France had obviously not reached the ears of the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph.* Here they highlight the positive aspects of the establishment of the Endell Street Hospital for the women's movement. However they then go on to suggest that the scientific women of the

[612] Watson, *Fighting Different Wars*, p.17.
[613] The All Women Hospital, *The Daily Chronicle*, 25th April 1916, WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook, p.20.
[614] *The Lady,* 28th December 1916, WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook, p.82.
[615] *The Lady,* 28th December 1916, WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook, p.82.

suffragette movement involved in this hospital have "all agreed to try and do something useful and uncontroversial."[616] Although this article is arguing that the pre-war suffrage movement was not useful the fact that it also suggests that women doctors, employed by the RAMC and running a military hospital is uncontroversial shows Gullace's notion that the war provided a context in which long standing feminist claims became increasingly persuasive to the general public, and the press.[617]

Portraying a legacy.

Anderson and Murray were keenly aware of the feminist legacy they themselves were part of and were creating. When it came to the official portrayal of their work, they were fully aware of the value of the WHC to the feminist cause. They arranged for two photographers to capture everyday life at Endell Street.[618] We can also see that the Endell Street scrapbook and Murray's memoir form part of this too. When the Imperial War Museum's (IWM) Women's Work subcommittee contacted Murray to invite one of the WHC staff to be photographed in her uniform for a travelling exhibition, Murray replied immediately.[619] However when the IWM commissioned some drawings of Endell Street by artist Austin Spare, the importance of the portrayal of their work is clear. After a drawing of the operating theatre at Endell Street was hung at the Royal Academy of Arts in December 1919, Murray wrote to the head of the IWM's medical section "in order to get this picture destroyed."[620]

[616] Use Found for Suffragettes, *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 27th February 1915, p. 8.
[617] Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons*, p. 6.
[618] According to J. Geddes these photographers were Bernard Alfieri of Red Lion Court and Reginald Haines of 4 Southampton Row.
[619] IWM EN1/3/HOSP/005, Hon. Secretary Women's Work Sub-Committee to Dr. Flora Murray,27th March 1918; IMW EN1/3/HOSP/005, Dr. Flora Murray to Hon. Secretary Women's Work Committee, 29th March 1918.
[620] IWM EN1/3/HOSP/005, Flora Murray to Colonel Brereton, 22nd February 1920.

Murray and Anderson believed that in this picture their work was being caricatured. They also wrote to Lady Norman, the chair of the Women's section of the IWM stating that this was a misrepresentation of the work of professional women, "an object of ridicule to all those who have some professional knowledge."[621] The reaction to the picture that they believed belittled and ridiculed their work shows, not only how entrenched the notion of being ridiculed for their views must have been for these women but also that they understood that this was yet another opportunity to fight for equality. Their contribution to the war effort had to be taken seriously and their professionalism recognised in order to be of benefit to the feminist cause.

Graded as Lieutenants, Captains, Majors or Lieut-Colonel.

Professionalism in military circles is often focused on rank. Anderson and Murray would be running a military hospital under the command of the War Office, so naturally there was a great deal of focus on the notion of the women's rank. The women of the WHC were not commissioned but they were "graded as lieutenants, captains, majors or lieut-colonel and each one drew the pay and allowances" commensurate with their role.[622] Whitehead suggests that by refusing to grant the women even honorary rank the War Office did nothing to help with the maintenance of discipline in the hospital.[623] Murray only mentions the difficulties of discipline as the war was coming to an end when Endell Street was sent men from hospitals "where discipline was slack."[624] The fact that the women did not hold the rank they were graded at, did not seem to matter to those who wrote and read the newspapers at the time. Indeed, the women themselves would have seen the benefits to the

[621] IWM EN1/3/HOSP/005, Flora Murray to Lady Norman, 3rd March 1920.
[622] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.160.
[623] Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War*, p.111.
[624] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p. 256.

movement with this "promotion" in the ensuing publicity it brought. *The Sketch* explained to its readers that Major. L. Garrett Anderson now held all the authority equal to the rank of a major in the RAMC and the press was eager to "give her the salute." [625] However "Major Louie" herself "rather relishes the humour of the situation" especially when she tried to explain to members of the public, that no woman could hold a commission in the British army.[626]

The Manchester Guardian told its readers that for the purpose of running Endell Street Anderson had been accorded the rank of Major, "a really working title and not purely an honorary military title."[627] *The Daily Graphic* also did not draw any distinction with the women's titles and rank, explaining that Anderson and Murray had achieved the highest rank won so far by any women in the Army.[628] Describing the two women as the "Two women majors" the *Daily Graphic's* coverage seems indicative as to how Anderson and Murray were portrayed and seen by the general public. It appears that these women had earned the right to these ranks surpassing ideals of gender. It did not matter in the eyes of those reading the newspapers and magazine articles that women could not hold an official rank without an act of parliament passing.

The Common Cause saw the importance to the women's movement of the achievement of military rank by women, publishing an article on "The Woman Army Doctor".[629] This article drew attention not only to Anderson and Murray but also

[625] Major. L. Garrett Anderson, *The Sketch*, 28th April 1915, p.72.
[626] Major. L. Garrett Anderson, *The Sketch,* 28th April 1915, p. 72.
[627] Miscellany, *The Manchester Guardian*, 6th April 1915, p
[628] Women Army Officers, *The Daily Graphic,* 11th November 1916, WL 7LGA/3, Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook.
[629] The Woman Army Doctor, *The Common Cause,* 12th May 1916, p.39.

women such as Dr. Everett Maclaren, ranked as a Captain in the 3rd Scottish Military Hospital in Glasgow, and Dr. Florence Stoney, who had been put in charge of a military hospital x-ray department.[630] In the letters column of the newspaper the following week there were replies discussing the women that the original article had forgotten. Sensing an opportunity to use this information to further the feminist cause *The Common Cause* was pleased to tell its readers that "we shall be glad to hear from correspondents of any other women doctors who have been given military rank."[631] It was also keen that it be noted that many of the organisations that had led to women holding military rank had been "initiated and administrated by Suffragists." This and the fact that the story of women's rank could be found not only in the NUWSS's *The Common Cause* but also in newspapers from, the WSPU, the WFL, and the US shows again the continuing networks of a suffrage movement that was still active during the war taking advantage of differing opportunities to advance its aims.[632]

Campaigning for Rank.

Although it appears that to the newspapers and general public the fact that women could not officially hold military rank did not matter, it began to matter when more women took advantage of the openings Anderson and Murray's achievement had created. In 1916 the RAMC required more doctors abroad and so the War Office applied for 50 women to join the colours.[633] Leah Leneman states that despite unsatisfactory conditions 85 women sailed for Malta that July.[634] These women

[630] The Woman Army Doctor, *The Common Cause,* 12th May 1916, p. 39.
[631] The Status of Medical Women, *The Common Cause*, 19th May 1916, p. 39.
[632] In addition to *The Common Cause* see also, Women's War Work, *The Vote,* 2nd July 1915, p.663; Items of Interest, *Votes for Women,* 9th April 1915, p.227; A Women's Military Hospital, *The Suffragette,* 16th April 1915, p. 13.
[633] 50 Women Doctors wanted for the Army, *The Daily Mirror*, 13th November 1916, p. 2.
[634] Leneman, 'Medical Women in The First World War', p. 1592.

were not given rank, grading, uniform or even the ration and billeting allowance that every male doctor was entitled too.[635] This gave Anderson and Murray a further chance to fight for female emancipation. According to her memoir, doctors who worked for the RAMC in these isolated posts wrote to Murray and Anderson to tell of their difficulties and grievances "arising out of their anomalous position."[636]

These were grievances and difficulties that the women had foreseen. Anderson wrote to those engaged in recruiting to state that every effort should be made to secure temporary rank for these women. She also suggested that her experience as an army surgeon meant that she could see difficulties for the women if they were not formed into a uniformed corps attached to the RAMC. This was, she stated, because they would be at a disadvantage "professionally" if they were not accorded the same status as their male colleagues for doing the same work.[637] Here Anderson seems aware of her status as an army surgeon and that she has some influence because of her success. Unfortunately, her advice was not heeded. Urged on by the President of the Medical Women's Federation (MWF), Dr. Jane Walker, Anderson and Murray took up this pressing question with the War Office.[638] The fact that Walker had asked them personally to take up this cause shows the importance of the work of the women as Walker herself would have had some influence in her role.

Although their request was refused many individual officers could see no objection to rank being held by women. The question was raised at the Annual Representative

[635] Leneman, 'Medical Women in The First World War', p.1592.
[636] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.238.
[637] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.230.
[638] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p. 239.

meeting of the British Medical Association (BMA). Although here the military doctors were not as positive in their view of the need for parity the BMA did concede that if after further inquiries there was a need to press for any alterations then they would fully support it.[639] The question was also raised in the House of Commons where Henry Forster, the financial secretary to the War Office was badgered by both Sir Robert Newman and Sir Arthur Shirley Benn as to why women doing the same job as men were not able to hold rank. [640] Forster appeared to be unable to grasp why women would need to hold an official rank dismissing the idea that he had received any correspondence from the MWF. Eventually radical Liberal MP Henry Chancellor joined the conversation and seemingly got to the crux of the matter when he stated, "Is it sex or incompetence that prevents them from getting commissions?"[641]

As this saga rumbled on, Anderson also wrote to *The Times* setting out again the problems faced by the women in the RAMC. Here she stated that medical women serving the war office did not "desire commissions for their own aggrandisement or in order that they may use military titles", but so that their work may be more efficient, highlighting the professional nature of their work.[642] Although in her memoir Murray specified that the editor supressed the correspondence that followed at least one letter was published agreeing with Anderson.[643] W. Leonard Thackrah believed that Anderson's letter was a striking illustration of the "heart-breaking stupidity with which competent people are confronted with when dealing with Government Departments."[644] There was also the matter that the Income tax commissioners

[639] Women Doctors and the War Office, 86th Annual meeting of the British Medical Association, *British Medical Journal,* 3rd August 1918.
[640] Hansard, HC Deb 02 July 1918 Vol 107 cc1555-1556.
[641] Hansard, HC Deb 02 July 1918 Vol 107 cc1555-1556.
[642] Medical Women and Income Tax, *The Times*, Saturday 12th October 1918, p. 9.
[643] Murray, *Women as Army Soldiers*, p. 240.
[644] Medical Women and Income Tax, *The Times,* Tuesday 15th October 1918, p. 9.

were making this situation worse by refusing the women the service rate of tax. Thackrah suggested it was laughable that they stated that this was because the work of medical women in a general military hospital such as Endell Street was not "work of military character."[645] A letter to *The Spectator* summed up this injustice: "it would seem that the work is of a military character when done by a man, but not when done by a woman."[646] Anderson and Murray had crossed paths with these sort of petty difficulties before and fought against them. This was not the end of their campaigning.

Around the time of the armistice the question was again raised in the House of Commons. Now the answer was one that would have been familiar to suffragists like Anderson and Murray; even if the Government agreed to the proposal there was no possibility of any legislation being "introduced this session."[647] Throughout the suffrage campaign before the war, bills which would have given some women the vote had been defeated due to lack of time.[648] Their suffrage campaigning background was also seen in the leaflet Anderson and Murray produced to circularise the House of Commons. *Bricks without Straw* was sent out to all members of parliament in November 1918.[649] Again pointing out the difficulties the medical women faced, the attention on the problems caused by the tax commissioners drew parallels with the work of the WTRL before the war. By this time some women over thirty had been enfranchised and Leneman wonders if this is why this leaflet received such a positive response.[650] Perhaps the 62 MPs who

[645] Medical Women and Income Tax, *The Times,* Saturday 12th October 1918, p.9.
[646] The Service Status of Women Doctors, *The Spectator*, 9th November 1918, p.515.
[647] Hansard, HC Deb 06 November 1918 vol 110 cc2090-2; Hansard, HC Deb 12 November 1918 vol 110 c2481.
[648] Many suffrage bills had been "talked out" a parliamentary procedure whereby opponents of the bills continue a debate after the time allowed for voting. No vote can take place and the bill fails. I. Zangwill, *Talked Out! ... Being a Verbatim Report of the Speech [on the Defeat of the Woman's Suffrage Bill of 1907] at Exeter Hall, March 8th, 1907.* 1907.
[649] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.240.
[650] Leneman, 'Medical Women at War', p.173.

promised active support were aware of the potential extra votes from this enlarged electorate. Despite this show of support Parliament was on the verge of dissolving to deal with the forthcoming election. Nevertheless, the doctors managed to get the question on the agenda when the Parliament returned in February 1919.

Although the war was now over, the continuation of this campaign shows its importance to the feminist cause. However, it proved to be frustrating. When Anderson and Murray appealed to parliament this time, they found that it met with far less response than before. “Members who had written almost gushingly before the general election forgot to reply at all. Others…pointed out that the War was over.”[651] Without an election in sight it suggests that Leneman was right about the lip service paid to the campaign. However, there was a victory as the government conceded on the point about income tax relief, allowing it to be applied retrospectively from 1915.[652]

Legitimacy as legacy.

The War Office’s response to the campaign to give women military rank gave Anderson and Murray yet another feminist cause to fight. Within this type of campaigning we see again the need for historical legitimacy. It has parallels to the height of the suffrage campaign and perhaps also a thought to what their legacy may be from this campaign to support other medical women. Here they are exercising Woollacott’s idea of legitimate power. Despite the success of Endell Street the prejudice against women in the military had not completely disappeared. This is curious when we consider that throughout the period of the battle for rank,

[651] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.244.
[652] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p. 244.

Anderson and Murray were called upon to give their advice to many queries posed by various bodies involved in the war effort, they were also amongst the first women to receive honours from the King and research carried out by them was published in medical journal *The Lancet.*[653] As Murray pointed out, as the war carried on the army had a need for women's services which it was "forced" to consider.[654] They had more than enough experience of bureaucracy and the men involved within it to know that women just being involved in the military wasn't enough. They had to be at least equal if not seen as better than the men if the feminist cause was going to come out of the war victorious. This was drilled into the women who worked under them.[655] Anderson and Murray were at the forefront of feminist campaigning and using their expertise, knowledge and connections to try and move women's positions forward.

They were keen to pass on this expertise, knowledge and what they had learned during the struggle. In September 1917, Anderson gave the inaugural address for the new term at the LSMW. To give this speech at the school her mother had helped found, whilst in the middle of her own triumph with the WHC, must have been an auspicious occasion for Anderson, consolidating her place in feminist history. The speech entitled "Ambition" drew attention to the ideals that medical women should keep before them. Anderson believed the medical profession was not only the finest vocation, but it was the best training for life.[656] Her words made it clear that those women involved in it should not be focussed on personal success, but rather

[653] See Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* pp.232-238 for a discussion on the different opinions sought from Anderson and Murray on a variety of topics. Chapter 3 of this dissertation discusses these activities further.
[654] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.213
[655] Marion Dickerman Papers, Franklin D Roosevelt Presidential Library, Transcript of an interview by Jennifer Starr quoted in Geddes, 'Deeds and Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street', p. 85.
[656] *British Medical Journal,* 6th October 1917, p.460.

on the idea of the professional woman, and what its success might mean for future generations. An ambition to make their lives and work enriching. “Do not let your personal preference for professional work or a quiet life hinder you from accepting responsibility when the demand comes.”[657] She spoke of ambition “in its best sense”, resonating alongside Murray’s idea of the “world of effort” [658]

One last effort.

Anderson and Murray’s idea of the world of effort had one last attempt to obtain rank for medical women. To remove the disparities between men and women would have been a tremendous victory for two feminist campaigners. In 1919 they came up against an old suffrage foe; Winston Churchill.[659] *The Sheffield Evening Telegraph* believed that the problem of women and rank would be “a matter one supposes that Mr Churchill will set right.”[660] He appears to have had the last word on the question of the rank of military women. As the Secretary of State for War, Churchill stated that he was “not prepared to introduce legislation during the present session.” which would allow women the recognition of the rank and privileges to which they were entitled.[661] His history with the suffrage movement makes it clear that Churchill understood that this was part of the campaign for female emancipation too.

[657] *Magazine of the London (Royal Free Hospital) School of Medicine for Women*, Nov 1917, 12, p. 80.
[658] *British Medical Journal,* 6th October 1917, p.460; The Position of Women in Medicine and Surgery by Dr. Flora Murray, M.D, B.S, D.P.H. *The New Statesman,* 1st November 1913, p. xvii.
[659] Churchill had a history with the suffrage movement. He was heckled at many by election meetings, he was seen as a “wrecker” over the matter of the conciliation Bills in 1910, and he would not order an enquiry into the violence of Black Friday, Pugh, *The Pankhursts*, pp.133-134; Hansard, HC Deb 01 March 1911 vol 22 cc367-8.
[660] Our London Letter, *The Sheffield Evening Telegraph,* 25th March 1919.
[661] Hansard, HC Deb 27 February 1919 vol 112 c1979W.

In the autumn of 1919, a circular invited the commanding officers of all units to suggest amendments to the Army Act. This gave Murray the opportunity to perhaps have her final say in this fight. It gave her "a last opportunity of pleading for equality for women and men, whether as medical officers, nursing orderlies, general service orderlies, clerks or store keepers."[662] However it seems that she had resigned herself to the hopelessness of this course "Whether her draft ever reached the War Office, or whether it was buried in some waste-paper basket on the way, is not known."[663] Medical women would not hold rank in the British Army until after the Second World War.[664]

Conclusion.

The First World War is often seen as a watershed for the feminist movement of the early twentieth century. A time which is sometimes seen as limiting for those women who had been caught up in the pre-war campaigns. A focus on the work of Anderson and Murray whilst they were based at the Endell Street Military hospital has shown that their work with the WHC had at its core a goal to further women's opportunities in public life. It has shown that they took advantage of the opportunity to be the first women to entirely run a military hospital and that they used it to pursue a feminist campaign aiming to secure an equality of opportunity with medical men in the RAMC. They supported the women who took up the opportunities created by Anderson and Murray's success. This success was acknowledged not only by their feminist networks but also by the countless positive reports and articles found in newspapers and magazines. Although sometimes only grudgingly accepted by

[662] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.244.
[663] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons,* p.245.
[664] Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War*, p. 117.

those in the military, they had their champions. It appears we find these women within Gullace's notion that the war provided a context in which long standing feminist claims became persuasive. Not afraid to fight for what they believed in and conscious of their legacy and the place they had created for themselves in feminist history, Anderson and Murray's work has shown that there was space to articulate their pro duty feminism. These were women who "represented work for the country and work for the woman movement combined…"[665]

[665] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p. vii.

Conclusion

> It was a fierce furnace through which we went, but a furnace which welded women together and made men understand that women could lead women, and that women should trust other women. When war came, and our weapons became Red Cross bandages, as it were, we found the training we had undergone of very great help to us.[666]

In late November 1928, Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson disembarked from the *SS Orford* in Sydney, Australia. She was there to undertake a small tour of various cities and reunite with fellow women doctors who had served under her during the First World War. When she made a fleeting visit to Melbourne, she was honoured with a luncheon thrown by the Anzac Fellowship of Women, who wished to show their gratitude for the work of Anderson's organisation the WHC during the First World War. Greeted with prolonged applause Anderson kept the gathering spellbound as she spoke about the "fierce furnace" her and her fellow suffragists had gone through in the fight for emancipation. In the year when women finally achieved equal enfranchisement and ten years since the Armistice, Anderson was clear that this furnace was the perfect training for their work during the war.

This thesis has shown that for some women the First World War was a time of self-actualisation rather than one of disruption. It has sought to challenge the standard approaches to women and the war suggesting that women proactively shaped their own war and positioned themselves as integral parts of the larger whole rather than passively waiting for the impact of war to reach them. By complicating some of the myths of women and the war it has shown that women's

[666] Notable Woman, Dr. Garrett Anderson Entertained at Lunch, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 30th November 1928, p.4.

experiences of women led communities and ideas of selfhood had a crucial impact on the way some women understood and responded to the war.

Nowhere is this shown more clearly than in the experiences these women had within the feminist movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, where Anderson and Murray were nurtured by women led communities. Whether it was their schooling, their medical training, their involvement in the women's suffrage movement, or the WHC, these atmospheres shaped Anderson and Murray and gave them the confidence to dedicate their lives to furthering women's opportunities, whether they be professional, political or personal. This, Murray stated, was a "world of effort", a place where women were achieving equality of opportunity with men in all walks of life. As Anderson stated to her Australian crowd in 1928, the training the women had been through in the Suffrage movement equipped them for war service.

Within the historiography of female suffrage there is often a tendency for the movement to have ended at the outbreak of war. Perhaps a focus on the leadership of the most well-known militants has obscured how important the ideas of the movement were to women being able to create a space for themselves, in life and in a time of war. Within this community women experienced fellowship and comradeship, where a strong emphasis was placed on the creation of new values, new consciousness and a sense of self. This sense of self was important in turning "all the cant's into cans" and giving the women involved a sense of autonomy.[667]

[667] Margery Corbett Ashby quoted in Rowbotham, *Dreamers of a New Day*, p.49.

Although this thesis has been concerned with the stories of individual lives, the importance of communities to how Anderson and Murray understood themselves as citizens, lovers, people and feminists has threaded itself through these pages. These communities offered these women places of safety and belonging leading them to find love and esteem. These communities and what was achieved within them gave the women the ability to realise self-actualisation during the war, demonstrating their desire to use all their abilities to achieve and realise their true potential. Using psychologist Abraham Maslow's definition of self-actualisation to scrutinize four well known "icons" of women and the war: Suffrage, Sexuality, Gender and Feminism, this work has explored the experiences of Anderson and Murray within such communities in order to expand understandings of women's participation in the First World War.

This work has discovered that Anderson and Murray were part of networks and communities that not only seemed to have understood cultural constructions of early twentieth century gender ideals to be more fluid than has been previously suggested, they also saw their actions as self-governed and calmly considered duties, embodying the liberal traditions of citizenship. Lauren Freeman states that a sense of autonomy centres around self-determination, self-governing, choosing, acting and that these ideas are important to self-hood, to community and to citizenship.[668] Being involved in a community not only involves living out your values and beliefs but also taking responsibility and can be an example of wider

[668] L. Freeman, 'Reconsidering Relational Autonomy: A Feminist approach to Selfhood and the Other in the thinking of Martin Hiedigger', *Inquiry*, 54,4,2011, p.364.

interconnectedness.[669] All these ideas have been discovered in this exploration of Anderson and Murray's lives.

Therefore, Anderson and Murray can be found within Pennell's notion that the reasons for being part of the war effort were rooted in the social makeup of those communities that people were part of. To expand understandings of how women understood and responded to the war this is an important place to start and runs parallel to the idea of Marcus who suggests that anchoring women's statements about their relationships, needs to be done in the context of their lives.[670]

The context here is that Anderson and Murray lived lives which had an expression of difference. They were non heterosexual, professional women doctors, involved in the campaign for female suffrage who from their life experiences believed they had a duty as citizens to participate in the war. These are the parameters this thesis has used to explore the First World War experiences of these two women. To do so it has not only explored the war but has moved back in time to try to ascertain how these women believed they could be part of this cataclysmic event.

This thesis has been an exploration of two women's lives and as such should not stand for the experience of "women" during the First World War. Nevertheless, it has shown that women had experiences that were as complex as mens during this period and in some cases as similar. One hundred years after the end of the war surely it is time for a more integrated and rounded story. We have seen that Anderson and Murray had times of despair but there were also times of great joy.

[669] Kavanagh, *The World is Our Cloister*, p.78.
[670] Marcus, *Between Women*, p.44.

It is difficult to know how the war affected them and how they portrayed themselves in the new post war world, but there is much more to discover. Both women immersed themselves in political discourse, with Murray campaigning on behalf of her brother in her native Scotland, and Anderson still involved in "the Irish Question", working with organisations such as the feminist Six Point Group and governmental committees alongside becoming one of the first female Justices of the Peace.[671] These women came out of the war with a heightened standing amongst their communities and in the public eye, while living as a visible couple. To flesh out this part of their story would require further research tempered with the knowledge that only five years after the armistice Murray died, after a short illness, on Anderson's fiftieth birthday.[672]

We draw on the kind of sources used here to invest the past with meaning; for then and now. Moss suggests that we should embrace the ways in which our own pasts and presents have brought us to a place where we can be truly intimate with our subjects.[673] Here my ideas have run parallel with not only those of Moss but also of Bennett, when she suggests "I want to participate in the creation of histories that can have meaning for those women who today identify as lesbians, bisexuals, queers or otherwise".[674] Spending this time with Louisa Garrett Anderson and Flora Murray I have in Moss's words been absorbed "in the messy embrace of history"[675]

[671] Murray's campaigning can be found in, Dr. Flora Murray, *Dumfries and Galloway Saturday Standard*, 7th December 1918; A Women's Protest, *Freemans Journal*, 9th March 1921 tells us of Andersons involvement in the "Irish Question"; Abuse of Children, *The Vote*, 6th March 1925 has information on Andersons role as chairman of a Six Point Groups investigation into childhood abuse; Central Committee on Women's Training, *The Common Cause*, 18th February 1921 suggests that the named committee has been strengthened by the appointment of Anderson; 13 New JPs, *The Buckingham Advertiser and Free Press*, 23rd February 1924 names Anderson as one of the new "Gentlemen" JPs for the county of Buckinghamshire.
[672] 28th July 1923.
[673] https://rachelemoss.com/2014/03/07/the-messy-intimacy-of-writing-history/ accessed 19th January 2019.
[674] Bennett, 'Lesbian like', p.4.
[675] https://rachelemoss.com/2014/03/07/the-messy-intimacy-of-writing-history/ accessed 19th January 2019.

The words of the women themselves from the dedication of *Women as Army Surgeons* encapsulate this dissertation,

> Your work was too good to be left unrecorded; and though in these pages I have said little in praise, yet if you will read between the lines you will find there a very genuine affection for each one of you, and admiration and pride for your courage and endurance.[676]

[676] Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons*, p.vi.

Bibliography: Primary sources

WL- The Women's Library@ LSE

WL 7LGA Papers of Louisa Garrett Anderson

- 7LGA/1 Letters from Holloway
- 7LGA/2 Women's Hospital Corps
- 7LGA/3 Endell Street Military Hospital Scrapbook
- 7LGA/5 Papers re death of Louisa Garrett Anderson
- 7LGA/6 Photographs

WL 7NLA Papers of Nina Last

- 7NLA/1/01b Reminiscence of School and War
- 7NLA/1/02b Transcript of War Memories, 1914-1918

WL WTR Women's Tax Resistance League Papers

- 2WTR/1/1 Committee papers 1909-1913

SRO I – Suffolk Record Office, Ipswich Branch

- SRO I HA436/1/4/6 papers of Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, Letters from Elizabeth Garrett Anderson and Louisa Garrett Anderson to Miss Brooks and Miss Sage.
- SRO I HA436/16831 letters and papers of Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 1837-1939.
- SRO I HA436/1/3/2 papers of Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, Letters from Louisa Garrett Anderson to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson and James George Skelton Anderson, her parents.
- SRO I HA436/1/3/5 papers of Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, Letters from James George Skelton Anderson and Family and Friends.

IWM- The Imperial War Museum

- EN1/3/HOSP/005 Correspondence between Endell Street Military Hospital and the IWM Women's Work section.
- IWM/WWC, BRC 10 2/14. Women's Work Collection.

TNA-The National Archives

- TNA, HO144/1193/220196(1-233), p.162. DISTURBANCES: Suffragettes' demonstration. Imprisonment. Forcible Feeding.

State Library of Queensland

- Eleanor Elizabeth Bourne Papers, OM81-130. accessed www.slq.qld.gov.au 1/11/2017

Hansard

- HC Deb 02 July 1918 Vol 107 cc1555-1556.
- Hansard, HC Deb 06 November 1918 vol 110 cc2090-2.
- Hansard, HC Deb 12 November 1918 vol 110 c2481.
- Hansard, HC Deb 27 February 1919 vol 112 c1979W.

Ancestry.com

- Medal Cards for the Women's Hospital Corps UK, WWI Service Medal and Award Rolls, 1914-1920, accessed 9th September 2017.
- London, Electoral Registers, 1832-1965, accessed 22nd April 2017.
- 1891 Census, accessed 22nd April 2017
- 1901 Census, accessed 22nd April 2017

Books

L. G. Anderson, *Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, 1836-1917* (Cambridge, 1939).

M.P. Doggett, *Women Wanted; The Story Written in Blood Red Letters on the Horizon of the Great World War* (London, 1918).

J. Marlow (ed.), *Votes for Women, The Virago Book of Suffragettes,* (London, 2001).

J. Marlow (ed.), *The Virago Book of Women and the Great War* (London, 1998).

F. Moxon, *What Forcible Feeding Means* (London, 1914).

F. Murray, *Women as Army Surgeons, being the history of the Women's Hospital Corps in Paris, Wimereux and Endell Street, September 1914-October 1919* (London, 1921).

C. Pankhurst, *Unshackled* (London, 1987 [first edition, 1959]).

E. S Pankhurst, *The Home Front,* (London, 1987).

E. Sharp, *Unfinished Adventure* (Bodley Head, 1933).

A. K. Smith (ed.), *Women's Writing of the First World War, An Anthology* (Manchester, 2000).

Newspapers

Lady Doctors and Scholars, *Nottingham Evening Post,* 17th May 1901, p.4

University of Durham, *Durham County Advertiser*, 1st May 1903, p.3.

Woman Suffrage: A Great Demonstration in London*, The Manchester Guardian,* 22 June 1908, p.7.

Women Suffragists and Militant Tactics, Vote for Legal Methods*, The Manchester* Guardian, 11 November 1908, p.4.

Women and politics, *Dover Express*, 5 February 1909, p.7.

Advert for meeting, *Hastings and St Leonards Observer*, 6 March 1909, front page.

Cuckfield, *Sussex Agricultural Express*, 11 June 1909, p.6.

Unmarried Daughters, *The Times,* 29 November 1909, p.13.

Enthusiastic Suffragettes, *Sheffield Evening Telegraph*, 11 November 1910, p.8.

In the police courts: sentences of hard labour, *The Manchester Guardian,* 6th March 1912, p.4.

The Women's War, *The Observer,* 31st March 1912, p.8.

Mrs. Pankhurst re-arrested, *Sunderland Daily Echo and Shipping Gazette*, 27 May 1913, p.2.

Suffragists and water strikes, *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette*, 28 June 1913, p.12.

If Women Got Honours, *The Daily Mirror*, 3rd July 1914, p.4.

A Criticism, *The Times*, 10th July 1914, p.13.

Splendid work carried out by women, *The Daily Herald,* 22nd July 1914, p.2.

Mrs. Fawcett on the Means of Service, *The Manchester Guardian*, 4th September 1914, p.10.

British Red Cross Unit for France, *The Manchester Guardian*, 4th September 1914, p.10.

Women Doctors' Hospital, *The Daily Mirror,* 12th October 1914, Front page.

An All-Woman Staff at a British Hospital in Paris: Splendid Treatment for the Wounded Soldiers, *The Daily Mirror,* 22nd October 1914, Front page.

Women Doctors, *The Times,* 22nd January 1915, p.35.

Women in Medicine, *The Times*, 19th February 1915, p.11.

Use Found for Suffragettes, *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 27th February 1915, p. 8.

The Need for Women Doctors, *The Weekly Telegraph*, 13th March 1915, p.10

Miscellany, *The Manchester Guardian*, 6th April 1915, p.3.

Letter to the Editor, *The Morning Post* 19th July 1915, p.9.

Women in Khaki, *The Times,* 20 July 1915, p.9.

Letter to the Editor, *The Morning Post,* 22nd July 1915, p.5.

1915 A Women's Year, *Wells Journal*, 7th January 1916, p. 3.

Women and War Work, *The Times,* 24th May 1916, p. 9.

Women and War Work, *The Saturday Review,* 17th June 1916, p.586.

50 Women Doctors wanted for the Army, *The Daily Mirror*, 13th November 1916, p. 2.

Co-ordination of Military Transport work, *The Globe*, 10th January 1917, p.7.

The King Honours Women for their Services, *The Daily Mirror,* 28th September 1917, p.1.

Medical Women and Income Tax, *The Times,* Saturday 12th October 1918, p.9.

Medical Women and Income Tax, *The Times,* Tuesday 15th October 1918, p. 9.

Skilled Needlework by Wounded Soldiers, *The Times*, 16th November 1917, p.9.

Dr. Flora Murray, *Dumfries and Galloway Saturday Standard*, 7th December 1918, p.1.

Our London Letter, *The Sheffield Evening Telegraph,* 25th March 1919, p.4.

Men and Women of today, *Dundee Courier*, 18 November 1920, p.10.

Women as Army Surgeons, *Aberdeen Press and Journal,* 27th December 1920, p. 5.

A Women's Protest, *Freemans Journal*, 9th March 1921, p.6.

Death of a pioneer woman doctor, *The Manchester Guardian*, 31 July 1923, p.14.

Dr. Flora Murray, Reminiscences of her War Work by Elizabeth Robins, *The Observer,* 3rd August 1923, p.3.

13 New JPs, *The Buckingham Advertiser and Free Press*, 23rd February 1924, p.3.

Notable Woman, Dr. Garrett Anderson Entertained at Lunch, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 30th November 1928, p.4.

Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson, *The Manchester Guardian*, 16 November 1943, p.3.

- Other newspaper articles are to be found in WL 7LGA/3 Endell Street Scrap Book, c.1916.

Journals and Magazines

Pleuritic Effusion Treated with Adrenalin by the Preliminary Intraserous Injection Method, by William Ewart MD Cantab, FRCP and Miss Flora Murray MD Durham, *The British Medical Journal,* 28th April 1906, pp.973-974.

I. Zangwill, *Talked Out! ... Being a Verbatim Report of the Speech [on the Defeat of the Woman's Suffrage Bill of 1907] at Exeter Hall, March 8th, 1907.* 1907.

A Case of Sarcoma of the Small intestine, by Louisa Garrett Anderson, MD, BS Assistant-Surgeon the new Hospital for Women, *The British Medical Journal,* Vol 2, 1907, pp.886-888.

Malignant Disease of the Uterus. A Digest of 265 cases treated in the New Hospital for Women by Louisa Garrett Anderson, BA, MD (Lond) and Kate Platt, MB, BS (Lond), *The Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the British Empire*, Vol XIV, 6, 1908, pp.381-392.

M. Scharlieb, Adolescent Girlhood under Modern Conditions, with Special Reference to Motherhood, *Eugenics Review*, April 1909, pp.175-176.

The New Sex Psychology, *The Westminster Review*, 172, 5, Nov 1909, p.506.

London Graduates' Union for Women's Suffrage, *The Saturday Review,* 20 November 1909.

The Spectator, 25th June 1910, p.1053.

Uranians, *The Freewoman*, 4th January 1912, pp.127-128.

Uranians, *The Freewoman,* 25th January 1912, pp.189-190.

Uranians, *The Freewoman,* 22nd February 1912, p.274.

Uranians, *The Freewoman,* 29th February 1912, p.291.

Forcible Feeding, *The British Medical Journal,* 6th July 1912.

The Position of Women in Medicine and Surgery by Dr. Flora Murray, M.D, B.S, D.P.H. *The New Statesman,* 1st November 1913, p. xvii.

Schoolgirl Hero Worship, *The Bystander,* 12th August 1914, 394.

The Question of Uniform, *The Sphere,* 22nd August 1914, p.212.

Women's Sphere in War Time, *The Sphere,* 29th August 1914, p.234.

Major. L. Garrett Anderson, *The Sketch*, 28th April 1915, p.72.

The Military Hospital, Endell Street, W.C., *The British Journal of Nursing,* 12th June 1915, p. 502.

The Girl in the Overall, *The Graphic,* 14th August 1915, p.214.

B. Harraden, 'The War and Women Doctors', *The Windsor Magazine*, Dec 1915-May 1916, p.186

The Treatment of Infected Suppurating War Wounds, *The Lancet*, 2nd September 1916, p.447.

Co-ordination of Military Transport work, *The Globe*, 10th January 1917, p.7

The Treatment of Septic Wounds with Bismuth-Idoform-Paraffin Paste by Louisa Garrett Anderson MD Lon. Chief Surgeon, Military Hospital, Endell Street and Helen Chambers MD Lon. Pathologist, Military Hospital, Endell Street, *The Lancet*, 3rd March 1917, pp.331-333.

What's in a Rank, *The Sketch*, 13th June 1917, p.28.

Letters of Eve, *The Tatler,* 15th August 1917, p. 194.

The London Gazette, 24th August 1917, p.8795.

Women's First Investiture, *The Sketch,* 3rd October 1917, p.8.

Honours for Women, *The Sphere,* 6th October 1917, p.6.

British Medical Journal, 6th October 1917, p.460.

Magazine of the London School of Medicine for Women, November 1917, 12, p.80.

Women Doctors and the War Office, 86th Annual meeting of the British Medical Association, *British Medical Journal,* 3rd August 1918, p.20.

The Service Status of Women Doctors, *The Spectator*, 9th November 1918, p.515.

Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson, *The Lancet*, 4th December 1943, p.719.

Suffrage Newspapers

Platform 18, *Votes for Women,* 18th June 1908, p.254.

Prisoners of War, *Votes for Women,* 26th April 1912, p.467.

Women Doctors for Children, *Votes for Women*, 29th November 1912, p.12.

Why We are Militant, *The Suffragette,* 14th November 1913, p.99.

Speech by Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, *Votes for Women,* 10th July 1914, p.633.

Women must never return to subordination*, Votes for Women,* 7th August 1914, p.678.

The Crimes of Statecraft, *The Vote,* 7th August 1914, p.268.

Show your Colours! *Votes for Women,* 14th August 1914, p.698.

The Peterloo Massacre, *Votes for Women*, 14th August 1914, p.591.

Into the Breach! *Votes for Women*, 21 August 1914, p.703.

The Longest War, *Votes for Women,* 21st August 1914, p.705.

A Women's Unit for War, *Votes for Women*, 11th September 1914, p.727.

Women Doctors for our Allies, *Votes for Women*, 18 September 1914, p.739.

Suffragists and Relief, *Votes for Women,* 1st January 1915, p.115.

For Men Only, *The Vote*, 8th January 1915, p.454.

Women Doctors and the War, *Votes for Women*, 26th February 1915, p.179.

Medical Women in War Time, *The Common Cause*, 26th February 1915, p. 730.

Suffragettes at the Front, *International Women's Suffrage News*, 1st March 1915, p.260.

Various Items, *Free Church Times*, 1st March 1915, p.18.

Women into the Breach, *Votes for Women,* 19th March 1915, front page.

The Woman's Dreadnought, 3rd April 1915, p.223.

Items of Interest, *Votes for Women,* 9th April 1915, p.227.

A Women's Military Hospital, *The Suffragette,* 16th April 1915, p.13.

Women's War Work, *The Vote,* 2nd July 1915, p.663.

Another Milestone! Women Doctors Recognised by War Office', *Votes for* Women, 11th December 1915, p.85.

The Woman Army Doctor, *The Common Cause*, 12th May 1916, p. 59.

The Status of Medical Women, *The Common Cause*, 19th May 1916, p. 39.

Honours Conferred on Women, *The Vote*, 5th October 1917, p.381.

Dr. Flora Murray, *The Vote* 10th August 1923, p.250.

Central Committee on Women's Training, *The Common Cause*, 18th February 1921.

Abuse of Children, *The Vote*, 6th March 1925.

Websites

www.rhhct.org.uk/news/may2000/may2000.html Dr. Dulcie Stanley describes vacation work at Endell Street as a medical student.

Will of Flora Murray accessed via www.probatesearch.service.gov.uk 22 January 2015.

https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/electionsvoting/womenvote/case-study-the-right-to-vote/the-right-to-vote/birmingham-and-the-equal-franchise/1918-representation-of-the-people-act/ accessed 6th July 2018

John, Angela V. "Sharp [married name Nevinson], Evelyn Jane (1869–1955), children's writer and suffragette." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. October 08, 2009. Oxford University Press. Date of access 15 Sep. 2018, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-37950

Inglis, Elsie Maud (1864-1917), Leah Leneman whttps://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/34101 accessed 15th September 2018.

Murray, Flora (1869-1923), Jennian Geddes, https://doi.org/10.093/ref:odnb/56304 accessed 17 February 2016

www.poetrynook.com/poem/dear-love-comrades accessed 12th October 2018.

Kuhn, William M. "Brett, Reginald Baliol, second Viscount Esher (1852–1930), courtier." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 2004-09-23. Oxford University Press. Date of access 3 Mar. 2018, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-32055

https://mbsbham.wordpress.com/2018/07/26/stories-about-individual-lives-or-intimate-histories/ accessed 12th January 2019.

E. Brayshaw, How embroidery therapy helped first world war veterans find a common thread, *The Guardian*, 25th April 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/apr/25/how-embroidery-therapy-helped-first-world-war-veterans-find-a-common-thread accessed 27th January 2019.

https://www.womenslandarmy.co.uk/first-world-war-womens-land-army/researching-ww1-land-girls/ accessed 15th February 2019.

http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/help-with-your-research/research-guides/british-military-campaign-and-service-medals/ accessed 15th February 2019.

https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/electionsvoting/womenvote/overview/suffragetteswartime/ accessed 4th March 2019.

Bibliography: Secondary Sources

Journal Articles

U. Abulof, ‘Introduction: Why We Need Maslow in The Twenty-First Century’, *Society*, 54, 6, 2017, pp.508-509.

J. Bennett, “Lesbian Like” and the Social History of Lesbianism’, *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 9, 1, 2000, pp.1-24.

L. Bibbings, ‘Images of Manliness: The portrayal of Soldiers and Conscientious Objectors in the Great War’, *Social and Legal Studies*, 12, 3, 2003, pp.335-358.

F. Binard, “The Injustice of the Women’s Vote’: opposition to female suffrage after World War 1’, *Women’s History Review*, 23, 3, 2014, pp.381-400.

J. Bourke, ‘Women and the Medical Services in World War One’, *Women, War and Society, 1914-1918*, Gale Digital Collection, pp.1-4.

J.M. Byles, ‘Women’s Experience of World War One: Suffragists, Pacifists and Poets’, *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 8, 5, 1985, pp.473-487.

B. Caine, ‘Australian Feminism and the British Militant Suffragettes’, paper presented as a lecture in the Department of the Senate Occasional Lecture Series at Parliament House on 31 October 2003, pp.1-17.

M. Calvini-Lefebrve, ‘The Great War in the History of British Feminism: Debates and Controversies, 1914 to the Present’, *French Journal of British Studies*, 20, 1, 2015, pp.1-17.

A. Carden-Coyne, ‘Masculinity and the Wounds of the First World War: A Centenary Reflection’, *French Journal of British Studies*, 20, 1, 2015, pp.1-8.

D. Cohler, ‘Sapphism and Sedition: Producing Female Homosexuality in Great War Britain’, *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 16, 1, 2007, pp.68-94.

L. Delap, ‘’Philosophical Vacuity and Political Ineptitude’: The Freewoman’s Critique of the Suffrage Movement’, *Women’s History Review*, 11, 4, 2002, pp.613-630.

L. Delap, ‘The Superwoman Theories of Gender and Genius in Edwardian Britain’, *The Historical Journal*, 47, 1, 2004, pp.101-126.

L. Doan, ’A Challenge to ‘Change’? New Perspectives on Women and the Great War’, *Women’s History Review*, 15, 2, 2006, pp.337-343.

E. Donoghue, ‘Doing Lesbian History, Then and Now’, *Historical Reflections*, 33, 1, 2007, pp.15-22.

J. Dowd Hall, “To Widen the Reach of Our Love”: Autobiography, history and desire’, *Feminist Studies,* 26, 1, 2000, pp.230-249.

J. D'Souza and M. Gurin, 'The Universal Significance of Maslow's concept of Self-Actualisation', *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 44, 2, 2016, pp.210-214.

C. Dyhouse, 'Driving Ambitions: women in pursuit of a medical education, 1890-1939', *Women's History Review*, 7, 3, 1998, pp.321-343.

A. Fletcher, 'Patriotism, the Great War and the Decline of Victorian Manliness', *History*, 2014, pp.40-72.

L. Freeman, 'Reconsidering Relational Autonomy: A Feminist approach to Selfhood and the Other in the thinking of Martin Heidegger', *Inquiry*, 54, 4, 2011, pp.361-383.

L. Garber, 'Claiming Lesbian History: The Romance Between Fact and Fiction', *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 19, 1, 2015, pp.129-149.

J. Geddes, 'Deeds and Words in the Suffrage Military Hospital in Endell Street', *Medical History*, 61, 2007, pp, 79-98.

J. Geddes, 'Louisa Garrett Anderson (1873-1943), surgeon and suffragette', *Journal of Medical Biography*, 16, 2008, pp.205-214.

J. Geddes, 'The Women's Hospital Corps: forgotten surgeons of the First Word War', *Journal of Medical Biography*, 14, 2, 2006, pp. 109-117.

J. F. Geddes, 'The Doctor's Dilemma: Medical Women and the British Suffrage Movement', *Women's History Review*, 18, 2, 2009, pp.203-218.

S. Grayzel, "The Outward and Visible Sign of Her Patriotism': Women, Uniforms and National Service During the First World War', *Twentieth Century British History*, 8, 2, 1997, pp.145-164.

S. Grayzel, 'Belonging to the Imperial Nation: Rethinking the History of the First World War in Britain and its Empire', *The Journal of Modern History*, 90, 2018, pp.383-405.

N. Gullace, 'White Feathers and Wounded Men: Female Patriotism and the Memory of the Great War', *The Journal of British Studies*, 36, 1997, pp.178-206.

L. Hall, 'Hauling Down the Double Standard: Feminism, Social Purity and Sexual Science in Late Nineteenth Century Britain', *Gender and History,* 16, 1, 2004, pp.36-56.

L. Hall, "Sentimental Follies' or 'Instruments of Tremendous Uplift'? reconsidering women's same-sex relationships in interwar Britain', *Women's History Review,* 25, 1, 2016, pp.124-142.

C. Hirshfield, 'Actresses Franchise League and the Campaign for Women's Suffrage 1908-1914', *Theatre Research International*, 10, 2, 1985, pp.13-26.

L. Inglis, 'Elsie Inglis, The Suffragette Physician', *The Lancet*, 8-14th November 2014, 384, pp.1664-1665.

R. Jennings, 'From Woman loving Woman to Queer, Historiographical Perspectives on Twentieth Century British Lesbian History', *History Compass,* 5, 6, 2007, pp.1901-1920.

K. Jenson, 'War, Transnationalism and Medical Women's Activism: the Medical Women's International Association and the Women's Foundation for Health in the aftermath of the First World War', *Women's History Review*, 26, 2, 2017, pp.213-228.

A. John, 'Behind the locked door': Evelyn Sharp, suffragette and rebel journalist', *Women's History Review*, 12, 1, 2003, pp.5-13.

H. Kean, 'Searching for the past in present defeat: the construction of historical and political identity in British feminism in the 1920s and 1930s', *Women's History Review*, 3, 1, 1994, pp.57-80.

S. Kingsley Kent, 'The Politics of Sexual Difference: World War 1 and the Demise of British Feminism', *Journal of British Studies*, 27, 3, 1988, pp.232-253.

R. Kunzel, 'The Power of Queer History', *American Historical Review*, 123, 5, 2018, pp.1560-1582.

J. Lee, 'Sisterhood at the front: Friendship, comradeship and the feminine appropriation of military heroism among World War 1 First Aid Nursing Yeomanry (FANY)', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 31, 2008. pp.16-29.

L. Leneman, 'Medical Women at War, 1914-1918', *Medical History*, 38, 2, 1994, pp.160-177.

L. Leneman, 'Medical Women in The First World War: Ranking Nowhere', *British Medical Journal*, 307, 6919, 1993, pp.1592-1594.

N. Martin, "The Rose of No Man's Land': Femininity, Female Identity and Women on the Western Front', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 13, 6, 2012, pp.5-17.

J. Meyer, 'Separating the Men from the Boys: Masculinity and Maturity in Understandings of Shell Shock in Britain', *Twentieth Century British History*, 20, 1, 2009, pp.1-22.

D. Monger, 'Nothing Special? Propaganda and Women's Roles in Late First World War Britain', *Women's History Review*, 23, 4, 2014, pp.518-542.

https://rachelemoss.com/2014/03/07/the-messy-intimacy-of-writing-history/ accessed 19th January 2019.

M. Moulton, “You Have Votes and Power”: Women’s Political Engagement with the Irish Question in Britain, 1919-1923’, *Journal of British Studies*, 51, 1, 2013, pp. 179-204.

S. Neuhaus, ‘Australia’s female military surgeons of World War I’, *ANZ Surg*, 83, 2013, pp.713-718.

L. Noakes, ‘Demobilising the Military Woman: Constructions of Class and Gender in Britain after the First World War’, *Gender and History*, 19, 1, 2007, pp. 143-162.

L. Noakes: Women's Mobilization for War (Great Britain and Ireland), in: 1914-1918-online. International Encyclopaedia of the First World War, ed. by Ute Daniel, Peter Gatrell, Oliver Janz, Heather Jones, Jennifer Keene, Alan Kramer, and Bill Nasson, issued by Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin 2014-10-08. **DOI**: 10.15463/ie1418.10277

L. E. Nym Mayhall, “Creating the ‘Suffragette Spirit’: British Feminism and the Historical Imagination’, *Women’s History Review*, 4, 3, 1995, pp.319-344.

A. Oakley, ‘Women, Peace and Welfare: A Supressed History of Social Reform, 1880-1920’, *Policy Press, 2018*, pp.210-211.

L. Pattinson, “Shirkers’, ‘Scrimjacks’ and ‘Scrimshanks’?: British Civilian Masculinity and Reserved Occupations, 1914-45’, *Gender and History,* 28, 3, 2016, pp.709-727.

J. Purvis, “A Glass half Full’? Women’s history in the UK’, *Women’s History Review*, 27, 1, 2018, pp.88-108.

J. Purvis, “Deeds not Words’, Daily Lives of Militant Suffragettes in Edwardian Britain’, *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 18, 2, 1995, pp.91-101.

J. Purvis, ‘Gendering the Historiography of the Suffragette Movement in Edwardian Britain: some reflections’, *Women’s History Review*, 22, 4, 2013, pp.576-590.

J. Purvis, ‘The Women’s Party of Great Britain (1917-1919): a forgotten episode in British women’s political history’, *Women’s History Review*, 25, 4, 2016, pp.638-651.

J. Rayner, ‘The Carer, the Combatant and the Clandestine: images of women in the First World War in War Illustrated magazine’, *Women’s History Review*, 2017, pp.1-18.

A. Rich, ‘Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence’, *Signs*, 5, 4, 1980, pp.648-649.

K. Robert, ‘Constructions of “Home”, “Front”, and Women’s Military Employment in First World War Britain: A Spatial Interpretation’*, History and Theory*, 52, 2013, pp.319-343.

M. Roper. ‘The Unconscious Work of History’, *Cultural and Social History,* 11, 2, 2014, pp.69-193.

A. Schwan, “Bless the Gods for my Pencils and Paper’: Katie Gliddon’s Prison Diary, Percy Bysshe Shelley and the Suffragettes at Holloway’, *Women’s History Review*, 22, 1, 2013, pp.148-167.

H. Sheard, ‘They will both go to heaven and have crowns and golden harps’: Dr. Vera Scantlebury Brown and Female Leadership in a First World War Military Hospital’, *Scholarship Research Centre, The University of Melbourne,* 2011, pp.90-104.

L. Stanley, ‘Romantic Friendship? Some Issues in Researching Lesbian History and Biography’, *Women’s History Review*, 1, 2, 1992, pp.193-216.

Z. Thomas, ‘At Home with the Women’s Guild of Arts: gender and professional identity in London studios, c.1880-1925’, *Women’s History Review,* 24, 6, 2015, pp. 938-964.

S. Tiernan, ‘Challenging Presumptions of Heterosexuality: Eva Gore Booth, A Biographical Case Study’, *Historical Reflections*, 37, 2, 2011, pp.58-71.

L. Ugolini, ‘War Stained: British Combatants and Uniforms, 1914-18’, *War and Society*, 33, 3, 2014, pp.155-171.

J. Vellacott, ‘Feminist Consciousness and the First World War’, *History Workshop*, 23, 1987, pp.81-101.

J. Vellacott, ‘Feminism as if All People Mattered: Working to Remove the Causes of War, 1919-1929’, *Contemporary European History*, 10, 3, 2001, pp.375-394.

J. Vellacott, ‘*Making Peace: The Reconstruction of Gender in Interwar Britain* by Susan Kingsley Kent’, *The American Historical Review*, 100, 3, 1995, p.903.

M. Vicinus, “They Wonder to Which Sex I Belong”: The Historical Roots of the Modern Lesbian Identity’, *Feminist Studies*, 18, 3, 1992, pp.467-497.

P. Ward, “Women of Britain say Go’, Women’s patriotism in the First World War’, *Twentieth Century British History*, 12, 1, 200, pp.23-45.

J. S. K. Watson, ‘Khaki Girls, VADs and Tommy’s Sisters: Gender and Class in First World War Britain’, *The International History Review*, 19, 1, 1997, pp.32-51.

J.S.K. Watson, ‘War in the Wards: Social Construction of Medical Work in First World War Britain’, *Journal of British Studies*, 41, 4, 2002, pp.484-510.

A. Woollacott, “Khaki Fever’ and its Control: Gender, Class, Age and Sexual Morality on the British Home Front in the First World War’*, Journal of Contemporary History*, 29, 2, 1994, pp.325-347.

A. Woollacott, ‘From Moral to Professional Authority: Secularism, Social Work and Middle-Class Women’s Self-Construction in World War I Britain’, *Journal of Women’s History,* 10, 2, 1998, pp. 85-111.

Bibliography: Secondary Sources

Books and Chapters

K. Adie, *Fighting on the Home Front: The Legacy of Women in World War One* (London, 2014).

J. Alberti, *Beyond Suffrage, Feminists in War and Peace, 1914-1928* (Hampshire, 1989).

M. Arthur, *Forgotten Voices of the Great War* (London, 2002).

O. Banks, *The Biographical Dictionary of British Feminists, Volume 1, 1800-1930* (Brighton, 1985).

I.R. Bet-El, 'Men and Soldiers: British Conscripts, Concepts of Masculinity and the Great War', in B. Melman, *Borderlines: Genders and Identities in War and Peace, 1870-1930* (London, 1998).

L. Bibbings, *Telling Tales About Men: Conceptions of Conscientious Objectors to Military Service During the First World War* (Manchester, 2009).

G. Braybon, *Women Workers in the First World War* (London, 1981).

G. Braybon (ed.), *Evidence, History and the Great War, Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, 2003).

G. Braybon, 'Winners or Losers: Women's Symbolic role in the War Story', in G. Braybon (ed.), *Evidence, History and the Great War, Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, 2003).

C. Brock, *British Women Surgeons and their Patients, 1860-1918* (Cambridge, 2017).

J. Bush, *Edwardian Ladies and Imperial Power* (Bloomsbury, 2000).

B. Caine, *Biography and History* (Basingstoke, 2010).

A. Carden-Coyne & L. Doan, 'Gender and Sexuality', in S. Grayzel and T. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War* (Oxford, 2017).

T. Castle, *The Apparitional Lesbian: Female Homosexuality and Modern Culture* (New York, 1993).

A. Clark, *Alternative Histories of the Self: A Cultural History of Sexuality and Secrets, 1780-1917* (London, 2017).

D. Cohler, *Citizen, Invert, Queer: Lesbianism and War in Early Twentieth Century Britain* (University of Minnesota Press, 2010).

R. Collis, *Portraits to the Wall, Historic Lesbian Lives Unveiled* (London, 1994).

M. Cook, *Queer Domesticities: Homosexuality and Home Life in Twentieth Century London* (Palgrave, 2014).

K. Cowman, ‘A Party between Revolution and peaceful persuasion: a fresh look at the United Suffragists’, in M. Joannou & J. Purvis (eds.), *The Women's Suffrage Movement: New Feminist Perspectives* (Manchester, 1998).

E. Crawford, *Enterprising Women: The Garretts and their Circle* (London, 2002).

E. Crawford, *The Women’s Suffrage Movement, a Reference Guide*, *1866-1928* (Routledge, 2003).

L. Doan, *Disturbing Practices, History, Sexuality and Women’s Experience of Modern War* (Chicago, 2013).

L. Doan, *Fashioning Sapphism, The Origins of a Modern English Lesbian Culture* (New York, 2001).

C. Dyhouse, *Girl Trouble, Panic and Progress in the History of Young Women* (London, 2013).

C. Earp- Jorgensen*, The Transfiguring Sword: The just war of the Women’s Social and Political Union* (University of Alabama, 2015).

P. Fara, *A Lab of One’s Own: Science and Suffrage in the First World War* (Oxford, 2018).

A. Fox-Godden, *Learning to Fight: military innovation and change in the British Army, 1914-1918* (Cambridge, 2018).

P. Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford, 1975).

R. Gerwath and E. Manela, ‘Introduction’, in R. Gerwath and E. Manela (eds.), *Empires at War 1911-1923* (Oxford, 2014).

J. Glynn*, The Pioneering Garretts: Breaking the Barriers for Women* (London, 2008).

J. Gottlieb and R. Toye (eds.), *The Aftermath of Suffrage: Women, Gender and Politics in Britain, 1918-1945* (Basingstoke, 2013).

J. Gould, ‘Women’s Military Services in First World War Britain’, in M. Randolph Higonnet, S. Michel, J. Jenson & M. Collins Weitz (eds.), *Behind the Lines, Gender and the Two World Wars* (Yale, 1987).

S. Grayzel and T. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War* (Oxford, 2017).

S. Grayzel and T. Proctor, ‘The Scholarship of the First World War’, in S. Grayzel and T. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War* (Oxford, 2017).

S. Grayzel, ‘Liberating Women? Examining Gender, Morality and Sexuality in First World War Britain and France’, in G. Braybon (ed.), *Evidence, History and the Great War, Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, 2003).

S. Grayzel, *Women’s Identities at War, Gender, Motherhood, and Politics in Britain and France during the First World War* (North Carolina, 1998).

A. Gregory, ‘British ‘War Enthusiasm’ in 1914: A Reassessment’ in G. Braybon (ed.), *Evidence, History and the Great War, Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, 2003).

A. Gregory, *The Last Great War: British Society and the First World War* (Cambridge, 2008).

N. Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons, Men, Women and the Renegotiation of British Citizenship During the Great War* (New York, 2002).

M. Harrison, *The Medical War: British Military Medicine in the First World War* (Oxford, 2010).

E. Hamer, *Britannia’s Glory, A History of Twentieth Century Lesbians* (London, 1996).

E. Hamer, ‘Keeping their Fingers on the Pulse: Lesbian Doctors in Britain, 1890-1950’, in G. Hekma, F. Eder and L. A. Hall (eds.), *Sexual Cultures in Europe: Themes in Sexuality* (Manchester, 1999).

C.G. Heilbrun, *Writing a Women’s Life* (New York, 1988).

K. Hunt and J. Hannam, ‘Towards an Archaeology of Interwar Women’s Politics: The Local and the Everyday’ in J. Gottlieb and R. Toye (eds.), *The Aftermath of Suffrage, Women, Gender, and Politics in Britain, 1918-1945* (Basingstoke, 2013).

S. Hynes, *The War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (London, 1990).

S. Jeffreys, ‘Does It Matter If They Did It?’, in Lesbian History Group (ed.), *Not a Passing Phase, Reclaiming Lesbians in History 1840-1985* (London, 1989).

S. Jeffreys, *The Spinster and her Enemies, Feminism and Sexuality 1880-1930* (London, 1997).

R. Jennings, *A Lesbian History of Britain, Love and Sex between Women since 1500* (Oxford, 2007).

M. Jackson, *The Real Facts of Life, Feminism and the Politics of Sexuality 1850-1940* (London, 1994).

K. Jensen, ‘Gender and Citizenship’, in S. Grayzel and T. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War* (Oxford, 2017).

K. Jenson, ‘Volunteers, Auxiliaries and Women’s Mobilization: The First World War and Beyond (1914-1939), in B. Hacker and M. Vining (eds.), *A Companion to Women’s Military History* (Brill, 2012).

A. John, *Evelyn Sharp, Rebel Woman, 1869-1955* (Manchester, 2009).

J. Kavanagh, *The World is Our Cloister* (O Books, 2007).

S. Kingsley Kent, *Gender and Power in Britain, 1640-1990* (Oxon, 1999).

S. Kingsley Kent, *Making Peace, The Reconstruction of Gender in Interwar Britain* (Princeton, 1993).

S. Kingsley Kent, *Sex and Suffrage in Britain, 1860-1914* (London, 1987).

S. Koven, *The Match Girl and the Heiress* (Oxford, 2014).

C. Law, *Suffrage and Power: The Women's Movement, 1918-1928* (London, 1997).

S. Lanser, 'Mapping Sapphic Modernity', in J. Hayes, M. R. Higgonnet & W. J. Spurkis (eds.), *Comparatively Queer: Interrogating Identities Across Time and Cultures* (New York, 2010).

Lesbian History Group, 'Introduction', in Lesbian History Group (ed.), *Not a Passing Phase, Reclaiming Lesbians in History 1840-1985* (London, 1989).

B. Lewis, 'Introduction', in B. Lewis (ed.), *British Queer History: New Approaches and Perspectives* (Manchester, 2013).

J. Liddington and E. Crawford, *Vanishing for the Vote, Suffrage, Citizenship and the Battle for the Census* (Manchester, 2014).

M. MacMillan, *The War that Ended Peace*: *How Europe Abandoned Peace for the First World War* (London, 2014).

J. Manton, *Elizabeth Garrett Anderson* (London, 1965).

S. Marcus, *Between Women, Friendship, Desire and marriage in Victorian Britain* (New Jersey, 2007).

A. Marwick, *Women at War, 1914-1918* (Fontana, 1977).

A. Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York, 1962).

T. Meade and M. Wiesner-Hanks, 'Introduction', in T. Meade and M. Wiesner-Hanks (eds.), *A Companion to Gender History* (Maldon, 2004).

J. Medd, *Lesbian Scandal and the Culture of Modernism* (Cambridge, 2012).

B. Melman, 'Introduction', in B. Melman (ed.), *Borderlines, Genders and Identities in War and Peace 1870-1930* (New York, 1998).

J. Meyer, *Men of War: Masculinity and the First World War in Britain* (Palgrave, 2008).

M. Moulton, 'Bricks and Flowers: unconventionality and queerness in Katherine Everett's life writing', in B. Lewis (ed.), *British Queer History: New Approaches and Perspectives* (Manchester, 2013).

S. J. Neuhaus & S. M. Dane, *Not for Glory: A century of service by medical women to the Australian army and its Allies* (Boolarony press, 2004).

L. Noakes, “Playing at Being Soldiers?’ British Women and Military Uniform in the First World War’ in J. Meyer (ed.), British *Popular Culture and the First World War* (Leiden, 2008).

L. Noakes, *Women in the British Army: War and the Gentle Sex 1907-1948* (Routledge, 2006).

L. E. Nym Mayhall, *Militant Suffrage Movement: Citizenship and Resistance in Britain, 1860-1930* (Oxford, 2003).

A. Oram, *Her Husband Was A Woman! Women’s Gender-Crossing in Modern British Popular Culture* (Taylor and Francis, 2013).

C. Pennell, *A United Kingdom: Popular Responses to the Outbreak of the First World War in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2012).

M. Pugh, *Electoral Reform in War and Peace, 1906-1918* (London, 1978).

M. Pugh, *Women and the Women’s Movement in Britain* (London, 2000 [1st edition, 1992]).

M. Pugh, *The Pankhursts* (London, 2001).

M. Randolph Higonnet, S. Michel, J. Jenson & M. Collins Weitz (eds.), *Behind the Lines, Gender and the Two World Wars* (Yale, 1987).

M. Ramelson, *Petticoat Rebellion* (London, 1976 [first edition 1967]).

D. Riley, *Am I That Name? Feminism in the Category of ‘Women’ in History* (London, 1988).

G. Robb, *British Culture and the First World War* (Palgrave, 2002).

Kristina Roberts, “All That is Best of the Modern Woman”? Representations of Female Military Auxiliaries in British Popular Culture, 1914-1919’, in J.Meyer (ed.), *British Popular Culture and the First World War* (Lieden, 2008).

M. Roper, *The Secret Battle: Emotional Survival in the Great War* (Manchester, 2009).

S. Rowbotham, *Dreamers of a New Day, Women who Invented the Twentieth Century* (London, 2010).

S. Rowbotham, *Hidden from History* (London, 1973).

J. Scott, ‘Rewriting History’, in M.Randolph Higonnet, S. Michel, J. Jenson & M. Collins Weitz (eds.), *Behind the Lines, Gender and the Two World Wars* (Yale, 1987).

E. Shipton, *Female Tommies: The Frontline Women of the First World War* (Gloucestershire, 2014).

E. Showalter, *The Female Malady*: *Women, Madness and English Culture* (London, 1987).

A. K. Smith, *Suffrage Discourse in Britain during the First World War* (Taylor and Francis, 2005).

A. K. Smith, *The Second Battlefield, Women, Modernism and the First World War* (Manchester, 2000).

A. K. Smith, *Women's Writing of the First World War* (Manchester, 2000).

L. Stanley with A. Morley, *The Life and Death of Emily Wilding Davison* (London,1988).

S. Stanley Holton, *Feminism and Democracy, Women's Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain 1900-1918* (Cambridge, 1986).

S. Stanley Holton, 'In Sorrowful Wrath: Suffrage Militancy and the Romantic Feminism of Emmeline Pankhurst', in Harold L. Smith (ed.), *British Feminism in the Twentieth Century* (Amherst, 1990).

S. Stanley Holton*, Suffrage Days: Stories from the Women's Suffrage Movement in Britain, 1865-1918* (Routledge, 1996).

P. Summerfield, 'Women and War in the Twentieth Century', in J. Purvis (ed.), *Women's History: Britain, 1850-1945: an Introduction* (London, 1995).

G. Sutherland, *In Search of the New Woman: Middle Class Women and Work in Britain, 1870-94* (Cambridge, 2015).

D. Thom, 'Gender and Work', in S. R. Grayzel & T. M. Proctor (eds.), *Gender and the Great War*, (Oxford, 2017).

D. Thom, 'Making Spectaculars: Museums and how we remember Gender in Wartime', in G. Braybon (ed.), *Evidence, History and the Great War, Historians and the Impact of 1914-18*, (New York, 2003).

D. Thom, *Nice Girls and Rude Girls: Women Workers in World War One* (London, 1998).

L. M. Todd, *World War I and Propaganda* (Brill, 2014).

D. Todman, *The Great War: Myth and Memory* (London, 2005).

V. Traub, *The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2002).

L. Ugolini, *Civvies, Middle Class Men on the English Home Front* (Manchester, 2013).

M. Vicinus, 'Distance and Desire: English Boarding School Friendships 1870-1920', in M. Duberman, M. Vicinus & G. Chauncey Jr (eds.), *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (London, 1990).

M. Vicinus, *Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1850-1920* (London, 1985).

M. Vicinus, *Intimate Friends, Women Who Loved Women, 1778-1928* (London, 2004).

M. Walters, *Feminism: A Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2005).

J. S. K. Watson, *Fighting Different Wars: Experience Memory and the First World War in Britain* (Cambridge, 2004).

I. Whitehead, *Doctors in the Great War* (Pen and Sword, 2013).

A. Woollacott, 'Sisters and Brothers in Arms: Family, Class and Gendering in World War One Britain', in M. Cooke and A. Woollacott (eds.), *Gendering War Talk* (Princeton, 2014).