This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Cultural Studies on 09/07/19, available online:

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09502386.2019.1638953

Title: All the Rage: Decolonising the History of the British Women's Suffrage Movement.

Author: Vron Ware, Professor of Sociology & Gender Studies, Kingston University London.

Vron.ware@gmail.com

v.ware@kingston.ac.uk

Abstract

The intervention of British feminists in the South African War is a chapter of feminist history that is rarely included either in the memorialisation of the suffrage movement or the genealogies of global counterinsurgency. The careers of pacifist Emily Hobhouse and suffragist Millicent Fawcett provide rich opportunities to examine the gendered and racialised politics of British imperial militarism. By exploring the confrontation between these two white women within the wider context of aggressive colonial expansion, this essay will draw out the implications of their differing stances towards the conduct and practice of war, particularly as it impacted on female civilians in the war zone. In doing so, it will contribute to our analysis of the interconnected histories of racism, imperialism, feminism and militarism that have undeniably shaped the politics of global security today.

Keywords: imperialism, feminism, whiteness, militarism, pacifism, suffrage,

Introduction

In 1902, following the conclusion of the South African War, the intrepid British peace activist, Emily Hobhouse, wrote:

> May it not be that, in reality, all war is barbarous, varying only in degree? ...None of us can claim to be wholly civilised till we have drawn this line above war itself and established universal arbitration in place of armaments. (Brits 2018, p. 134)

Almost two decades later, Millicent Fawcett, a leading British suffragist recently commemorated with a statue in London's Parliament Square, reflected on the role that women had played in the First World War:

> It is a source of great pride and thankfulness that the womanhood of the whole country, quite irrespective of political party or creed, were eager to do everything in their power to help their country (1918, p. 97).

These two statements represent the radically opposing positions taken by feminists in response to Britain's involvement in war in the first quarter of the 20th century. For this reason, the careers of these two women provide rich opportunities to examine the gendered and racialised politics of British imperial militarism. This historical phenomenon, the legacy of which continues to shape the UK's aspirations on a global stage, was not just an ideology that endorsed war as a noble and necessary activity to defend both nation and empire; it also entailed deeply-rooted beliefs about

what constituted military service, who was eligible to perform such work and what might be its social, economic and political rewards.

Today, Hobhouse's legacy as an anti-imperialist pacifist has long been forgotten, in the UK at least, not least because the story of the emerging global women's peace movement, of which she was a part, has yet to be told in full. Fawcett, on the other hand, is commemorated as a fearless campaigner for women's political rights and promoted by the Fawcett Society, a leading gender justice charity that dates back to the 19th century. However, her record as a loyal advocate of the British Empire, particularly in times of war, has been overlooked, in spite of the fact that many other white suffragists who were committed to humanitarian social reform developed fierce critiques of militarism and nationalism shaped by the specific circumstances in which they worked. In 1915, almost the entire organising committee of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) left en masse after Fawcett, who was president at the time, vetoed sending a delegate to the International Women's Congress for Peace and Freedom conference in The Hague. Ray Strachey, a close friend of Fawcett, described the split as 'a great cataclysm' but claimed triumphantly that they had managed to 'drive all the pacifists out' (Colbeck, 2018, p. 8)[1].

The fact that these details are largely missing from the potted biographies that one finds online, including Wikipedia and the Fawcett Society 'factsheets', suggests that this is a contested aspect of suffragist history. Yet the split between those who aligned themselves with peace and those who chose actively to support the war in 1914 has significant implications for our understanding of the gendered relationship between patriotism, military service and democracy. At the heart of the issue there was a conviction that women could finally prove their right to full citizenship if they

threw themselves behind the war effort, whether as mothers, wives, workers or nurses. Towards the end of her life, Fawcett commented that the war 'revolutionized the industrial position of women. It found them serfs and left them free.' (2018, p. 106). This observation proved to be wishful thinking as it turned out, but it was actually a statement founded on her personal conviction that war work was an opportunity to demonstrate to men that women were eligible for inclusion within the parliamentary system.

The politics of suffrage cannot be fully understood without taking into account their entanglement with parallel movements for freedom, whether derived from class or race oppression, fighting for liberation, social democracy and socialism or resisting white supremacist colonialism. It would be unthinkable to approach the origins of feminism in the US as separate from women's participation in the abolitionist movement, especially before, during and after the Civil War. From this history there is much to be learned about how movements shaped and sustained each other, especially in periods where revolutionary change seemed possible. David Roediger's meditation, *Seizing Freedom* (2015), is valuable here in returning us to the Jubilee of the slaves' strike during the US Civil War to look through what he calls 'the windows of revolutionary time'. Using his method to consider the moments in which 'radiating impulses towards freedom' (p.11) were set in motion by the revolutionary actions of the oppressed, we might pause to consider what else was happening in the early years of the 20th century which might have influenced radicals, women as well as men, black as well as white, who were campaigning for peace, equality, liberation from colonial domination, Home Rule or socialism.

Suffragists like Fawcett and Strachey were not alone in believing that, by offering their services in war-time, women could advance their claims for political

rights. There were parallel arguments about the benefits of military service emerging from anti-colonial struggles, although these were articulated much more forcefully and debated more widely at the time. Millions of men (and women) across the empire – white settlers as well as indigenous and colonised peoples – volunteered to take part in WW1, or were conscripted, in the hope of making political gains or regaining their land in the event of victory. There is, of course, an extensive literature on this phenomenon, which is integral to the histories of struggles against slavery, colonial rule and racial subordination from the American War of Independence onwards.[2] The centenary of WW1 has enabled a greater appreciation of the extent to which colonial peoples participated as well as the consequences of their involvement – or their refusal, for that matter (Shepperson 1958). Often this has been linked to citizenship claims in the present (Ware 2017). Meanwhile, the many episodes of violent repression after 1918 suggest that hopes for any such rewards were subsequently crushed. This too demands further investigation, as Olusoga observes in a commentary on the aftermath of the war:

> One of the many effects and after-effects of the first world war that have been forgotten is the way in which the war challenged the racial hierarchies of the early 20th century and how, in 1919 and the early 1920s, those hierarchies were violently reasserted. This is part of a wider amnesia. (2018)

In 1900 Fawcett and Hobhouse encountered one another as foes in the context of the South African War (1899-1902), otherwise known as the Second Boer War. This was a brutal colonial conflict that in many ways foregrounded the global cataclysm that erupted in 1914. It also marked the start of an evolving military strategy that would,

fifty years later, become known as ‘counterinsurgency’. This can be defined as ‘asymmetrical warfare by a powerful military against irregular combatants supported by a civilian population’ (Khalili 2011, p. 1471).

By exploring the confrontation between these two white women within the wider context of aggressive colonial expansion, this essay will draw out the implications of their differing stances towards the conduct and practice of new forms of warfare, particularly as they impacted on civilians. This means actively seeking disciplinary promiscuity in the interests of developing wider conversations about race, gender, militarism and militarisation. This strategy follows the lead set by John Gillis and others who, in 1980, urged that the concept of militarization forces us ‘to confront history in its totality and to override the conventional distinctions between political, economic, cultural and social history’ (Gillis 1980, p. 3). Today, we are becoming increasingly inured to the prospect of war as infinite, endless, perpetual, covert and remote. As David Goldberg suggests,

> The pervasive contemporary regime of global securitization presumes that nations are now under constant attack from rogue forces, antistatists, quasi states, and terrorists...The projection of constant threat or possibility of violent events is taken to require not just vigilance but perpetual preparation. Such states are on a ceaseless war footing (2016, p. 20).

Militarization proceeds on a global scale when governments invest heavily in armaments, including new nuclear weapons systems[3], and civil security technologies, while starving resources in social justice, education, environment, healthcare and culture (Berland and Fitzpatrick 2010, p. 9). Meanwhile, our everyday lives can be

transformed as military needs and militaristic presumptions become ‘not only valuable but also normal’ (Enloe 2000, p. 3). The elasticity of the concept demands a constant attention to the assumptions about what war is and what it does to those of us who dwell in countries whose military forces are polluting the planet in the interests of ‘global security’. As Mary Dudziak suggests in her reflection on war, time and the law (2012, p. 8) ‘Wartime’ has become normal time...Wartime has become the only time we have’.

Liberal Feminism and Colonial Imperialism

The memorialisation of the British women’s suffrage movement, which saw its first success in 1918, provides a useful entry point into this discussion. For a start, the convergence of the centennial celebrations for the Representation of the People Act with the final year of the commemoration of WW1 offers fresh opportunities to reflect on the connections between patriotism, sacrifice and the granting of political rights to women. However, the convergence of the twin centenaries threatens to overwhelm the historical detail. In Britain at least, it gives the impression that parliament reluctantly acceded to suffragists’ demands as a reward for patriotic behaviour, in return for their valiant services as munition workers or nurses, for example, despite the fact that historians have exposed this idea as a myth some time ago (Evans 1977, p. 222).

Aside from historical inaccuracy, the notion that war can benefit democracy has wider implications for the way in which military intervention is justified by humanitarian arguments today. But there are other reasons why it is important to inquire more deeply into women’s political agency in the period before 1914. It is here that we learn more about the unprecedented involvement of women in the conduct of war itself, whether as critical members of an increasingly informed public

or as experts invited to adjudicate on matters of military policy. These overlooked historical details demand a revised account of the salience of gendered constructions of whiteness in relation to the surge in militarism that was manifest at the turn of the 20th century.

In many ways, Victorian feminism was a product of the British Empire and the philanthropic impulse of many female activists, both pro- and anti-suffrage, was to support the spread of white, Christian civilisation to the furthest reaches of the earth, especially if it meant liberating native women from customs and habits regarded as barbarous and uncivilised (Ware 1992; Jayawardena 1995; Midgley 1998; Levine 2004). Just as political leaders did not expect to advise generals on military strategies in the long Victorian era, women were widely regarded as the 'weaker sex' and war was considered men's domain (Rendall 1977, Christ 1977, p. 159).[4] While there were numerous campaigners for social reform and women's welfare (Vicinus 1977, Oakley 2018), as well as for anti-imperialist causes (Bressey 2015), there were no guarantees that the supporters of female suffrage would be intrinsically hostile to the 'civilizing mission' of British imperialism. Yet the historical contribution of female peace campaigners and anti-militarists has, by and large, been confined to walk-on parts in the historiography and genealogy of militarism, with notable exceptions (Enloe 2014 (1989); Hochschild 2012; Liddington 1989). The relative absence of woman pacifists and peace activists from the reconstructed panoply of female suffrage heroines makes it harder to trace the genealogy of women's involvement in peace-making at a global level today, not least the uneven attempts to implement UN Security Council Resolution 1325.

The double centenary of the armistice and the initial female vote means there is an opportunity to discover how much more complicated the politics of suffrage might

actually have been, not just in the context of national movements operating within local constraints but as an international network – based in heart of empire – addressing many of the same problems of female exclusion and oppression in different parts of the world. But if we shift the focus from women's activism *against* war to their attempts to *influence the conduct* of war, a different picture emerges in which the battle appears to be driven less by what happened a hundred years ago and more by a manifest failure to interpret historical evidence in the present. Seen in this light, the solid presence of this new feminist commemorative sculpture can offer a focus for bringing this argument to life.

Commemorating the Cause

In April 2018 a new public artwork dedicated to Millicent Fawcett was unveiled in Parliament Square in the heart of imperial London. The statue, designed by Gillian Wearing, features a life-like representation of Fawcett, who co-founded the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) in 1897 and was president until 1919. Holding a placard that reads: 'Courage Calls to Courage Everywhere', Fawcett is the first and only woman in the square, a hectic, ugly space steeped in traffic fumes and saturated with Westminster's symbolic power. The statue, installed to mark the centenary of the 1918 Representation of the People Act which enfranchised certain categories of women over 30, ostensibly celebrates her lifelong commitment to The Cause, as it was then known, while simultaneously gesturing towards the fractured movement of which she was a part. Round its base, the plinth bears small photographic portraits of 55 activists, writers and reformers, many of whom had quite divergent views from the eminently respectable Fawcett towering above them.

Charlotte Despard, for example, whose portrait on the plinth shows a frail but

dignified older woman dressed in black, was an ‘uncompromising socialist’ (Hochschild 2011, p.13). A close friend of Karl Marx’s daughter, Eleanor, in 1896 she was a delegate at the Second International, a meeting of the federation of socialist parties and trade unions from around the world (ibid). For many years she carried out welfare work in south London and was a vocal opponent of the South African War. She was an active member of the Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU) until she broke with the authoritarian leadership of the Pankhursts, and as a pacifist she threw herself into campaigning against WW1, particularly after conscription was introduced in 1916.

The second example is Sylvia Pankhurst, whose life as a pacifist, communist and anti-imperialist cannot be compressed here. The image on the plinth is a copy of a photograph taken in 1910 which features Emmeline Pankhurst, founder and president of the WSPU with three of her daughters: Christabel, Sylvia and Adela. The depiction of the happy family is an insult to Sylvia’s memory; the rift with her older sister and mother in 1914 over how to respond to the outbreak of war was profound.[5] Adela was given a one-way ticket to Australia after following in Sylvia’s footsteps, both daughters becoming an embarrassment to the family name after an irrevocable divergence of paths. Sylvia’s decision to have a child out of wedlock shortly after the war was the final straw for her embittered and by then, ultra-conservative mother, who was recently commemorated as the inspiration for the suffragette movement with a new statue in Manchester.

The statue was part funded by the Arts Council through its 14-18 NOW initiative: a five-year programme of ‘extraordinary arts experiences connecting people with the First World War – based on the belief in the transformative power of the arts to bring the stories of the First World War to life’.[6] Thus British women’s entry into

parliamentary democracy became one more story to be celebrated through art and performance in the context of reassessing the impact of ‘the war to end all wars’. However, while there are significant problems in oversimplifying the relationship between female suffrage and military service, WW1 was undeniably a catalyst of social and political change. It scarcely needs pointing out that ‘the cataclysm of the Great War led to collapse, revolution, and potential upheaval’ on a global scale (Morrow 2004, p. 295), and ‘laid bare the social arrangements on which the European social order had rested’ (Geyer 1989, p. 73; Schonplflug 2017). Comparative research on female citizenship has produced a far more nuanced account of ‘the actual impact of war’ (Bader-Zaar 4.22) on the social relations of class and gender in different national contexts. In many countries, the realities of the immediate post-war period brought a backlash in women’s employment as populations were desperate to return to a semblance of normal life. Demobilised soldiers seeking to resume their place as breadwinners were given priority in the workplace and women were expected to embrace their ‘natural’ sphere in the home. In particular, young women who had experienced financial independence as a result of working in industrial sectors, as opposed to the drudgery of traditional domestic service, found that they were often blamed for unemployment among men returning from the war (Noakes 2007, p. 145).

Other historians have made the point that the idea that the vote was granted in response to women performing war work actually downplays the pre-war struggle of suffrage movements. The legendary militancy of the suffragettes from 1908 to 1914 placed immense pressure on the police and criminal justice system (Raeburn 1973), but the relentless campaigning of more conservative organisations up and down the country would have had a profound impact on local politics as well (Oakley 2018). Given the tumultuous political circumstances of the closing stages of the conflict, it is

much more likely that female suffrage was enacted ‘to maintain stability in the face of increased threats of disorder and revolution’ (Evans 1977, p. 223). Meanwhile it is important to remember that ‘Women’s movements had already been successful in some countries before the war...Specific political settings connected to modern nation building formed the impetus for electoral reform (ibid)’.

The supporters and proponents of Millicent Fawcett as an iconic leader of the suffrage movement were adamant that she should take her place alongside famous 19th and 20th century figures such as Winston Churchill, Abraham Lincoln, Jan Smuts, Nelson Mandela and Mahatma Gandhi. These are men whose legacies represent the blood-soaked efforts to hold the British Empire together as well as the determination to be free of colonial rule. In a reflection on the lack of monuments marking the black and Asian presence in British public history, John Siblon (2012) observes that from Trafalgar Square down through Whitehall to Parliament Square was one of those spaces ‘designed specifically to display imperial grandeur, military and racial superiority’ (p. 149).[7] To those who were fretting about the absence of political women in the vicinity of the Houses of Parliament, one might well ask: where are the women in the historical pantheon of empire and war?

Despite the fanfare that greeted the unveiling of Fawcett’s statue, which included speeches from the prime minister and other dignitaries including the mayor of London, this is not the only statue of a female icon in Westminster. Across the river, facing the Houses of Parliament, stands the larger-than-life figure of Mary Seacole (1805-1881), a Jamaican-born nurse who cared for wounded British soldiers during the Crimean War.[8] Unveiled in the grounds of St Thomas Hospital in 2016 after a 12-year campaign to raise £500,000, this is believed to be the UK's first memorial in honour of a named black woman. In her case, a controversy arose over

the choice of location for the statue. Medical historians were concerned that the prominent memorial would overshadow the hospital's connections with Florence Nightingale whose work in establishing nursing as a profession for women dated back to the same time. Others were apparently worried about the impact of the artwork on the tranquillity and greenery of the garden where it was to be sited but in the end both objections were overruled. It is unlikely that Fawcett would have heard of Seacole but she was a big fan of Nightingale, whose statue perches high above the traffic in nearby Waterloo Place. With lamp in hand, she stands on an ornate pedestal bearing four bas-reliefs that illustrate her diverse roles: caring for the injured; negotiating with politicians and generals; challenging medical and hospital managers; and being a teacher and inspiration to nurses. Fawcett credited Nightingale with “kindling the fire” of women’s fight for political agency through her work in the Crimean War:

> Miss Nightingale’s work in war was work that never had been done until women came forward to do it, and her message to her countrywomen was educate yourselves, prepare, make ready; never imagine that your task can be done by instinct, without training and preparation (1912, p. 15).

Perhaps she was less familiar with Nightingale’s subsequent antipathy to the imperial project and her support for the Indian National Congress (Gourlay 2003). It is more likely that the spirits of Nightingale and Gandhi would have more to say to each other in the afterlife than the two women did during their respective careers.

Fawcett is not without other female friends in the vicinity, and it is no coincidence that all these statues of famous women are linked to war. Ten minutes walk up Whitehall would take you to Edith Cavell, who worked in a hospital in

Brussels where she nursed soldiers, regardless of nationality. In 1915 she was arrested and a German military court found her guilty of 'assisting men to the enemy'. She was shot by firing squad on October 12 that same year. Her statue stands in front of a tall column dedicated to king and country. At the bottom is a plinth bearing the words: 'Patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred or bitterness towards anyone'. Today her memorial is the site of regular vigils by the group Women in Black.

On the near side of Westminster Bridge, barely 200m away, there is a statue of the legendary Celtic warrior, Boudicca, a figure that provides an appropriate counterpart to the suffragist's role in imperial history. Leader of a successful rebellion against Roman occupation, the ancient queen acquired an elevated status during the reign of Victoria. Prince Albert originally sponsored the bronze statue of Boudicca and her daughters, but it was not completed until 1902, the year that saw the end of the fighting in South Africa.[9] The sculpture was viewed as a fitting symbol of the British nation and its imperial ambitions since it represented Boudicca as a patriotic heroine who died defending the liberty of her country against a foreign invader. The Second Boer War provides the setting that reveals Fawcett's political formation most clearly, in particular her patriotic commitment to an imperialist view of the world.

Glimpses of the great cataclysm ahead

While this was a colonial war for wealth on Britain's part, for Afrikaners this period subsequently became known as the Second War of Freedom 1899-1902 (Marx 1998, p. 86), prompted by the discovery of a massive gold seam in the Transvaal, one of the two Boer Republics led by Paul Kruger. Many referred to it as 'Milner's War,' engineered by the young high commissioner to South Africa, Sir Alfred Milner, who was known for his 'almost religious devotion to "the British race"' (Hochschild 2011,

p. 21). When hostilities began in Britain's first major deployment since Crimea in the 1850s, the prospect of teaching the Boers a lesson was greeted almost as a continuation of the Diamond Jubilee celebrations of 1897. The public expected the war to be over by Christmas and revelled in the prospect of sending a warning to Germany, which was busy investing in a massive ship-building programme. In this and other ways the war 'would offer additional glimpses of the great cataclysm ahead', in ways that no one understood at the time (p. 19).

It was also Britain's first deployment that involved contingents from the colonies, as troops from Australia, New Zealand and Canada were dispatched to play their part in this latest imperial venture. It was deemed inappropriate to deploy Indian troops against fellow white men (Hyslop 2011, p. 266) although thousands of troops from the British Indian Army travelled to South Africa to work as non-combatant auxiliaries, often providing ambulance services under fire.[10] M. K. Gandhi, for example, led the Natal Indian Ambulance Corps so successfully that he later wrote in his autobiography: 'Our humble work was much appreciated...and the Indians' prestige was much enhanced' (Gandhi 2012, p. 166). Meanwhile, both sides used Africans as combatants and scouts as well as labourers and servants.

In Britain, many on the left vehemently protested, viewing the Boers as innocent victims of rampant colonialism (Hochschild 2011, p. 31) but also arguing that the cost of armaments alone was having a prohibitive effect on the economy at home. Anti-war meetings attracted a violent response on the basis that they were 'pro-Boer'. The war also provided a foretaste of what was to happen to the suffrage movement in 1914. Millicent Fawcett was clear about connections between what she was doing as a suffragist and her duty to her country. Reflecting ten years later she wrote: 'Two fires cannot burn together, and the most ardent of the suffragists felt that,

while the war lasted, it was not a fitting time to press their own claims and objects' (1912, pp. 69-70). However, the war did not go as planned as the Boers 'refused to fight a pitched battle' (Khalili 2013, 174). Mounted guerrillas began to get the better of British troops by carrying out ambushes and quick raids before disappearing into the veldt. The military retaliated by burning homesteads, livestock and crops, and poisoning wells and fruit trees. This strategy entailed corralling 100,000 civilians within a network of concentration camps fenced in with barbed wire. Boer women and children, and men too old to fight, were swept into these camps ostensibly for their own safety, but with no provision for comfort or welfare. Meanwhile, thousands of black men, women and children were held in segregated camps situated along railway lines and on the border, where they were expected to act as 'the eyes and ears of the British army, forming an early warning system against Boer attacks' (SAHO). The facts were initially concealed from the British public (Brits 2018, p. 91), although, since this was the age of mass circulation newspapers and a growing global telegraph network, the government would soon face new pressures from informed critics (MacKenzie 1984).

In 1899 Emily Hobhouse was appointed secretary of the South African Conciliation Committee, a group that opposed the British government policy regarding South Africa. She then arranged a mass meeting in London in June 1900 where women protested against the actions of the British Army. Three months later she founded the South African Women and Children Distress Fund to collect money for Boer families, and prepared to take the funds to South Africa herself. When she arrived in Cape Town in December, she learned that thousands of Boer women and children as well as African tenants and farmhands were dying as a result of profound neglect. The military commanders under Lords Roberts and Kitchener, the latter's

reputation enhanced as a result of slaughtering thousands of Sudanese in the Battle of Omdurman where the Maxim gun was first put to the test, had made no provision for welfare of the inmates, and showed little interest in their fate. In fact, Kitchener saw the Boers as 'uncivilized Africanda savages with only a thin white veneer' (Doherty 2019).[11]

Hobhouse toured the camps, interviewing the women and collecting photographic evidence. After returning to England she published a pamphlet in which she described the conditions and enumerated the mortality rate; she then distributed her report to all members of parliament before touring the country giving talks.[12] Her report changed the terms of the debate, not least because the public understood that the burning question was now one of gender – 'of gallant men protecting helpless women and children or of unmanly men allowing helpless women and children to starve' (Krebs 1999, p. 85). Her focus on the women and children in the camps was understandable, given their overwhelming majority compared to men, but, as Paula Krebs has argued in her invaluable book *Gender, Race, and the Writing of Empire: Public Discourse and the Boer War* (1999), it might also be seen as a political strategy. By portraying the women as victims of a military tactic that actively targeted non-combatants, Hobhouse was more effective in countering the government's emphasis on the inhabitants as 'refugees' of war who were merely being protected.

Her insistent campaigning would soon have an impact, forcing politicians to take a stand on the moral implications of what was taking place in the Transvaal. Hyslop notes a significant development when, in London, on 14 June 1901, the leader of the opposition Liberal party, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, made a speech that was to resound across the country, throughout the British empire, and around the world.

The affable and patrician ‘C-B’ had until that time patriotically deferred to the Conservative government on the South African war. But now he launched a full-scale attack on Lord Salisbury’s administration. ‘When’, he asked, ‘is a war not a war? When it is conducted by the methods of barbarism in South Africa’ (Hyslop 2011, p. 252).

This intervention was all the more effective since it highlighted the fact that this military operation was being conducted in the face of growing international concern. In May 1899 the first Hague Convention had brought together representatives of all the world’s major powers to agree on rules and procedures for moderating the conduct of war (ibid). Many politicians found Bannerman’s intervention hard to ignore. Having shared a podium with Hobhouse in Cornwall, Liberal MP David Lloyd George, whose statue stands barely 20 feet from Fawcett’s today, called for a debate. The government was compelled to respond, rising to the challenge that Hobhouse had issued (Brits 2018, p. 100). A commission, to be composed of women, was appointed to investigate the camps and make recommendations to improve them. Fawcett was invited to head the delegation and she accepted eagerly. This was a significant development since it acknowledged the degree to which gender had become a factor in determining colonial war policy (Krebs 2004, p. 92).[13]

The Ladies Commission appointed to visit South Africa was adamant from the start that this would be an objective investigation carried out on behalf of elected leaders. Before the delegates left for Cape Town, they refused to meet with Hobhouse; Fawcett was determined to avoid anyone who might be ‘pro-Boer’, considering those with ‘strong political views’ on the other side of the issue ‘as incapable of advising in such matters’ (Krebs 1999, p. 88). Krebs draws attention to an important article that Fawcett wrote for the *Westminster Gazette*. It critiques

Hobhouse's report and asserts that the creation of the camps was 'necessary from a military point of view.' She notes that Fawcett 'was firm in her assertion that Boer farms had been centers for supplying correct information to the enemy about the movements of the British'. For this reason, Fawcett continued,

> No one blames the Boer women on the farms for this; they have taken an active part on behalf of their own people in the war, and they glory in the fact. But no one can take part in war without sharing in its risks, and the formation of the concentration camps is part of the fortune of war (Krebs 1999, p. 87).

Undeterred, Hobhouse attempted to return to South Africa that same summer in order to continue her own investigations and to put in place more welfare schemes in the camps. However, in a dramatic turn of events that was to provide more evidence of the threat she posed, she was intercepted in Cape Town harbour. Despite traveling anonymously, she was arrested before she disembarked, following a tip-off by a journalist, and forcibly deported on the next ship going back to London. The military commander of Cape Town, backed by the high commissioner and Lord Kitchener himself, had decided that she was not to step foot in South Africa (Brits 2018, p. 113).

Early the following year, three months before peace was declared in May 1902, the Ladies Commission delivered their findings. They corroborated much of Hobhouse's evidence – although enough time had passed for some improvements to have been put in place – and their conclusion made similar recommendations. The tone of the report, delivered in February 1902, can be gauged by this brief description of the causes of death in the camps. First: The unsanitary condition of the country caused by the war; second: Causes within control of the camp inhabitants; and third:

Causes within the control of the administrations'' (Report on the Concentration Camps 14, quoted in Krebs 1999, 89). Krebs notes that, 'it was to cause number two that the Commission gave the most graphic evidence, and the jingo press naturally seized upon it' (Ibid). The information was cited repeatedly in outlets 'aimed at vindicating the British government for the death rates'.

In private correspondence Hobhouse referred to the Ladies Commission as 'Great and shining lights in the feminine world, they make one rather despair of the "new womanhood" – so utterly wanting are they in common sense, sympathy and equilibrium' (Krebs, 1999, pp. 86-87). However, it was not just the lack of sympathy for Boer women that made her furious. The Ladies Commission made no effort to visit camps holding Africans nor did it address their treatment. Krebs underlines this point: 'Millicent Fawcett recorded in her diary no narrative about any of the black camps – only captions on photos of African camp inmates, such as "Natives at work. Singing"'(p. 91).

Hobhouse did not witness an African camp during her first visit but was able to observe Africans being caught up with whites in the 'sweepings' of the 'mass military drive' (Brits 2018, pp. 86-87). In response to the Commission's lack of attention to the camps holding black men, women and children, she contacted the secretary of the Aboriginal Protection Society (APS), Henry Fox Bourne, who wrote to Chamberlain asking the British government to attend to the matter (Brits 2018, p. 129). By the end of the war, estimates of African deaths varied, but are thought to have reached 14,000 to 20,000, or as many as 25,000 (Hyslop 2011, p. 259; Brits 2018, p. 131).

Later, in her autobiography composed in the mid 1920s, Fawcett would reflect that:

> ...it was a real satisfaction to us to be allowed to some special work for our country in South Africa during the present crisis. I will not say that visiting and reporting on the camps was not fatiguing; but it was very interesting and quite straightforward and easy, for ... all we had to do was ‘to see and hear all we could and to tell the truth’ (1925, p. 2081).

At the heart of her political vision was the conviction that in matters of war and foreign policy at least, British military and diplomatic personnel – in particular Lord Kitchener and Sir Alfred Milner – were behaving in an honourable manner. As we have seen, it was not the strategy of creating the camps that shocked her, as they were part of the ‘fortune of war’ (Krebs 1999, p. 87). It was merely the standard of care given to the inmates, and she was gratified when the requisite changes were made, resulting in a fall in the death rate.

For Emily Hobhouse, this experience of seeing top military commanders prepared to commit such heinous crimes against civilians convinced her that war could never solve political problems. In one of three books on the war, entitled *The Brunt of the War and Where it Fell*, written during 1902, she made the comment that begins this essay. It bears repeating in full.

> May it not be that, in reality, all war is barbarous, varying only in degree? History shows that as nations have advanced in civilisation this line has gradually been raised, and watchful care is needed in case it slips back. None of us can claim to be wholly civilised till we have drawn this line above war itself and established universal arbitration in place of armaments (Brits 2018, p. 134).

In a discussion of the subsequent impact of the concentration camp strategy on warfare in the 20th century, Hyslop explains that the South African War was one of four colonial wars of 1896-1907 that offered a precedent.[14] The concept of the camp, which was diffused 'via the new forms and technologies of print media,' represented the system 'as a modern form of management of populations amongst military and political leaders' (2011, p. 255). Laleh Khalili (2013) has pointed to the influence of Major General C.E. Callwell's book *Small Wars: Their Principles and Practice* in her genealogy of the doctrine of counterinsurgency. This manual was first published in 1896 and revised in 1906 after Callwell's experiences of fighting in the Boer War. 'The basic difference between regular and irregular warfare in Callwell's experience', she writes, 'is degrees of civilization, which he distinguishes by categorizing enemies along a spectrum from "a savage race swayed by a despotic sovereign" to "independent clans" to "semi-civilized states"' (pp. 28-9). As Paul Gilroy noted earlier in *After Empire* (2004),

> ...the argument [Callwell] makes is all the more powerful for being couched in a commentary on the fate of civilized troops who fall into savage hands rather than the other way around: "in conflict with savages and semi-civilized opponents, and even in many cases with guerrillas in a civilized country, there is no such thing as surrender. The fate of the force which sacrifices itself in a small war is in most cases actual destruction"(p. 24).

Hyslop explains that media coverage was also influential in legitimizing the camp strategy 'in the eyes of civilians' (2011, p. 55). Here we see the pertinence of Millicent Fawcett's role in carrying out the Commission's work on behalf of the

British government. As Hyslop continues, ‘Movements which might have been expected to see the dangerous logic of the war on civilians – socialist and anti-imperialist groups – did not do so, instead sharing many of the assumptions of their military antagonists’ (ibid).

To overlook the significance of this war – very much condensed here – is to lose an opportunity to understand what was at stake in aligning the suffrage movement with a patriotic commitment to both imperialism and militarism. For Fawcett, women’s access to the political sphere meant that ‘We also very early arrived at the conclusion that the care of infant life, saving the children, and protecting their welfare was as true a service to the country as that which men were rendering by going into the armies to serve in the field’ (1925, p. 2632).

This statement exposes the lineaments of a docile feminism, well and truly conscripted into the imperial project. There is no doubt that Fawcett was a patriotic woman whose readiness to serve the British state by leading the Commission was not a matter of expressing solidarity or concern for Boer women, but rather a point of principle: the war was justified because of the Boer oppression of ‘Uitlanders’ who were denied a vote in the Transvaal. This was judged to be comparable to the way in which women were treated in Britain. ‘So, for this suffragist, Boer and African women’s positions were not comparable to British women’s’ (Krebs 1999, p. 87).

It was also prompted by her sense that national interests were threatened by the actions of the Boers. Her dismissal of Hobhouse as an ungrateful and treasonous individual lay in her conviction that sympathy for the enemy constituted a rejection of one’s own people, a form of disloyalty that could not be tolerated. Her stance was echoed by fellow Commission member, Jane Waterson, who, before her appointment, had poured scorn on those, like Hobhouse, who campaigned against the incarceration

of Boer women and children, referring to it as ‘hysterical whining’ (Downes 2008, p. 172).

Although the ensuing decade would see many changes in terms of tactics and alliances, not least the militancy of younger women who had lost faith in bourgeois liberalism, it also presaged what would happen when war was declared in 1914. Fawcett would be rewarded for her patriotic stance towards the end of her life, when, in 1925 she was made the Dame Grand Cross of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire.

War, white supremacy and suffrage movement

One significant implication of the South African War for the suffrage movement is that it brought into sharp relief the different understandings of appropriate gendered behaviour in ‘wartime’. When Boudicca’s statue was unveiled as a symbol of defiant victory in 1902, Fawcett would have had a particular sense of satisfaction derived from the unprecedented role she had played in proving women’s agency under conditions of war. In addition, she would have been gratified that she was able to end the injunction on campaigning to prove her point.

> The war temporarily suspended the progress of the suffrage movement, but it is probable that it ultimately strengthened the demand of women for citizenship, for it has been observed again and again that a war, or any other event that stimulates national vitality, and the consciousness of the value of citizenship is almost certain to be followed by increased vigour in the suffrage movement, and not infrequently by its success (1912, pp. 69-70).

Seen within the wider context of anti-colonial struggles, Fawcett and her allies were not alone in thinking that, if they could prove their worth when the nation was at war, they would be able to further their own political goals as a result. Many native Africans assumed that the British aim of subduing the Boer republics would work in their interest as well. Anthony Marx describes how 'Africans looked to Britain and her queen as potential saviours, akin to American slaves' view of the Union and Lincoln' (1998, p. 88). Convinced by the British record of abolition in 1833, some went so far as to burn their passes in public when British troops arrived in Pretoria in 1900, 'believing that a British victory meant the documents would be no longer required' (p. 88).

As the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) resumed their vigorous suffrage work in the summer of 1902, the British began task of 'restarting the new colonies and moulding them and the two existing colonies into one entity, which would soon take its honoured place as part of the empire.' Historians have suggested that the conflict marked 'the end of the long process of British conquest of South African societies, both Black and White' (Gilliomee and Mbenga 2007). Milner, now a Lord, commented, 'It was taken for granted – on this alone the British and Boers had always agreed – that in the new South Africa the black majority would be powerless' (Hochschild 2012, p. 37). In his book on the making of national racial orders in the US, South Africa and Brazil, Marx dissects the racialised politics of post-war reconciliation that quickly emerged following the final Treat of Vereeniging. Where, in fact, there had been a vague commitment to the native franchise before the war, the stream of compromises made by the British revealed the 'overriding nation-state building imperative of the post-Boer War era': 'Concessions to Afrikaner

sentiment'...were expressly intended to placate the defeated adversary, to 'denationalize' and incorporate them within a unified white nation (1998, p. 89).

Despite the clear signs of a growing Afrikaaner nationalism, Hobhouse, who had maintained her welfare work with war survivors in South Africa, was insistent on the principle of equality between black and white in the newly unified colony. In the speech that she wrote for the inauguration of the Women's Monument in Bloemfontein in 1913, which was based on her sketch of two grieving women and a dying child (Grundlingh 2002), she appealed to 'their better natures not to withhold the very liberties and right that you have valued and won for yourselves':

> We in England are ourselves still but dunces in the great world-school, our leaders still struggling with the unlearnt lesson, that liberty is the equal right and heritage of every child of man, without distinction of race, colour or sex. A community that lacks the courage to found its citizenship on this broad base, becomes 'a city divided against itself, which cannot stand' (Brits 2018, p. 283).

The respective positions taken by the two campaigners, and the ideological distance between them, illustrate the range of choices that they faced as individuals. One of these vectors was the understanding of gender in relation to the ideology of militarism and the rapidly changing conduct of war. This entailed an orientation to British imperialism as a historical project in which women had been very much involved, whether as advocates or antagonists. Hobhouse represented the latter: in addition to her connections to established anti-colonial groups like the APS, her work in South Africa brought her into contact with the young M. K. Gandhi, who was said to have admired her deeply (Brits 2018, p. 292). She had also developed a close

personal friendship with the young Boer statesman and soldier, Jan Smuts, at least until 1914 when she felt betrayed by his support for the British war effort. She was later said to be 'the woman who made him famous' (Steyn 2015, p. 43).

Fawcett, on the other hand, was convinced that white women had played a significant role in the history of the empire, for which they needed acknowledgement. In 1912 she wrote that 'The sufferings and torture of women during the Indian Mutiny heroically borne helped people to see that Empire is built on the lives of women as well as on the lives of men' (1912, p. 16). At the dawn of the 20th century, she felt that this was a positive attribute that underlined their qualification for suffrage. The growing independence of the settler colonies – which included the granting of the vote to women as early as 1892 in New Zealand – strengthened her view that 'the difference in the political status of women in Great Britain and her daughter states will become increasingly indefensible and cannot be long maintained' (1912, p. 47). Fawcett found this discrepancy particularly galling, 'as the ties of a sane and healthy Imperialism draw us closer together' (ibid). For her, the British government was lagging behind many of its white settler colonial possessions, and their example was proof that the coherence of empire itself would not suffer if British women were able to vote.[15] Here we glimpse the vision of Greater Britain as a global Anglo-Saxon community 'bound by shared norms, values and purpose' which had gained currency in the late Victorian period (Bell 2007, p. 172).

Fawcett was not averse to making links with non-white suffragists when she felt they were behaving appropriately (Burton 1992). Shortly before the war ended, Fawcett began to offer her support to the Women's Indian Association (WIA), writing an article in her magazine *Common Cause* in July 1918 and sending a letter to the Imperial Conference that same year on behalf of the NUWSS urging them to consider

the subject of Indian female suffrage (Mukherjee 2018, p. 44). In the letter she noted that Indian women were campaigning for suffrage with ‘moderation’ and deserved to be taken seriously (ibid). Returning to the statue, with its awkward clustering of representatives of the wider suffrage movement beneath her feet, one can see portraits of two activists with Indian names: Sophia Duleep Singh and Lolita Roy. Both women were based in the UK and were involved in the Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU) in the period before 1914. Their inclusion is partly due to the influence of historian Sumita Mukherjee who advised the group commissioning the monument. Her book *Indian Suffragettes: Female Identities and Transnational Networks* (2018) explores the experiences of the Indian ‘suffragettes’ who lobbied the British parliament, attended international women’s conferences, and conducted speaking tours to gather support for Indian women. This point also serves as a reminder that, towards the end of the century, London was a milieu seething with anti-colonial energies as ‘networks of anti-imperial activism began to swell inside Britain’ (Bressey 2013, p. 227).

In 1900, for example, the world’s first Pan-African Congress took place in the city, a gathering that produced W.E.B. Du Bois’ famous proclamation ‘To the Nations of the World’. It is difficult to gauge the extent to which the occasion caught the eye of feminists (including suffragists) who were involved in their own disparate campaigns for political recognition. However, the occasion attracted significant media attention – the *Westminster Gazette* commented that ‘the Pan African Conference ... marks the initiation of a remarkable movement in history’ (Schneir 1999, p. 224). The congress did not meet again in that form, although it was emblematic of new types of organisations and alliances formed expressly to articulate opposition to European colonial rule, as well as industrial capitalism.

That same year, Keir Hardie formed the Labour Representation Committee, which would officially become the Labour Party in 1906. This new socialist organisation provided the most reliable backing for the suffragist cause, of all political parties. Many, including Fawcett, welcomed their unconditional support after becoming frustrated by the false promises of the Liberal government. Novel forms of solidarity forged on the basis of race, religion, class and gender produced all kinds of alliances and partnerships, illustrative of the 'radiating impulses towards freedom' (Roediger 2015, p. 11) that were palpable at the zenith of Britain's imperial power. The examples of Despard and Sylvia Pankhurst, relegated to the plinth beneath Fawcett's feet, provide further evidence that there were many radical suffragists whose vision encompassed women's suffrage, a world free of the racist, white supremacist principle of colonial domination *and* a deep understanding of 'the gendered reality of war' (Cohn 2013, p. 1*).*

Conclusion

The statue of Millicent Fawcett represents a lost opportunity to memorialise a more complex heritage of feminism as both a national and a global movement. As Adrienne Rich once said of Susan B. Anthony: 'Her exuberance of moral passion was circumscribed by the blinders set on her vision by her whiteness. This fact in turn circumscribed the movement in which she worked so long and so hard' (1986, p. 137). Fawcett's appointment as leader of the Ladies Commission and her critical endorsement of the concentration camps were hugely significant, not just for bringing women closer to the source of political power in the heart of Westminster, but also in demonstrating that women could be relied upon for taking an objective view of military policy, as long as it conformed to the government line at home. Hobhouse

played an equally important role through her attempts to document British atrocities in the war zone, proving herself to be an effective opponent of colonial administrators and military alike. Despite their different orientations to the politics of this war, both women were able to exploit the rapidly expanding media which was proving remarkably effective in shaping public opinion on matters of foreign policy.

The concentration camp strategy adopted by British military leaders would rapidly become integral to their doctrine of counterinsurgency in the context of anti-colonial struggles that followed. Although she does not mention Fawcett and the Ladies Commission by name, Khalili points to the legacy of liberal critique in her history of incarceration in 'small wars' throughout the 20th century:

> ...when liberalism became embroiled in the imperial project, and when it was invoked in times of colonial war, it could – and did – affect the method of warfare in particular ways, through mobilization and advocacy. And, paradoxically, the liberal ethos was ultimately co-opted by the colonial project, providing a 'softer,' more acceptable patina to relations of domination (2013, p. 216).

Today, after two decades of military intervention in Afghanistan, feminist scholars have thoroughly scrutinised the gendered significance of counterinsurgency as a military strategy that employs economic, social, political and psychological agendas in an effort to overcome unconventional forces (Welland 2016, p. 127). This body of work has shown that the main benefit of 'population-centric' warfare lies in its appeal to 'the hearts and minds' of domestic audiences back home, alerting

contemporary readers to the fact that they too can be targets of war (McBride and Wibben 2012; Ware 2014).

By examining polarised feminist responses to evolving military practices in the pre-WW1 era, this essay has drawn attention to the way in which mainstream feminism – or rather, the campaign for equal political rights – became complicit very early on with the liberal critique of colonial war in such a way that it 'softened' the brutal impact of violence perpetrated far afield. As a result, large sections of the suffrage movement absorbed and embraced militaristic notions of duty and service to the nation in return for the promise of citizenship, abandoning feminism's radical potential as a peace-making project that sought justice through arbitration as well as liberty for all, without distinction of race, colour or sex. Mainstream accounts of Fawcett's achievements today effectively brush aside the logic of this feminist pact with the norms and social practices that sustain militarism. Instead, we are left with a hollow form of 'banknote feminism', whose achievements can be measured by the fact that gender is no longer a barrier to professions that require lethal force, or to senior executive positions in state security institutions and the arms industry (Spade and Lazare 2019).

This argument has not set out to demolish Millicent Fawcett as a feminist heroine with feet of clay, and to propose one of Emily Hobhouse in her place. Nor is it a plea to remove her statue, demanding that #Fawcettmustfall, as if she was the worst of them.[16] Perhaps it would be enough to simply drape a garland of miniature skulls around her neck as a reminder of the dangers presented by a headlong rush to place a single woman on a pedestal, heedless of the dangers of cleaving to what Virginia Woolf would shortly identify as the 'unreal loyalties' that sowed the seeds for the next war: 'pride of nationality in the first place; also of religious pride, college

pride, school pride, family pride, sex pride and those unreal loyalties that spring from them' (1938, pp. 79-80).

The legacy of Hobhouse's campaign in South Africa, and of all those women who worked for peace in the early years of the 20th century, points to an alternative feminist approach to the prevention and regulation of armed violence. The controversial women's peace congress held in the Netherlands in 1915, and attended by 1300 women from Europe and North America, marked the founding of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) and the start of a concerted involvement in the transnational politics of peace-making. In April 2015, three years before the centenary of limited female suffrage in the UK, WILPF celebrated its own centennial milestone as 'the oldest international feminist organisation active in the world today' (WILPF website). As Carol Cohn and Ruth Jacobson point out in an essay on women and political activism in the face of war and militarization, WILPF now has sections in Africa, the Asia-Pacific region, South Asia, West Asia, the Americas and Europe and its UN office played a key role in the passage of Security Council Resolution 1325 (2013, p. 117). I suggest that this distinguished lineage of feminist solidarity might offer more effective resources with which to analyse and resist the deadly tentacles of global militarization, especially now that 'Wartime has become normal time...Wartime has become the only time we have' (Dudziak 2012, p. 8).

Bibliography

Bader-Zaar, B. (2014) ‘Controversy: War-related Changes in Gender Relations: The Issue of Women’s Citizenship’ in: 1914-1918-online. International Encyclopedia of the First World War, (eds) U. Daniel, P. Gatrell, O. Janz, H. Jones, J. Keene, A. Kramer and B. Nasson, issued by Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin 2014-10-08. DOI: 10.15463/ie1418.10036.

Bell, D. (2007) ‘The Victorian Idea of a Global State’ in *Victorian Visions of Global Order*, D. Bell (ed) Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 159-185.

Bourne, S. (2019) *Black Poppies: Britain’s Black Community and the First World War,* London, The History Press.

Bressey, C. (2013) *Empire, Race and the Politics of Anti-Caste*, London, Bloomsbury.

Brits, E. (2018) *Emily Hobhouse: Feminist, Pacifist, Traitor?* London, Robinson.

Burton, A. M. (1992) ‘The White Women’s Burden: British Feminists and ‘The Indian Woman,’ 1865-1915,’ In *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance*, N. Chaudhuri and M. Strobel (eds) Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press.

Chaudhuri, N. and Strobel, M. (eds) (1992) *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance*, Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press.

Christ, C. (1977) ‘Victorian Masculinity and the Angel in the House’ in *A Widening Sphere: Changing Roles of Victorian Women*, M. Vicinus (ed) London, Methuen & Co. pp. 146-162.

Colbeck, S. (ed) (2018) ‘Catherine Marshall: Suffragist and Pacifist 1880-1961’. Independent pamphlet available from cumbriaoutdoors.enquiries@cumbria.gov.uk

Cohn, C. (ed) (2013) *Women & Wars*, Cambridge, Polity.

Das, S. (2014) *Race, Empire and First World War Writing*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Demetriou, D. (forthcoming) 'Ashes of Our Fathers: Racist Monuments and the Tribal Right' in *Ethics, Left and Right: The Moral Issues That Divide Us*, B. Fischer (ed) Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Doherty, M. R. (2019) 'The Boer War and Malayan Emergency: Examples of British Counterinsurgency pre- and post-"Minimum Force"'. *Small Wars Journal*. https://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/boer-war-and-malayan-emergency-examples-british-counterinsurgency-pre-and-post-minimum (accessed 5 May 2019)

Downes, A. B. (2008) *Targeting Civilians in War*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

Dudziak, M. L. (2012) *War Time. An Idea, Its History, Its Consequences*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Enloe, C. H. (1989/2014) *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Enloe, C. H. (2000) *Maneuvers: The international politics of militarizing women's lives*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Evans, R. J. (1979) *The Feminists: Women's Emancipation Movements in Europe, America and Australasia 1840-1920*, London, Croom Helm.

Fawcett, M.G. (1912) *Women's Suffrage: A Short History of a Great Movement*, CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform (18 Jun. 2016)

Fawcett, M. G. (1925) *What I Remember*, Forgotten Books (19 April 2018).

Fawcett, M. G. (2018) *The Women's Victory and After: Personal Reminiscences 1911-1918*, Madison and Adams Press.

Gandhi, M. K. (2012) *Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth*, USA: Renaissance Classics.

Geyer, M. (1989) 'The Militarization of Europe, 1914-1945' in *The Militarization of the Western World*, J. R. Gillis (ed) London, Rutgers University Press.

Gillis, J. R. Ed. (1989) *The Militarization of the Western World*, London, Rutgers University Press.

Gilliomee, H. and Mbenga, B. (eds) (2007) *New History of South Africa*, Cape Town, Tafelberg.

Gilroy, P. (2004) *After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture?* Basingstoke, Routledge.

Gourlay, J. (2003*) Florence Nightingale and the Health of the Raj*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Grundlingh, A. (2002) 'The National Women's Monument: The Making and Mutation of Meaning In Afrikaner Memory of the South African War' in *Writing a Wider War: Rethinking Gender, Race and Identity in the South African War, 1899-1902*, G. Cuthbertson, A. Grundlingh and M. Suttie (eds) Cape Town, David Philip Publishers, pp. 18-36.

Hochschild, A. (2012) *To End All Wars: A Story of Protest and Patriotism in the First World War*, London, Pan Books.

Howe, G. (2002) *Race, War and Nationalism: A Social History of West Indians in the First World War*, Oxford, James Currey.

Hyslop, J. (2011) 'The Invention of the Concentration Camp: Cuba, Southern Africa and the Philippines, 1896–1907, *South African Historical Journal*, 63:2, 251-276.

Jayawardena, K. (1995) *The White Woman's Other Burden: Western Women and*

South Asia During British Rule, London, Routledge.

Khalili, L. (2011) 'Gendered practices of counterinsurgency', *Review of International Studies*, 37: 1471–91.

Khalili, L. (2013) *Time in the Shadows: Confinement in Counterinsurgencies*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press.

Krebs, P. M. (1999) *Gender, Race, and the Writing of Empire: Public Discourse and the Boer War*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Levine, P. (ed) (2004) *Gender and Empire*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Liddington, J. (1989) *The Long Road to Greenham Common: Feminism and Anti-Militarism in Britain since 1820*, London, Virago.

MacKenzie, J. M. (1984) *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion 1880-1960*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Marx, A. W. (1998) *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of the United States, South Africa, and Brazil*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

McBride, K. and Wibben, A.T.R. (2012) 'The Gendering of Counterinsurgency in Afghanistan,' *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 199–215.

Midgley, C. (ed) (1998) *Gender and Imperialism*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Morrow, J. H. (2004) *The Great War: An Imperial History*, London, Routledge.

Mukherjee, S. (2018) *Indian Suffragettes: Female Identities and Transnational Networks*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Noakes, L. (2007) 'Demobilising the Military Woman: Constructions of Class and Gender in Britain after the First World War,' *Gender & History*, Vol.19 No.1 April, pp. 143–162.

Oakley, A. (2018) *Women, Peace and Welfare: A Suppressed History of Social Reform, 1880-1920,* Bristol, Policy Press.

Olusoga, D. (2018) 'Black soldiers were expendable – then forgettable'. *The Observer*. 14 October https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/nov/11/david-olusoga-black-soldiers-first-world-war-expendable (accessed 26 June 2019).

Pitzer A. (2019) '"Some Suburb of Hell": America's New Concentration Camp System', June 21, *New York Review of Books NYR Daily*. https://www.nybooks.com/daily/2019/06/21/some-suburb-of-hell-americas-new-concentration-camp-system/ (accessed June 26 2019)

Raeburn, A. (1973) *The Militant Suffragettes,* Newton Abbott, Victorian (and Modern) History Book Club.

Rendall, J. (ed) (1987) *Equal or Different? Women's Politics 1800-1914,* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Rich, A. (1986) *Blood, Bread and Poetry, Selected Prose 1979-1985*, New York, NY, Norton.

Roediger, D. (2015) *Seizing Freedom: Slave Emancipation and Liberty For Us All*, London, Verso.

Schonplfug, D. (2017) *A World on Edge: The End of the Great War and the Dawn of a New Age,* New York, NY, Metropolitan Books.

Schneir, J. (1999) *London 1900: The Imperial Metropolis*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

Shepperson, G. A. & Price, T. (1958) *Independent African: John Chilembwe and the Origins, Setting and Significance of the Nyasaland Native Rising, 1915,* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Siblon, J. (2012) 'Monument Mania? Public Space and the Black and Asian Presence

in the London Landscape,' In *Public History and Heritage Today: People and their Pasts*, P. Ashton, and H. Kean (eds) Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 146–62.

South African History Online (SAHO) https://www.sahistory.org.za/about-us (accessed 17 June 2019).

Spade, D. and Lazare, S. (2019) 'Women Now Run the Military-Industrial Complex. That's Nothing To Celebrate: Against the feminist-washing of U.S. militarism'. *In These Times*. January 12. http://inthesetimes.com/article/21682/women-military-industrial-complex-gina-haspel-trump-feminism-lockheed-marti (accessed 8 May 2019)

Steyn, R. (2015) *Jan Smuts: Unafraid of Greatness*, Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.

Ware, V. (1992/2015) *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History*, London, Verso.

Ware, V. (2014) 'Thin Ice: Postcoloniality and Sexuality in the Politics of Citizenship and Military Service,' in *Gender, Globalisation and Violence: Postcolonial Conflict Zones*, S. Ponzanesi (ed) London, Routledge.

Ware, V. (2017) 'From War Grave to Peace Garden: Muslim Soldiers, Militarized Multiculture, and Cultural Heritage,' *Journal of War & Culture Studies***,** http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17526272.2017.1396069

Welland, J. (2016) 'Gender and 'Population-Centric' Counterinsurgency in Afghanistan.' in *Handbook on Gender and War,* S. Sharoni et al., (eds) Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 127–145.

Williams, C. L. (2010) *Torchbearers of Democracy: African American Soldiers in the World War 1 Era,* Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press.

Woolf, V. (1938) *Three Guineas*, New York, NY, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

[1] In the event, the 1915 peace conference was attended by delegates sent from Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Sweden and the United States, laying the foundations for the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom which still exists today. No French women were allowed to travel at all, and only three of the 180 British women who applied were successful in acquiring passports. One of those who would have attended, had health permitted, was Emily Hobhouse.

[2] See, for example, Howe (2002) on Caribbean soldiers in WW1; Williams (2010) on African Americans and WW1; Das (2014) on Indian soldiers on the Western Front; Bourne (2014/9) on Britain's black community and WW1.

[3] https://sipri.org/media/press-release/2018/modernization-nuclear-weapons-continues-number-peacekeepers-declines-new-sipri-yearbook-out-now

[4] Carol Christ quotes John Ruskin's address to the girls of England in *Sesame and Lilies*:

> There is not a war in the world, no, nor an injustice, but you women are answerable for it; not in that you have provoked, but in that you have not hindered. Men, by their nature, are prone to fight; they will fight for any cause, or for none. It is for you to choose their cause for them, and to forbid them when there is no cause. (cited in Christ 1977).

[5] As Sylvia attended the WSPU meeting held to suspend campaigning activities, she listened to her mother 'with grief, resolving to write and speak more urgently for peace' (Hochschild 2011, 106). A few weeks later, she spoke out against the war at a meeting in Glasgow, becoming one of the first suffragettes to do so.

[6] https://www.1418now.org.uk

[7] 'This celebration of the abolition of the slave trade, as well as London's huge involvement, is evident in the London landscape. An example of this is the Buxton Memorial Drinking Fountain erected in 1865 with the support of the Metropolitan Drinking Fountain Association and originally located in Great George Street on the corner of Parliament Square. It was designed to commemorate both the activity of Sir Thomas Foxwell Buxton MP, the leader of the Anti Slavery Society and also the abolition of American slavery (Siblon 2012, p. 149).

[8] Seacole's statue stands in front of a 4.5 metre-high disc, cast from shell-blasted Crimean rock. The sculptor is Martin Jennings. 'There's a kind of anomaly to a sculptor in the early 21st century making a monument to a great figure of the mid-19th. You need to acknowledge the historical gap, and a good way of doing that was to locate her in her time and place.' Jennings sees her as a figure against a battlefield, of the Crimean war, but also of gender and race. 'Not only that,' he says, 'there's this patch of war-torn land, directly facing Parliament, as if to say, "Was it just to win dusty scraps of earth like this that these great imperialist wars were fought?"'

https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2016/jun/21/sculptor-defends-his-mary-seacole-statue-if-she-was-white-would-there-be-this-resistance (accessed 17 June 2019).

[9] The sculptor was Thomas Thornycroft, father of the more well-known William Hamo Thornycroft. He started on the group in the 1850s, exhibiting a head of Boadicea in the mid 1860s, but the full sized bronze was only erected here in 1902, the gift of another one of his sons, some years after the sculptor's death in 1885.

[10] See Churchill's view of the whiteness of the Boers (Khalili 2013, p. 214).

[11] Kitchener went on to say:

> The people who have lived all their lives with them have only seen the veneer, hence they have no idea what bringing up in this wild country has produced, savages – the Boer woman in the refugee camp who slaps her protruding belly at you, and shouts 'when all our men are gone, these little khakis will fight you' is a type of the savage produced by generations of wild lonely life – back in their farms and their life on the veldt, they will be just as uncivilized as ever, and a constant danger (Doherty 2019).

[12] For more details of this episode and the camps themselves, see South African History Online; https://www.sahistory.org.za/about-us.

[13] An earlier precedent could be seen in the British government's handling of the Sepoy Rebellion in India in 1857, when the charge that British women had been abused in the uprising was used as justification for a vindictive military response. (See Ware 1992/2015, pp. 153-4.)

[14] Hyslop (2011) continues: 'And in agreeing that the camps of such colonial wars were predecessors of the vastly more lethal camp systems of Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot and many lesser dictators, scholars have also recognised their significance for the

major catastrophes of the subsequent age' (p. 4). The US detention centre 'Camp Delta', otherwise known as Guantanamo, was a direct legacy of the colonial concentration camp first set up by the Spanish government in 1894, continuing a system of incarceration where, as Gilroy (2004) observes, prisoners are simultaneously held 'inside and outside of the law' (p. 24). Today the system continues wherever migrants are detained out of site in inhuman conditions, particularly minors and those without papers. For the latest atrocity that has come to light, see Pitzer (2019).

[15] For this reason she was keen to endorse international links, particularly with peers in the USA and northern Europe. Following the South African War she was instrumental in forming the International Women's Suffrage Association, in 1902. The elderly Susan B. Anthony, the doyenne of the US women's suffrage movement, was honorary president, and Carrie Chapman Catt, also from the USA, and Fawcett were first and second presidents, respectively. The IWSA held the first conference in Berlin in 1904, attended by delegates from Australia, Chile, Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Russia and Turkey (*International Women's News* 2004, p. 7.

[16] This point relates to the surge in writing about the fate of monuments that celebrate racist, genocidal and otherwise unacceptable heroes. See Demetriou, Dan (forthcoming) 'Ashes of Our Fathers: Racist Monuments and the Tribal Right'.