WOMEN IN PUBLIC 1850–1900

Documents of the Victorian Women's Movement

Patricia Hollis

ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS: WOMEN'S HISTORY

ROUTLEDGE

ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:
WOMEN'S HISTORY

WOMEN IN PUBLIC
1850–1900

WOMEN IN PUBLIC 1850–1900

Documents of the Victorian Women's Movement

PATRICIA HOLLIS

Volume 22

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published in 1979

This edition first published in 2013
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-0-415-53409-3 (Set)
eISBN: 978-0-203-10425-5 (Set)
ISBN: 978-0-415-62347-6 (Volume 22)
eISBN: 978-0-203-10406-4 (Volume 22)

Publisher's Note
The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original copies may be apparent.

Disclaimer
The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and would welcome correspondence from those they have been unable to trace.

Women in Public 1850–1900

Documents of the Victorian Women's Movement

PATRICIA HOLLIS

London
GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN
Boston Sydney

First published in 1979
Reprinted 1981

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
40 Museum Street, London WC1A 1LU

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Hollis, Patricia
Women in public, 1850-1900.
1. Feminism—Great Britain—History
I. Title
301.41'2'0941 HQ1593 78-40788

ISBN 0-04-900033-0

Reproduced from copy supplied
printed and bound in Great Britain
by Billing and Sons Limited
Guildford, London, Oxford, Worcester

Preface

Despite a scatter of feminist writing in the 1830s and 1840s, the feminist movement in England truly began in the 1850s. It was motivated by three main concerns: the concern with 'surplus women' and their need for work if they were to be self-dependent; a more particular concern with the plight of governesses, which led directly to the movement for women's education; and the increasing awareness of women's status at law, publicised by the case of Caroline Norton, summarised by Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon's *Brief Summary of the Laws*. Not until the 1860s did the demand for the vote become prominent.

It was in the 1850s that women acquired their public heroine in Florence Nightingale, whose work in the Crimea, to quote Anna Jameson, broke through a 'Chinese wall of prejudice'. The movement's first circle of workers came from that courageous and happy group around Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon, Emily Davies, Elizabeth Garrett, Maria Rye, Jessie Boucherett; and associated with them Octavia Hill, Helen Taylor, Frances Buss and Dorothea Beale. In 1857 this circle founded their Ladies Institute at Langham Place, in 1858 they published their *English Woman's Journal* (later renamed *Englishwoman's Review*), which was to be the voice of the women's movement until the founding in the 1870s of the *Women's Suffrage Journal* by Lydia Becker and the *Women's Union Journal* by Emma Paterson. Through Isa Craig as assistant secretary, as well as the contributions of Emily Davies and Elizabeth Garrett, they were linked to the Social Science Association, founded in 1857, which did much to 'professionalise' women's public service. And they were to form the first women's suffrage committee when they lined up John Stuart Mill as their parliamentary spokesman in 1867.

Half a century later, by 1900, women had obtained new careers in retailing and commerce, and transformed teaching and nursing as work for women. Women in workshops and factories had acquired a degree of protection, through legislation and combination. Medicine had been opened up as a profession; a network of high schools and women's colleges had been established; and legal changes in custody, property and separation had made major advances towards equity for women at law. The CD campaigns had been an explicitly feminist and highly successful pressure group, by women, for women; and in the fields of politics and public service, women now voted for and served on a wide range of bodies and boroughs. The most significant exception remained the parliamentary vote.

Most prefaces tend to be defensive, and this one is no different. The first defence is of the chronological scope of the book. It attempts to reflect the range of women's public activity from around 1850, when

the movement began, to around 1900, when new figures, most notably the Pankhursts in the suffrage campaign, and Mary Macarthur and Margaret Bondfield in the trade union movement, were to take women into a more militant and confident era. Their work and their generation require a book of their own.

The second defence is of women in *public*. Domestic and marital life, women's health and women's childbearing, have been excluded, partly for reasons of space, but also because the material chosen seeks to illustrate the consciousness of women both of their position and of their claims to a 'wider sphere'.

The third defence is of the somewhat arbitrary nature of the divisions in the book, and the location of certain of its contents. To take one example, the CD campaign was crucially about prostitution (Part 7); but is was also about the status of women at law (Part 6), and was as well a most important Victorian pressure group (Part 9). Nursing, to take another example, has been split between hospital nursing (Part 3) and poor law and district nursing (Part 8) when arguably they should have been kept together.

Most sections contain what I believe to be some of the most significant 'statements' of the period—such as John Stuart Mill's House of Commons speech in 1867, or Caroline Norton's description of the wrongs done to her by law; or W. T. Stead on 'The maiden tribute of modern Babylon', or Beatrice Webb on women and the Factory Acts. They also try to suggest some of the changes in attitudes and aspirations over time. Inevitably there are many omissions, and equally as many pieces condensed that deserve to be reprinted in full. I can only plead lack of space. There is not, as yet, any collection of primary material on the women's movement, and very few reprints, comparable to the material available for studying labour movements and industrial conditions in the nineteenth century. Later books by others will rectify my omissions and abbreviations.

Some particular debts. Of the many libraries I have used, two deserve especial thanks. The skilled and courteous staff at the Fawcett Library (newly located in the City of London Polytechnic) helped me find many of the political pamphlets of the 1870s. And the library staff, particularly the patient inter-library loan staff, of the University of East Anglia allowed me to reach more source material than would otherwise have been accessible to an author confined throughout with a broken leg. To Dr B. H. Harrison of Corpus Christi, Oxford I owe the temperance reference (9.1.3). I would also like to acknowledge permission to quote from Margaret Llewelyn Davies, *Life As We Have Known It*, published by the Hogarth Press; Adelaide Anderson, *Women in the Factory*, published by John Murray; E. Moberley Bell, *Octavia Hill*, and Barbara Stephen, *Emily Davies and Girton College*, both published by Constable.

Contents

PART 3 WOMEN AT WORK

PART 8 PUBLIC SERVICE

Part One

Images of Women

Introduction

Behind parliamentary debates on law reform as it affected women; behind pamphlets opposing women's suffrage; behind the articles which doubted whether girls' health could stand the strain of higher education, lay an image or stereotype of Victorian womanhood, which deemed that 'women in public' were unwomanly (1.1.1). Most of the women who became publicly prominent were self-consciously ladylike, as an aid to disarm the opposition (1.1.2). Mary Carpenter, while careless about her clothes, and while bombarding ministers with memoranda, would refuse to chair a meeting and in her early days even to speak at one, as it was not respectable. Many an early public suffrage meeting concluded with resolutions congratulating the 'lady speakers' on their 'heroism' in mounting the platform. In part it was to give her students some privacy that Emily Davies was reluctant to build her college at Cambridge. Though it was an image which most constricted middle-class women (see below, W. R. Greg, 3.1.2), trade union organisers at the end of the century explained their failure to recruit women by describing the orthodox teaching for women as 'submission' whereas trade unionism 'means rebellion' (see below, 3.13.6).

At its simplest, the stereotype drew on three main bodies of ideas. The first was religious in orientation. Woman had been made from and was therefore dependent on man, and she should glory in her God-given weakness (1.2.1). Thoughtful women replied, as had Mary Wollstonecraft in 1792, that women like men had immortal souls and mortal reason, the responsibility for which could not be off-loaded even on to a husband's shoulders (1.2.2). More practically, women like Harriet Martineau pointed out that there were too many 'surplus' women for all to be protected by and dependent on men (see below, Part 2); women must become self-dependent, in an economic as well as in a moral sense. The *Saturday Review* dismissed their arguments (1.2.3). Marriage was a woman's business, and if a woman failed to marry, she had simply failed in business. An exception might be made of female servants, however, since like wives they ministered to men (1.2.4). Mrs Grey and her sister Emily Shirreff, later to found the Girls' Public Day School Trust (see below, 4.5), pointed out that the lot of the single woman, bleak though it was, did not lack advantages compared with the continuous self-abnegation required of married women (1.2.5); and their *Thoughts on Self-Culture* mapped out a mental and moral education for women forced to be self-sufficient. Later writers like Clara Collett, Assistant Commissioner in 1893,

emphasised the contribution that could be made by active socially aware single women (see below, 3.12). Engels was only summarising a view held by many women when he stated that marriage was for many women legalised prostitution (1.2.6) and the married state economic bondage.

A second source of the stereotype was socio-political. Society was a community of families and each family, in W. Cooke Taylor's phrase, was 'a sovereign commonwealth'. At the heart of the family, and therefore of social stability, was the patriarchal principal: any challenge to the husband's rights, over his wife or his children, was represented as undermining all that was stable in the social order (see below, 9.2.5). And central to the family was its division of labour, the separate spheres of world and home. Mrs Ellis produced a series of best-selling moral etiquette books (1.3.1) which asserted that where man was an individual, woman was one of a social circle, whose life belonged to others and not to herself; and whose greater sensitivity, selflessness and religious sense made her the moral arbiter of her society, guardian of its moral health. Ruskin's well-known romantic description of the home (1.3.2) pushed the separate spheres metaphor to absurdity, judged Emily Davies (1.3.3), for 'men have no monopoly of working, nor women of weeping'. John Stuart Mill, and Mrs Catherine Booth (co-founder of the Salvation Army) denied that women's 'traditional' characteristics of passivity rather than activity, feeling rather than thinking, being rather than doing, were innate, but were rather the artificial products of the economic and social educational arrangements of a society still appealing to feudal concepts of physical force (1.3.4). Mrs Lynn Linton defended the 'womanly woman' against the 'shrieking sisterhood' who claimed self-determination (1.3.5), and Beatrice Webb noted the prevalence of such views even among 'chaffing' colleagues (1.3.6).

Perhaps the most insidious (and third) source of the stereotype came from the new 'science', that woman's biology was her destiny (1.4). Darwinian arguments were used to show that the greatest differentiation of male and female roles was to be found in the most advanced societies and therefore represented 'progress'. Doctors were enrolled to show the baneful effect that emancipation in general and higher education in particular had on women's menstrual rhythms and therefore on the health of the race as a whole (1.4.2). The novelist Grant Allen judged that the very existence of the race was being threatened by an obsessive attention to the claims of barren spinsters (1.4.3).

It was the unreality of the stereotype, given the number of women forced to be self-dependent, as well as its constrictiveness, that feminists deplored. But a more common note was struck by Mrs Josephine Butler in 1869: 'We need the extension beyond our homes of the home influence.' Just *because* women had distinctive traits and

alternative perceptions to offer, they should enter public life. And, as the century progressed, just because government increasingly trespassed on the domestic dimension of health and education, housing and the relief of poverty, so women found their philanthropy politicised and themselves 'in public'.

Suggestions for further reading:
M. Vicinus (ed.), *Suffer and Be Still,* 1973; *The Widening Sphere,* 1977; K. Thomas, 'The double standard', *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 1959; P. Cominas, 'Late Victorian respectability and the social system', *International Review of Social History*, 1963; L. Davidoff, *Best Circles*, 1973.

1.1 Respectability and Public Life

1.1.1 *Impropriety of public life*

It is averred that 'public life' is injurious to women; they are meant for the domestic ... What is meant by it? Is there any woman living who does not go more or less into public ... The work of a medical practitioner is scarcely more public than that of a district visitor ... the business of a chemist and druggist is no more public than a confectioner ... Fathers who would shake their heads at the idea of taking their daughters into their own counting-houses, allow them to stand behind a stall at a bazaar, or to lead off at a charity ball—far more public scenes, and, where indeed, publicity is essential to success.

Emily Davies, *Letters to a Daily Paper,* Newcastle, 1860

1.1.2 *The Image of a Lady*

Many people in the University disapproved strongly of the presence of women students in Cambridge, and probably most people looked upon them with some suspicion. If any inconvenience followed from their being there, or if any individual deviated in the slightest degree from the ordinary standards of society, it would be considered as a complete justification of this attitude ... Miss Clough was keenly alive to these things ... education should be kept quite apart from other questions and causes, and she meant to show that a desire for education, and even the possession of it, did not involve any departure from recognised customs and conventions ...

I remember someone had been complaining that Newnham students went along the streets buttoning their gloves. The Principal gave us a sympathetic address on the subject. 'I know, my dears, that you have a great deal to do, and have not much time; but I don't like people to say such things about you, and so, my dears, I hope you'll get some gloves that don't want buttoning.'

B. A. Clough, *Memoir of Anne Jemima Clough*, 1897, pp. 195, 240

Experience is modifying my notions about the most suitable style of dress for me to wear at the hospital. I feel confident now that one is helped rather than hindered by being as much like a lady as lies in one's power. When my student life begins, I shall try to get very serviceable, rich, whole coloured dresses that will do without trimmings and not require renewing often.

Elizabeth Garrett to Emily Davies, 5 September 1860,
quoted in Barbara Stephen,
Emily Davies and Girton College, 1927, p. 59

It was evident that the audiences came expecting to see curious masculine objects walking on to the platform, and when we appeared, with our quiet black dresses, the whole expression of the faces of the audience would instantly change. I shall never forget the thrill which passed through us when, on one occasion, a Nonconformist minister assured the audience in his speech from the chair, that we were 'quite respectable'—meaning to convey that we were people with some position, and not merely seeking notoriety or earning money by our speaking.

Lilias Ashworth on her West of England speaking tour for the suffrage, 1872, quoted in Helen Blackburn, *Women's Suffrage,* 1902, pp. 110-11

1.2 Dependence and self-dependence

1.2.1 *The strength of weakness*

But let it be granted, for argument's sake, that it is substantial power, and no mere shadow of additional influence, which a woman would gain by such a change [the franchise]; and we then ask, will the consequent result be an improvement in their position? We decidedly think that it would not. In all modern civilized communities, and especially in the most refined and cultivated portion of those communities, women are treated by men with peculiar deference, tenderness, and courtesy. Do they owe this treatment to their strength or to their weakness? Undoubtedly to the latter. The deference, the tenderness, the courtesy of man towards the other sex, are founded principally on the feeling that they need his protection, and can never question his power. But let women be made ostensibly powerful; let a sense of competition be introduced; let man be made to feel that he must stand on the defensive—and the spirit of chivalry, so eloquently described by Burke, will speedily cease; and it will be useless to expect a continuance of that feeling, to which women can now appeal with confidence, and which lends the most essential charms to the ordinary intercourse of civilized society. Women, as a class, cannot enjoy, at the same time, the immunities of weakness and the advantages of power.

T. H. Lister, 'Rights and conditions of women', *Edinburgh Review,* vol. 73, 1841

Woman's strength lies in her essential weakness. She is at this hour what 'in the beginning' the great Creator designed her to be—namely Man's help; not his rival but his help. Sheltered throughout her earlier years from all polluting influences: accustomed from the first to ministrations of domestic kindness and the sweet charities of home: removed from the stifling atmosphere in which perforce the battle of life has to be fought out by the rougher sex—she is, what she was intended to be, the one great solace of Man's life, his chiefest earthly joy.

J. Burgon, *Sermon,* 1884

1.2.2 *The indignity of dependence*

Woman is taught to believe, that for one half of the human race, the highest end of civilization is to cling upon the other, like a weed upon a wall.

Mrs Hugo Reid, *A Plea for Women*, 1843, p. 200

Our duty in this world is to try and make it what God intends it shall become: we are his tools ... To do God's work in the world is the duty of all, rich and poor, of all nations, of both sexes ... Women must, as children of God, be trained to do some work in the world. Women may not take a man as a God: they must not hold their first duty to be towards any human being ...

Fathers have no right to cast the burden of the support of their daughters on other men. It lowers the dignity of women; and tends to prostitution, whether legal or in the streets. As long as fathers regard the sex of a child as a reason why it should not be taught to gain its own bread, so long must women be degraded. Adult women must not be supported by men, if they are to stand as dignified, rational beings before God ... Women must have work if they are to form equal unions.

Barbara Leigh Smith, *Women and Work*, 1856, pp. 6, 11

From that time [the emergence of a middle class] to this, the need and the supply of female industry have gone on increasing, and latterly at an unparalled rate, while our ideas, our language, and our arrangements have not altered in any corresponding degree. We go on talking as if it were still true that every woman is, or ought to be, supported by father, brother or husband ...

A social organization framed for a community of which half stayed at home, while the other half went out to work, cannot answer the purposes of a society, of which a quarter remain at home, while three-quarters go out to work.

Harriet Martineau,
'Female industry', *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 109, 1859

From babyhood women are given to understand that helplessness is feminine and beautiful ... We women are, no less than men, each of us a distinct existence ... accountable only, in the highest sense to our own souls, and the Maker of them. Is it natural, is it right, even, that we should be expected—and be ready enough too, for it is the easiest way—to hang our consciences, duties, actions, opinions, upon some one else—some individual, or some aggregate of individuals yclept Society?

... We *must* help ourselves by self-dependence ... Marriage ought always to be a question not of necessity, but of choice.

Mrs Craik, *Women's Thoughts about Women*, 1862, pp. 25-6

That women spend the best part of their lives in preparing for an event which may never happen—an event for which the very worst preparation is to hanker after it, while the very best is to be strenuously occupied with something different, is the result, not of God's decision

that one form of life should be *happier* than another, but of man's invention that it should be deemed more *womanly*.

Julia Wedgwood, 'Female suffrage',
in Josephine Butler (ed.),
Woman's Work and Woman's Culture, 1869

What dignity can there be in the attitude of women in general, and towards men in particular, when marriage is held (and often necessarily so, being the sole means of maintenace) to be the one end of a woman's life, when it is degraded to the level of a feminine profession, when those who are soliciting a place in this profession resemble those flaccid Brazilian creepers which cannot exist without support, and which sprawl out their limp tendrils in every direction to find something—no matter what—to hang upon; when the insipidity or the material necessities of so many women's lives make them ready to accept almost any man who may offer himself? There has been a pretence of admiring this pretty helplessness of women. But let me explain that I am not deprecating the condition of dependence in which God has placed every human being, man or woman,—the sweet interchange of services, the give and take of true affection, the mutual support and aid of friends or lovers, who have each something to give and to receive. That is a wholly different thing from the abject dependence of one entire class of persons on another and a stronger class. In the present case such a dependence is liable to peculiar dangers by its complication with sexual emotions and motives, and with relations which ought, in an advanced and Christian community, to rest upon a free and deliberate choice,—a decision of the judgment and of the heart, and into which the admission of a necessity, moral or material, introduces a degrading element.

I cannot believe that it is every woman's duty to marry, in this age of the world. There is abundance of work to be done which needs men and women detached from domestic ties; our unmarried women will be the greatest blessing to the community when they cease to be soured by disappointment or driven by destitution to despair . . .

Josephine Butler, Introduction, loc. cit.

1.2.3 *Marriage, a woman's profession*

We say that the greatest of social and political duties is to encourage marriage. The interest of a State is to get as many of its citizens married as possible. The equality of the sexes demonstrates this to be a law of nature. And we add that man, in European communities, has deliberately adopted the view that, as much as possible, women should be relieved from the necessity of self-support. The measure of civilization is the maximum at which this end is attained in any given community or nation. Women labourers are a proof of a barbarous

and imperfect civilization. We should be retrograding in the art and science of civilization were more women encouraged to be self-supporters. And the reason of this is plain enough. Wherever women are self-supporters, marriage is, *ipso facto*, discouraged. The factory population is proof of this. In the manufacturing districts women make worse wives and worse helpmates than where they are altogether dependent on the man. And where there are fewer marriages there is more vice . . . The prevailing theory is, let as many women as possible be dependent on marriage. Let women be trained to this as the end of her being. And though it is not seldom more roughly expressed, there is the highest social wisdom in it. Distressed governesses and distressed workwomen are social anomalies, but the social fabric is for the greatest happiness of the greatest number. And this is attained by making marriage the rule. In a community where all the women were clerks, telegraph-workers, watchmakers, and book-keepers, the inducements to marriage would be lessened on either side. Men do not like, and would not seek, to mate with an independent factor, who at any time could quit—or who at all times would be tempted to neglect—the tedious duties of training and bringing up children, and keeping the tradesmen's bills, and mending the linen, for the more lucrative returns of the desk or counter. It is not the interest of States, and it is not therefore true social policy, to encourage the existence, as a rule, of women who are other than entirely dependent on man as well for subsistence as for protection and love.

Married life is woman's profession; and to this life her training—that of dependence—is modelled. Of course by not getting a husband, or losing him, she may find that she is without resources. All that can be said of her is, she has failed in business; and no social reform can prevent such failures. The mischance of the distressed governess and the unprovided widow, is that of every insolvent tradesmen. He is to be pitied; but all the Social Congresses in the world will not prevent the possibility of a mischance in the shape of broken-down tradesmen, old maids, or widows. Each and all are frequently left without resources; and each and all always will be left without resources; but it would be just as reasonable to demand that every boy should be taught two or three professions because he may fail in one, as it is to argue that all our social habits should be changed because one woman in fifty—or whatever the statistics are—is a spinster or widow without any resources.

'Queen bees or working bees',
Saturday Review, 12 November 1859

1.2.4 *Service, a woman's career*

Female servants do not constitute any part (or at least only a very small part) *of the problem* [of surplus women] *we are endeavouring to*

solve. They are in no sense redundant; we have not to cudgel our brains to find a niche or an occupation for *them*; they are fully and usefully employed; they discharge a most important and indispensable function in social life; they do not follow an obligatory independent, and therefore for their sex an unnatural, career:—on the contrary, they are attached to others and are connected with other existences, which they embellish, facilitate, and serve. In a word, they fulfil both essentials of woman's being; *they are supported by, and they minister to*, men. We could not possibly do without them. Nature has not provided one too many. If society were in a perfectly healthy state, we should no doubt have to manage with fewer female servants than at present; they would earn higher wages; they would meet with more uniform consideration; and they would, as a rule, remain in service only for a few years, and not for life: but they must always be a numerous class, and scarcely any portion of their sex is more useful or more worthy.

W. R. Greg, 'Why are women redundant?',
National Review, April 1862

1.2.5 *The advantages of single life*

A woman should be reminded . . . that in marrying she gives up many advantages. Her independence is, of course, renounced by the very act that makes her another's. Her habits, pursuits, society, sometimes even friendships, must give way to his, and this readily and cheerfully, as part of the obligations of a wife . . . The husband has less pliancy, and considers it as his undoubted right that his wife should regulate her mode of life upon his wishes. The wife, therefore, must yield or be prepared for perpetual discord . . . Where a woman's affection for her husband is only a tenderer kind of friendship, continual concession may sometimes appear burdensome. She may find it difficult to renounce what would give her great pleasure in compliance to a mere fancy, perhaps to caprice or indolence. She may chafe at her dependence, and the habitual want of consideration in men for women's pursuits and friendships. Above all, she will feel it hard to be forced to check her devotion to her children . . . but if once she allows these feelings to become apparent, her domestic happiness is in jeopardy. These are the things which a girl should be taught to weigh well before she takes so irretrievable a step as marriage, and they may perhaps be set against the less advantageous social position, and the comparative isolation, of the unmarried woman . . . The single woman must repress these affections and renounce the hope of being the object of exclusive love; but on the other hand she retains her independence, and her own friends, from whom marriage would probably have separated her to a great extent; and the feelings and capacities which with the married woman are concentrated within the

home, may by her be exercised on a higher scale for the benefit of a larger circle, and bring her all the happiness (perhaps the surest we can enjoy on earth) which results from the active exercise of our faculties towards a worthy object . . .

Perhaps in time even mothers might be found wise enough to prefer their daughters remaining cheerful amiable old maids, to becoming miserable wives . . . If the balance, therefore, be fairly struck, we shall find the average degree of happiness in both conditions more nearly equal than is commonly supposed, with this advantage on the side of the single woman, that her happiness is less dependent on the character and conduct of others, and therefore much more with her own power.

The question is seldom tried fairly on its own merits, owing to the injustice which condemns women to the dependence of poverty, from which they can only escape by marrying. Brought up in comfort . . . they are left without the means of maintaining [themselves]. This error of our social system forces women too often to consider marriage, not as a question of happiness, but of subsistence, and it would be little flattering to the vanity of men, who are apt enough to think women cannot live without them, to know how many a one has shrunk with repugnance from the ties her poverty compels her to form, and represses her warmest feelings, to enable her to bear the trials of a condition she would not have entered into had she been free.

Maria Grey and Emily Shirreff,
Thoughts on Self-Culture, 1872 edn, pp. 181-3

1.2.6 *The domestic enslavement of women*

The position is no better with regard to the juridical equality of man and woman in marriage. The inequality of the two before the law, which is a legacy of previous social conditions, is not the cause but the effect of the economic oppression of women. In the old communistic household, which embraced numerous couples and their children, the administration of the household, entrusted to the women, was just as much a public, a socially necessary industry as the providing of food by the men. This situation changed with the patriarchal family, and even more with the monogamian individual family. The administration of the household lost its public character. It was no longer the concern of society. It became a *private service*. The wife became the first domestic servant, pushed out of participation in social production. Only modern large-scale industry again threw open to her—and only to the proletarian woman at that—the avenue to social production; but in such a way that, when she fulfils her duties in the private service of her family, she remains excluded from public production and cannot earn anything; and when she wishes to take part in public industry and earn her living independently, she is not in

a position to fulfil her family duties. What applies to the woman in the factory applies to her in all the professions, right up to medicine and law. The modern individual family is based on the open or disguised domestic enslavement of the woman; and modern society is a mass composed solely of individual families as its molecules. Today, in the great majority of cases, the man has to be the earner, the bread-winner of the family, at least among the propertied classes, and this gives him a dominating position which requires no special legal privileges. In the family, he is the bourgeois; the wife represents the proletariat. In the industrial world, however, the specific character of the economic oppression that weighs down the proletariat stands out in all its sharpness only after all the special legal privileges of the capitalist class have been set aside and the complete juridical equality of both classes is established. The democratic republic does not abolish the antagonism between the two classes; on the contrary, it provides the field on which it is fought out. And, similarly, the peculiar character of man's domination over woman in the modern family, and the necessity, as well as the manner, of establishing real social equality between the two, will be brought out into full relief only when both are completely equal before the law. It will then become evident that the first premise for the emancipation of women is the reintroduction of the entire female sex into public industry; and that this again demands that the quality possessed by the individual family of being the economic unit of society be abolished.

F. Engels,
The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, 1884, pp. 232-3 (1962 edition)