Dear all,

I really appreciate the time that you are taking to read my work. This work-in-progress is currently the second chapter of my thesis, which looks at the role of heterosexual love and marriage in Labour and Conservative party cultures (1918-1970).

The chapter preceding this uses data from election results and archival sources to assess the marital status (married, single, widowed, separated) of over 2000 women and men who stood for parliamentary and local elections during this period. Demonstrating that, contrary to the historiography, Labour women were more commonly married and Conservative women spinsters. Another important finding was the predominance of married couples standing for elected office together, particularly at a municipal level. For the boroughs studied, an average of 20% of all female candidates for local elections were married to a male candidate – with the proportion married to another party activist being undeniably higher.

Chapter two investigates this idea of couples undertaking political activism together by presenting three central case studies of political partnerships.

Thanks again – and I look forward to see you in New York!

Best wishes,

Ellie

**’The right hand and the left hand’: models and functions of political partnerships**

This chapter presents three models of political partnerships between husbands and wives, analysing how their marriage was a crucial factor in beginning, supporting and sustaining both partners’ political activities. Each model focuses on one partnership as a central case study and incorporates examples from other partnerships whose marriage followed a similar model. The relationships discussed here focus on political *partnerships,* where each partner was an activist in their own right, though their relative importance might wax and wane*.* This contrasted, meanwhile, to the role of the political spouse, where their function was predominantly the support of a partner. This chapter demonstrates that this distinction was not always hard and fast. In practice, couples often moved between these two kinds of relationship over the course of their lives. Initial partnerships could lapse into less reciprocal models of spousal support over the course of a marriage, but the direction of travel could equally be reversed. This was particularly the case for wives who found new opportunities for political activism in later life, often after the death or retirement of their husbands.

The first model considered in this chapter is public partnerships, where both partners were equally devoted to their chosen political cause~~s~~. Their lives were saturated with political activity, while both simultaneously pursued public-facing political life, often through elected office or official party roles. There are many Labour couples who could be used as case studies of this kind: Beatrice and Sidney Webb, Ethel and Philip Snowdon, Ramsay and Margaret McDonald, Jennie Lee and Aneurin Bevan, Ruth and Hugh Dalton, Katherine and John Bruce Glasier, Jim and Lucy Middleton, to name just a few. Chosen for discussion here are Jack and Bessie Braddock, who authored a joint political autobiography, offering insight into how they used their separate political roles to form a dominant presence in the government of Liverpool for decades. They met through the Independent Labour Party and their careers culminated with Jack serving as Leader of Liverpool City Council and Bessie as MP for Liverpool Exchange.

The second model discussed here is that of the ‘weather house’ partnership.[[1]](#footnote-1) These were couples who were both political, but their political involvement and prominence worked in cycles. Switching between one partner’s political activity taking precedence and the other playing the role of a supportive spouse. It is here that the majority of political partnerships fall, and this model accounts for most of the relationships discussed in chapter four on of the ‘halo effect’.[[2]](#footnote-2) In this chapter, the ‘weather house’ model is explored through the marriage of Juliet and Rhys Rhys-Williams. Both were Liberals turned Conservative; beginning their relationship when Juliet worked as Rhys’ private secretary during his stint as a Transport Minister. There was a large age gap between the two, and as Rhys’ political career and involvement waned, Juliet’s grew.

The third model contrasts to the others in investigating examples of emergent partnerships. Politics was not a cornerstone of these marriages, unlike the other two models, but the overriding political passions of one spouse influenced and enhanced the political beliefs and activity of the other. The partner of the political spouse could be mildly politically interested and share similar views, but did not at first seek political a career for themselves. As an example, this chapter uses the relationship between Evelyn and Thomas Addis Emmet. Evelyn began her political life as a Conservative LCC councillor. She was married to Thomas who by the age of 30 had failed in all his various attempts to become, consecutively, a naval officer, an artist and an Oxford graduate. He eventually settled on being a farmer and a Conservative district councillor. Evelyn would go onto become the Conservative MP for East Grinstead and later Baroness Emmet of Amberley.

This perspective of seeing politics as a family and relational project suggests deeper continuities from the 18th and 19th century than the move to mass democracy might suggest. Women have always interacted with political structures in various ways, and historians looking before the twentieth century have often found agency in women’s political roles as spouses, hostesses, confidantes, sisters and daughters.[[3]](#footnote-3) The work of this chapter, in looking from 1918, is to emphasise that the importance of family and relationships did not disappear with the arrival of mass democracy. Instead, they needed to be accommodated into new forms of political party culture. Analysing intimate personal relationships between husbands and wives are very useful in understanding political activism and cultures in twentieth century Britain.

**Public partnerships, political power: Bessie and Jack Braddock**

The case studies in this chapter are built predominantly on correspondence and personal archival material to create an impression of the couple’s marriage and relationship. Accessing working-class marriages within archives has been more difficult, as most collections of correspondence and personal material belong to middle-class couples. Bessie and Jack Braddock were a working class couple, who have not left rich archival material, but were the only political partnership to author a joint autobiography. Whilst Bessie Braddock’s career and role has not been short of attention from historians, the role of the Braddocks as a political partnership has not been discussed.[[4]](#footnote-4) Although the Braddocks were unique in co-authoring their autobiography, ideas of love and politics come into the titles of many other Labour figures’ written works. The title of Beatrice Webb’s second volume of autobiography is *Our Partnership*; Peggy Jay, meanwhile, calls her autobiography *Loves and Labours*, and Jennie Lee titles hers *My Life With Nye*. The historian Jane Cox titles her edited collection of Ramsay and Margaret McDonald's letters *A Singular Marriage: A Labour Love Story in Letters and Diaries*. As seen in chapter one, no Labour marriages were really ‘singular marriages’ but part of much a larger trend.

*The Braddocks* was published in 1963 and recounts Bessie and Jack’s political life. Considering the numerous Labour autobiographies penned in this period by comparable politicians, both Jack and Bessie would have warranted their own volumes independently. That they chose to write an autobiography together suggests that they conceived of their political lives and work as a joint project. The individual achievements that they described had been made under the shared name of Braddock. This is an important feature of public partnerships; that they shared this unity of mind, purpose and political philosophy.

The Labour party couple Alfred and Ada Salter had a very similar political relationship to the London Borough of Bermondsey as the Braddocks did to Liverpool. Like Jack and Bessie, their political activity brought them together, and they were founding members of the Bermondsey ILP. Alfred became the MP for Bermondsey in 1922, the same year that Ada served as Mayor of the borough. Alfred wrote to Ada early in their courtship that: ‘We are living and working for the same goal - to make the world, and in particular, this corner of the world, happier and holier for our joint lives.’[[5]](#footnote-5) Although they had individual interests, their political work belonged to a larger project of what they would achieve as a couple. Their spouses’ achievements were equally part of their ambitions and achievements.

Although the Braddocks were authoring a joint autobiography, there is very little reference to each other: their work and triumphs rarely interact in the book. They conceive of their work as important in their chosen fields and, although they attend many events, conferences and meetings together, there is almost no reference that they did so together. This lack of interaction could also reflect the way that they considered their political work. Although they shared the same political values, their championed political causes were in different fields. Alfred and Ada Salter had a similar arrangement. When interviewed about her marriage by a journalist investigating ‘Two-Career Marriages,’ Ada Salter said: ‘I don't know what it would be like to have two politicians in the home who take opposite views, but we two, who have the same opinions, but different fields of administration, find it very satisfactory indeed.’[[6]](#footnote-6) For Jack and Bessie, that there is lack of physical interaction between their political activities, but that they chose to write their political life story together, again suggests they perceived their different interests and achievements united to form the overall legacy of the Braddocks.

As a source, the book offers considerable insight into their personalities and the dynamics of their marriage. The autobiography begins equitably, with Bessie and Jack each taking alternate chapters to narrate their own life stories. But after the initial accounts of the flourishing socialism in Jack’s life, and his escapades with the Communist party, Bessie’s contributions dominate the work. In the jointly-authored chapters, Bessie’s sections run nearly four times the length of Jack’s. One co-authored chapter looks at their work on hospitals. Bessie writes a long and emphatic account of the people she met; the conditions she saw, and the problems she solved. By contrast, Jack only contributes a few paragraphs covering the committee that he sat on.[[7]](#footnote-7) This reticence on Jack’s part could also simply be indicative of his personality: Bessie was considered to be the dominant force in their relationship, while Jack the taciturn ‘off-stage shadow’.[[8]](#footnote-8) His death in 1963 was reported on the front page of the *Daily Mirror* with the headline ‘Bessie Braddock’s Husband Is Dead.’[[9]](#footnote-9) Bessie had, and sought after, a much higher profile than Jack. She was celebrity obsessed: proudly recounting that some of her friends were Marlene Dietrich, the bookmaker William Hill and Max Bygraves.[[10]](#footnote-10) This imbalance in personalities is perhaps also reflected by the fact that Bessie took on the role of MP whilst Jack stayed in local government.

Bessie, christened Elizabeth Margaret Bamber, was born in 1899 in Zante St, Liverpool. She was the daughter of Scottish born Mary ‘Ma’ Bamber, who Bessie describes as ‘a real revolutionary’ and icon of Liverpool socialism.[[11]](#footnote-11) Bessie’s mother had not been born into poverty, but into a comfortable family of Edinburgh lawyers who provided private education for their six children.[[12]](#footnote-12) But Mary’s father turned to drink and disappeared. The family moved to Liverpool and Bessie’s grandmother, Agnes Little, lived with the Bamber family caring for Bessie and her sister Enid when their mother was engaged in her political work as an official in the Warehouse Worker’s Union, and later a local councillor. [[13]](#footnote-13) From three weeks old, Bessie was taken to meetings of the ILP: ‘beginning her training early’.[[14]](#footnote-14) Bessie’s upbringing was not as socially and economically varied as her mother’s had been, although she reports that they lived to a lower standard than they needed to as ‘mother spent every spare penny on other people. But Enid [Bessie’s sister] and I were always properly clothed and fed.’[[15]](#footnote-15) The Bamber family were undeniably working-class, but not without an economic safety net. Bessie’s father, Hugh, held a reasonably good job as a book-binder and guillotine worker in a Liverpool newspaper company, while her mother earnt a wage through her union work. Bessie was proud that her parents did not force religion upon her or her sister, nor sent them to Sunday school, but left them to decide for themselves.[[16]](#footnote-16) However, the question of Socialist Sunday School at the club rooms of the British Socialist party was a different question. Whilst religion was not something to be inherited, there was little choice for the Bamber girls but to become socialists.

Jack Braddock’s family, similarly, had connections in working-class politics. His father was a pottery worker, but politically engaged and a co-opted member of the Hanley School Board.[[17]](#footnote-17) His maternal uncle was chairman of the Bricklayer’s Union in North Staffordshire. Sam Davies claims that Jack’s upbringing was also by no means poor, with his father earning about £160 a year in the late nineteenth century. [[18]](#footnote-18) Jack only received elementary school education, as his father died in 1907, and Jack left to become a clerk for a drapers shop and then an apprenticeship at a wagon building workshop. Jack never stayed in any jobs for long. He moved around the north, working for a few weeks here and there, mostly for railway companies. During this time, however, Jack joined ‘one of the small political organisations which were all over the industrial areas.’[[19]](#footnote-19) Jack made his way to Liverpool with his brother to save enough to take a ship to Canada in an attempt to join the Canadian Army, which paid more than being conscripted into the British Army. But once in Liverpool, he never left. Jack found his political home at the ILP Branch at Upper Parliament Street. It was there that he first met Bessie Bamber.

*Partner Choice – love and socialism*

 Bessie and Jack devote no time to the story of their meeting, courtship, or marriage in the co-authored autobiography. Only mentioned in passing, it could be easily missed. Bessie simply writes that: ‘I had married Jack on February 9, 1922, during lunch break from my clerical job with the Warehouse Workers’ Union.’[[20]](#footnote-20) In promoting her 1957 book on the Braddocks, the journalist and author Millie Toole used the story of their somewhat unconventional relationship as a selling point.[[21]](#footnote-21) Bessie and Jack met in the ILP rooms from which time, as Toole puts it, they began to ‘walk out together’. Bessie’s quote to Toole on the matter was simply: ‘You don’t get time for courting. We just realized that sooner or later we would marry.’ Fellow comrades noted that oddness of the arrangement with an anonymous source saying ‘That courtship was like nothing on earth…They were thrown together a great deal. He was living at her home some of the time. Anyway, no one would have known they were courting if they had not been told.’ [[22]](#footnote-22) It was not just Bessie with whom Jack had formed a strong relationship, but also Bessie’s mother, Mary Bamber. Presumably this explained why Jack lived at the house as a lodger before Jack and Bessie were actually married. Toole describes Jack as accepting ‘Bessie as Ma Bamber’s heir and his natural partner in the work he had to do.’[[23]](#footnote-23) They courted for seven years before making the marriage official for practical and political reasons. Jack was imprisoned in 1921 during an unemployment demonstration. At the committee meeting of Ward no.2 branch, of which Bessie was the chair, the meeting decided that perhaps it would be prudent for Jack and Bessie to set a date. ‘We agreed,’ says Bessie, ‘that if Jack got stuck into prison again, contact with him would be easier if we were married.’[[24]](#footnote-24) This aromantic conception of partner choice were not unique to Jack and Bessie - Beatrice Webb employed a similar articulation of choosing a ‘political partner’ rather than a romantic lover in Sidney Webb.[[25]](#footnote-25) But an emphasis on a practical partner choice emerged as of paramount importance to enable them to pursue their first and true love of socialism. Jack was not Bessie’s first romantic interest that flowered within her gang of ILP associates. Bessie recounts her relationship with Ernest Silverman, a brilliant young socialist but with a proclivity for theft and fraud. Bessie helped him throughout her life, including supporting him in prison and acting as the executor of his will upon his suicide. People used to ask Bessie why she bothered to maintain her friendship with Ernest, to whom she felt a degree of responsibility for his behavior and eventual death:

I regretted the loss to Socialism of his fine brain. Before all these regrettable things happened, Ernest asked me to marry him and I refused… So it’s just possible that I could have altered the sad, lost life of Ernest Silverman. But I suppose that to have done so would have cost me my own.[[26]](#footnote-26)

 What is so revealing about Bessie’s friendship with Ernest was her rejection of him as a romantic, and political partner. Very early in her life, Bessie recognized that she needed to choose a partner who would not be a liability to her own work or ambition. Although she had deep feelings for Ernest, coupled with a shared sense of socialist commitment, Bessie saw in Jack a man who would be a support to her, and compliment her political ambitions, rather than stand in her way. Historian Sam Davies suggested that Jack was not the overpowering personality that his reputation might suggest, and that he paled in comparison to Bessie.[[27]](#footnote-27) She describes her husband in a similar way, claiming that: ‘Some of us hear our husbands talk a lot, and some of us get tired of it. But I like hearing Jack, because he doesn’t talk unless he has something to say.”[[28]](#footnote-28) She needed a more passive partner who would allow her political ambitions to flourish, and whose own voice would not overpower hers.

 Whilst a practical choice of partner was important for these public partnerships, shared political values became inextricably entangled with their concept of love. It is difficult to demonstrate from the evidence the ways that Jack and Bessie conceived of their love for each other, although clearly their socialist ideals constituted the cornerstone of their relationship. For Alfred and Ada Salter, meanwhile, there is more evidence in their correspondence of how they envisioned their relationship together. Graham Taylor has viewed their relationship as part of the couple’s commitment to ethical socialism, which he describes as ‘an emancipation that comprised not just strikes and protests but fun and fellowship, reading and song.’[[29]](#footnote-29) Indeed, this was a transformation of daily life that incorporated a form of socialism that was lived within all things. For those adhering to this ideology, it would have been inconceivable to marry a partner who did not share the same left-wing views, or more crucially, were accepting of the certain sacrifices that therefore had to be made.

 Having a partner who did not share these values was incompatible with the belief in a wider mission that they were set to fulfill through socialism. This was integral to these Labour dual-career partnerships. An excellent example of this integrity to a sense of self is well summarized in the marriage of the suffrage campaigners, and Labour figures, Emmeline and Frederick Pethwick-Lawrence. Below is Emmeline’s response to a proposal of marriage from Frederick. She is conflicted, for however much she cares for and could see a future with him, she cannot reconcile her fondness for Frederick with his political beliefs. Writing how irreconcilable their political beliefs and future together looked, Emmeline recalled:

I have always felt this compelling force – the authority that sets choosing aside: And now knowing this, when I come to face the question that you put to me, I cannot help thinking first… But my - Socialism,- call it, - (for want of a better name) is not an idea in my head - it is in my bones - it was born in me- my whole life long it has been my touch-stone - my Standard of values. I mean this - my first consciousness was the clearest, strongest & most inveterate sense of the dignity & worth of the human body & soul above everything else - and this has forced me into life long campaign - against every sort of bondage, against all sorts of established authorities: and it has kept me (not by choice but by inward necessity) always against the stream. Now what has this to do with you? Can you not see? It is impossible for me in a letter to do more than suggest why it is, that I could not help you play your party as a Liberal Unionist politician.[[30]](#footnote-30)

 Compromise from Frederick allowed the couple to resolve their impasse. Alongside his aspirations to be an MP, the other great point of disagreement that Emmeline struggled to reconcile was Fred’s views on the Boer War. Fred toured South Africa to assess the situation for himself, returning a pro-Boer, prepared to abandon his parliamentary candidature.[[31]](#footnote-31) This allowed Emmeline to abandon her doubts and agree to their engagement. Emmeline describes her socialism as fixed and immutable. Her socialism was not just a set of opinions, or political creed, but part of her soul. Being a Liberal-Unionist did not carry with it the same sense of loyalty for Fred. This allowed him to both align his beliefs to the woman he wished to marry and move into the Labour party after the demise of the Liberals.

*Family and kinship networks*

 The Braddocks had networks of familial and kinship support that allowed them to live fully political lives. After marriage, Jack’s employment record was patchy, where he repeatedly lost jobs when employers learnt of his communist connections and the police investigation into his charge of handling arms for the IRA.[[32]](#footnote-32) He was unemployed between 1920 and 1925. Luckily, Sir Benjamin Johnson, who owned a large dye works, was a great friend of Mary Bamber. ‘He thought Mrs Bamber was wonderful’, Jack reported, ‘and he would talk politics and economics with her for hours…He told Mrs. Bamber that he didn’t like to see me out of work because I ought to have a steady income and enough free time to be active in politics.’[[33]](#footnote-33) Sir Benjamin leant Jack £150 to buy an insurance book with the Co-operative Insurance Society. Jack was initially skeptical about accepting this offer:

 ‘I was independent, and I did not like the idea that anyone might be able to claim my allegiance because of something they had done for me. On the other hand, I didn’t want to live off Bessie and her parents, not that they objected. I had a talk with Bill Cruickshank, an old Liverpool Socialist, who was in the insurance business and could tell me how it worked, and how much time I would have free for politics. Bill’s report was favourable, but I still didn’t want Sir Benjamin’s money, and I wouldn’t have taken it if Mrs Bamber had not persuaded me to do so… I worked really hard at door-to-door collecting for three years until I had the book so well organised that it looked after itself, and I had the money to pay back Sir Benjamin. Then I became a politician again.’[[34]](#footnote-34)

Financial stability and security was essential for all politicians irrespective of political party allegiance. Even in working-class Liverpool, family connections and financial support were essential in providing the economic conditions to be politically active. Jack’s marriage to Bessie, with the networks of support and relationships he gained through her, allowed them to both pursue political work. This is a large factor in what distinguishes these public partnerships: couples commitment to re-organise their lives to be full-time politicians.

 Practical and domestic support were also crucial to sustain political lives for both partners. The Braddocks had considerable help in their domestic arrangements to allow them to pursue politics simultaneously. The couple lived with Bessie’s sister, Enid and her family, in a four-bed semi-detached house in Liverpool, where Enid ran the household and looked after Bessie and Jack, as well as her own husband and daughter. This must have felt a normal arrangement to Bessie and Enid, who had grown up living with their own grandmother, who cared for them when their mother was busy with political work. Ada Salter had the help of a ‘homely Bermondsey woman’, Mrs Hoadley, who worked full time at the Salter’s house as a housekeeper, and on her death was soon replaced by another comrade from the ILP.

 Another factor in the organization of their lives were that Jack and Bessie did not have any children. A Liverpool comrade of Bessie’s, Annie Myers, recalls that she was an unabashed follower of Marie Stopes, where she could be seen striding the streets of Liverpool with her nose in a copy of *Married Love*. Sometimes she organised *ad hoc* street meetings, usually composed of men with recitals from the text. Annie claimed that Bessie knew ‘everything a woman of those days was not supposed to know before marriage…Bessie called it scientific birth control for the purposes of the meeting, but she did not bother to wrap up what it meant.’[[35]](#footnote-35) Public political partnerships were not conducive to having children. The Pethwick-Lawrences’, mentioned above, also did not have children. The Salters tragically had one daughter, who died after contracting scarlet fever for the third time in the slums of Bermondsey. For those who did have children, Labour party cultures were particularly instrumental in allowing women access to political spaces.

 Reuben and Florence Farrow were active together in the Birmingham Labour party, both standing for election throughout the 1920s and 30s. Reuben preserved his memories of Labour party life in a set of manuscript letters. Reuben and Florence had been intensely involved in setting up the local ILP branch in Derby in 1912. Reuben was one of the first socialist town councilors in Derby, but they later moved to Birmingham. He and his wife took part in Labour politics together, which he described was made possible by ‘an ample reservoir of baby sitters’ available in the local party.[[36]](#footnote-36) In part, this was made possible as Reuben was a fervent believer that ‘socialism was not simply about external changes but about living differently by creating a new culture of everyday life.’[[37]](#footnote-37) This new ‘culture of everyday life’ included a more communal approach to childrearing and childcare. A more communal approach to children was also apparent in the Bermondsey Labour party. Eveline Mary and George Lowe, for instance, were stalwarts of the party and best friends of the Salters.[[38]](#footnote-38) In her obituary, Eveline Lowe’s house was described as always open to visitors, and that: ‘If our families were busy at committee meetings... we went “round to Mrs Lowe”…. Looking back it is astonishing how often so busy a woman happened to be at home at least in time or tea and to direct our games.’[[39]](#footnote-39) Offer conluding sentence here.

*Partnerships and power*

Although they had these strong political networks of family, Jack and Bessie would vehemently deny any suggestions of nepotism at play in the Liverpool Labour party. Bessie benefitted from her mother’s reputation and the political networks that Mary Bamber had spent years building. She was welcomed at many events that she found politically useful to attend (bazaars, Christmas fairs, summer rallies and so on) because ‘so many of the older women remembered my mother. Many had been helped by her when she and Ellen Wilkinson were joint women’s organisers of the National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers …I have a reputation of my own, but I remain proud still to be living on hers.’[[40]](#footnote-40) However, Bessie and Jack were vociferously opposed to any ideas of familial favouritism on the opposition benches. When Jack was quite newly elected onto Liverpool City Council, there was a motion to approve the new Lord Mayor of Liverpool: a Tory Councillor, George Strong. The motion was put forward by the leader of the Liverpool Tories in which he listed Councillor Strong’s somewhat mediocre qualifications. He then moved on somewhat additionally to list the qualities of Mrs. Strong, who although not a councillor, ‘identified herself with child welfare work and played golf.’[[41]](#footnote-41) Jack decided that this nomination would not stand. He was fed up with the system of the Lord Mayor always being chosen by the Tory group, and felt that Councillor Strong was only being given the role because of his familial connections. In his speech, Jack protested:

‘Councillor Strong - who is, of course, the father-in-law of Sir Thomas White’s son… It is about time, in our view, that we nominated somebody who is really entitled to be considered for this very high position. On the grounds of service, and other things, I want to support Alderman Fred Richardson. He is a good family man - none of his family is in any way association with this council and he lacks the kind of support that has so generously been given to Councillor Strong.’[[42]](#footnote-42)

Jack fails to acknowledge that his own family has three members all associated with the council. Jack, who had no family roots in the area, married into the Bamber family: he benefited from the support and connections that this gave him. Presumably Jack would defend this as the Braddock/Bambers were good socialists, but relationships and marriage clearly did give political advantage, even if Jack did not view his own life in these terms.

Some authors have been very critical of a style of politics that the Braddocks adopted in Liverpool of ‘boss politics’. Robert Baxter has compared the Braddock leadership with city politics in the US, where political ‘machines’ – based on ethnic identification and cutting across class boundaries – have been historically significant.[[43]](#footnote-43) Baxter views similar sectarian lines being created in Liverpool under the power of the Braddocks. Within the Liverpool Labour party post-1945, the party descended into factional conflict between a ‘right-wing’ machine, controlled by the Braddocks, and a radical left wing group.[[44]](#footnote-44)

 P J Waller takes up this theme and is very critical of John Braddock whom he calls ‘Boss Braddock’. He criticises Jack for not embarking on new initiatives to attract diversity into the Liverpool Labour party, preferring instead to commit himself against electoral change and, although irreligious himself, concentrate on the old Irish Catholic demographic in Liverpool.[[45]](#footnote-45) Bessie and Jack had become obsessed with their complete opposition to Aneurin Bevan and his followers who had a power base in the Liverpool Labour party.[[46]](#footnote-46) Jack was also described as having ‘an insularity and intolerance, an obsession with loyalty and discipline appeared his outstanding characteristics.’[[47]](#footnote-47) Strong networks of families and relationships would cement this factionalism. Bessie, Jack, and Mary Bamber had always moved together politically, from the Communist Party to the ILP and then the Labour party: sticking together as a powerful political unit.

 But ‘boss politics’ or not, they held a great deal of power together in Liverpool. Towards the end of their autobiography, the narrative voice changes, and Bessie begins to write in the present tense. She narrates the story from her constituency office, which is crumbling around her, and she has not taken much trouble to brighten up as ‘we’re going to drive a new ring road through my office.’[[48]](#footnote-48) Although it is unclear of the extent that their political activities worked as a project, they certainly conceived of their political power together. There are not many couples who would have had the power to drive ring roads where they pleased, but the Braddock’s entire lives were centered around politics. Political partnerships sometimes did not work on the basis of two people in a romantic relationship, but also friendly or familial cliques, benefiting from political partnerships, especially when one had many social and economic connections.

Labour politicians are very much more strongly represented in this model of partnership. It seems likely that there is an ideological component to this: couples who met and grew up in the milieu of socialist politics were more inclined to subordinate other aspects of their lives and relationships to their political activism. This manifests itself in a number of ways. Not least of all, many of these couples were childless and their belief in socialist life was so distinct that it was impossible for them to consider a partner who was not similar absorbed. But this way of life did seem to incorporate a decision to be childless and, for those without the financial means, to live a more communal style of living.

**‘Weather house’ Partnerships: Juliet and Rhys Rhys-Williams**

By contrast, spouses in ‘weather house’ partnerships moved in and out of public political life. Either they made the choice, or did not have the financial or practical arrangements, to both pursue public political life at the same time. They fluctuated between periods of support and periods of promotion, and this model of the waxing and waning of political careers is seen again in chapter 4 on the ‘halo effect’. These couples often faced other pressures in their lives that prevented both partners from pursuing their political ambitions. The couple used as the primary case-study here is Juliet and Rhys Rhys-Williams. Juliet has a rich archive, which incorporates many items from other family members, including correspondence between Rhys and Juliet at various times throughout their marriage. In contrast to the Braddocks, we see glimpses of the everyday lives and relationship of the couple. The collection did not just feature Juliet’s political life, but too her family and personal views. Through this source material a greater sense of the relationship between Rhys and Juliet is emphasised, rather than a presented narrative like the Braddocks.

Juliet Rhys Williams was born in 1898 at Sheering Hall, Essex. She was the youngest of two daughters of the barrister Clayton Louis Glyn and his wife, the romantic novelist Elinor Glyn. Although heavily criticized for her grammar and style in literary circles, Elinor gained a vast international readership.[[49]](#footnote-49) Her novels included *Three Weeks*, which sold millions of copies and revolutionized the romantic fiction genre by focusing more on women’s sexuality, and the view of the female protagonist.[[50]](#footnote-50) Once Clayton had spent his inherited fortune, the Glyns’ economic situation was precarious, resulting in Elinor becoming a prolific writer; having to publish at least a novel a year to support the family. Juliet claims that Elinor deliberately signed away her ‘substantial marriage settlement’ to extricate her father from some moneylenders, and consquently had to write more books and articles, which she hated doing.[[51]](#footnote-51) Just before her father’s death in 1915, Juliet refused to return to boarding school in Eastbourne, and instead joined the Voluntary Aid Detachment aged sixteen. She worked for two years as an operating theatre assistant at the Hospital for Officers in Park Lane, before passing the civil service exams for the clerical grade of the War Office and Admiralty, where she moved into several secretarial and administrative roles.[[52]](#footnote-52)

Juliet’s future husband, Lieutenant Colonel Rhys Rhys-Williams, was considerably older. He was 38 years her senior: the son of a ‘well-known and popular judge’, Gwilym Williams, growing up at Miskin Manor, which was a large Victorian manor house south of Cardiff.[[53]](#footnote-53) Rhys followed his father into the legal profession, after an education at Eton and Oriel College, Oxford and subsequently worked as a barrister on the South Wales Circuit.[[54]](#footnote-54) On the outbreak of the First World War, however aged 49, Rhys Rhys-Williams joined the Grenadier Guards, where he fought until he was injured at the Battle of Loos. He was brought back to England and treated at the Hospital for Officers in Park Lane, which brought him into contact, for the first time, with Juliet then aged 17. As soon as he was well enough, Rhys was sent as a military attaché to Tehran before returning after a year to work at the War Office and Admiralty. At the 1918 election, he entered Parliament as a member for the Banbury Division of Oxfordshire as a Coalition Liberal, and was appointed as the Under-Secretary of the Transport Ministry.

It was here that Rhys and Juliet’s paths crossed once again. Juliet had left nursing to become a clerk in the Military Intelligence department of the War Office from 1917-18. After the war, she moved through a number of clerical roles before arriving in the Transport Ministry in 1918, where she became, what she describes, the private secretary of Rhys Rhys-Williams.[[55]](#footnote-55) The relationship, that had begun in the hospital blossomed and as Sir Rhys Rhys-Williams said of the matter: ‘Well, we could neither get out of it then.’[[56]](#footnote-56) They married on 24 February 1921 in Westminster, and honeymooned in the bridegroom’s constituency.[[57]](#footnote-57) Their first child, Glyn, was born later that year. They had four children with their youngest child, Elspeth, born in 1937, when Rhys was 72 years old. The age gap here is important in understanding how this couple had a model of supporting each other at various times throughout their political life. Rhys almost had a full career behind him before he even met Juliet.

*Fluctuations in promotion vs support*

During their early marriage, Juliet’s political life revolved around supporting Rhys in his role as an MP and then Transport Minister. Juliet lists this as a facet of her experience that she worked doing ‘organising and political work as wife of Member for North Oxfordshire to 1922.’[[58]](#footnote-58) At this time in her life, Juliet’s focus was on her children and supporting Rhys in his political ambitions. Their main residence was Miskin Manor, where Juliet held several honorary charitable positions in Wales for organisations such as the Red Cross, St John’s Ambulance, and the Group of Council Schools. Rhys resigned his Banbury constituency in 1922 to try for the Pontypridd seat, where the familial home was, but lost. He left electoral politics, returning to the legal profession where he served for the next 38 years as Chairman of Quarters Sessions for Glamorgan and Recorder for Cardiff with directorships at several companies. Whilst Rhys’ role in party politics and elected office abated, Juliet’s grew. Throughout the 1930s, she involved herself in social and political causes: such as maternity services and child welfare. Juliet helped found the National Birthday Trust in 1928 and received a DBE in recognition of her role writing the Midwives Act in 1937, going on to conduct pioneering work in the role of nutrition in relation to maternal mortality. The political home of the Rhys-Williams’ was ambiguous. Sir Rhys was still considered an important voice with the Liberal party and ‘one of the most prominent Liberals in Wales’, but he gave his support to the local Conservative candidate at the 1931 election because of the prospect of a socialist government. [[59]](#footnote-59) Juliet’s political background was Conservative and she was ‘an unlikely Liberal in a number of respects…she was a fervent imperialist and supporter of tariff protection.’[[60]](#footnote-60) But she increasingly became a leading figure in the Liberal party, standing twice unsuccessfully for parliament, trying for Pontypridd herself in 1938 and Ilford North in the 1945 general election. She became a member of the party’s ruling council and honorary secretary of the Women’s Liberal Federation.

As will be seen later with many of the women who ‘inherited’ parliamentary seats from their husbands, supporting husbands as MPs was crucial political experience for many women who subsequently developed independent political careers of their own. Joan and John Colin Campbell Davidson were another example of a ‘weather-house’ partnership. J C C Davidson was the MP for Hemel Hempstead from 1920-1937, when it was taken over by Joan (or ‘Mimi’ as she was known to her family). Joan moved in political circles before her marriage to John. She was the daughter of an MP and the couple were introduced by their great mutual friend, Stanley Baldwin. Joan Davidson refers to the Hemel Hempstead constituency repeatedly as ‘our seat’ – in her writing – even before she was elected as an MP.[[61]](#footnote-61) During the 1923 election campaign, Joan worked out of the local campaign headquarters extensively, sending instructions and orders to John’s many other personal assistants and secretaries. John could afford to employ an agent, as well a friend, called Colonel Storr who worked as ‘a kind of personal assistant’: drawing no pay from the government, nor was he a civil servant.[[62]](#footnote-62) Letters sent to John suggest that Storr did not enjoy being sent batches of questionnaires from Davidsons ‘lady wife’, as he referred to her, preferring to communicate directly with John and to prioritise the matters that he saw as important.[[63]](#footnote-63) But Joan’s main political astuteness came from her local knowledge: she was best placed to know which issues had the most local salience, and which of the constituents needed to be replied to with the greatest haste and care.[[64]](#footnote-64) Joan Davidson had effectively run the Hemel Hempstead constituency for nearly 20 years before becoming the MP herself. In doing so much constituency work, she saw herself as ‘releasing her husband for his work in parliament and government’.[[65]](#footnote-65) When J.C.C Davidson left government, it seemed natural for her to take over the seat. The local press reported that: ‘Lady Davidson brings to the House an intimate knowledge of politics behind the scenes over a long period. Her husband ‘J.C.C,’ was ‘keeper of the Premier’s secrets’ in two regimes and he found in his wife a colleague whom he could consult with benefit to himself and safety to the realm.’[[66]](#footnote-66) The by-election for Joan was deemed by the electorate to be a foregone conclusion and political apathy was high, with turnout at just over 50%. At the declaration of the poll, Lady Davidson said she would try to represent the men as well as her husband had tried to represent the women.’ This sense of interchangeability between the Davidsons made them a formidable political force. At the dinner given six months after Viscountess Davidson’s victory, the local constituency party proposed a toast saying: ‘Lady Davidson used to be Lord Davidson’s right-hand, and now Lord Davidson is her left hand, but the combination is just the same as before.’[[67]](#footnote-67) Unlike the Rhys-Williams, there was only a five year age gap between the couple, but Lord Davidson took no further part in public political life once he stood down. Perhaps because as the previous quote attests, he remained active and involved in his constituency by virtue of his wife.

 Like J C C Davidson, Rhys Rhys-Williams did not take such an active role in politics later in his life, but supported his wife politically in many ways. After the Second World War, Juliet’s political interests concentrated on building European unity. One collection of letters, within the family’s archive, illustrates the role that Rhys, and the whole family, played within Juliet’s political activities. These letters paint a picture of everyday life at Miskin Manor in Wales where the family spent much of their summer months. Rhys Rhys-Williams, their daughters Susan and Elspeth, and Susan’s infant daughter Caroline all stayed at Miskin whilst Juliet was away in Paris for over a month. She attended a meeting of the United Europe Movement as the Secretary of the organisation. Rhys acts almost as Juliet’s own secretary during her absence, opening and organising her post for her and sending on anything that he deemed important. He writes informing her that: ‘Nothing of interest for you in the post this morning. I see you are to speak on Income Tax Reform on September 17th at 11.30.’[[68]](#footnote-68) Rhys took his duties for Juliet very seriously writing from London that ‘I shall stay here till Thursday and deal with your correspondence. I have rung up Goddard’s office several time, but there no-one there today! I will see that your books are sent on Monday.’[[69]](#footnote-69) Their eldest daughter Susan writes to Juliet with concerns about the role her father was playing:

Daddy is rather tired, I think. He took it out of himself so much seeing relays of the family off, in London, and since he came down has had tedious appointments. He toils over your letters for hours but I simply can’t persuade him not to. I hope the ones he is keeping back are not anything you want, but he says they are of no interest and he has answered them, and filed them. (Please don’t ever do that to me if I am away unless I am really in Timbuktu.) *[[70]](#footnote-70)*

Although the family had domestic help at Miskin (they report being overjoyed that Susan sacked Caroline’s nanny and heavily criticize the ‘lazy fat’ cook Marta), Rhys did take on some aspects of the organizational and emotional duties within the family. For example, he organised his granddaughter Caroline’s birthday present in Juliet’s absence, writing to her: ‘It’s Caroline’s birthday tomorrow. I am giving her a record from you and me. She adores them.’[[71]](#footnote-71) Clearly the age gap between the Rhys-Williams’ played a part in changing role that Rhys took later in life. He had experienced a full political life already when Juliet was in middle age, and was ready with the time and knowledge to support her.

Describing her marriage to a newspaper, Juliet claimed that she had been ‘extraordinarily fortunate - I’ve found being married to a Welshman an enchanting experience. I’ve found the Welsh extremely kind-hearted and not dominating. They have sympathy for women’s aspirations and interest…I have never been bored or bullied.’[[72]](#footnote-72) This was a facet of Rhys’ personality that was emphasized by others, that one of the outstanding features of his character was the ‘kindly considerate manner in which he deals with everybody.’[[73]](#footnote-73) Clearly Rhys did have sympathy for women’s aspirations and interests in the way that he supported Juliet, but there was also an element of seeking control of their relationship, and approach to wider family life. Although the example above of how Rhys organised Juliet’s post could be interpreted as helpful, their daughter Elspeth’s vehement objection that she couldn’t stand the thought of someone reading and responding to their post for them suggests that this could similarly be viewed as controlling behaviour. There was other evidence of the involvement and interference that Juliet and Rhys Williams exerted over their adult children. Their youngest son, Brandon, followed his parents into political life.[[74]](#footnote-74) He found working as a Junior Executive at Imperial Chemical Industries frustrating, and subsequently wanted to enter politics.[[75]](#footnote-75) The political knowledge and support of his parents were invaluable. He also had to contend, however, with his mother and father interfering in his affairs. Juliet followed up a letter that Brandon, who was now in his twenties, had sent to a senior figure in an attempt to further his career with their own: ‘I would like you to know that I advised Brandon against writing to you. But children don’t always take their parent’s advice, as perhaps you know by now! I told him it would do not good, and would merely oblige you to snub him.’[[76]](#footnote-76) Brandon’s father-in-law also corresponded with the Rhys-Williams over his concerns with Brandon’s career. He was unhappy about the prospect of Brandon and his wife Caroline going on a trip to Russia with Juliet and wrote saying:

I must confess that I very much dislike appearing so soon in the role of a heavy interfering father and would not do so if I were not deeply concerned about the implications of your proposal on Caroline and Brandon’s whole future… should he be elected to the LCC he would need yet more latitude over working hours and equally his absence from one or two of his first valuable committees at County Hall could well be misconstrued.[[77]](#footnote-77)

In the similar way to public partnerships, politics was a family endeavor. After the death of Rhys, their youngest daughter Elspeth remained living with Juliet and attended many society and social events with her mother, who served as her companion. She became involved in the management of the Conservative pressure group, the Monday Club, not marrying until she was 44, long after her mother’s death.[[78]](#footnote-78) Although the support and knowledge provided by spouses and family members was invaluable, it also was difficult to diverge from expected roles and expectations. The hierarchical power relations and structures of upper middle-class families makes the possibilities for husbands and wives to present as equitable public partnerships more difficult.

*Difficulties in sustaining two political lives*

Whilst the Rhys-Williams’ show how lifecycles could be used to a political couple’s advantage, there were other factors that made sustaining political involvement difficult at various times, particularly for women. Unlike the Braddocks, the Rhys-Williams’ had three children. Larger families were much more common for Conservative and Liberal political women who could afford greater amounts of paid help with domestic duties and childcare. The press noted Juliet’s candidature for the 1938 Pontypridd by-election for the fact she accepted the invitation to stand only eight days after giving birth to her youngest daughter Elspeth. They reported her as being confident that fighting the election, and possible parliamentary duties, would not interfere with the bringing up of her daughter, saying: ‘I think I should be able to combine family life and parliament.’ The reporter requested Juliet respond to comments made by the Conservative MP Sir Paul Latham, who said that he was not going to stand for parliament when his term ended because his parliamentary duties ‘did not allow him to see as much of his four-year-old son as was proper for a father to see of his child.’[[79]](#footnote-79) Juliet used this as a moment to reiterate her strong local credentials for the seat and replied: ‘It is very different in my case, for my interests are in Pontypridd. When my husband was a member for Banbury we used to find things a strain, but you don’t feel that when you belong to the place you are to stand for.’[[80]](#footnote-80) The fact that the Rhys-Williams could afford to pay for domestic help such as nannies and nursery maids, meant that Juliet could pursue political opportunities when they were offered to her, regardless of the fact that she had just given birth. Juliet lost the seat by over 7,000 votes to the Labour candidate. She stood again at the 1945 General Election but she and Rhys were by then disagreeing more and more with the Liberal leadership on policy matters. Juliet and Rhys both resigned from the Liberals and concentrated their energies on the Conservative party from this point. Like the Braddock family, they moved to a different political party at the same time.

Domestic and childcare pressures were not so easily alleviated for other political couples, leading to greater fluctuations in the political involvement of the partners. The nature of electoral politics was another factor that political couples had to contend with. Inevitably and often unpredictability, one partner could win and the other could lose. Caroline Selina Ganley and her husband Jim Ganley were an example of a Labour party couple who faced these tensions. Jim’s political life had started through the Garment Maker’s Union as he worked a tailor’s cutter. After having children, Caroline described how she:

 In order not to deprive myself of his company I used to take the children in a perambulator and accompany him to meetings. I heard arguments that deeply interested me; I heard people expressing very lucidly just what I felt; I enjoyed the feeling of true comradeship; in fact I really ‘belonged’ to such meetings even as I do now…Then arose the problem of family life; three children and a home and a burning desire to participate in a fuller political life along with my husband.[[81]](#footnote-81)

 Although Jim had introduced Caroline to political involvement and had championed her political career, her political life very quickly eclipsed his own.[[82]](#footnote-82) Both stood for election to the local council in 1919; Caroline won, and Jim lost by 17 votes. Although Jim had introduced Caroline into political life, he never stood for election again whilst Caroline went from strength to strength. She was next elected to the LCC and then became the MP for Battersea and President of the Co-operative Society. The unpredictability of elections was a factor for ‘weather-house’ couples, with some victories changing the course of their lives very quickly. For the Ganleys, there was also the pressure of money and work. Before being elected as an MP, Caroline had to resign from the LCC as she simply could not fund the travel and expenses she faced in the role. Jim had many periods of unemployment and ill health which made her political ambitions difficult to sustain.[[83]](#footnote-83) This is a direct contrast with how the Braddocks were able to maintain a public political partnership, they had the financial and familial support networks to manage and did not have the pressure of three children as dependents.

Compared to public partnerships, ‘weather house’ partnerships were more pragmatic than ideological – from both a Labour and a Tory side. Practical circumstances like age gaps, child raising, finances and the unpredictability of electoral life meant that couples moved between periods of promotion and periods of support. The political knowledge, networks and commitment that spouses shared was invaluable for each other’s career, but their lives were not organised in such a way that they could pursue political prominence simultaneously.

**Emergent partnerships: Evelyn and Thomas Addis Emmet**

To contrast this picture of active political partnerships, this third model looks at the emergent partnerships, and the process of becoming political for spouses. As shown in chapter one, usually women who desired political careers often remained single, or, in the case of Labour women, sought a public political partnership. This final model explores relationships in which one partner was more political than the other and the ways in which the marriage worked to accommodate and support this political ambition. The advantages of spinsterhood and bachelorhood for political men and women are explored later in chapter five. This model argues that emergent partnerships benefitted from the presence of devoted but undomineering spouses who gradually developed their own political interests to complement the more political partner.

These themes will be returned to in chapter four, which shows how women and men were not automatically incorporated into their spouses’ political work but that this was an active process within political cultures. Political parties were often facing difficulties that spouses did not feel not sufficiently supported and involved in their husbands work, and this incorporation was important to the parties. Beatrice Webb founded the ‘Half-Circle Club’ as she was concerned that the wives of Labour MPs and Trade Unionists were not sufficiently incorporated into their husbands’ political work. The club was a vehicle of both sociability and education to bring women into the Labour movement.[[84]](#footnote-84) Christine Collette refutes the claim that the Women’s Labour League consisted ‘chiefly of the wives and daughters of labour men who use it to voice their husbands’ opinion or to please their fathers.’[[85]](#footnote-85) But Margaret Bondfield did believe that the League had a educative purpose for the wives of trade unionists and Labour men to take an interest in their wider work.[[86]](#footnote-86) The Conservative party also had actively trained and supported political spouses. In the 1930s, the Conservative Training Centre developed a course for MPs wives, that trained them in political issues, public speaking, party organisation, local government, and running bazaars amongst others.[[87]](#footnote-87)

Evelyn Emmet was the daughter of Sir James Rennell Rodd, a distinguished diplomat, who briefly served as a Conservative politician from 1928-1932. Coming from a diplomatic family, she was educated chiefly on the continent: speaking Italian, German and French fluently. She returned to England as a teenager where she finished her education in Hertfordshire and then went up to Lady Margaret Hall college, Oxford where she studied ’the Greats’ graduating with a third in 1920. Sir Rennell Rodd was the British Ambassador in Rome from 1908-1919 and during the turbulent war years Evelyn served as his secretary at the British Embassy in Rome - presumably during her University vacations. When her father resigned from his post in 1919, she returned to England, where she spent several months in London’s East End slum carrying out social work at Toynbee Hall.[[88]](#footnote-88)

Thomas Addis Emmet was the youngest son of Major Robert and Louise Emmet, wealthy Americans who had emigrated to the UK at the end of the nineteenth century. His father became a naturalised Englishman, and fought with the British Army in the First World War.[[89]](#footnote-89) In 1926 the family purchased Amberley Castle in Sussex, to which Thomas became heir. Although there are no recorded details of how Eveleyn and Thomas met, they married in June 1923 at St James’ Roman Catholic Church in Marylebone, with one of his naval friends serving as the best man. The wedding was a large society wedding and reported widely in the press before a honeymoon to Italy followed.[[90]](#footnote-90) Soon after they were married, Evelyn fell pregnant with their first child, giving birth almost exactly a year after their wedding to a daughter, Lavinia. 1924 was also the year that Evelyn officially became a member of the Conservative party.[[91]](#footnote-91) Evelyn did not have paid employment after marriage. She began some study at the LSE, but, as Thomas noted, he ideally wanted her ‘to find a really interesting occupation and one which fills up your time, for at present you haven’t got one’.[[92]](#footnote-92)

***Apolitical partners***

Although he felt that it was important for Evelyn to have an occupation to fill her time, Thomas never established a successful career for himself. Following his education, Thomas joined the Royal Navy as a midshipman in 1918. He was promoted to Acting Sub-Lieutenant in 1921 and sent for further officer training at the Royal Naval College in Greenwich. A few months later he obtained a private medical certificate that recommended several weeks of sick leave due to ‘inflammation of the throat and debility’. He was due to be sent to Portsmouth for further officer training, but it seems that Thomas never returned to duty from his illness and requested to be placed on the retired list in November 1922.[[93]](#footnote-93) Since Thomas had left the Navy, his passions lay in becoming an artist. Due to the financial support of both their parents, they were able to live of independent means. But to the alarm of their parents (particularly Evelyn’s father) they decided to spend several months apart when Lavinia was only 6 months old for Thomas to pursue his painting.[[94]](#footnote-94) This separation does not seem to have been prompted by a lack of affection between the couple, but that Thomas was passionate about becoming an artist. Evelyn remained in London whilst Thomas travelled to Rome, living next to the Tiber to study painting. It was during this time, in January 1925, that Evelyn was approached with the idea standing for the London County Council by Captain Warburg of the Municipal Reform party. It is not clear from her archive why Evelyn was approached. She had joined the Conservative party in 1924 and had helped in her father’s diplomatic office. The family identified politically as Conservatives, although it is not clear whether she had been active before. The previous Municipal Reform incumbent for the Hackney North seat had been Lady Trustrum Eve, who was vacating Hackney to stand for Kensington. There may have been a concerted effort, as was common, from the Municipal Reform party to recruit another woman to stand in her place to keep similar numbers of female representatives. Evelyn, as a young female Conservative party member and the daughter of a Conservative politician, may have been an excellent suggestion. Due to their geographic separation at this time, some of the correspondence between Thomas and Evelyn about whether she should pursue the offer has been preserved. She herself was surprised at the invitation and in her initial approaches to Thomas on the subject, Evelyn appears to be reluctant to take up the idea:

With regard to the County Council everybody is pressuring me to stand but I am not going to because I afraid of anything coming between us and because of the child. I couldn’t bear the idea of swinging away any of our happiness for the sake of the L.C.C!!!![[95]](#footnote-95)

Thomas’ reception to the idea was unenthusiastic. The letter that contained his most strongly voiced objections has not been saved, but this lost letter sparked a volley of twice daily letters and telegrams on the subject between the couple. Thomas’ reasons against Evelyn standing were predominantly that he was concerned that Evelyn’s role on the LCC would interrupt their future plans for the family. Although besotted with their ‘wonder-child’ Lavinia, they were very keen to conceive their next baby, a desperately longed for boy who, within their imaginations, they were already referring to as ‘Christopher’.[[96]](#footnote-96) However, once Thomas raised his objections to the idea, it became clear that Evelyn really did want to take up the offer of the LCC seat and had in fact already reconsidered her answer to the local party. In a telegram sent on the 27th Evelyn ends the message with: ‘You decide’. In reality, she had no intention of leaving the decision to Thomas. On the same day she sent the following letter:

 As your letter this morning of the 27th repeats, our family must come before anything else. Beside, I want you and Christopher! Every bit as much as you; I knew it would be the one thing that would really worry you so I put it in the wire it is also the reason why I refused in the first instance. It is also only when it was put to me that I should be allowed to put family considerations first that I reconsidered my decision and sent you the wire.

My darling, I wasn’t going to do without you for 3 years! All L.C.C work is over by 5.30. The council sit once a week on Tuesday afternoons all the work being done by Committees of which I should only have attend one a fortnight. This would be all my obligations for the first year except about a twice monthly visit to N Hackney. I think it will really be just enough to keep me occupied but not enough to interfere with family affairs.[[97]](#footnote-97)

With her mind already made up, Evelyn goes further to gain assent from Thomas for this idea. She chooses this moment, quite out of context of the rest of the letter, to voice some of her concerns about Thomas’ artistic aspirations and career path. She has been trying to persuade him to enroll at the Slade School of Fine Art in London to obtain qualifications that would enable him to earn a living and establish ‘if you have it in you to be a great painter’:

Its far as your work goes, darling, I should never want you to change it for my sake but you know anxious I am that you should feel self-supporting as soon as possible… I am always rather haunted by the thought of what might become of our family supposing there was another war or some financial crash. I also want them to grow up respecting you and ambitious to follow in your footsteps…

You see, my Tom, I think you will more than likely learn to paint and draw very well but that would only be good enough for a pastime - museums and picture galleries are crowded already with thousands of useless pictures by people who took themselves seriously as artists and should only have used their talent as a pastime.

Of course you are happy painting, so is everybody with the least little nit of art in them that does not necessarily indicate that it is your profession.[[98]](#footnote-98)

Evelyn voicing these concerns after she has been dissuaded from undertaking the North Hackney seat by Thomas certainly feels calculated. This no doubt was something that niggled Thomas, and Evelyn reports that his father was concerned about the direction that his son was taking. If this was her desire, it seems to have worked. Evelyn writes to apologise for the letter the next day and tells him to forget all about it (although at the same time she sends a wire to say that she is going to proceed with the selection process). Thomas’ tone changes markedly and sensing defeat he moves to be fully supportive of Evelyn’s plans:

It’s wonderful, your wire. I had just written you not to give up the idea of it for all sorts of reasons so long as Christopher wasn’t interfered with, & had posted it when along came your wire, so I’m now hurrying off another line to tell you how pleased I am. As I said in my last letter, I wasn’t at all satisfied with the idea of your spending another year or two with nothing besides our married life to pass your time. It is a poor substitute when I’m away working all the day! But now this apparently is giving us all that we can ask from it, for two years anyway, and lots may happen in that time!…Then we can combine everything, work like niggers at what pleases us most, have every evening together, & our own days, which we were bound to spend separated, well filled with our next greatest interests in life. It is perfect, darling, perfect. Darling, its wonderful. Let me know when the election comes off so I can pop back to help, but if it is a safe seat, there shouldn’t be much expense. All my love dearest, & all my congratulations.

Devotedly, Tommy.[[99]](#footnote-99)

The effusiveness by which Thomas meets his wife change in decision is perhaps telling of his character. Not only does he suddenly assent to the plan, but now tells Evelyn how he considers the idea perfect. Thomas remained in Italy for another few months whilst Evelyn rushed into being adopted as the Municipal Reform candidate for the May elections. She was told that she did not have to do any of the canvassing for the seat herself and needed to only speak at meetings. She also writes to her father to ask him if they could borrow some money for election expenses, which he happily agrees to.[[100]](#footnote-100)

Evelyn won the North Hackney election comfortably and took up the seat on the LCC. Thomas finally heeded his family’s advice and gave up on his painting. Thomas’s next attempt was to join Balliol College, Oxford, as a student and lived apart from the family again during term time. Christopher was now a reality and had been born in November of that year. Thomas’ career at Oxford was not auspicious. He struggled with his studies and, after finding his exams very difficult, did not pass his first year. The college appear to have provided a dispensation and agreed he did not have to do exams but undertake some reading and write an essay a week instead.[[101]](#footnote-101)

 A series of letters from Thomas’ first year at Oxford have been saved in the archive. Their first daughter, Lavinia, was 2 years old and their long-awaited son Christopher only 2 months. Evelyn wrote to Thomas with a copy of her maiden speech and a description of its reception, that was met with this mildly interested reply by Thomas: ‘How splendid you having managed your maiden speech. It seemed very good indeed from what you wrote to me but it can sound so different when spoken.’In the next breath Thomas shares his important news: ‘And I have something to tell you, too. I have been chosen in the Jiu Jitsu team!’[[102]](#footnote-102)Jiu Jitsu becomes a very common theme in their letters, including an 8-page letter explaining his training regime, diet and competitions. Evelyn responds rather coolly after a deluge of Jiu Jitsu themed letters with:

Darling,

The Baby’s temperature is normal but he isn’t himself yet. I hope to see an improvement tomorrow. I haven’t done anything today except look after the children so have no news and am now off to bed as I am rather tired.

All my love dearest,

Evelyn[[103]](#footnote-103)

Thomas does notice that Evelyn might not be sharing his same enrapturement with Japanese martial arts whilst she is awake with a feverish baby. He offers to come home that weekend to ‘help relieve the pressure’. Noting that not only does he love to see his daughter but that his presence ‘must be a blessing for Nanny’.[[104]](#footnote-104) The Emmets had a nanny, a nursery maid and other domestic staff at their London residence. This domestic and financial support that the family had was crucial to Evelyn’s ability to pursue her political aspirations. But it was also her husband’s general lack of aspiration and talent that helped Evelyn. Her husband did not have a career which required devoted spousal support from her, rather a succession of hobbies and mild interests. Eventually, Thomas settled on farming and they bred Jersey and Dexter cattle. His daughter Lavinia noted on an annotation about Thomas’ artistic career to this collection of letters: ‘He was Quite good but not very, and gave it up…This kept them both very happy.’[[105]](#footnote-105) Evelyn was undoubtedly the more dynamic force in the relationship. Having a husband who was agreeable to abandoning original interests for ones that would not conflict with her own aspirations was crucial for her political involvement.

***Inevitable Incorporation***

Although Thomas came from a wealthy family and owned shares in the Conservative newspaper, *The Morning Post*, he did not have such a strong political identity as Evelyn. This is captured in an incident recalled in one of his letters. Thomas was daily being persuaded to join the Oxford Labour Club by the secretary who sat next to him at meals. Instead of being open about his political views, he told him that he was saving up for his subscription to the Farmers’ Union and so couldn’t afford to join yet.[[106]](#footnote-106) He apparently failed to mention his Conservative wife or family. After Thomas left Oxford and the couple were settled at Amberley Castle, Thomas did, however, become more political. Alongside his farming and the development of their estate, Thomas became a Conservative district councillor and was the youngest member of the Chanctonbury Rural District Council. After a few years, he also rose to the position of Chairman of the Public Health Committee and a member of the Arundel Sewers Commission.[[107]](#footnote-107) This is a useful example of the trend seen in chapter one, whereby wives of male MPs served as local councillors in the same constituency. The processes of standing for office was often about inhabiting the political networks that would lead to the party organisation approaching a candidate. Thomas had moved from having little discernable political engagement to serving as a Conservative party councillor, his wives influence undeniable in this transformation. With Evelyn’s political experience and Thomas’ flexible working life, serving on a district council was a natural fit.

In 1934, Evelyn lost her North Hackney seat on the LCC to the Labour candidate Molly Bolton, whose career and marriage exhibited some similarities to the Emmets’ emergent partnership. Molly had begun her life working as Beatrice Webb’s secretary and research assistant, retaining this job for a few years after marriage until she had her first child. She had ‘four years of uninterrupted domesticity’ after having her two children until taking up part-time work for various political societies and causes.[[108]](#footnote-108) Beating Evelyn in 1934 and becoming an LCC councillor allowed Molly’s career to grow and in 1953 she became chair of the LCC. The husbands of these two women shared qualities in common. Molly was married to Douglas James Bolton, a civil engineer who later become a lecturer in engineering at a London polytechnic. He was mildly politically interested, but it was through Molly that he became much more engaged. So early in their courtship that Douglas was still enquiring of the proper spelling of Molly’s name, he called on the Webbs and wrote to Molly to report on the meeting:

Well I’ve just been calling on those wonderful employers of yours and I have had an extremely interesting time which is probably more than they did:- in fact I’m afraid that they thought I stayed far too long…and I finished a fully blown fabian with no discernable differences from them themselves![[109]](#footnote-109)

Beatrice Webb described in her diary how she viewed Douglas Bolton as vastly inferior to Molly. She describes Molly as ‘a clever and courageous speaker, upright and rather defiant in her independence; left in opinion and cool and determined…she will probably stand for Parliament and may eventually become an M.P’. Douglas had been correct in his assumption that the Webbs had not been impressed by him. Beatrice describes him as: ‘a second rate intellectual’. At this meeting, the Webbs and Douglas Bolton disagreed over Soviet planning and Beatrice noted that: ‘Molly listened with kindly tolerance to her husband’s insistent argumentation, but apparently agreed with the old Webbs.’[[110]](#footnote-110) But Douglas did become more political and involved in the Labour movement, submitting articles to the *Manchester Guardian* on issues within the electricity industry (which it does not seem were accepted for publication). Douglas also worked abroad as an electrical engineer for much of their marriage. Like for the Emmets, although Molly still faced domestic and organizational pressures, Douglas’ absence and middling career allowed her more focus on her own political work.

***The advantages of absence***

Thomas died suddenly only a few years later in 1934, aged 34. By this time, they had moved almost permanently to Amberly Castle in West Sussex, working on renovating the residence and building up their cattle herd. His death was a huge shock to the family. Evelyn was away traveling in Freiburg when Thomas was admitted to hospital. He had kept his ill health hidden from those around him and none of them were aware that he had been tubercular in his childhood. Evelyn was too overcome with grief to attend his funeral.[[111]](#footnote-111) Their third child, Penelope, was just a year old.

Yet Evelyn’s political life grew after Thomas’ death. From 1938 to 1945 she was the county organizer for the Women’s Voluntary Service in Sussex. As well as serving as a JP, chair of the children's court, the matrimonial court and chair of the Sussex county probation advisory committee. As her children became older, she became determined to obtain a parliamentary seat. She campaigned for selection to the vacancy in East Grinstead in 1953, which attracted 60-70 applicants from all over the country, reflecting its safe status: it had a 18,352 Tory majority at the previous election.[[112]](#footnote-112) As part of her campaign material she spoke of her reasons for standing in this seat:

If my name has not appeared before you until now, it is because before the war my children were too young, and since the war your minds and my mind have been bent on winning the war, not fussing over problematical happenings…. I have no personal ambitions, and am no place seeker. I was brought up by my Father in a strong tradition of public service - a tradition which taught me as a child that it would take very hard work indeed to repay the privilege of being born an Englishwoman.[[113]](#footnote-113)

Evelyn was also determined to win a seat as she was tired of the Conservatives being so underrepresented by women in the House. She wrote to the selection committee to say: ‘One of the principal reasons I am offering you my services is that I am a Woman…On the Socialist side there are 19 women, on our side two only. These two gallant ladies are being killed by the work that is being put upon them.’[[114]](#footnote-114) Evelyn was successful in her selection and became the MP for East Grinstead in 1955. She served until 1964 when she was elevated to the House of Lords. As noted in chapter one, many women who were widowed took an active part in national and local government. In many ways the partnership of the Emmets was an ideal model for a woman who wished to be politically active. Thomas had not demanded her own time and energies greatly in his own pursuits, he had gradually become incorporated into her political world. However devastated by his early death, she had sufficient means and support to sustain a political life as a widow.

*Conclusion*

This chapter proposes that marriage played a significant role in catalysing and sustaining political lives in this period. Dual-political marriages could provide men and women with many opportunities for their political careers. The fact that these opportunities arose does, however, highlight some of the obstacles women faced in their ability to fully participate in public life post-1918. We should not fall into the trap of viewing marriage as the cause of these barriers. As these case studies show, love in a political climate was an important way women could side-step or overcome their political exclusion. This was, in some ways, nothing new. These case studies indicate a continued relevance of the ‘family’ as a political organising unit within the era of mass democracy. Enduring links of family, kinship and personal relationships were as crucial to political activism as has been seen in the centuries before. It is notable that most of the men and women in these case studies had political mothers and fathers, of whom they often attributed their political beginning. Their choice of partner may reflect an attitudinal political inheritance and in some cases the inheritance of established networks of political support.

Despite this continuity there were changes, however. Women’s ability to become elected politicians in their own right fundamentally changed the roles that they could play in these networks. With the 1918 Representation of People Act, women were able to be incorporated into familial political networks in the same ways that brothers, uncles and cousins had been for centuries. Political activism was, however, a peculiar path, demanding intense sacrifice and commitment. Both men and women were aided in the support of a spouse to navigate these waters.

 And changing conceptual understandings of marriage meant that a shared political world-view was becoming a more important attribute in a potential love-match. The 1930s and 40s were noted for the move towards more companionate forms of marriage.[[115]](#footnote-115) By the post-war period, so the argument went, marriage was being redefined as a relationship in which the partners negotiated their roles in accordance with personal preferences rather than externally imposed expectations.[[116]](#footnote-116) Political beliefs become a key part of these preferences. In these case studies, this can be particularly seen amongst Labour couples for whom a shared commitment to socialist principles underpinned both their personal and political lives. Couples like the Braddocks and the Salters built their relationships along the lines of their political beliefs. Such fervent commitment is harder to detect amongst the Conservative case studies cited. Nevertheless, with a greater willingness to follow the ebbs and flows of political fortune, these companionate partnerships remained resilient. Juliet Rhys-Williams and Evelyn Emmett, for example, focus on their family and domestic lives before a more political turn in later life. And when this time came, they had husbands who were happy to move between periods and promotion and support, or did not have a career that demand the energy or identity of their wife. As is reasserted later in this thesis, the fact that many successful political women benefited from the knowledge, political experience and connections of their husbands should not be seen in a negative light. It is rather a pragmatic response to the challenges for women in accessing political worlds in the twentieth century.
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