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**ABSTRACT**

The Ilford Carnival was a procession of costumed individuals and decorated vehicles held annually in this then outer-lying London suburb between 1905 and 1914 to raise funds for establishing a local hospital. This thesis utilises the carnival to provide an insight into how different suburban organisations and social groups came together in a particular performance of community. It argues that the carnival’s administrative body, and other organisations involved, provided opportunities for inclusion and social capital attainment. It also demonstrates how a local culture of voluntary action provided the basis of a large-scale charitable initiative with an ethos of communal self-help. The suburban setting demonstrates the continued relevance of carnival, originating in the premodern ritual year, within a modern urban environment. In the wake of Ilford’s drastic expansion, the carnival’s annual recurrence provided reassuring familiarity, and an opportunity for inversionary performances, with the carnival’s philanthropic rationale providing a justification for what might have otherwise been seen as transgressive.

The thesis illustrates that the procession functioned as a suburban public sphere. Performances throughout operated between poles of artifice and sincerity, with dominant ideals about national and imperial identity, or class and gender roles, being projected through acts of dressing up, while such ideals were both transgressed and upheld through practices like crossdressing and blackface. The suburb too was reimagined, as both rural idyll and metropolitan tourist attraction. It also highlights how the carnival’s timing, structure and content were impinged upon and influenced by expanding cultural industries, with the carnival commodified by participating businesses and media, but also appropriating fundraising models and imagery from commercialised formats like sport and theatre, connoting the topicality and recognisability that enabled it to compete within the metropolitan market for people’s spare time and money.
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British Newspaper Archive (BNA): An online repository of digitised historic newspapers.

County of London: Administrative region of government established in 1889 with its own council (LCC), covering the area formerly under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Greater London: Combined area of the County of London and the Outer Ring.

General Register Office (GRO): Government body responsible for undertaking the Census, as well as accumulating statistics relating to births, marriages and deaths.

Ilford: Formerly a ward in the Essex parish of Barking, it was established as its own civil parish in 1888 and then became an urban district in 1894.

Outer Ring: Parts of Middlesex, Hertfordshire, Essex, Kent and Surrey that while not incorporated into the County of London, were affected enough by London’s suburban growth to be included in Greater London.

Urban District (UD): Unit of local government with their own councils (UDCs) established outside London through the 1894 Local Government Act.
PROLOGUE:
CARNIVAL DAY IN ILFORD, 1905

THE BUILD-UP

It was 2:30am on Saturday 8 July, 1905. The night was a mild one; after several weeks of unsettled weather, summer had begun in earnest. Ilford’s High Road lay empty in the darkness, the legion of commuters who traipsed it each morning and evening were presently soundly asleep in homes along the roads that led off of it. Yet now a solitary figure trudged slowly along the road, that of a Mr W. H. Nockold, collecting box in hand, heading in the direction of Ilford Railway Station. There he set up his pitch and waited. As the skies above him lightened, bleary eyed men on their way to work began to pass, firstly in a trickle of ones and twos, then in a steadier stream. Workmen catching the earlier, low-fare trains stopped to put a few loose pennies in his box, wishing him well before moving swiftly on. Later came the black-coated clerks, some of whom also stopped to donate, others who strode past with badges on their lapels showing they had already given to the cause. The hour passed eight and Nockold’s box had grown heavier, now containing over £2 of coinage.

The break of daylight revealed a change in the appearance of Ilford’s residential streets and shopping parades, the usually uniform frontages now broken by decorations. On Ilford Hill, builder Freddy Willmott had adorned the trees in his garden with fairy lights. Nearby, the facade of the Ilford Conservative Club had also been decorated with fairy lights, to be switched on that evening, and bunting, while victualler Harry Warner had hung from his Red Lion public house a yellow flag featuring the eponymous feline. Other publicans in the district, such as William Dennis Goldman of the White Horse on the High Street and Charles Henry Williams and Edward Josiah Percy Jennings, proprietors of the General Havelock on the High Road, had similarly festooned their premises with flags. Owners of other businesses along the High Road had made less spectacular efforts, but still chose to mark the occasion with bunting. In Ilford Lane, the premises of hatters and hosiers Messrs G. Moore & Sons featured a particularly
elaborate display comprising the model of a child’s hospital cot with a child in it attended by two nurses.

As the morning progressed, adults and children too set up other fixed collecting stations around the district. In Clementswood, they stood outside the Town Hall, the Congregational Church and at the entrance to South Park, as well as on Green Lane, Albert Road and on the corner of Richmond and Albert Roads. In North Hainault, collecting efforts centred in the village of Barkingside, by the Chequers public house, at Barkingside Railway Station, and at the Maypole Mission, while dairyman Henry Pilbeam had also set up a collecting station at his premises in Newbury Park. They sought to capture the custom of Saturday shoppers, but also the gaggles of people who from the early afternoon began to congregate on the streets in wait of the start of proceedings. In Loxford, they gathered from 2pm along the Broadway, and by 3:30pm the crowds outside the County Bank at the top of Ilford Lane had become too dense to pass through, with local residents augmented by visitors from nearby Manor Park, across the urban district border with East Ham.

**THE PROCESSIONS**

By that point, the first carnival ward procession – and smallest – had already begun. Most of the vast North Hainault ward remained as apparently unaffected by carnival day as it had been by the suburbanisation process more generally. Yet at 2:30pm, a small column began the task of travailing a small portion of the district, centred on Barkingside village, where most of these participants were also drawn from. The Barkingside Brass Band led the way, their trumpets and trombones echoing down country lanes to herald the procession’s arrival. Behind them were a handful of decorated vehicles, followed by representatives of the Hainault and King Charles Lodges of Oddfellows, and of the Ancient Order of Foresters and of the Court Oak of Essex. The rear was brought up by several decorated bicycle and then a combination manual fire engine operated by Wanstead Fire Brigade. Marshalling them was ward organiser Arthur Denham.

It was not until 3:30pm that further ward processions also commenced. One of these was Park’s, which made its way from Ilford Railway Station, north along the Cranbrook Road, and then around the streets lying south of Central Park. Its opening accompanying rhythms were
distinctly more martial than that heard in Barkingside, being provided by the band of the 3rd Essex Voluntary Battalion. Following them were the visiting East Ham Fire Brigade with their steam fire engine, an emblematic car representative of ‘Britannia’ and inscribed with an invocation to ‘Help the sick’, a decorated pony and trap, and a coach and four, carrying several committee members and their wives. There was also a model ambulance, staffed by two rock climbers, and a model of the desired hospital; between them, a number of decorated bicycles and their riders. The remainder of the procession combined decorated vehicles – including the ‘HMS Lively Polly’ and the ‘British Sports Cars’ – with costumed individuals.

At the same time, the Seven Kings procession commenced at Downshall Schools, before snaking up and down the parallel streets running directly northwards of the High Road, under the stewardship of marshal James Mein, tasked with keeping the array of decorated vehicles and costumed individuals in as orderly a fashion as possible and with maintaining a steady pace. It began with a banner, and was accompanied by the sounds of the C Company band from the Essex Regiment’s first Voluntary Battalion, which followed immediately afterwards. Thereafter came youths interspersed with commerce: children bearing flags, a decorated car sent by Quakers Oats, bearing an individual dressed as the company’s famous emblem, thirty schoolchildren in fancy dress, (of which one boy, dressed as Mephisto, would later be awarded a prize for best costume by the ward marshal), replicas of the Bovril bulls, and thirty more children with decorated cycles. Next came one of the procession’s main set pieces: the ‘Heptarchy’ car, bearing men dressed as monarchs of England’s seven early medieval kingdoms, after whom the ward was allegedly named – the costumes having been borrowed from the organisers of the previous month’s Sherborne Pageant in Dorset. A further assemblage of costumed individuals followed, then a carriage bearing men dressed as costers, more costumed individuals, and a car submitted by the Ilford Guardian, whose riders all wore outfits covered in newsprint. Near the rear were those tasked with soliciting donations from the crowds who had stopped and gathered to view this spectacle: 38 young women, all dressed as nurses, followed by male collectors. Finally, at the procession’s end was a combination chemical fire engine ridden into town by the Leyton Fire Brigade, all proudly wearing medals attained in the line of duty.

Proceedings were also commencing in the far east of the district, at Chadwell Heath, where the South Hainault procession started out from, heading westwards along the High Road, through an interlude of fields, before arriving in Goodmayes, where it circled a number of residential streets, before eventually drawing to a close at Seven Kings Station. Pride of place in the procession went to two items that had already been making names for themselves in the
growing, interlinked world of Edwardian suburban carnival. The Leytonstone Ferndale Cycling Club’s impersonation of Gilbert and Sullivan’s ‘The Mikado’ had been awarded a prize for the best club tableau at the recent, nearby Woodford Meet, while Miss M. Fleming (also of Leytonstone) had been named best decorated cyclist for her *Daily Express*-themed get up, and both repeated their imitations at the lead of the procession here. Behind them were more costumed cyclists, and then a motor car, a contingent from the Chadwell Heath Lodge of the International Order of Grand Templars, the Seven Kings Men’s Meeting’s ‘Brotherhood’ car, emblemising various men at work, a local branch of the Boys Brigade, and a contingent from the Ilex Cycling Club. The procession was completed by individuals wearing national dress, decorated traps, a mock-up of an ambulance wagon, more decorated cyclists, an assortment of costumed collectors, and lastly a manual fire engine visiting from Romford, along with its crew.

Shortly after 4pm, Loxford’s ward procession commenced its route from Stratton Road, marshalled by Corporal C. Smith of the Westminster Dragoons, with Freddy Wilmott as his deputy. It weaved its way around the tight grid of streets directly south of the High Road’s western end, the brassy strains of the Horns Silver Prize Band sounding above the hubbub of the gathered ranks of people. Behind it were a series of decorated vehicles, many of them carrying costumed children from the local Cleveland Road Schools, representing – among other themes – ‘The Queen of Hearts and Her Court’, ‘May Day Mummers’ and a ‘Japanese Group’. There were also the coach and four of the Ilford Conservative Club; a steam-powered fire engine manned by the fire brigade from nearby Barking; two model ambulances, complete with nurses, submitted by the South Essex Steam Laundry; and the *Ilford Guardian’s* ‘Ye Ilford Guardian Printeries’ car, which featured a working printing press that printed copies of the newspaper en route, which riders distributed to those watching from the roadsides. The contingent marched with a grand banner, adorned on one side with the legend ‘Loxford Ward, I.H.S.C’ [Ilford Hospital Saturday Committee], above the image of a hand dropping a coin into a box and the message ‘Every little helps’ written underneath, while hospital crosses sat in each corner; on the other side another message – ‘Loxford Ward thanks you’.

Synchronously, a little way further north, the Cranbrook ward procession also began its pathway from outside the Highlands School at the topmost of the ladder of wealthier residential ‘avenues’ and ‘gardens’ that extended eastwards from the north-by-north-westward running Wanstead Park Road. Another contingent of the Westminster Dragoons was the first link in this particular chain, while also riding near the front, in the guise of Dick Turpin, was marshal F. Newman. Behind them was a van carrying a banner featuring the ward’s emblem, ‘Ye Coque’, and thereafter, adding music to proceedings, the visiting East Ham Borough Prize
Band. In their wake trailed a series of decorated vehicles contributed by individual residents under the collective auspices of the Ilford Toy Fund, one of which – ‘The Golliwog’ – had to be withdrawn after the horses pulling it became excessively resistive. Thereafter came an array of individual processionists in a variety of costumes, representations including those of ‘Oxo’, ‘Uncle Sam’, a ‘French Chef’, and the historic clown, ‘Joey Grimaldi’. Mr Lee’s bicycle, complete with elliptical wheels, drew laughter from those watching on. Among the vehicles that completed the display was one contributed by the builders of the local Cranbrook Park Estate, signifying ‘The Sons of Empire’, as well as a model ‘Venetian Gondola’, a motor car, and finally, the Loughton Fire Brigade.

To the east of Loxford and south of the High Road was Clementswood, Ilford’s most populous ward. Given that fact, the procession which began at Oakfield Road at 4:30 pm was perhaps on the short side. It began with a banner and a band, the Rainham Town Band in instance. In their wake came individuals in fancy dress, among them members of the ward committee, and then decorated cycles, a decorated motor car carrying passengers who had paid to ride along the route in it, and three lodges of the United Ancient Order of Druids, dressed in regalia and carrying their friendly society’s London district banner. Among the decorated vehicles which came next were trade cars offering mock-ups of a blacksmith’s forge, a carpenters’ bench and a dairy farm, as well as an ambulance car in the style of a greenhouse, from which plants growing inside were sold to raise funds for the carnival. Ilford’s own fire brigade rode their combination fire engine towards the rear of this column, followed lastly by riders from the East Ham Social Cycling Club and from the St Mary’s Cycling Club. All this occurred under the watchful eye of marshal Charles Wade, who had proudly donned his old Imperial Yeomanry rough rider’s uniform, which he had previously worn on service in South Africa.

By 6:30pm, the various ward contingents had collected at various points along the High Road for the grand final procession. Firstly, the South Hainault group made its way along from Seven Kings Station, headed on this occasion by 16 members of the Westminster Dragoons, led by E. F. Gillard, a printer who served on both the carnival’s general committee and the Cranbrook ward committee. As it passed the Seven Kings Hotel, the Seven Kings contingent fell in behind. Waiting just to the north of the railway line, the North Hainault and Park contingents crossed over the Cauliflower Bridge to extend the chain further. From the south, the Clementswood contingent joined in at Buckingham Road and Loxford’s at Green Lane. Finally, at the Havelock Bridge, the Cranbrook contingent joined the end of the procession from north of the railway line.
All the while, people had been gathering along the High Road to the west of the Havelock Bridge, on the Broadway that led northwards from the High Road across the railway line, and then along Cranbrook Road until the entrance to Central Park. Those who had watched the ward processions as they passed along their streets had travelled to the town centre, joined by other residents who had been saving themselves for the main event, and visitors from neighbouring suburbs. By the time the full procession had formed, this short trajectory had developed a thick encasement of watching crowds, almost spilling onto the road itself, while behind them faces appeared in every window, seeking a clearer, more comfortable view from an elevated position. W. H. Ridgley, the Cranbrook ward organiser, would subsequently claim as many as 100,000 people had gathered to see the procession that evening. They would be serenaded by the various participating bands, strategically positioned far enough away from each other so that wherever along the route someone stood, the music of one band would fade out just as another came into earshot, ensuring a relatively melodic rather than dissonant soundscape. To this, the crowd added volume of their own, cheering, applauding and laughing at, and interacting with particular favourites, such as the various Cleveland Road Schools cars, ‘Ye Olde Ilford Printeries’, the various hospital-themed vehicles, and the Seven Kings nurses. Yet amid the kaleidoscopic sights and the intermingling of music and voices, a degree of physical order was maintained, the teeming crowds allowing the procession sufficient room to pass through their ranks.

**THE EVENING’S PROCEEDINGS**

Three quarters of an hour after their assemblage, the parade of costumed individuals and decorated vehicles, riders and cyclists, triumphantly entered Central Park, where it broke up and dispersed, participants now joined by the crowds who entered the park for the evening’s proceedings. Messrs H. W. King and H. Ponder, local residents who had ridden in a motor car as part of the South Hainault contingent, now inspected each category of processionist to decide which would be awarded prizes, their task made all the more difficult by the swarming of onlookers into their judges’ enclosure.

The carnival’s organisers had arranged an evening’s entertainment to take place in the park, in order to supplement earlier fundraising efforts. Firstly, the gathered crowds were
treated to a series of sports. There was a 60-yards handicap swimming race, entered by teams from Ilford, Barking, Romford and East Ham; an exhibition of swimming by former London champion John W. Noble; diving displays; a series of comic tournaments including pillow fights on greasy poles, and a race in which competitors had to wear a night shirt and drink a feeding bottle of milk before reaching a designated point; a water polo match between teams from Ilford and Barking, as well as a water tourney between these same sides; a game of ‘Hunt the Bellman’, in which competitors were armed with bladders with which to beat the bellman when he came within an arm’s length; and a scratch invitation 60 yard-race. Following on from this, an evening concert took place, including a calisthenics display by the girls’ section of the Ilford Gymnasium Club.

Proceedings were to conclude at the bandstand with the prize-giving, only for it to be realised that the prizes had not been brought to the park. While they were being retrieved, William Griggs, a developer who was at that time leader of Ilford Urban District Council, as well as president of the carnival’s general committee and a member of the Cranbrook ward committee, held court. He told the crowds present that the hospital’s construction was a certainty, and began to address the question of whether Ilford might have a free library as well, but the suggestion brought dissent from the crowds, including calls for Ilford to have a swimming baths instead. This municipal debate was halted by the belated arrival of the prizes – an assortment of cash prizes, ornaments, furniture, cigarette cases and matchboxes, and food products – to be distributed by Griggs’s wife. There was a prize apiece for the best decorated home for each ward; for the ‘Ye Cranbrook Car’ and ‘The Heptarchy’ as the first and second best decorated cars; and for the Leytonstone Ferndale and St Mary’s Cycling Clubs for having the best and second best turnouts on the day. There were also first, second and third prizes for the best costumed men, women, boys and girls, and for the best decorated cycles accompanied by male and female riders respectively.

The ringing of a bell sounded the end of the formal proceedings and the call for revellers to leave the park. Crowds of people, plain clothed and in fancy dress, broke up into smaller parties and filtered out to various parts of the district to engage in lower key amusements of their own – in some scattered cases at least, this apparently involved inebriation and petty theft. As midnight passed the numbers in the street lessened, although there were still onlookers to record the appearance of a solitary clown cycling down Ilford Hill. Twenty-four hours after Mr Nockolds’ early sojourn to the station, Ilford’s first carnival day had come to its conclusion.¹

¹ All information taken from Ilford Guardian (7 Jul 1905; 14 Jul 1905; 21 Jul 1905).
**INTRODUCTION**

**WRITING THE HISTORY OF THE ILFORD CARNIVAL**

*The Ilford Carnival, 1905–1914*

On Friday, 5 May 1905, a meeting was held of the Ilford Emergency Hospital Committee. The committee had been set up by the Ilford Medical Society to pursue the development of a local emergency hospital following a decade and a half of rapid population growth in the district as it had become increasingly suburbanised. As a means of raising funds towards that cause, delegates at the meeting established a general committee tasked with holding a Hospital Saturday carnival, with organisers subsequently appointed to lead committees in each of Ilford’s seven wards. The outcome was the day’s events described in the above Prologue.

This format was largely adhered to thereafter – save for the replacement of the general committee with an executive one in 1907 – with the carnival held annually on the second Saturday of July. The event’s scale generally increased year-on-year. The final procession was nearly three miles long in 1907, and four miles long in 1909, when it involved between three and four thousand participants. Crowds were also estimated at more than 100,000 for the 1910 carnival and by 1912 exceeded 250,000. The amounts raised by the carnivals escalated from £445 in 1905, to £828 in 1910, to £950 in 1913. Takings during the processions were increasingly supplemented with fundraising through auxiliary entertainments such as concerts, balls, fetes and sports, mostly held prior to carnival day. The procession was nonetheless abandoned in 1915 due to organisational and moral considerations resulting from the First World War, although Hospital Saturday continued to be marked in Ilford every July, with fetes and collections.

---

5 *Ilford Recorder* (30 Jun 1911; 3 Jul 1914).
**Studying the White-Collar Carnivalists**

Ilford’s carnival was one of a growing number taking place in London’s suburbs, and elsewhere in Britain, during this period – and is the subject of this thesis. I first stumbled upon the historic occurrence of suburban carnivals after coming across a file of newspaper cuttings on the Finchley Carnival at Barnet Archive. Trips to other borough archives across London revealed the commonness of carnivals along the urban periphery during the latter decades of the nineteenth and early decades of the twentieth century, held with the aim of raising funds for charitable causes – events that left a scattered paper trail in surviving ephemera such as programmes and photographs, as well as newspaper column inches. Carnivals offered an opportunity to scrutinise suburban community in action, examine suburbanites’ preferences and passions in relation to philanthropic and leisure activities, and interpret their identities through the carnival costumes they donned and vehicles they decorated. However, the subject matter posed methodological problems. Ambitions of a London-wide study running from the 1890s through to the 1930s were soon scuppered, for the history of London’s carnivals is to be found primarily in the city’s local newspapers, of which there were hundreds, most of which remain undigitised and unindexed. Providing a comprehensive picture of carnivals in the capital over so long a period would have meant hunting for needles in countless haystacks.

Instead, I opted to focus on the Ilford Carnival specifically, for several reasons. Its scale was grander than other carnivals of that period, and the volume of information available about it through its local press vaster. Concentrating on one carnival would also enable me to ground my analysis of the event more fully in its local context, thus enhancing my understanding of it and of the community that held it. The sheer pace of Ilford’s suburbanisation made it a fascinating case study in itself, but I also wanted to use the carnival to uncover Ilford’s connections to its neighbouring suburbs and to London more broadly – to use it as a prism through which to view the shifting social and cultural geographies of the expanding metropolis.

I also became fascinated with carnival as a transepochal, transnational phenomenon. What place did a cultural form dating back to the Middle Ages have in an advanced industrial society? What did the persistence of ritualised transgression say about people’s identities and relationships with each other, or about the modern organisation of time?
Structure of this Introduction

The remainder of this Introduction explains how I tackle these, and other questions, but firstly explains where this thesis sits in relation to existing scholarship, and locates the Ilford Carnival within the histories of both carnival and of suburban London. It firstly defines my analytical approach, which involves undertaking a detailed localised study but positing it within the context of broader historical and geographical processes, with a particular focus on performance as a means of displaying and attaining different forms of capital within the context of temporal and accompanying spatial reorganisations. Subsequently, it outlines the history and historiography of carnival, and explaina its evolution as a polysemous occasion of inversionary performances, in relation to temporal reconceptualisation and reorganisation, urbanisation and globalisation. It then discusses the history and historiography of London’s suburbanisation, examining it as a spatial outcome of economic and technological developments, with implications for the attainment of social capital and composition of cultural capital for suburbia’s new residents. Thereafter, it explains how the thesis demonstrates the relevance of carnival and suburbia to each other through the case study of the Ilford Carnival. This was part of a broader process of community formation and an opportunity for suburbanites to themselves engage in an array of performances, within the contexts both of the ascendancy of the working week and linear notion of time, and of the emergence of a national, commercialised culture peppered with international influences. Finally, it discusses my sources and how I analyse them, before laying out the structure of the rest of the thesis.

DEFINING MY ANALYTICAL MODEL

Histories of Everyday Life

Since the 1970s, many historians have sought to eschew deterministic grand narratives and turned to small-scale studies in order to demonstrate the unevenness of modernisation and
restore human agency. In Germany, practitioners of ‘alltagsgeschichte’ (meaning ‘the history of everyday life’) sought to reframe historical processes as outcomes of actions of ordinary people, maintain empathy with their historical subjects, and – by constricting their scale of analysis - integrate all available material, social, political and cultural data to reconstruct life experiences at their most complex. In Italy, advocates of ‘microhistory’ have either used seemingly minor episodes to illuminate aspects of history not unveiled by conventional methods, or systematically reconstructed social relationships within a restricted geographic setting, through dense archival sources. While these approaches are not synonymous with local history, a focus on individuals generally entails scaling down to the smaller spatial scales at which they live their lives, while taking a local focus is certainly a potential route to analysing the way people engage with and are impacted upon by broader issues.

A number of claims have been put forward for the benefits of small-scale historical research. Carlo Ginzburg, perhaps the doyen of episodic microhistory, asserted that ‘any social structure is the result of interaction and of numerous individual strategies, a fabric that can only be reconstituted from close observation’. István Szijártó, championed it over macro-oriented traditional social history due to its greater general appeal, its realism (owing to the closer attention it pays to historical detail), its capacity to convey personal experience, and the opportunities it offers for considering the relationship between the subject of study to a diversity of contexts, thereby allowing individual case studies to teach us about society more broadly. Taking the argument further, Sigurdur Gylfi Magnússon lamented that microhistory was still treated as an adjunct to existing modes of doing history rather than as a challenge to them, with many microhistorians still feeling the need to locate and interpret their studies in relation to existing metanarratives. He instead advocated the ‘singularisation’ of history: ‘investigating with great precision each and every fragment connected with the matter in hand and for which there are sources and in bringing up for consideration all possible means of interpretation that bear directly upon the material.’

---

Yet small-scale approaches also have shortcomings. Brad S. Gregory questioned microhistory’s ability to develop generative models capable of explaining human behaviour within more complex, urban contexts. He also highlighted the need for a priori knowledge of wider contexts in order to gain a sense of how representative a microhistory is, and for larger geographic scales and longer time periods to explain some institutions’ power and longevity. More recently, Jo Guidi and David Armitage’s controversial The History Manifesto, which advocated a return to longue durée approaches and engagement with big questions in order to ensure history’s continuing relevance as a discipline, asserted that:

‘…microhistory that fails to reconnect to larger narratives, and to state frankly what it hopes to overturn and what to uphold, may court antiquarianism. What we hope for is a kind of history with a continuing role for micro-historical, archival work embedded within a larger macrostory woven from a broad range of sources.’

Growing emphasis on transnational approaches to history in recent years likewise poses further existential questions: as Francesca Trivellato recently asked, ‘is there a future for microhistory in the face of the global turn? And if there is, what does it look like?’

Individual in-depth case studies can facilitate a more holistic approach to history. Greater specialisation within the discipline has encouraged development of new tacit metanarratives stressing the particular significance of individual subfields as prisms through which to view history, rooted in their own definitive bodies of scholarship. By contrast, approaching a single event, site, or object with a broader selection of more open-ended questions allows the historian to understand the different contexts and ways in which it is produced, interpreted and used. Constricting scale also allows for a reconciliation of social and cultural historical approaches, facilitating in-depth exploration of relationships between structure and agency, and how context, action and thought influence and amend each other.

Unlike Szijártó, however, I do not believe the microhistorical focus on minutiae makes for more ‘realistic’ historical accounts. Framing evidence within multiple contexts and seeking to restore the historical subject’s agency and convey their experiences offers valuable insights, but nonetheless the narratives this approach produces remain just that. However empirical we

---

might strive to be, we all possess a priori understandings of the historical process that facilitate our deciphering of evidence and interlinking of it within narratives; better to be explicit about these theoretical underpinnings to guarantee their rigour and responsiveness. I also strongly disagree with Magnússon’s assertion that microhistory’s incorporation by rather than wholesale transformation of the practice of social history, and the tendency of microhistorians to locate their work in relation to existing grand narratives, constitute some sort of failure. I do not believe everyone should be doing microhistory, for other approaches are capable of answering questions it cannot, just as it provides its own unique insights. Rather, microhistory and macrohistory should be written and rewritten in permanent dialogue with each other. For historians attempting to relate stories of everyday life, grand narratives and explanatory models can offer potential points of departure into and directions through their material.

**Capital, Performance and Temporality**

In order to interpret my research material, I draw in particular on the work of sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Erving Goffman, and political scientist Timothy W. Luke. Bourdieu subdivided cultural capital into three categories: embodied (i.e. possessed within the mind and body), often unrecognised as capital, accrued over time and an integral part of individual habitus; objectified (i.e. cultural goods), which can be consumed materially through economic capital and symbolically through possession of embodied cultural capital; and institutionalised (such as educational qualifications), which bestows recognition upon an individual’s embodied cultural capital and thereby facilitates its conversion to economic capital. Bourdieu meanwhile defined social capital as aggregations of relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition, produced and reproduced through material and symbolic exchanges, group nomenclature and instituting acts, with an agent’s social capital dependent upon the extent of their social networks and the volumes of capital their contacts possess. These, and economic capital, are convertible into each other.\(^{15}\) Cultural and social capital are essential to explaining the persistence of value systems and social structures. Value systems are, I would argue, the means by which cultural capital (i.e. what it is worth knowing) is evaluated, and social structures the means by which social capital (i.e. who is worth knowing) is calculated. These in turn are upheld by agents

---

investing their social, cultural, economic and political capital (which I define as an agent’s capacity to compel others to act as they wish them to) in their maintenance.

Yet value systems and social structures are also pliable because of the performative nature of human relations. Goffman argued that social interaction centres on individuals’ and groups’ efforts to effuse certain impressions unto others, through settings, appearance and manner, in order to demonstrate their possession of certain values and status and be treated accordingly. These performances might by cynical or heartfelt, and the performer might move between these two states at different stages or even believe and disbelieve in their own performance simultaneously. The recipient in turn interprets the performance in relation to their own past experiences and existing knowledge.16 Social structures, value systems and social identities exist through their performance. Individuals present their capital in order to attain more, and the risk of jeopardising their existing and potential capital discourages misperformance. However, presentation and reception of capital are interpretive acts, and so over multiple performances, practices and valued ideals and social connections might incrementally evolve. Loss of identification with a group, or disaffection with a social structure or value system, lead to re-evaluations of capital and performances that challenge the status quo, resulting in periods of more drastic social and cultural change. New entrants to a group who possess different quantities and types of capital to existing members might therefore be excluded for their performances not matching expectations, but alternatively if their performances are accepted, might also engender social and cultural changes within the group.

Underpinning all this are temporality and territoriality. Time is, as Bourdieu noted, invested in the accumulation of all capital.17 All groups, meanwhile, are implicitly or explicitly spatially defined. Definitions of time and space, therefore, are central bases of value systems and any changes to them cause wider reverberations. It is here that Luke’s theorising of tradition and modernity is valuable. He argued that societies actively choose which combinations of tradition and new practices and ideals to enact, with what falls into each category being actively and discursively produced. Moreover, he explained social and cultural change through space-time compressions that drastically transform understandings of the world, highlighting the existence of stable sites facilitating the continuation of tradition and destabilising ones that de-traditionalise practices ‘by collapsing the settings and accelerating the meter of human action’. In this way, a world composed of sites identified, arranged and demarcated around the human

body’s capacity for travel and in terms of their natural qualities, in which time was measured ‘in registers marked in organic/astronomical/generational/particular terms’, was superseded by one whereby states sought to urbanise space through architectural constructs and transport, power and communications networks. Organically defined sites were collapsed and organic bodies re-contextualised within an artificial, mediated, rationalised and localised new order defined by states, capital and experts, with existing customs governing thought and behaviour interrupted and time re-measured in ‘civic/dynastic/administrative/universal terms’.

Discursive identification of what is traditional and what is modern, what is to be discarded or retained, entails continual adjustments of measurements of capital. Therefore, while time-space compressions might be the primary vehicles of historical change, facilitating organisation of human affairs at ever greater scales, they are themselves products of quests for capital and reactions to them are dependent upon the capital those affected already possess. Yet space-time compressions also fundamentally alter the composition of groups, disarraying existing modes of estimating cultural capital and encouraging formulation of new ones in search of social and economic capital. Returning to Goffman’s dramaturgical reading of human behaviour, if the stage expands, the set changes and roles are recast, the actors are likely to adjust their performances accordingly, seeking to present their existing capital in a manner amenable to its retention and expansion within new geographic contexts. What I would add to Luke’s reading is that time-space compressions are part of a broader array of transformative temporal reconfigurations, which also includes other types of increase in productiveness over time, and linked, but separate, changes in the understanding of time itself.

This model for the formation, maintenance and adjustment of normative identities, practices and relations is, as I hope to show through the remainder of this introduction, highly pertinent to understanding the histories of carnival and of life in suburban London, and of course the Ilford Carnival itself. It is compatible with a localised microhistorical approach, which lends itself to the study of performances and capital accumulation within particular groups. In turn, my interpretive model provides a blueprint for assembling archival evidence into a holistic approximation of the web of social relations and taxonomy of normative values that existed in a historic locality, and of the shifting geographies underpinning them. In doing so, I hope to answer Emma Griffin’s call for historians of popular culture to ‘integrate popular

---

cultural experiences with the power structures that variously encouraged, permitted, and suppressed them’.

**The History of Carnival**

*Defining and Historicising Carnival*

The concept of carnival has been applied in studies of sports fan behaviour, transgressive literature, Hollywood cinema, 1950s British comedies, the seaside resort, and Indian street-food, to provide a few, hardly exhaustive, examples. Broadly speaking, within this literature, the cultural entities discussed are conceived as playing an oppositional role in modern societies similar to that which carnival once fulfilled. However, carnival’s resonance as a term lies in recognition of the existence of actual events called carnivals by their organisers and participants (with abstractions of the term inherently alluding to the real thing). Its identifiable features are historically given, a product of the processes of its occurrence, development and spread to date. The word ‘carnival’ itself has been central to any continuity between carnivals across space and time, with the decision to name an event a carnival referencing pre-existing events given that title.

From the High Middle Ages onwards, a growing number of European cities held carnivals. Typically running from January until Lent, Carnival was strongest in southern Europe and weakest in the north, where weather did not permit outdoor festivals at that time of

---

year. 21 Throughout the season, actions such as singing and dancing in the street, fancy dress, masking and play-acting, playful assaulting of other members of crowd, and attacks on animals were all common. The events of its final few days – usually processions of decorated floats and individuals in fancy dress, competitions (e.g. races, mock battles) and plays – were more structured, with clearer distinction between participants and spectators, and organised by local clubs and societies (often comprised of young upper class men). 22 Carnivals were typically marked by themes of excessive eating, sex (both symbols of and actual sexual activity), aggression (verbal and physical), and the reversal of the normal order. 23 Other festivals – such as the Feast of Fools at Christmastime – provided further opportunities for revelry. 24

The spread of Protestantism from the sixteenth century onwards fuelled successful efforts to purge popular culture of its excesses in many parts of Europe, while the Catholic Church also began pursuing its own policy of curbing licentiousness as part of the Counter-Reformation. 25 Religious change had implications for the celebration of Carnival: for example, the city council abolished Nuremberg’s Schumbartlauf parade in 1525 after officially adopting Protestantism, while the increasing influence of Counter-Reformation Catholicism over authorities in Rouen prompted it to increasingly curtail the city’s carnival activities from the late sixteenth century. 26 Governments could also prohibit carnivals on secular grounds, as France’s new leaders did shortly after the revolution. 27

Yet despite the frequent opposition of church and state, Carnival persisted or was revived in many areas, and spread to new ones. During the 1820s, Cologne’s cultural and business elites reinvigorated the city’s carnival – which had declined significantly during the recent French occupation – but in a more respectable guise, structured around a banquet meeting, large parade and public ball. 28 Just over a century later, municipal authorities relaunched

---

Dijon’s local carnival, originally suppressed during the seventeenth century. Moreover, imperial expansion took the celebration from continental Europe to the Americas. Carnival was initially introduced to Trinidad, for example, by French planters during the eighteenth century, but subsequently taken over by the island’s Black population following emancipation in the 1830s. The rise of carnival in colonial and post-colonial societies has seen its epicentre as a cultural form shift across the Atlantic, with carnivals in Brazil and the Caribbean becoming hugely popular international tourist attractions. Meanwhile, in Britain, carnivals instigated during the 1960s in deprived, racially mixed inner-city districts such as Notting Hill in London and St Paul’s in Bristol were from the 1970s and 80s increasingly dominated by local residents of Caribbean descent and based around elements of Caribbean carnival and culture, particularly the Trinididian mas.

The Historiography of Carnival

Among academics, carnival is interminably associated with Russian literary studies expert and theorist Mikhail Bakhtin, who discussed the subject extensively in his works *Rabelais and His World* and *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, first published in English in 1968 and 1973 respectively. Bakhtin described premodern ‘carnivalesque’ festivities that accompanied and often mocked more serious rituals, including those of the Church, as almost a second world outside of ordinary social and political relations. Carnival, he claimed, tended towards the spectacular but made no distinction between actor and spectator, and during carnival time no life existed outside of its inverted laws. Hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and prohibitions were all suspended and new, playful and ever-changing forms of communication, unburdened of etiquette, engaged in instead, along with universal laughter.

---

In both books, Bakhtin’s discussions of carnival served as prelude to emphasising its historic role in shaping literature’s content and generic bases, although he argued that from the late seventeenth century this connection was lost as Carnival ceased to be a wholly communal, public festival, although elements of it persisted in other cultural forms. As Michael Holquist has highlighted, Bakhtin’s celebration of collective mockery and subversion in the face of a persecutory and censorial official culture functioned as tacit critique of the Soviet state at the height of Stalinism, which he had himself fallen foul of.

As Peter Burke has reflected, Bakhtin inspired a generation of historians, including himself, to study late medieval and early modern carnival during the 1970s. Yet many scholars of carnival have subsequently implicitly or explicitly rejected aspects of Bakhtin’s approach and influence. Burke himself spoke of Bakhtin’s failure to recognise the dialogue within carnival between official and popular culture. Chris Humphrey, meanwhile, criticised academics influenced by him who depict ‘the utopian world of medieval carnival as being gradually suppressed over the centuries, leaving us with a bland, neutered and commercialised popular culture in the present day’. Post-Bakhtinian scholarship of Carnival has instead tended to concentrate on historic and geographic specificities of individual events, and to analyse them at the citywide scale at which they were organised. Doing so has helped them better explain the individual carnival’s polysemy and divergent agendas, and discern insights into the social structures and values of the community that hosted them. Academics have also tended to focus on Carnival in relation to periods of significant cultural change: its curtailing during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, or its persistence and reappearance in an industrialising Europe. Others have chosen to concentrate on a single year’s carnival in order

36 Burke, Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe, p.260.
37 Ibid.
to capture its particular complexities, as in the case of Nicholas Scott Baker’s work on the 1513 Florence Carnival, or Lizzie Richardson’s on the cancellation of the 2012 St Paul’s Carnival.\footnote{Baker, ‘Medicean Metamorphoses’; Richardson, ‘Working at the Ambivalence of Race’.}

**Performance and Inversion**

In his study of misrule in medieval England, Humphrey advocated understanding these diverse customs as cases of ‘social inversion’, in which alternatives were presented to otherwise predominant cultural codes, values and norms. He said this captured their central feature but without preloading them with interpretations of what each meant, as well as shedding light on the performative nature of social norms, rather than treating them as prior monolithic structures.\footnote{Humphrey, *Politics of Carnival*, pp. 40–43.} If performance in everyday life was strenuous, if the values individuals publically upheld grated internally, then Carnival and similar festivals offered them an opportunity to misperform without jeopardising their capital; indeed, the communal nature of these occasions made them conducive to accumulating and enhancing social capital. Such occasions were sanctioned by those within the group who had the most to lose in terms of capital (political rulers, clergy, etc.) precisely because they saw them as temporary occurrences that reduced risk of more severe unlicensed transgression. Furthermore, carnival humour’s usage of cultural norms and social structures as referents in inversions that present things as they were known not to be could reduce the possibility of change to a joke, and thereby ultimately reinforce dominant interpretations in the longer term.

However, carnival also highlighted the existence of usually concealed alternative norms, liminal but present, which at anointed times were brought to the fore. This was particularly the case up until the early modern period, when Carnival season was extensive, opportunities for festive inversion myriad, and Carnival contraposed with Lent to signify two poles of human behaviour. Carnival also possesses a simultaneously normative and transgressive position in some contemporary societies, as Gerald Aching has highlighted in relation to Trinidad.\footnote{Gerald Aching, ‘Carnival Time versus Modern Social Life: A False Distinction’, *Social Identities*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (2010), 415–425 (pp. 421–423).} Carnival might thereby have demonstrated the contingency of the political capital possessed by the upper echelons of a group’s hierarchy. Elite performances of power and taxonomies of
cultural capital might have been tolerated in exchange for windows in which the apparently subjugated might take their turn to define what is culturally of worth, wield power and enrich their own social capital (qualitatively and quantitatively). Things did not simply return to ‘normal’ after a carnival, for the competition for power and for the definition of cultural capital was more persistent and carnival therefore offered challengers a valuable opportunity to redefine the definition and allocations of capital more permanently.

For this reason, those in possession of substantial political capital have frequently viewed carnival with mistrust for its capacity to sow disorder. This was particularly strong during the early modern era, when Enlightenment thought interpreted negative outcomes not as God’s will but rather as products of human conspiracy disguised through false performances.\(^\text{44}\) In sixteenth-century England, masking practices were frequently attacked as evasions of God-given identity and self-delusory acts.\(^\text{45}\) James H. Johnson has contextualised the ban on carnivals in France after the revolution, meanwhile, within wider contemporary paranoia over royalists adopting figurative and literal disguises in order to restore the monarchy.\(^\text{46}\) Yet the history of carnival has also been marked by ‘elite’ or ‘establishment’ performances in and through carnival, in ways that have been both hegemonic and inversionary, inclusive and ordered. In early sixteenth-century Florence, for example, the Medici used carnival to legitimise their return to power through evoking a shared culture while adhering to traditional invitations to revelry and messages of renewal.\(^\text{47}\) Similarly, in twenty-first century Britain, local authorities use carnival to project their vision of a post-racial, multicultural community.\(^\text{48}\)

Elite hegemonic carnival performances have been tolerated because individuals and groups who we might perceive as subjugated to varying degrees within existing regimes of valuing and distributing capital have themselves have invested their capital in the status quo. Medicean usage of Florentine Carnival to justify their rule over the city attracted minimal negative contemporary comment, which Baker has attributed to wider hopes their return would help maintain Florence’s independence from foreign rule.\(^\text{49}\) Furthermore, when the ordinary rules governing conduct have been relaxed at Carnival time, the targets of inversion have often been marginalised rather than dominant groups, such as peasantry in late fourteenth-century


\(^{46}\) Johnson, ‘Versailles, Meet Les Halles’.

\(^{47}\) Baker, ‘Medicean Metamorphoses’ (pp. 497–504).

\(^{48}\) Richardson, ‘Working at the Ambivalence of Race’ (p. 717).

\(^{49}\) Baker, ‘Medicean Metamorphoses’ (pp. 502–503).
Nuremberg, Jews in late nineteenth-century Cologne, and women in 1930s Dijon. Common to all the diverse agendas for inversion were a desire for untrammelled agency, whether that be to perform as one wished free from judgement, to demonstrate one’s hidden values and materialise an alternative social structure, to exercise political power and vision without contention, or to attack perennial scapegoats.

**Temporality, Urbanisation and Globalisation**

According to Aching, ‘The foremost obstacle to theorizing carnival…has been the broad acceptance that carnival time and modern social life are mutually exclusive and, by the same token, that carnival invokes a temporality and space in which ideologies may be blissfully suspended.’ Nonetheless, the notion of Carnival’s temporal singularity is important to understanding its development over time. As Samuel Kinser has noted, Carnival emerged within a medieval worldview which regarded human nature as essentially unchanging and conduct as governed by calendrical custom. Over the course of the early modern era, the predominant medieval understanding of time was undermined. Early Protestants often rejected the notion that some days were holier than others, while Catholic reformers challenged the profanation of the Christological year. In Kinser’s words, ‘contemporary, changeable norms of sociopolitically defined orderliness’ supplanted calendrical custom as defining codes of conduct during festive occasions. Opportunities for performing alternative cultural capital thus became politically constrained, with newly dominant ideas of time as linear rather than circular and of humanity as capable of progress dictating that more time be given over to the deliberate accumulation and demonstration of capital. Furthermore, concentration of growing numbers of people in towns and cities broke their economic connection to the natural year, which predated and reinforced the Christological one, and thereby reduced calendrical periods of economic inactivity that provided opportunities for inversion, supplanting them with allocation of more regular pockets of more sharply defined leisure time.

50 Kinser, ‘Presentation and Representation’ (pp. 7–8); Spencer, ‘Adapting Festive Practices’ (p. 646); Whalen, ‘The Return of Crazy Mother’ (p. 485).
51 Aching, ‘Carnival Time versus Modern Social Life’ (p. 415).
52 Kinser, ‘Presentation and Representation’ (p. 23).
54 Kinser, ‘Presentation and Representation’ (p. 424).
Yet carnival itself was always a form of urbanisation. Since the middle ages, it has encouraged congregation in cities’ main squares and streets, and with it cultural engagement and transformation, while themes of civic pride and independence were frequently invoked. Dylan Reid’s study of carnival in sixteenth-century Rouen emphasised its basis ‘in the urban activities of craft, commerce, administration, and organization through highly developed communal structures’. Carnival has emerged as a facet of urbanisation in later periods too, as in the cases of Buenos Aires and Montevideo in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indeed, carnival’s envisagement as a public, urban phenomenon is one of its most enduring facets. However, it has also functioned as a negotiation of urbanisation, a ludic rejection of or engagement with the civilising process and reaffirmation of the ritual year. For newcomers to the city, or for the citizenry in general during periods of rapid urban change, it may have thus served as bulwark against alienation, promising them familiarity and staking a claim for their collective ownership of urban space and for a place for their values and heritage in urban culture. Carnival has also been affected by a further aspect of urbanisation: commercialisation, arising from the opportunities for attainment of economic capital through trade due to greater concentration of potential patrons. Commercial leisure providers have occupied an increasingly central role in providing carnival entertainments, as with theatres in early-twentieth century Buenos Aires, or professional musicians in contemporary Brazil. Carnival’s emphasis on spectacle has also been well-suited to turning the city itself into a form of objected cultural capital to be monetised, through the advent of the modern tourist industry.

The geography of carnival might also be read as part of a long-term process in which western Europe developed a common Catholic culture (including its Christological ritual year), which though subsequently curtailed, diluted and fragmented, was simultaneously exported to and became dominant across much of the Americas, surviving the collapse of the French, Portuguese and Spanish Empires. Carnival’s subsequent continuation on both sides of the Atlantic is testament to the continued influence of that culture on a global scale in the modern era. This spread is, without question, illustrative of how time-space compression affects the geographies of value systems. Carnival’s place in the development of modern international

55 Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, p. 261; Carroll, ‘Carnival Rites’ (p. 491); Baker, ‘Medicean Metamorphoses’ (pp. 491–494).
56 Reid, ‘Carnival in Rouen’ (pp. 1053–1054). Literature was also a facet of later carnivals, such as those in nineteenth century Cologne, for which newspapers were printed. Brophy, ‘Carnival and Citizenship’ (pp. 879–880).
tourism, moreover, has resulted in new audiences for these performances of cultural capital, tailored to maximise the economic capital they can generate, within an increasingly globalised ritual year. Yet this narrative overlooks the extent to which specific histories of individual carnivals and the performances undertaken during them have also been shaped by local contexts, including variations in socioeconomic composition, ethnic and race relations, cultural preferences and norms, religious adherences, political tensions, built environment and climatic conditions. Carnivals have thus always been hybridised: a model for repeated, ritual social inversion whose proliferation owed to interlinked European and later global trends, but whose particular meanings and forms were largely decided by the local urban populations who opted to hold them.

THE HISTORY OF LONDON’S SUBURBS

Defining the Suburb

The words ‘suburb’, ‘suburbia’, ‘suburban’, ‘suburbanisation’ and ‘suburbanite’ defy easy definition. In 1973, sociologist David C Thorns characterised suburbs as located on the outskirts of, but remaining part of, the city, with an urban geography intermediate between town and country, and dependent upon urban centres for employment, goods and services.59 Building on this model a quarter of a century later, historian Mark Clapson also stressed that suburbs could vary significantly vary in facets such as of size, distance from town centres and social composition.60 More recently, Ruth McManus and Philip J. Ethington classified suburbs as possessing, at least initially, a peripheral location; as having a functional dependence upon the urban core, but also an ideological connection with the countryside; as comparatively low-density and dominated by single-family dwellings with gardens; and as marked by social segregation. Significantly, they also noted that suburbs were related to particular types of cultural formations, which some have positively interpreted as a utopian ideal ‘middle landscape’ and private romantic paradise, whereas others have more negatively branded

suburbia as a dystopian, sprawling, vacuous aesthetic wasteland, anti-intellectual and intolerant.61 Other analyses have posited suburbia as a hybrid of tradition and modernity: Roger Silverstone, for example, emphasised this dimension to both suburban physical geography and culture.62

The problem with seeking to essentialise the suburb is doing so often leads to conflating spatial, economic, social and cultural dimensions that have frequently converged in districts labelled suburban, but which are not universally bound together, with there being numerous examples of districts where some characteristics listed above are present but others not. If ‘suburb’ is intended to denote districts on the periphery of and economically dependent upon an urban core, then it cannot be stretched to include the ‘edge cities’ of America, described by Joel Garreau, which comprised a relocation of sites of residence, consumption and production away from traditional cities; nor can it describe Britain’s post-war ‘new towns’, which also bear these hallmarks.63 Similarly, if one uses suburban as a euphemism for ‘white middle-class’, then it cannot incorporate some of the impoverished, mostly non-white neighbourhoods surrounding modern Los Angeles or Paris.64

I define suburbanisation as the supplanting of radial, self-contained, compact cities, predominant until the nineteenth century, by lower density, centred settlement forms, due to the flow of populations from agriculture into productive and service sector occupations, advancements in transport and communication, and diverse agendas of businesses, government and residents. Using this terminology to characterise spatial qualities avoids preloading it with meanings about its social or cultural composition, both of which have been historically and geographically heterogeneous. However, within more specific contexts, suburbanisation has been bound up intrinsically with particular social and cultural trends and groups. By the suburbanisation of London, I refer therefore to the process by which, between the mid-nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries, the growth of London’s built-up area outpaced that of
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its population, and its citizenry and (to a lesser extent) industry became far less densely and more distantly distributed.

The Suburbanisation of London

In 1851, the population of London’s metropolitan area (as defined in contemporary London weekly tables of mortality) was 2,362,236 – 146.4% higher than half a century earlier. This growth occurred in the wake of the industrial revolution, which had rapidly accelerated the rate and unevenly increased the spatial scale of manufacturing; of increasing agricultural productivity, which along with population growth had created a surplus of labour in rural areas; and of Britain’s ascent to the position of the world’s foremost imperial and trading power, aided by advancements in sea travel, expanding demand for its output – all of which encouraged the urban agglomeration of people, workplaces, goods and capital. As Michael Ball and David Sunderland have noted, as the country’s largest consumer market and possessing specialisms in numerous industries, London was well placed to take advantage of these trends, especially following the construction of new docks along the Thames from the 1800s, and the incursion of new railway networks from the 1840s.

Much of London’s population growth had been packed into the city’s existing built-up area: 65.9% of its 1851 population lived in just 9.8% of the entire metropolitan area, at densities of over a hundred residents to the acre. Thereafter, however, London’s built-up area began to extend more rapidly and its citizenry to diffuse more widely. Populations in the innermost districts began to fall and, despite agricultural depression in the 1870s fuelling a new wave of rural depopulation, new arrivals were offset by existing residents departing for more outlying parts of the capital. In 1901, the population of the County of London reached a peak of
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65 GRO, Census of Great Britain, 1851. Population Tables. I. Numbers of the Inhabitants in the Years 1801, 1811, 1821, 1831, 1841, & 1851. Vol. I. (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1852), div. i, p. 2. The longer-term rate of London’s population growth is given in Figure 1 in the Appendix.
4,536,541, yet by this stage, just 34.9% of its residents lived in a metropolitan borough with more than a hundred people to the acre.69

London and its population also poured rapidly beyond the recognised metropolitan area into the Outer Ring from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. By 1901, the Outer Ring had a population of 2,045,135 – almost five-and-a-half times its 1851 level.70 Growth was particularly strong to the east and north: Middlesex UDs from Finchley eastwards and Outer Ring Essex together accounted for just 27.6% of the Outer Ring’s area, but 53.9% of its 1901 population.71 A number of factors made this dispersal possible. Construction of new railway lines and stations and improvements to existing services, complemented by the early twentieth-century rollout of electric trams and motorbuses, facilitated commuting between the city centre and suburbs. Breakup of country estates amid the agricultural depression ensured a supply of affordable peri-urban land, which was acquired and developed during a series of speculative building booms. Commercial expansion in London’s innermost districts, meanwhile, served as a centrifugal force.72

Between 1901 and 1911, the population of the County of London decreased marginally for the first time, although there were still significant increases within the more suburban boroughs in the south and west. The number of inhabitants of the Outer Ring, by contrast, grew by a further 33.5% during this decade, with the direction of suburban growth shifting slightly further westwards, Middlesex accounting for 48.8% of the Outer Ring’s absolute population increase.73 By 1911, the population of Greater London stood at 7,251,358, meaning 16.0% of all residents of Great Britain and Ireland now lived there, including 6.0% in the Outer Ring alone.74 Nonetheless, London’s suburban extension remained uneven, with large swathes of

70 GRO, Census of England & Wales 1921. County of London. Tables (Part I) (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1922), p. 1. Figure 2 in the Appendix provides a more detailed picture of population growth rates in suburban Middlesex and Essex compared to the rest of the Outer Ring.
the surrounding countryside still untouched and suburban developments interspersed with rural land. After the First World War, suburbanisation spread to previously rural parts of the Outer Ring in west Middlesex, Surrey and Kent, but the shift towards even lower density, semi-detached housing meant that, whereas Greater London’s population rose by only 16.6% between 1921 and 1939, the extent of its built environment doubled between the wars.75

*The Historiography of Suburban London*

Historical study of British suburbs remains relatively undeveloped, especially in comparison with the richness and diversity of existing scholarship on American suburbs, encapsulated in Kevin M. Kruse and Thomas J. Sugrue’s edited volume, *The New Suburban History*.76 Two key strands are notable within the British historiography. One is the study of the construction and inhabitation of suburbs individually and collectively; with particular focus on the role of developers, transport providers and local authorities.77 The other prominent trend is the study of fictional representations of suburbia, primarily by literary studies scholars.78 While these bodies of work provide valuable insights into how the suburbs emerged and were depicted, their predominance within suburban scholarship has denied suburbanites themselves agency, emphasising how they were housed and viewed rather than what they did and thought for themselves. Nonetheless, since the 1990s, a number of scholars have undertaken valuable work on the experiences and enthusiasms of people who have lived in Britain’s suburbs during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. These include Mark Clapson, whose research into twentieth-century suburbs and new towns has explored residents’ reactions to and lifestyles within their new environments; David Gilbert and John Law on suburban modernity, in relation
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to sport and motoring respectively; Rebecca Preston on suburban gardening; Christopher French on the social composition and associational life of Victorian Surbiton; and Geraldine Biddle-Perry on leisure and fashion in suburban London at the turn of the twentieth century.79

There remain, however, a number of themes of suburban life that have hitherto little explored, and potential sources that have been similarly neglected. There is certainly scope for using census data and returns and directories to get a clearer picture of suburban London’s residential make-up in all its diversity, touching on issues such as people’s migratory pathways into the suburbs; the range of occupational groups who resided there, including those working within burgeoning suburban economies; and family structure and lifecycles. Local archives and newspapers contain a welter of untapped information as to suburban associational culture, the activities it pertained, and the encounters it facilitated. Finally, with some exceptions, suburban history has tended to be written as local rather than national history, despite the pervasiveness of suburbanisation across Britain since the nineteenth century, and its pertinence to a number of the most studied themes in modern British history, such as identity, modernity, class, and gender.80 This last shortcoming in particular reflects the somewhat tangential place the suburbs possess within the national imagination (particularly in transatlantic comparison), and in the broader historiography.

---


London’s spatial reordering reflected Britain’s economic advancement. Early industrialisation and long-term leadership in international trade resulted in the expansion of the country’s service sector, while its agricultural sector shrank in the face of cheap food imports. This led to the aforementioned spread of business premises within central London, availability of space in the city’s hinterland for suburban development, and the growth of the lower middle class. Geoffrey Crossick has calculated that the share of adult men in paid employment who worked in white collar roles rose from 2.5% in 1851 to 7.1% by 1911, with concentration particularly high in London.\(^81\) Their relative prosperity meant they could afford better quality accommodation in the suburbs and to travel back into London for work. By 1921, 42.1% of people working in the City of London lived in Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Surrey or Kent, as did 24.4% employed in Westminster.\(^82\)

However, occupational composition varied from suburb to suburb: commercial clerks, for example, were particularly predominant in late Victorian suburbs to the east and north-east, whereas Edwardian suburban expansion further west tended to attract wealthier professionals, merchants and bankers. Within any individual suburb, furthermore, a variety of occupational groups might be substantially represented, including large minorities or even majorities working locally or elsewhere in their county. Much of this employment was in the service sector or in production for local consumption. However, districts that became partly suburbanised also often retained significant agricultural sectors.\(^83\) Moreover, some large scale industries relocated to districts outside London, encouraging working class migration there, as in the case of West Ham and Enfield.\(^84\)

---


\(^82\) GRO, *Census of England & Wales 1921. Workplaces* (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1925), pp. 11–12, 86, 95. These are the earliest workplace location information provided by the census.


Suburbs have often been characterised as the spatial manifestation of Victorian ideas about separate spheres: the city as place of male work, the suburb as site of female confinement. It is true that the more solidly lower middle-class or middle-class suburbs of Edwardian London tended to have higher female populations (even excluding domestic servants) than the national average, and fewer women in work, reflecting the relative affluence of their inhabitants and taboos around female paid employment. Yet suburbs were also locations of paid employment for men and women alike, while by 1911 rising employment in white collar occupations was also observable among its female residents. Moreover, rather than old-fashioned, suburbs were also sites where lower middle-class couples piloted what would eventually become national trends towards smaller family sizes (out of concern for children’s health and well-being) and more companionate marriages.

Suburban Life and Leisure

While suburban populations grew, so too did the pile of increasingly vitriolic and condescending attacks on them by writers and intellectuals, who resented both the despoliation of the countryside through suburbanisation, and suburbanites’ perceived materialism, pettiness and lack of taste. In 1905, one of its bitterest critics, author Thomas Crosland, described suburbia as:

…a country wherein nothing is, save villas; where no bird sings excepting in front-windows; where the principal objects of cultivation are the stunted cabbage and the bedraggled geranium…and the principal population appears to consist of milkmen, postmen, bus-guards, scavengers, butchers’ boys, nursemaids, drapers’ assistants (male and female), policemen, railway-porters, Methodist ministers, and sluttish little girls who clean doorsteps.
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Liberal MP Charles Masterman painted a kinder picture of ‘the Suburbs’ in his 1909 book *The Condition of England*, but nonetheless remarked: ‘It is a wrong estimate of the significance of rank, of birth, of wealth, of various material accumulations – which produces the more desolating ingredients of suburban life.’ Unfortunately, some historians have reiterated these crude stereotypes. F. M. L. Thompson, for example, described suburbia as ‘an unlovely, sprawling artefact of which few are fond’. More recently, Tristram Hunt called London’s suburbs ‘a planning phenomenon and social movement instinctively hostile to the precepts of Victorian civic pride…their very design thwarted the public life of urban man; there was no civic space, no agora for political or economic debate’.

Hunt’s characterisation of suburbanisation as anti-urban – a withdrawal from community and engagement in public spaces in favour of domestic privatism and consumerism – is a common misconception. Historically, urbanisation has arisen from quests for freedoms, whether from persecution and bondage, or of trade, assembly and speech; but arising simultaneously from this has been a quest for order and collective responsibility to ensure certain freedoms are maintained, even if it means curtailing others. Suburbanisation comprised an evolution of this dynamic tension, whereby citizens sought freedom from overcrowding and poor sanitation, but also to continue to access urban jobs and amenities; they sought freedom to associate, but with whom and when they wanted to. It was the product of free market capitalism, of private developers and railway companies, yet these same agents could also, through the types of houses they built, or fares they offered, keep suburbs free from perceived undesirables. The result was not a site barren of social and cultural capital, a charge often levelled against it, but one where suburbanites could define and attain both on their own terms, albeit in dialogue with others – from marketers to hostile public intellectuals – who circulated competing visions of suburbia.

As Christopher French has argued, indices used to measure community in traditional working-class neighbourhoods, such as residential persistence, kin relations, closeness of residence and workplace, and patterns of marriage, are ill-suited to measuring it in the suburbs, where life has so often been organised around associational culture instead. One need only to look at a suburban directory or newspaper from the early twentieth century to find a plethora of voluntary organisations of varying hues through which residents could obtain social capital.
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as they defined it, by associating with those who they thought it worth associating with. Existing studies have demonstrated how golf clubs, cycling clubs, educational institutions and professional societies, to give a few examples, supplied suburbanites with opportunities for interaction on the basis of shared interests. That is not to deny that such organisations could practice implicit or active exclusion on class or gender grounds, but then groups with high levels of social capital (as they define it) often seek to safeguard it by denying entry to perceived outsiders and more traditional, geographically bounded communities were frequently far from inclusive themselves, as K. D. M. Snell has demonstrated.

Associational culture, as well as more private or informal forms of leisure and consumption, were also demonstrative of suburbanites’ cultural capital, whose currency was thoroughly national. In the narrowest sense, this involved expressing patriotic and imperialist sentiments. More broadly though, it entailed reading national newspapers, playing sports codified by national bodies, attending national churches, and buying products sold nationwide. *Rus in urbe*, promised in advertising, experienced through activities like gardening and rambling, was a version of the broader contemporary celebration of the southern countryside, which according to Alun Howkins, had come to stand for England itself and to embody continuity, community and harmony. On this new suburban stage, nationhood was a play all cast members could perform, despite their unfamiliarity with their co-actors, and so was thus particularly convertible into social capital. Despite the amount of economic and political capital invested from beyond the suburbs in promoting this national culture, this was no mere top-down imposition, for suburbanites demonstrated agency too, from working to attain the economic capital necessary to buy into it, to interpreting the performances of it by those external agents and how to perform it themselves, to using it as a means of building new local communities.

---


THESIS OBJECTIVES, SOURCES AND STRUCTURE

Thesis Objectives

The Ilford Carnival sat at the intersection of the histories of carnival and suburbanisation, which share a number of parallels. Both are dimensions of urbanisation, spatial phenomena whose historic occurrences and configurations were shaped through accelerations of action in and accompanying reorganisation of time. Both arose from quests for particular liberties, though both also faced and contained constraining forces. For participants, both entailed performances of their cultural capital in search of social (and sometimes economic) capital. A study of a suburban carnival, therefore, offers an opportunity to gauge both how carnival manifested in this latest version of urban built environment and society, and how residents of suburbia used this longstanding cultural form to pursue their contemporary agendas.

Within the context of the historiography of carnival, I believe my thesis makes a valuable contribution by supplementing a growing body of work exploring this form’s significance in modern and contemporary society. In particular, it draws attention to the themes of urban change and globalisation often implicit in carnival’s history, by exploring its manifestation in a new urban form and, in Britain, a country from which it had long been absent. In relation to suburban history it similarly adds to the growing body of work on suburban leisure and culture. However, through the prism of carnival’s millennium-long history, it also offers an opportunity for considering suburbanisation itself as a process and how it relates to long-term trends in the histories of economics, temporality, spatiality and liberalism, as well as to discuss the history of suburban charity and welfare.

I utilise the Ilford Carnival to provide an insight into how different organisations and social groups within a suburb came together in a particular performance of community, and how the suburb existed and evolved as a community through recurring events such as this. My thesis argues that the carnival’s administrative body, and other organisations involved, provided delimited opportunities for inclusion and social capital attainment among a range of groups, while building on an existing culture of voluntary action as an end unto itself. This occurred within a geographically broader array of networks with whom residents engaged.
through the carnival, revealing and convening wider suburban, metropolitan, and national communities.

My thesis also demonstrates the continued relevance of carnival, originating in the premodern ritual year, within a physical manifestation of the work-leisure demarcation imbued with various ideals and practices of modernity. In the wake of Ilford’s drastic expansion, the carnival’s annual recurrence provided reassuring familiarity, and an opportunity for inversionary performances without jeopardising accumulation of social capital. Carnival also provided an opportunity for monetisation, both for commercial interests through advertising and media coverage, but also for the organisers who mimicked commercial entertainment models to raise funds for the hospital, while operating within a competitive metropolitan market for people’s spare time and money.

The thesis furthermore illustrates that the procession functioned as a suburban public sphere – a continued opportunity to congregate en masse – and that performances throughout operated between poles of artifice and sincerity, with dominant ideals about national and imperial identity, the international situation, or class and gender roles, projected through acts of dressing up as fictional or historical figures, while such ideals were inverted on one level and upheld on the other through practices like crossdressing and blackface. Suburban history is national history, and global history. The suburb was an outcome of developments at those two geographic levels; it was also a place where nation and world were imagined, and national and global cultural forms consumed and negotiated. The suburb too was reimagined through carnival, as both rural idyll and metropolitan tourist attraction. My thesis reveals how suburban life’s complexities and contradictions were played out in similarly ambiguous performances on carnival day and more generally.

**Sources and Methodology**

The main primary sources I use in my thesis are Ilford’s two main local newspapers, *The Ilford Guardian* and *The Ilford Recorder*. These provided in-depth accounts of the carnival’s organisation, including details of committee meetings, news about organisations taking part, and updates on fundraising. Both supplied complete carnival programmes, including the names of contributing individuals and organisations, and of their entries in the procession, as well as photographs of some of them. I have analysed these in detail for the base years 1905, 1908,
1911 and 1914, to get a sense of how the procession’s content changed over time, although I also refer to entries from other years where relevant. The *Ilford Guardian* also provided names of committee members for every year save 1914 and so I have analysed the composition of the committees for the years 1905, 1908, 1911 and 1913, including crosschecking the 1905 and 1911 committees against census returns in order to gauge details such as their occupations, familial situations and migratory histories. Furthermore, it listed the ward and final procession routes up until 1909, and the final procession routes thereafter, and I have plotted the 1905, 1907 and 1909 onto contemporary OS maps so as to discern which portions of the district were covered and how this changed over time.

The *Ilford Guardian* and *Ilford Recorder*’s coverage of the Ilford Carnival also provides insight into debates around the event. The *Guardian*’s proprietor Walter A. Locks and the *Recorder*’s editor Ethelbert E. Fyson both held senior positions within the carnival’s administration, so the two publications’ commentary would have been informed by discussions among committee members. Moreover, the newspapers published direct communications and comments from other leading organisers, and readers’ correspondence regarding the carnivals, as well as sometimes themselves disparaging rumours and criticisms allegedly being voiced locally. While this analytical approach might appear to privilege some voices over others, local press narratives did echo ideas expressed in the processions, suggesting they were in many ways representative of local public opinion. I have also examined reports on the carnival in other local newspapers from neighbouring districts, as well as national newspapers, in order to discern the carnival’s impact and reputation beyond Ilford, as well as viewing film footage of the carnival itself from 1911.

In order to find out how representative or distinctive the Ilford Carnival was, I sought to contextualise it in relation to other carnivals held in Britain during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. I drew particularly detailed comparison with carnivals that took place in three other suburbs of north and east London, again gathering information on them from the

95 *Ilford Guardian* (14 Jul 1905; 17 Jul 1908; 14 Jul 1911; 17 Jul 1914). All information regarding carnival items for these years is drawn from these newspaper articles, unless otherwise cited.

96 *Ilford Guardian* (14 Jul 1905; 17 Jul 1908; 14 Jul 1911; 18 Jul 1913). The 1905 and 1911 were crosschecked against 1871–1911 census returns using the online genealogy resource *Find My Past* <http://findmypast.co.uk> (Accessed Jun 2011 and Apr 2012 respectively). All details as to committee members are derived from these sources unless otherwise cited.

97 *Ilford Guardian* (7 Jul 1905; 19 Jul 1907; 9 Jul 1909). These were crosschecked against the 1920 OS map of Ilford, obtained through the mapping database *Digimap* <http://digimap.edina.ac.uk/> (Accessed Oct 2012). All details as to procession routes are derived from here unless otherwise cited.

98 Fyson was for several years the carnival’s honorary secretary, while Locks was ward organiser for Loxford.

local press: Enfield, which hosted a number of separate carnivals at different times between 1890 and 1914; Tottenham, which had a hospital carnival between 1898 and 1904 and then from 1909 to 1913; and Finchley, which also intermittently held a hospital carnival between 1905 and 1914. In addition to this, I visited London’s various local borough archives, looking through their files on festivals, generally containing a combination of press cuttings and paraphernalia such as programmes and flyers, in order to gain an impression of carnival’s wider proliferation across the capital between the 1870s and the 1930s.\textsuperscript{100} I subsequently used the BNA to look for newspaper coverage of carnivals across Britain more generally, as well as to examine the meanings invested in the word ‘carnival’ more generally in press discourse.\textsuperscript{101}

I also used a range of other primary sources to contextualise the Ilford Carnival within the broader history of both Ilford and suburban London more widely. Census records, for example, supplied a wealth of detail in relation to population sizes, age, sex and occupational compositions, birthplaces and workplaces, to give but a few examples, while Registrar General’s reports supplied information as to birth rates. Directories were an important source of information as to Ilford’s and other districts’ local government, business community and other assorted organisations. OS maps enabled me to examine how Ilford’s built environment changed over time. Local guides and memoirs offered insights into how Ilford and other suburbs were viewed and portrayed by their local authorities and residents.

\textit{Thesis Structure}

The remainder of this thesis is broken down into four parts, containing ten chapters between them. Part I examines the contexts of the Ilford Carnival. Chapter One tackles the history of carnival in Britain through to the 1930s. It outlines briefly the history and historiography of British leisure, before examining how carnival was discussed in nineteenth

\textsuperscript{100} Over the duration of 2009, I visited: Barnet Local Studies Centre; Bexley Local Studies and Archives Centre; Brent Archives; Bromley Local Studies and Archive; Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre; Croydon Local Studies Library; City of Westminster Archives Centre; Ealing Local History Centre; Enfield Local History Unit; Greenwich Heritage Centre; Hackney Archives; Hammersmith & Fulham Archives and Local Studies Centre; Haringey Archive; Harrow Local History Collection; Hillingdon Local Studies, Archives and Museum Service; Hounslow Local Studies; Islington Local History Centre; Kensington & Chelsea Local Studies; Lambeth Archives; London Metropolitan Archives; Merton Local Studies Centre; Newham Archives and Local History Centre; Redbridge Local Studies and Archive; Richmond-upon-Thames Local Studies and Special Collections; Southwark Local History Library; Sutton Local Studies; Tower Hamlets Local History Library and Archives; Waltham Forest Archives; and Wandsworth Heritage Centre.

\textsuperscript{101} BNA. \texttt{<http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/>} (Accessed Feb–Apr 2014).
and early twentieth century Britain, both as an abstract concept and as an actual event, and considering the key themes of ritual, revelry and spectacle within this discourse. Chapter Two focuses on the history of modern Ilford. It firstly details its development from village to populous suburb, before analysing its residential composition in terms of places of origin, occupation, gender, family size and age.

Part II then moves onto the anatomy of the Ilford Carnival movement. Chapter Three examines its organisational geography. It discusses the continued importance of locality in early twentieth-century Britain, before examining how the Ilford Carnival’s ward committees illustrated how locality determined parameters of administration and variations in participation, thereafter discussing the assortment of local organisations that contributed to the Ilford Carnival, and the broader networks of networks of communication that disseminated information about carnivals in Ilford, and how these encouraged wider attendance of and involvement in the processions. Chapter Four takes a more detailed look at how the carnival committees operated and at the makeup of their membership, including their migratory histories, and their occupational, gender and age balance.

Part III is concerned with the carnival’s different dimensions. Chapter Five considers its voluntary and charitable elements. It begins by outlining the proliferation of hospitals across Britain generally and the suburbs specifically from the mid-nineteenth century. Thereafter, it supplies a detailed analysis of the Ilford Carnival’s fundraising history, analysing the strengths and weaknesses of its fundraising model, before examining the cultures of charitable and voluntary activity that fuelled support for hospitals, and how carnivals functioned as a conduit between local community and hospital. Chapter Six discusses carnival as a spectacle and inversionary performance. It debates the relationship between artifice and sincerity involved in dressing up, the carnival’s adaptations from other cultural forms, and how potentially transgressive elements were negociated, before considering how the carnival was commodified through media coverage and business advertising. Chapter Seven then examines the temporalities of the Ilford Carnival, including its roles as a space where modernity and tradition could be negotiated, and as a recurring ritual through which meaning was brought to suburban time, as well as its relationship with the broader metropolitan organisation of work and leisure time.

Finally, Part IV of the thesis is on the performance of identities through the carnival. Chapter Eight is concerned with local, suburban and class identities. It looks at how these were projected through both procession items and wider discussions around the carnival, and how local rivalries were fought through them, before considering the procession route itself as an
interpretation of local place. Chapter Nine focuses on gendered national, imperial and racial identities, beginning by discussing how these were expressed in Edwardian Britain more generally and in relation to the suburb, before highlighting how patriotic and imperialist sentiments were performed in the procession, and how these related to gender, local identity and the suburban public sphere, as well as how national, racial and gender identities were inverted through blackface and crossdressing.
PART I

CONTEXTS OF THE CARNIVAL
CHAPTER ONE
DEFINITIONS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ‘CARNIVAL’ IN MODERN BRITAIN

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contextualises the Ilford Carnival by demonstrating the resonances of carnival as an abstract idea and its configurations as an actual event within contemporary Britain more broadly. It firstly outlines the development of leisure in Britain through to the 1930s, discussing changes in its temporal organisation, clashes over its appropriate usage, its increased commercialisation, and its place within a broader international context. It then explains how, within this setting, media and advertisers used the term ‘carnival’ to connote particular qualities in describing British occasions and leisure practices, and how charitable events formally called carnivals subsequently proliferated across the country (with particular reference to their proliferation through London). Finally, the chapter examines in greater detail the evocation of ritual and revelry in the abstraction of carnival. Its findings are drawn primarily from newspapers on the BNA, supplemented with details from carnival programmes contained in London borough archives and from London newspapers.

The chapter also seeks to challenge the fragmentation of the history of British popular culture and recreation. Since historians began treating this as a subject worthy of serious scrutiny in the 1970s, the body of work written on this subject has expanded exponentially. Searching the online Bibliography of British and Irish History for publications on leisure and sport or popular culture in Britain from 1800 to the present results in 1,780 hits for period from 2010 to 2015 alone. Yet the vast majority of these studies focus on one particular cultural form: sport (or individual sports); film; music; theatre; tourism; and so on. By contrast, studies examining particular themes across popular cultural and recreational formats remain

comparatively scarce, with the exception of significant recent works by the likes of Brad Beaven, Hugh Cunningham and Bob Snape.\textsuperscript{103} This chapter – and this thesis more broadly – strives to demonstrate the value of the latter approach by highlighting the porousness of borders between different leisure forms and their operation within a conceptual framework united by shared imperatives and lexicon.

\section*{THE MAKING OF MODERN BRITISH LEISURE}

\textit{The Temporality of British Leisure}

While carnival itself was absent from the medieval and early modern British Isles, play was arranged there around a ritual year as on the continent. Opportunities for inversion and amusement, such as the crowning of mock kings and boy bishops, were ostensibly sanctioned through religious custom, occurring during Christmas, Candlemas, Easter and St George’s Day, for example, but were also frequently bound up with progress through the natural year and its economic rhythms, as with ‘Plough Monday’ in January, and with pre-Christian rites as with Midsummer.\textsuperscript{104} Following England’s break with Rome, reformers sought to purge worship of its perceived Catholic excesses and the popular rituals that accompanied it, aided by elite fears of popular disorder, although periods of repression such as the reign of Edward VI and the Interregnum were followed by negotiated partial reversals.\textsuperscript{105} Moreover as David Cressy has noted, while the Christian calendar was significantly pared down during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, anniversaries of relatively recent national events such as

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{104} For fuller discussions of the medieval and early modern ritual year, see Clifford Davidson, \textit{Festivals and Plays in Late Medieval Britain} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Ronald Hutton, \textit{The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year 1400–1700} (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Ronald Hutton, \textit{The Stations of the Sun: A History of the Ritual Year in Britain} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
\item\textsuperscript{105} Hutton, \textit{Rise and Fall}, pp. 260–262.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
the coronation of Elizabeth I and the Gunpowder Plot, which celebrated Protestantism and Protestant monarch supplanted it in supplying opportunities for celebration.\textsuperscript{106} The Industrial Revolution wrought further change, bringing more people into towns and cities to work longer, more strictly enforced hours. Through a combination of government and trade union action, these hours were scaled down, providing more time for leisure, including a weekly half-holiday. Yet alongside smaller, more frequent bouts of spare time organised around the working week, customary annual opportunities for leisure such as fairs and wakes remained popular, although the government slowly enforced a more nationally standardised holiday calendar following the 1871 Bank Holiday Act.\textsuperscript{107} Christmas in particular enjoyed revived popularity.\textsuperscript{108} As Ronald Hutton has stated, with economic change reducing the vast majority of the population’s contact with farming and its rhythms, so the centre of the ritual year shifted from rural communities and seasonal change to celebration of private relationships and the lifecycle.\textsuperscript{109}

\begin{center}
\textit{Revelry and Restraint}
\end{center}

Hugh Cunningham has argued that capitalism and Christianity together instilled the people of modern England with a stronger sense of the importance of time.\textsuperscript{110} This, combined with broader fears of public unrest, fuelled a strong mistrust of popular recreations among the authorities for much of the nineteenth century as wasteful or even potentially seditious. Fairs, for example, were frequently banned, or curtailed in the length of time they ran for, the amount

\textsuperscript{110} Cunningham, \textit{Time, Work and Leisure}, p. 199.
of space they took up, and the activities they included. As Douglas A. Reid has noted in the case of Birmingham, however, the reform of popular culture during the nineteenth century also owed much to the support of sections of the working class committed to self-improvement. The gospel of respectability, which also possessed strong middle-class appeal, encouraged attainment of cultural capital and appropriate performance in order to maintain and build social and economic capital.

Yet its appeal was far from universal: as Mike Huggins has demonstrated, many middle-class men actively eschewed it, while people of all classes attended horse-racing meets. Furthermore, by the late nineteenth century, attitudes to leisure time had relaxed somewhat, and while debates as to its appropriate uses persisted, particularly in relation to the perceived temptations of the Victorian city, the rise of associational culture – with its boundaries to admission, collective middle-class engagement, and mutual vigilance – helped allay concerns. For example, Dominic Erdozain has argued that churches and other Christian organisations embraced the intrinsic benefits of physical activity in what was tantamount to secularisation from within. Even after the First World War, anxieties were voiced over popular cultural forms such as cinema and professional football, but spare time was now often posited as a positive opportunity in discourse bound up with democratic ideas of citizenship.

The campaign for universal access to holidays with pay, which in 1938 entered the statute book, demonstrated the press and politicians’ increasing acceptance that the working class had the same right to a privilege their middle-class counterparts had long enjoyed, as well as their recognition of the benefits of recreation.

111 Alexander, St Giles’s Fair, pp. 10–11; Cunningham, ‘Metropolitan Fairs’, p. 168.
112 Reid, ‘Interpreting the Festive Calendar’, p. 132.
Commerce and Spectacle

Changes in the temporal organisation of and attitudes towards leisure were also closely linked to its increasing commercialisation. This process was underway as early as the sixteenth century, as Angela Schattner’s work has shown, but during the nineteenth century eventual reductions of working hours, growing urbanisation and rising real wages facilitated its acceleration. Purpose-built enclosed venues were constructed to ensure the monetisation of different sporting entertainments, for example. Commercial leisure providers adeptly tailored their products to the new cycle of work and leisure. Peter Bailey described the weekly publication of the popular periodical *Ally Sloper’s Half Holiday* as ‘a kind of portion control of pleasure in which appetites are stimulated and contained in a half-way house between instant and deferred gratification’. Luke McKernan, meanwhile, has shown how London’s earliest cinemas used ‘continuous show’ programmes that tapped into passing trade by enabling people to attend when they wanted and were able to. Commercial providers also, however, capitalised on the continuing resonance of the ritual year, as in the case of organisers of sporting events during traditional holidays, or retailers during Christmas. Commercial expansion continued after the First World War, with growth in a number of different leisure sectors and proliferation of venues such as cinemas, dancehalls, sports stadia and holiday resorts. Moreover, within this increasingly competitive marketplace, providers sought to add value to their offering by integrating other leisure forms into it. Public houses, retailers, music halls and holiday resorts all sought to capitalise on the late Victorian and Edwardian vogue for sport, for example.

120 Bailey, *Popular Culture and Performance*, p. 75.
British Leisure in Its International Context

The narratives outlined above bear strong comparisons with the themes I highlighted within the global history of carnival in the Introduction. As in continental Europe, the ritual year in Britain was significantly pared down through early modern religious reform, and yet retained its significance following industrialisation. Its annual revels often prompted fears of disorder, and were subjected to externally and internally driven reforms. As with European carnivals, British popular festivals were frequently commercialised by a leisure industry capable of exploiting the ritual year as well as more regular periods of spare time.

A further commonality is the theme of globalisation itself. Despite the uniqueness of its early modern calendrical reforms, the ritual year in nineteenth and twentieth-century Britain still bore testament to its shared Christian heritage. Furthermore, its privileged place within imperial and international trade and communication networks ensured it imported and exported cultural products and influences as well, driven by the expansion of its own cultural industries, as a number of studies have illustrated. Jack Zipes, for example, has demonstrated how continental European oral folktales adapted into children’s literature between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries were translated into English and published in Britain during the early nineteenth century. Brenda Assael, meanwhile, has highlighted how restaurant cuisine in late Victorian and Edwardian London became increasingly hybridised amid the influence of foreign-born owners and cooks. Americanisation was also a growing influence: this had been visible in the mid-nineteenth century with the arrival of minstrelsy in different parts of the British Empire, while from the late Victorian period it was also visible in the field of musical theatre, and in the popularity of the Buffalo Bill’s Wild West Tours in Britain. This influence


would persist post-First World War with Hollywood’s dominance of British cinema exhibition, as well as the heavy American influence on British motoring culture.¹²⁸

THE CHANGING MEANINGS OF ‘CARNIVAL’ IN BRITAIN

Overview

The concept of carnival flourished within the context described above. Figures 1 and 2 indicate the changing abundance of references to carnival in newspapers included in the BNA. Figure 1 shows the average number of articles containing the word ‘carnival’ per issue for every year between 1870 and 1939. This is particularly good for illustrating short term changes in the prevalence of this term in the press during this period, but can be misleading as to longer term trends because of the increasing lengthiness of individual issues with the passing of time.¹²⁹ For this reason, Figure 2 demonstrates the average number of articles containing the word ‘carnival’ per newspaper page for each decade, so as to provide a more accurate picture of how extensively this word featured in press coverage and how this changed over a 70-year period.¹³⁰ Taken together, they suggest that the word became more ubiquitous in press coverage over the final three decades of the nineteenth century, dipped slightly over the first half of the 1900s, revived in the late 1900s and early 1910s, declined again during the First World War, before demonstrating a far sharper upward trajectory (based on both modes of calculation) on the whole during the interwar era.

¹²⁸ For the Americanisation of British cinema, see Mark Glancy, Hollywood and the Americanization of Britain: From the 1920s to the Present (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2014). For the Americanisation of British motoring, see Law, “Turning Night into Day” and Law, “Flashy Strings of Neon Light Unravelled”.

¹²⁹ This was calculated by conducting a search for the word ‘carnival’ on the BNA website in order to calculate how many hits the term generated for each year, and then dividing this by the total number of articles on the website for each year (accessed on 17 May 2014).

¹³⁰ This was calculated by conducting a search for the word ‘carnival’ on the BNA website in order to calculate how many hits the term generated for each decade, and then dividing this by the total number of pages on the website for each decade (accessed on 17 May 2014). The BNA website only provides data for the total number of pages for decades, not for individual years, so it is not possible to calculate the annual number of articles containing the word ‘carnival’ per newspaper page.
Definitions of Carnival

Before poring over this chronology in greater detail, it is important to sketch out first the various ways in which the term carnival was used over this period. Firstly, there were reports on carnivals in European cities including Rome, Florence, Madrid, Basle, Berlin, Naples, Paris,
and Nice. These had received coverage in Britain since the birth of its news press in the seventeenth century, and continued to do so in the period covered by this article – especially during the late nineteenth century. By this point, a growing number of Britons could experience the continental carnival first hand for themselves: in 1886, the *London Standard* carried a Thomas Cook advert for a ‘Carnival Tour’ to France and Italy, while in 1894 the *Glasgow Herald* made reference to British attendees at the Nice Carnival.

There were also numerous instances of carnival being used as a more descriptive term, drawing upon the metaphor of continental carnival to indicate the presence of certain shared elements in other leisure forms, such as golf, horse-racing, cricket, water sports, fairs, pantomimes, and musical entertainments, to provide a far from exhaustive list. It was also

---

131 *London Gazette* (26–29 Mar 1866); *Daily Courant* (Feb 1703); *Public Advertiser* (28 Nov 1781); *Hull Packet and Original Weekly Commercial, Literary and General Advertiser* (2 Mar 1813); *Morning Chronicle* (12 Jan 1853); *Western Times* (22 Feb 1870); *Taunton Courier, and Western Advertiser* (23 Feb 1870); *Western Times* (4 Mar 1870); *Nottinghamshire Guardian* (1 Apr 1870); *Oxford Journal* (25 Feb 1871); *Pall Mall Gazette,* (5 Feb 1879); *Belfast News-Letter* (6 Mar 1879); *Birmingham Daily Post* (26 Dec 1879); *Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer* (30 Jan 1882); *London Daily News* (31 Jan 1882); *London Daily News* (22 Feb 1882); *Manchester Evening News* (26 Jun 1882); *Portsmouth Evening News* (1 Jan 1886); *Aberdeen Evening Express* (23 Jan 1886); *Aberdeen Journal* (18 Feb 1886); *Daily Gazette for Middlesbrough* (1 Apr 1886); *Stamford Mercury* (7 May 1886); *Bucks Herald* (8 May 1886); *Birmingham Daily Post* (23 Nov 1886); *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* (12 Feb 1890); *Glasgow Herald* (21 Feb 1890); *Pall Mall Gazette* (21 Feb 1890); *Liverpool Mercury* (17 Mar 1890); *Morning Post* (9 May 1890); *Sheffield Evening Telegraph* (29 Jan 1894); *Dundee Courier,* (7 Mar 1894); *Sussex Agricultural Express* (18 Feb 1898); *Evening Telegraph* (10 Mar 1898); *Northants Evening Telegraph* (24 Feb 1902); *Coventry Evening Telegraph* (20 Mar 1902); *Aberdeen Journal* (31 Jan 1914); *Gloucester Citizen* (5 Mar 1923); *Dundee Courier* (22 Aug 1933).

132 *London Standard* (23 Jan 1886); *Glasgow Herald* (30 Jun 1894).

133 References to golf as carnival were found in: *Fife Herald* (22 Sep 1870); *Evening Telegraph* (28 Aug 1906); *Evening Telegraph* (6 Dec 1910); *Evening Telegraph* (25 Feb 1914); *Dundee Courier* (28 Sep 1918); *Evening Telegraph* (1 Jan 1923); *Aberdeen Journal* (24 Apr 1928). References to horse-racing events as carnivals were found in: *Wrexham Advertiser* (2 Apr 1870); *Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer* (27 Dec 1871); *York Herald* (13 Sep 1879); *York Herald* (10 Apr 1882); *Northampton Mercury* (27 May 1882); *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* (14 Sep 1882); *Manchester Evening News* (19 Feb 1886); *Edinburgh Evening News* (4 May 1898); *Hull Daily Mail* (27 May 1914); *Newcastle Journal* (8 Jun 1914); *Yorkshire Evening Post* (3 Mar 1923); *Derby Daily Telegraph* (29 May 1933). References to cricket matches as carnivals were found in: *Cambridge Chronicle and Journal* (19 Aug 1871); *York Herald* (2 Aug 1879); *Blackburn Standard* (13 Sep 1879); *Leeds Mercury* (22 Aug 1882); *York Herald* (24 Aug 1886); *Northampton Mercury* (4 Sep 1886); *Daily Gazette for Middlesbrough* (27 Aug 1890); *Yorkshire Post* (13 Aug 1894); *Yorkshire Evening Post* (21 May 1898); *Dundee Courier* (30 Jun 1914); *Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer* (19 Aug 1918). References to water sport events as carnivals were found in: *Portsmouth Evening News* (18 Jun 1890); *London Standard* (16 Jul 1890); *Hampshire Advertiser* (16 Aug 1890); *Coventry Evening Telegraph* (19 Feb 1894); *Dover Express* (1 Apr 1898); *The Era* (19 Nov 1898); *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser* (12 Apr 1902); *The Cornishman* (21 Aug 1902); *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette* (9 Feb 1906); *Chelmsford Chronicle* (5 Aug 1910); *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette* (15 Sep 1910); *Hull Daily Mail* (18 Mar 1914); *Manchester Evening News* (7 May 1914); *Hereford Times* (29 Jun 1918); *Nottingham Evening Post* (14 Jul 1923). References to fairs as carnivals were found in: *Wrexham Advertiser* (2 Apr 1870); *Coventry Herald* (21 Jun 1872); *London Standard* (7 Apr 1874); *Nottinghamshire Guardian* (Oct 1874); *Hull Packet* (15 Sep 1882); *Nottingham Evening Post* (7 Oct 1882); *Tamworth Herald* (9 Oct 1886); *The Era* (9 Oct 1886); *Royal Cornwall Gazette* (2 Jun 1898); *Nottingham Evening Post* (3 Oct 1902); *Gloucester Citizen* (5 Oct 1906); *Nottingham Evening Post* (28 Mar 1910). References to pantomimes as carnivals were found in: *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette* (23 Dec 1872); *Sunderland Daily Echo and Shipping Gazette* (2 Jan 1902). References to musical entertainments as carnivals were found in: *The Era* (5 Oct 1879); *Liverpool Mercury* (10 Apr 1882).
often used to describe either particular traditional holidays such as Christmas, New Year, Easter, and Shrovetide (the latter called ‘an old English carnival’ by the Leeds Mercury in 1882), or in relation to annually recurrent leisure events, such as particular fairs, The Lord Mayor’s Show (the ‘Cockney Carnival’) and long established sporting events like the Henley Regatta and the Oxford-Cambridge Boat Race.\textsuperscript{134} Horse-racing at Chester was described as ‘time-honoured carnival’ by the Edinburgh Evening News in 1898, for example, while the Hull Daily Mail called Epsom an ‘annual carnival’ in 1914.\textsuperscript{135} In some instances, such as with horse-racing or traditional festivals, this use of the idea of carnival to describe certain recreational practices was hardly new, but it does appear to have significantly increased and diversified in line with the late Victorian expansion of leisure provision.\textsuperscript{136}

There were also even more abstract usages of the word ‘carnival’ in the press, sometimes in relation to leisure activities, sometimes even more generally. Dancers at a fancy dress ball in Cheltenham were described as holding ‘high carnival’ by the Cheltenham Looker-on in 1873, as were residents of Bradford by the Northern Echo during an 1882 Royal Visit, and citizens of Edinburgh on Hogmanay 1902 by the Evening Post, to name but a few examples.\textsuperscript{137} Again, then, this reflected a conceptualisation of carnival as a sense of levity and accompanying behaviour upon certain occasions that contrasted with the everyday. Yet it was also extremely common for the expression to be used disparagingly, in relation to activities deemed immoral: ‘carnival of drunkenness’; ‘carnival of vice and corruption’; ‘carnival of indulgence’; ‘high carnival of lawlessness and blood’; ‘carnival of rioting’; ‘Through tracts where Hell holds carnival...’; and so forth.\textsuperscript{138}

Despite this plurality of meaning, it is clear carnival increasingly came by the end of the nineteenth century to be used above all in relation to a particular type of event: one given this name by its organisers rather than the press, and that aspired to the aforementioned combination

\textsuperscript{134} References to Christmas as a carnival were found in: Derbyshire Times and Chesterfield Herald (16 Dec 1882); The Era (20 Nov 1886); Sheffield Evening Telegraph (9 Dec 1890). References to New Year as carnival were found in: London Daily News (2 Jan 1882); Dundee Advertiser (27 Dec 1890); Aberdeen Evening Express (2 Jan 1918); Leeds Mercury (23 Feb 1882). References to Easter as carnival were found in: Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette (9 Apr 1874); Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer (12 Apr 1879). Reference to Shrovetide as carnival was found in: Leeds Mercury (23 Feb 1882). References to the Lord Mayor’s Show as carnival were found in: Belfast News-Letter (11 Nov 1870); Nottingham Evening Post (10 Nov 1882). References to the Henley Regatta as carnival were found in: London Standard (19 Jul 1886); Pall Mall Gazette (8 Jul 1898). References to the Oxford-Cambridge boat race as carnival were found in: The Era (2 Apr 1871); The Cornishman (6 Mar 1879).

\textsuperscript{135} Edinburgh Evening News (4 May 1898); Hull Daily Mail (27 May 1914).

\textsuperscript{136} For horse-racing as carnival, see Mike Huggins, Flat Racing and British Society 1790–1914: A Social and Economic History (London: Frank Cass, 2000), 117–123.

\textsuperscript{137} Cheltenham Looker-On (22 Feb 1873); Northern Echo (21 Jun 1882); Evening Post (1 Jan 1902).

\textsuperscript{138} Sheffield Independent (18 Mar 1873); London Daily News (7 Feb 1874); Manchester Evening News (13 Sep 1879); Belfast News-Letter (11 Apr 1882); Southern Reporter (8 May 1890); Gloucester Citizen (20 Jun 1890).
of spectacle, levity and sense of occasion. These events, though sometimes arranged by a specific organisation, like a cycling club or a political body, more frequently had their administrative base in the local community, or at least sections of it, and sometimes local government, and aspired to synonymy with the host district, in a similar fashion to carnivals held elsewhere in Europe. They also often had a benevolent goal in mind, usually of raising funds for a particular charity, especially local medical provision, but in some cases also explicitly designed to promote the district and its businesses. Such facets were more consistent than the actual cultural forms these carnivals comprised, which varied across both time and place.

**British Carnivals, 1870–1914**

Both Figures 1 and 2 indicate a scarcity of references to ‘carnival’ in the 1870s by comparison with later periods. For this period, the term was generally used in relation to overseas carnivals, as a reporter’s metaphor in describing other leisure forms, and as a pejorative description of perceived immorality. At this stage, it would appear that it was rare for events to be organised in Britain with the specific title of carnival. ‘Carnival’ recurred more frequently in newspaper articles during the 1880s. By this stage, the provincial press were capturing a new phenomenon: the marking of Bonfire Night with a carnival, which generally consisted of a procession of individuals in fancy dress and decorated vehicles, followed by a bonfire. These appear to have been particularly common in the South West, taking place in towns such as Teignmouth, Bridgwater, Exmouth, Dawlish, Chard and Torquay, for example. However, they also took place in other parts of the south of England, including London and its hinterland. Hampstead had a Bonfire Boys’ Carnival from the mid-1870s through to 1911, while Bonfire Night in 1890 also saw the inauguration of the Camden and Kentish Towns’ and Queen’s Crescent Carnival, and the Enfield Bonfire Carnival as well. All three were held with the aim of supporting local hospitals, as was true of Bonfire Night carnivals elsewhere. Collectors, frequently in fancy dress themselves, solicited donations from

---

139 Exeter and Plymouth Gazette (10 Nov 1882); Bristol Mercury (1 Apr 1886; 6 Sep 1886).
140 The history of Hampstead Bonfire Carnival was recounted in Valerie Hart, ‘Popular Celebrations and Customs in Hampstead, 1820–1914’ (Unpublished diploma thesis, Portsmouth Polytechnic, 1985). The history of the Camden and Kentish Towns’ and Queen’s Crescent Carnival was recounted in Daily Chronicle (6 Nov 1897). The first Enfield Carnival was covered by Meyers’s Observer (7 Nov 1890).
those who gathered along the streets to watch the procession pass, fulfilling the event’s charitable rationale, while also legitimising the celebration of an occasion often frowned upon as disreputable by sections of the middle classes, as well as by the press.

As Figure 2 indicates, the ratio of articles containing the word ‘carnival’ to number of newspaper pages on the BNA escalated during the 1890s. It appears that this largely related to an upsurge at this time in local fundraising entertainments given the title of ‘carnival’ by their organisers. As well as proliferating, such events diversified. Firstly, while Bonfire Night carnivals remained popular, similar events began to be held in spring, summer and early autumn. Secondly, while scanning through the BNA suggests they remained more concentrated in the south, and particularly the south west, during this period, there is also greater evidence of events called carnivals taking place in northern English towns and cities as well, such as Manchester, Hull and Sunderland. Analysis of London’s local press also illustrates their emergence along its periphery during the late 1890s. On the capital’s north-eastern fringe, 1896 saw the Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club and the Wood Green Cycling Club organise their first parades, while Tottenham’s cycling clubs did likewise in 1898, as did New Southgate Cycling Club in 1899. In suburban South London, meanwhile, processions of costumed individuals and decorated vehicles took place in Croydon, and in Kingston, Surbiton and Teddington, in aid of the Royal National Lifeboat Institution in 1898.

Thirdly, the forms these events took also became more varied. Amid the cycling boom of the 1890s, cycling clubs became more prominent as organisers of carnivals, and cycling parades became increasingly common as a central feature of them. Yet processional forms were often joined and sometimes supplanted by a growing range of other entertainments. Foreshadowing developments to come elsewhere, ‘Carnival Week’ at the Isle of Wight resort of Ventnor in 1892 comprised not only a parade of florally decorated vehicles, but also golf, sports arranged by the local rowing club, illuminations, fireworks, a football match, amateur dramatics, and a ball. Dancing, athletics, fairs and fetes, among other activities, also

---

141 Manchester Evening News (12 Feb 1890); Sunderland Daily Echo and Shipping Gazette (23 Jul 1894); Hull Daily Mail (5 May 1898).
142 First Enfield Tradesmen Cycling Club Carnival was covered by Meyers’s Observer (18 Sep 1896). First Wood Green Cycling Club Carnival was covered by Meyers’s Observer (2 Oct 1896). First Tottenham Carnival was covered by Tottenham and Enfield Weekly Guardian (22 Jul 1898). First New Southgate Cycling Club Carnival was covered by Meyers’s Observer (18 Oct 1899).
143 1898 Croydon Life Boat Day Procession programme in Croydon Local Studies Library (P570 (394.2) LIF). Kingston, Surbiton and Teddington Life Boat Day Procession was covered by Morning Post, June 18, 1898.
144 Isle of Wight Observer (7 Apr 1894); Morning Post (1 Sep 1894).
accompanied processions as part of other carnivals. This trend continued into the 1900s. For example, in the Merseyside town of West Kirby, which held a carnival annually in aid of local charities, the 1906 instalment included a children’s parade, old English sports, an aquatic display, a cyclists’ and harriers’ procession, a cake walk, and a fancy dress ball. In some cases, national events spurred the holding of one-off carnivals across the country, as with a wave of torch-lit processions held across London and its suburbs in 1900 in aid of the Daily Telegraph’s fund for the widows and orphans of soldiers and sailors killed in the Boer War, or in celebrating the 1902 coronation of Edward VII.

It is quite likely that this whetted public appetite for carnivals, as well as leaving a legacy of experience in organising them. However, limitations placed on street collections within a six-mile radius of Charing Cross under a 1903 amendment to the 1867 Metropolitan Streets Act rendered this far less effective as a fundraising initiative in this part of the capital, although some were still held regardless after this point, such as in Hammersmith in 1906 and in Islington in 1907. Yet street carnivals were far more common on the outskirts of London. In suburban Essex, for example, West Ham began to hold an annual carnival in 1904, followed by Ilford in 1905, Barking in 1906, and East Ham in 1907. Suburban Kent was also home to cycle parades in Penge and Thornton Heath.
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145 Leeds Mercury (27 May 1890); Exeter and Plymouth Gazette (23 Oct 1890); Devon and Exeter Daily Gazette (6 Nov 1890); The Cornishman (3 May 1894); Yorkshire Evening Post (2 Jun 1898); Chelmsford Chronicle, (8 Jul 1898).
146 Liverpool Daily Post (2 Aug 1906).
147 The Boer War Carnivals were extensively covered on a daily basis by Daily Telegraph (Jan–Oct 1900). For 1902 Coronation Carnivals, see for example: The Cornishman (5 Jun 1902); Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser (25 Jun 1902); Reading Mercury (5 Jul 1902).
150 Ephemera and press cuttings from Penge Cycle Carnivals contained in Bromley Local Studies and Archive (1648/1); Thornton Heath Carnival and Cycle Parade mentioned in press cuttings in Croydon Local Studies Library.
The ratio of articles containing the word ‘carnival’ to the number of newspaper pages on the BNA was lower for the 1910s, largely due to the outbreak of the First World War. It is likely there was a declining inclination as the death toll on the continent rose to hold events called carnivals, given the high spirits the term implied, but it is also possible many potential organisers were otherwise serving in the armed forces, or using their spare time for other forms of war work. Following the end of the First World War, events titled carnivals became more ubiquitous than was previously the case. The annual ratio of articles containing the word ‘carnival’ to the number of newspaper issues in the BNA surpassed pre-war levels during the 1920s and in particular the 1930s, before slipping back as war broke out again in 1939.

This upsurge in press usage of the term ‘carnival’ owed partly to increasing newspaper length, but also to a greater concentration of stories covering charity carnivals and other leisure occasions. It continued to be used by the press as a descriptive term for other types of entertainment, especially sporting ones, while its use to signify immorality appears to have had largely discontinued. Yet above all, perusing the BNA suggests there were a plethora of local events formally titled as ‘carnivals’ in the 1920s. By now, they comprised ever-widening permutations of cultural forms. The 1923 Chelmsford Carnival, for example, included stalls and sideshows, military bands, a grand carnival procession, a flower show in nearby gardens – including a pastoral display and dancing – and a competition to win motor car.\footnote{Chelmsford Chronicle (18 May 1923).} The 1925 Willesden Grand Carnival, meanwhile, featured along with two processions, a prize-giving ceremony featuring film star Alma Taylor, ‘Old English Sports’, a pageant of the history of Willesden, episodes in the history of Empire, a comic football match, a turnout by the Willesden Fire Brigade, music and dancing, a balloon race, a treasure hunt, sideshows, a military tattoo, a torch-lit procession, illuminations, and a firework display.\footnote{Programme contained in Brent Archive (LCH1/ENT/1; LHC1/ENT/4).}

Moreover, in order to accommodate this growing range of events, it became increasingly common for carnivals to last up to a week, rather than just a day.\footnote{Cheltenham Chronicle (17 Mar 1923); Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer (18 Jun 1928); Western Daily Press (20 Jul 1928).} While processions generally remained a key component, and often the centrepiece, of these carnivals, other shorter events confined to a single (often indoor) site, and focused entirely around different types of entertainment.
amusement were also given the title of ‘carnival’. In particular, there was a vogue for carnival balls or dances, whereby fancy dress was integrated into a different leisure form. Philanthropy remained a central rationale for holding carnivals, but there were also a growing number of ‘shopping carnivals’, organised by local traders to promote the district’s retail offering (although these too tended to promote some charitable cause as well as a marketing one). Moreover, national events were again a particular stimulus for the holding of carnivals – particularly in the 1930s, such as George V’s 1935 Silver Jubilee, or George VI’s 1937 Coronation.

Such trends were also visible within the capital itself. Processions of costumed individuals and decorated vehicles remained common, particularly in suburban districts. Yet here too, the procession was increasingly a component of a wider selection of entertainments. The Eastern Enfield Carnival of 1928, for example, also included sports for children, a comic football match, a pageant, and a carnival dance, while the 1931 edition also involved a baby competition and a garden party; similarly, the ‘Streets of Adventure’ Carnival held in Croydon during the interwar year involved a range of events including baby shows, fun fairs and gymnastic displays. Again, while in some cases these compendiums of entertainments could be incorporated into a single day, in others they were spread across three days or even a week.
THEMES IN THE ABSTRACTION OF CARNIVAL

*Carnival and the Ritualisation of British Leisure*

The increasing ubiquity of the term ‘carnival’ in Britain from the late Victorian through to the interwar era was illustrative of changing attitudes to leisure and its usage. Firstly, in temporal terms, ‘carnival’ implied ritual, promising repetition in an uncertain, changing world. Some occasions described as ‘carnivals’ were over a millennium-old, such as Christmas and Easter, whereas the sporting events given the same sobriquet were comparatively recent, such as the Epsom Derby and the Boat Race. Yet even for the latter category, the term ‘carnival’ still tended to be utilised as part of a broader discourse of longevity and permanence. For example, *The Era*’s report on ‘the Epsom Carnival’ of 1856 was subtitled ‘Seventy-seventh anniversary of the derby’, while in 1882 the *York Herald* reported that York’s August races:

‘…commenced to-day under gratifying auspices on the time-honoured Knavesmire, which has been the scene of so many past equine struggles…At many of the hives of industry holiday will be kept, and multitudes will travel to our ancient city to inspect its unrivalled antiquities and thereafter participants in the racing carnival.’

This is illustrative of continuities in the interpretation of new leisure practices, that the amusements of an increasingly urbanised, industrialised society might be understood as fulfilling a similar cyclical function to those predating modern temporal structures, partially reflecting the seasonality of the cultural forms being described, from outdoor sporting activities like cricket whose timing was dependent on weather conditions, to entertainments arranged to coincide with traditional festival period, such as pantomime at Christmas.

A minority of events branded carnivals were not annual occasions at all. Some charitable occasions designated as carnivals by their organisers (or dubbed thus by the press) were one-offs, such as the Boer War processions of 1900, the Coronation carnivals of 1902, 1911 and 1937, and the Jubilee carnivals of 1935 – although Coronation and Jubilee carnivals obeyed the longer, more irregular cycles of monarchical history, and while embodying a sense of

159 *The Era* (1 Jun 1856); *York Herald* (23 Aug 1882).
temporal linearity emphasised national continuity. Then there were entertainments labelled ‘carnivals’ whose timings had little to do with the calendar year and were rather part of the panoply of leisure options targeting workers’ spare time as it existed on a day-by-day, week-by-week basis. Perhaps their being described in this way sought to encourage their ritualisation as part of the daily and weekly activities of their would-be patrons.

While in some cases the geographies of ‘carnivals’ were fairly unspecific, referring solely to a specific point within the year, in others they referred to events taking place within more defined sites, from horse races at particular courses, to processions within particular localities – connections emphasised in names official and unofficial (the Oxford-Cambridge Boat Race being nicknamed ‘the Putney Carnival’, for example), thereby grounding them in a set space as well as time. This conceptualisation, pushed by a still very localised and regionalised press, bears some parallels to the civic identities traditionally promoted by continental carnivals, albeit within a new context of rapid urbanisation and accompanying population movements. For example, in 1880s there was the annual week-long ‘Cricket Carnival’ organised by local politician Lord Londesborough at Scarborough; in 1888 the York Herald described it as part of Scarborough’s ‘season’, during which attractions organised for residents and visitors also included a tennis tournament and a masquerade ball – highlighting the way diverse leisure forms old and new interacted with traditional local aristocratic patronage and the emergence of the modern seaside resort.

Carnival and the Evocation of Revelry

Further underpinning the concept of carnival was the implication of a degree of levity beyond the scope of ordinary leisure time. This schism was partially an artificial, rhetorical device, glossing over the sharing of cultural formats, the operation of modern annual ritual events within economies whose processes were arranged largely along daily and weekly schedules, and the ritualisation of daily and weekly leisure practices. In some instances, it genuinely indicated a greater degree of release and license than was true of spare time more generally, and illustrated a difference in how the activity in question was interpreted by its observers, organisers and participants. In others it was hyperbolic, used to distinguish common

---
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entertainments from the competition by emphasising their alleged wildness. What ‘carnival’ implied was a degree of temporary transformation, whether that related to the behaviour of crowds at major sporting events, or to masquerading in costume in processions, fancy dress balls or ice skating rinks.

This language and imagery was extensively commodified across cultural industries. Reporters using ‘carnival’ as a metaphor for other leisure forms utilised the historically loaded concept to communicate a sense of excitement about the fast-growing world of entertainment to newspaper buyers. Commercial leisure providers also seized upon the language and forms of carnival, particularly around Christmastime. In 1858, ‘Dykwynkyn’, set and costume designer at the Theatre Royal on Drury Lane, organised a ‘Crystal Palace Grand Christmas Carnival and Revels and Juvenile Holiday Festival’, whose entertainments included Christmas foods, pantomimes, the giving of Christmas presents, dances, a magic show, an electrical display, a chemistry lecture, sports and games for youths, and a magic lantern display; admission was charged at a shilling, for adults and sixpence for children. The event even featured a ‘Lord of Misrule’, in a deliberate evocation of Britain’s own Yuletide traditions. Commercial ‘carnivals’ of disparate types were a feature of later Christmases too. New Star Music Hall in Liverpool held a ‘Christmas Carnival’ in 1879, as did Lusby’s Music Hall in London in 1880. In 1893, meanwhile, there was a ‘Christmas Carnival and Yuletide Fair’ at Caledonian House in Glasgow, featuring a toy exhibition and ‘Oriental Courts and Palace of Novelties’, while that same year the Waverley Market ‘Christmas Carnival’ in Edinburgh included displays by ‘the Amazon warriors from Dahomey’, cyclists, tightrope walkers, performing animals, and acrobats, not to mention music. In these two instances, shopping and entertainments were integrated into a multifaceted, electrically lit spectacle. Then there were the ice carnivals that became particularly popular during the interwar era, combining the centuries-old practices of masquerade and ice-skating to provide a hybrid visual form suitable for exploitation within a commercial leisure space.

The ubiquity of ‘carnival’ in the press from the late nineteenth century onwards partly reflected the proliferation of new leisure activities for them to report upon. Yet it was also demonstrative of changes in attitude to usage of spare time. ‘Carnival’ was still used at times through the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to denote overly licentious behaviour.

---
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including in relation to leisure activities such as drinking. Nor should it necessarily be assumed the myriad news reports calling horse-racing meets ‘carnivals’ throughout the nineteenth century intended for the term to be understood entirely benevolently: as Mike Huggins’s work has highlighted, racecourse life was marked by gambling, drinking, occasional violence and various forms of petty crime.166

Yet, as noted earlier, respectability was contested and negotiated, and by the late nineteenth century new accommodations were being reached on what were morally and socially acceptable ways of spending leisure time. If this reflected the tempering of evangelical Christianity as a force in public life, so too did the increasing usage of the concept of carnival – both as descriptive term, and as a type of charitable event – in spite of its continental Catholic connotations. Linda Colley has argued that the conversion of Britain from artificial polity to nation in the eighteenth century centred on its Protestantism and anti-Catholicism, specifically its enmity with Catholic France, which was characterised by its ignorance and oppression, but that the strength of this feeling was subsequently weakened by the integration of Ireland into the Union in 1801, France’s defeat at Waterloo in 1815, and the emancipation of Catholics in 1829.167 According to John Wolffe, while anti-Catholic sentiment nonetheless remained discernible in Britain right through into the twentieth century, its focus shifted from Rome to British Catholics, and then from converting them to Protestantism to preventing Protestants from converting to Catholicism.168

Growing usage of the term ‘carnival’ in nineteenth century Britain therefore reflected a greater comfort in appropriating continental Catholic culture, and redefining British culture in these terms. The now much tamed carnivals in France, Italy and Germany played a part in this, absorbed by a minority able to travel to Europe to sample them for themselves, and a greater number who could read about them in the newspapers – demonstrating the role advancements in communications had in this process as well. John Walton’s work on the Blackpool Carnival of the early 1920s shows how this continued into the interwar period, with the Nice Carnival offering its organisers a model for imitation to draw upon.169

---

166 Huggins, Flat Racing, pp. 120–121, 126–128.
At the same time, however, British absorption of ‘carnival’ as metaphor and nomenclature required discursive negotiation on the part of the press, categorising their culture within a broader European context on the one hand and emphasising its distinctiveness and superiority on the other. Take, for example, this extract from a *Birmingham Post* article on Christmas in 1860:

**Talk of the Carnivals of Venice and Rome, with their glittering street pageants and frothy amusements, what are they to the substantial English Carnival – the Christmas season of in-door feasting and merrymaking, when every holy family tie is closer drawn around the blazing hearth, every good and purifying aspiration strengthened under the genial influence of the hour, and where – to come to the material “justification of the title” – the carnivorous achievements of a respectable “hardware village” during one week would more than equal a twelvemonth’s consumption of food by an ordinarily ravenous Italian principality.**

The implicit message of the piece, which also called the Christmas pantomime ‘the peculiarly British substitute for the street masque of the great Italian festival’, was that the English/British (the two conflated so often in nineteenth-century England) could more than match the Italians for revelry but that these celebrations should be clothed safely in the language of Protestant morality. The *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette* was even more explicit in 1871, calling Christmas the ‘Protestant Carnival’.

**CONCLUSION**

The term ‘carnival’ already strongly resonated in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Britain, with connotations of ritual, excitement and spectacle. This illustrated a familiarity with the carnival culture of Catholic Europe, which many journalists, advertisers and event organisers were willing to use as a referent in describing their own popular culture – one in which annual events remained important despite the increasing availability of leisure opportunities on a daily and weekly basis, and in which exhortations to revel made for good

171 *Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette* (12 Jan 1871).
marketing, and were not considered overly transgressive. The looseness with which the word ‘carnival’ was already applied perhaps helps to explain why communities and organisations organising charitable events from the late nineteenth century onwards felt comfortable calling these carnivals despite some significant formal variations.

As subsequent chapters will demonstrate, the organisation of work and leisure and the existence of an expanding, increasingly commercialised, partly globalised popular culture would strongly influence the form and content of the Ilford Carnival. The Ilford Carnival was also part of a broader, multifaceted culture of carnival in Britain, which both preceded and outlasted it. The story of the Ilford Carnival also bore many of its hallmarks more generally: a continuing emphasis on ritual; the encouragement of ludic behaviour for financial gain; a tendency towards spectacle; and the transmission of carnival, as idea and as event, between different places, as well as between different cultural industries and the voluntary sector.
CHAPTER TWO

ILFORD: THE MAKING OF A SUBURBAN COMMUNITY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contextualises the Ilford Carnival by detailing the emergence of the community that held it. It firstly outlines the suburbanisation of Ilford itself, and the migratory histories of those who came to reside there. It then examines the male and female occupational composition of the district, as well as commuting patterns and Ilford’s local economy. Thirdly, it details the district’s gender balance, marital patterns, birth rate, family structures and age composition, and how this related to the process of suburban growth. Finally, it discusses the development of associational culture, commercial leisure and public amenities in the district, before discussing how life in Ilford was shaped by suburbanisation, internal geography and leisure options beyond the district.

Ilford’s rapid suburbanisation and appeal as a residential location in the 1890s and 1900s has drawn it to the attention of scholars of suburbia in the past. Alan A. Jackson used it as a case study of suburban expansion in the Edwardian period in his 1973 book Semi-Detached London.\textsuperscript{172} Much more recently, Michael Heller used Ilford to examine how stakeholders cooperated in marketing suburbia in a 2014 article.\textsuperscript{173} This chapter draws on both their work, and on the Victoria County History of Essex. It also, however, makes extensive use of OS maps, census records, registrar generals’ reports and directories in order to provide a fuller picture of Ilford’s social composition and to look at the life of its residents in greater context.

\textsuperscript{172} Jackson, Semi-Detached London, pp. 59–70.
THE SUBURBANISATION OF ILFORD

Suburban Development in Ilford

Prior to its suburbanisation, Ilford’s primary point of settlement was around High Road, while farms and hamlets were scattered around the Hainault Forest in the north of the district, particularly at Barkingside and Little Heath. As well as High Road, many other of what would remain Ilford’s primary roads – such as Cranbrook Road (then Lane), Ley Street and Green Lanes – were already in place. Figure 1 demonstrates Ilford’s population growth between 1851 and 1931. At the start of this period, its population was 4,521; this rose to 7,645 in 1881, facilitated partly by the destruction of Hainault Forest providing new land for cultivation. Ilford’s still largely rural nature at this time is demonstrated in Figure 2.

\[\text{Figure 1: The population of Ilford, 1851-1931}\]

---

By the early 1880s, former farm estates were being bought up for development. Construction picked up pace in the 1890s, initially focused either side of High Road at the district’s western end (see Figure 3), encouraged by improvements to Ilford railway station during the mid-1890s. Between 1891 and 1901, Ilford’s population almost quadrupled from 10,922 to 41,244. Thereafter, construction spread northwards, southwards and eastwards,
mostly undertaken by developers W. Peter Griggs and Archibald Corbett (see Figure 4).\textsuperscript{177} Corbett made houses available for leasehold sale, while he and Ilford UDC also provided mortgages, making homeownership more common in Ilford than other suburbs.\textsuperscript{178} New railway stations opened at Seven Kings in 1899, Goodmayes in 1901, and then further north at Newbury Park, Barkingside, Fairlop and Hainault in 1903; that same year, Ilford UDC began running electric tram services from Ilford Broadway to Barkingside to the north, Chadwell Heath to the east, the Barking boundary to the south and the East Ham boundary to the west, while from 1905 East Ham Urban District Council also began to run a service between Broadway to Manor Park, extended in 1910 to Aldgate East.\textsuperscript{179} Between 1901 and 1911, Ilford’s population almost doubled to 78,188, although by this stage housing supply outstripped demand and many homes lay vacant.\textsuperscript{180} Population growth was significantly slower over the ensuing decade, with 85,194 people living in Ilford in 1921, but picked up again in the 1920s, reaching 131,061 in 1931.

Ilford’s 1911 population density of 9.2 people per acre masked significant variation between individual wards, as shown in Figure 5.\textsuperscript{181} Loxford was particularly densely populated, while four other wards had more people to the acre than the average for Outer Ring Essex. Yet South and North Hainault – which together made up nearly three quarters of Ilford’s total area – remained mostly rural and thinly inhabited, with detached points of settlement at Barkingside and Newbury Park in North Hainault and Chadwell Heath in South Hainault. Between 1911 and 1921, much of Ilford’s population growth took place in Seven Kings and the two Hainault wards. This trend continued during the 1920s, when North Hainault and the Goodmayes ward formed from the old South Hainault one both saw their populations more than treble.\textsuperscript{182} Ilford’s internal geography also displayed a marked social divide. South of the railway line, in Loxford and Clementswood, many homes built after 1900 were smaller and cheaper, and it is unsurprising that these were the two most densely populated wards in the district by 1911.\textsuperscript{183}
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\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{177} Jackson, \textit{Semi-Detached London}, pp. 61–63.
\item\textsuperscript{178} Heller, ‘Suburbia, Marketing and Stakeholders’ (pp. 71–74)
\item\textsuperscript{179} Jackson, \textit{Semi-Detached London}, pp. 59–60.
\item\textsuperscript{180} Ibid p. 60.
\item\textsuperscript{182} GRO, \textit{Census of England and Wales 1931. County of Essex (Part I)} (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1932), p. 5.
\item\textsuperscript{183} Jackson, \textit{Semi-Detached London}, p. 64.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Figure 3: OS map of Ilford and its environs, c. 1896–1897.
Figure 4: OS map of Ilford and its environs, 1920.
Even by the standards of the period, Ilford’s population growth was phenomenally rapid. It lagged behind the suburbanisation of more inner-lying parts of Essex, and it is quite possible that the falloff in demand for housing there owed much to competition from new suburban developments much further west, where housing was generally more up-to-date, transitioning towards the mock-Tudor style so popular in the interwar period.\(^{184}\)

**Migratory Histories of Ilford’s Population**

Figure 6 provides a breakdown of where Ilford’s 1911 population were born, in order to map out migratory routes into Ilford.\(^{185}\) In total, 18.6% of Ilford’s residents were born within the district – a strikingly low figure, even in comparison with other similarly sized suburbs.\(^{186}\) The share of men living in the district who were born there is slightly higher than it was for women, almost certainly due to the large number of women who had come to Ilford to work in domestic service, as discussed in the next section. The vast majority of Ilford’s locally-born populace had probably been born over the past two decades, after the district had become increasingly suburbanised. 22,850 people were born in Ilford between 1891 and 1911, while 24,282 people gave Ilford as their birthplace on the 1911 census.\(^{187}\) That means the share of

\(^{184}\) Ibid, pp. 45, 70.


\(^{186}\) Figures 3 and 4 in the Appendix provide a comparison between birthplaces of Ilford residents and those of residents of other large Essex and Middlesex suburbs.

\(^{187}\) See Figures 7 and 15.

\[\text{Table: Population and Population Densities in Ilford’s Wards, 1911 and 1921.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Populations 1911</th>
<th>Populations 1921</th>
<th>Population Densities (people per acre) 1911</th>
<th>Population Densities (people per acre) 1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementswood</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>16,618</td>
<td>17,593</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>9,960</td>
<td>9,935</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>12,318</td>
<td>13,248</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hainault</td>
<td>4,317</td>
<td>7,974</td>
<td>9,117</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>11,825</td>
<td>12,640</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Sisters</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hainault</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>10,673</td>
<td>12,654</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ilford</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,496</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,188</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,194</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{184}\text{Ibid, pp. 45, 70.}\]


\[^{186}\text{Figures 3 and 4 in the Appendix provide a comparison between birthplaces of Ilford residents and those of residents of other large Essex and Middlesex suburbs.}\]

\[^{187}\text{See Figures 7 and 15.}\]
Ilford-born born before 1891 would have been higher than 5.9% (once deaths and emigration are taken into account) but not by very much. At the same time, however, given that Ilford’s 1891 population was 14.0% the size of its 1911 population, it is likely that a reasonable minority still living within the district had lived there since before it became suburbanised.

The share of Ilford’s residents born in London was 33.8% – very large in itself but actually slightly on the low side in comparison with some other, earlier developed suburbs. A

```markdown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilford</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>7,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Essex</td>
<td>6,581</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyton</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthamstow</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>14,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsey</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willesden</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern Counties (Exc. Surrey and Kent)</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Midlands Counties (Exc. Hertfordshire</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Middlesex)</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Western Counties</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midland Counties</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Midland Counties</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western Counties</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Counties</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England (County not Stated)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands in the British Seas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Colonies &amp; Dependencies</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Countries &amp; at Sea</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace not Stated</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>35,626</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,562</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
further 18.8% had been born in a part of Essex other than Ilford, while 6.6% had been born in one of Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Kent and Surrey. Even by comparison with other suburbs, this was on the high side, and included 12.2% born in other Outer Ring UD’s with populations of 50,000 or more, illustrating Ilford’s place towards the end of chains of out-migration through the suburbs. In particular, significant shares of Ilford’s population had been born in older, nearby suburbs like West Ham, East Ham and Leyton. In many cases, these would have been the children of parents who moved to those suburbs from London in the first place. It is possible that some of the ‘born elsewhere in Essex’ category were actually born in Ilford before 1888, when it was still part of Barking parish, and had put down Barking as their place of birth, thereby making the proportion born in Ilford appear artificially low.188

It is also likely that a minority resident in Ilford had been born in more rural parts of Essex, and migrated inwards, while 2.6% had been born in one of Norfolk and Suffolk, which were also served by the Great Eastern Railway, highlighting the importance of rail networks to slightly longer haul migration. There were also significant numbers born in other parts of England, particularly southern counties like Hampshire, Sussex and Devonshire. A further 1.6% had been born in Scotland, 0.6% in Ireland and 0.5% in Wales, while 1.4% had been born abroad. The share born outside of Greater London in Ilford was significant, but it was even higher in some Middlesex suburbs that had seen strong recent population growth. While it is quite possible some had firstly migrated into London and then out to its periphery, it does appear likely that by the Edwardian period, London’s suburbs were becoming increasingly popular places to relocate to from other parts of Britain too.

Heller has argued that Ilford’s higher levels of homeownership and close cooperation between railway companies, developers, the UDC and its residents made it more successful at maintaining its white-collar reputation.189 This success at retention is demonstrated in Figure 7, which shows where people who gave Ilford as their place of birth were enumerated on the 1911 census.190 While it is possible some of these were residents of Ilford from before it became suburbanised, the vast majority would have been born there since 1891. The census showed that 59.9% of those who cited Ilford as their place of birth were still resident there – a strikingly high figure, reflecting the fact most had been born there relatively recently to parents who had moved to the district, and had not as yet anyway decided to move on.191 Males born in Ilford

188 ‘The Ancient Parish of Barking: Introduction’.
189 Heller, ‘Suburbia, Marketing and Stakeholders’ (pp. 78–79).
191 Figures 5 and 6 in the Appendix provides comparative data for other large Middlesex and Essex UD’s.
were more likely to stay there than females, perhaps reflecting a tendency of those who had married someone from outside the district to subsequently move to where their husbands lived.

Nonetheless, it is also clear large numbers of Ilford-born did depart the district. Most of these appear to have been moving to other suburbs, either in Essex (particularly East Ham) or else on the fringes of the County of London or elsewhere in the Outer Ring. It is likely they would have been departing with their families, and illustrates that patterns of suburban migration were often convoluted and did not simply follow an older-to-newer suburb trajectory.

**Figure 7: Places in England and Wales where individuals born in Ilford were enumerated, 1911.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of enumeration</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilford</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>7,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Essex</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyton</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend-on-Sea</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthamstow</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsey</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willesden</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern Counties (Exc. Surrey and Kent)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Midlands Counties (Exc. Hertfordshire and Middlesex)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Counties (Exc. Essex)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Western Counties</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midland Counties</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Midland Counties</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western Counties</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Counties</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11,897</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or necessarily involve moving to nearby districts. There was also a minority who left Greater London entirely, usually to another part of southern England, as with the 1.3% resident in Southend-on-Sea. One uncertainty is how many people had been born in Ilford and subsequently left but given their birthplace as Barking, which makes it hard to discern just to what extent its pre-suburban population had departed to find work elsewhere as Ilford’s former rural economy shrank (and therefore how many of these remained in Ilford).

WORK AND COMMUTING

Occupational Composition

Figures 8 and 9 indicate occupations of all males aged ten and over in Ilford in 1901 and 1911 respectively. The share categorised as retired or unoccupied was 23.1% in 1901 and 22.1% in 1911. The largest category of employment for adult male Ilford inhabitants in both 1901 and 1911 was as commercial and business clerks, with 10.8% and 12.7% respectively registering this as their occupation. The share employed in clerical work more broadly was even larger, with many others clerks classified as working in banking, insurance and railways, for example. The clerk is particularly heavily associated with Late Victorian and Edwardian suburb in general, but even by these standards Ilford was rather exceptional. A further 8.1% of Ilford’s adult male residents were employed in other commercial occupations in 1911, particularly in commercial travelling (3.3%) and in banking and insurance (3.6%). Ilford also had 5.8% of its adult male population employed in government roles in 1911: 4.5% in national government and 1.3% in local government. A further 4.8% of adult males in Ilford worked in professional occupations and their subordinate services at that time, particularly in teaching (1.4%), law (1.0%), and the arts (1.0%).

Data taken from GRO, Census of England and Wales. 1901. County of Essex. Area, Houses and Population; also Population Classified by Ages, Condition as to Marriage, Occupations, Birthplaces and Infirmities (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1902), pp. 80–81; GRO, Census of England and Wales, 1911. Vol. X. Occupations and Industries (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1914), pp. 173–177. A fuller breakdown of Ilford’s occupational composition from 1911 is provided in Figure 7 in the Appendix. See Figure 8 in the Appendix for a breakdown of male occupations in other suburbs.
Census figures also show that 8.7% of Ilford’s men aged ten and over were employed in ‘conveyance of men, goods and messages’ in 1901, rising slightly to 9.2% in 1911. This included 3.8% who worked in rail, slightly over half of them as officials and clerks, 2.2% in storage, porterage and messages, and 2.0% on the roads. Ilford also had a significant minority of male residents engaged in various retail and service trades. In 1901, 6.0% of men of working age living in the district worked in the provision of food, drink, tobacco and lodgings, rising to 7.0% in 1911, of whom 5.7% were employed in food-related roles, including as dairymen, butchers and grocers, while 1.1% worked in the supply of board and lodging and in dealing alcohol. Other important sectors of male employment in Ilford included metals, machines, implements and conveyances (4.1%), paper, prints, books and stationery (3.1%), dress (3.0%), wood, furniture, fittings and decorations (1.8%), and textile fabrics (1.8%).

Figure 8: Occupations of male residents of Ilford aged 10 and over, 1901.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied &amp; Unoccupied</td>
<td>14,490</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired or Unoccupied</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or Business Clerks</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance of Men, Goods, and Messages</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture – On Woods, Farms and Gardens</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Machine-Making</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Works of Construction</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Furniture, Fittings and Decorations</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick, Cement, Pottery and Glass</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals, Oil, Grease, Soap, etc.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skins, Leather, Hair, Feathers</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, Prints, Books, Stationary</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Tobacco, Drink, and Lodgings</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Occupations</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were two other sectors of import that nonetheless accounted for a declining share of jobs for Ilford’s men residents over the first decade of the twentieth century. One was construction, which in 1901 10.7% of working-age men living in Ilford were employed in, roughly the same share as were working as business and commercial clerks. Yet by 1911, this had fallen to 5.4%, with the total number who worked in the sector also slightly lower than ten years earlier – almost certainly a product of declining demand for housing in Ilford. This sector comprised a combination of builders and their staffs and of tradesmen such as plumbers, decorators and carpenters. The other sector of decreasing, though still substantial, significance was agriculture. In 1901, 4.4% of men of working age in Ilford worked in the sector, but by 1911 this had fallen to 3.0%. However, unlike construction, this nonetheless amounted to a rise
in the total number resident in the district employed in agriculture, reflecting the continuing job opportunities that the mostly still undeveloped district offered in this area. The majority of this was on farms, mostly as labourers and servants, with a minority working as non-domestic gardeners, nurserymen and seedsmen.

Figure 9: Occupations of male residents of Ilford aged 10 and over, 1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied and Unoccupied</td>
<td>27,675</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired or Unoccupied</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General or Local Govt. of the Country</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence of the Country</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Occupations and Their Subordinate Services</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Offices or Services</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Occupations</td>
<td>5,833</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance of Men, Goods, and Messages</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (On Farms, Woods, And Gardens)</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In and about, and Working and Dealing in the Products of, Mines and Quarries</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals, Machines, Implements, and Conveyances</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious Metals, Jewels, Watches, Instruments, and Games</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, and Works of Construction</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Furniture, Fittings, Decorations</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick, Cement, Pottery, and Glass</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals, Oil, Grease, Soap, Resin, etc.</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skins, Leather, Hair, and Feathers</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, Prints, Books, and Stationery</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Fabrics</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, Tobacco, Drink, and Lodging</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas, Water, and Electricity Supply, and Sanitary Service</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, General, and Undefined Workers and Dealers</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 10 and 11 indicate the occupations of women of working age in Ilford for 1901 and 1911 respectively. In 1901, 77.0% of women of working age were not in paid employment, falling slightly to 75.6% in 1911; this included 54.9% of unmarried women, and 95.8% of married women. The largest employer of women during this period was domestic service (excluding hotels and lodging and eating houses) with 10.5% of females over ten enumerated in Ilford in 1901 giving it as their occupation, decreasing to 7.8% in 1911, at which point there were 159 female domestic servants to every thousand households in the district.

Dress was also an increasingly significant employer of Ilford’s female residents. In 1901, 2.4% of women of working age living in the district worked as tailoresses, milliners,

---

dressmakers, shirtmakers, and seamstresses; by 1911, 3.4% worked in the dress sector, particularly as dressmakers (1.9%). A further 3.3% of women of working age resident in Ilford in 1911 were employed in one of the professions, including 1.8% who worked as teachers, 0.7% as midwives, sick nurses and invalid attendants, and 0.5% in the arts. A final increasingly important employer of women from Ilford was clerical work. In 1901, 1.0% of women of working age living in the district were commercial or business clerks; by 1911, this had risen to 2.3%, reflecting a broader nationwide growth in employment of women in this field.

Taken altogether, these figures characterise Ilford as perhaps the definitive white collar suburb. By 1911, it had superseded slightly older suburbs such as East Ham and Leyton in prominence of male clerical workers among its population, and did not possess the same levels of male employment in sectors like transport, storage, manufacturing, and food and drink as in older suburbs like West Ham, Tottenham and Willesden, which were markedly more proletarian in their composition. At the same time, wealthier male occupational groups, such as those employed in the professions or in better-paying commercial roles, were more predominant in suburbs lying northwest and west of London. This picture is reinforced once female paid employment is considered. This was particularly low in Ilford partly because the district was affluent enough for women not to have to go out to work in the same levels as in many older suburbs, but not as affluent as other districts further west which had higher ratios of domestic servants to households.\(^\text{195}\) One area where Ilford was ahead of the trend in terms

\(^{195}\) See Figure 9 in the Appendix for a breakdown of female occupations in other suburbs.
of female employment was in clerical roles, and this would continue over the next decade, with
the 1921 census finding that 8.8% of women over 12 in the district were employed as clerks
and typists by that point.\footnote{196 GRO, \textit{Census of England & Wales 1921. County of Essex}, p. 76.}

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\hline
\textbf{Occupation} & \textbf{Number} & \textbf{Percentage} \\
\hline
Total Occupied and Unoccupied & 34,450 & 100.0 \\
Retired or Unoccupied & 26,050 & 75.6 \\
General or Local Govt. of the Country & 189 & 0.6 \\
Defence of the Country & 0 & 0.0 \\
Professional Occupations and Their Subordinate Services & 1,119 & 3.3 \\
Domestic Offices or Services & 3,584 & 10.4 \\
Commercial Occupations & 942 & 2.7 \\
Conveyance of Men, Goods, and Messages & 76 & 0.2 \\
Agriculture (On Farms, Woods, And Gardens) & 41 & 0.2 \\
Fishing & 0 & 0.0 \\
In and about, and Working and Dealing in the Products of, Mines and Quarries & 0 & 0.0 \\
Metals, Machines, Implements, and Conveyances & 24 & 0.1 \\
Precious Metals, Jewels, Watches, Instruments, and Games & 22 & 0.1 \\
Building, and Works of Construction & 0 & 0.0 \\
Wood, Furniture, Fittings, Decorations & 24 & 0.1 \\
Brick, Cement, Pottery, and Glass & 9 & 0.0 \\
Chemicals, Oil, Grease, Soap, Resin, etc. & 50 & 0.2 \\
Skins, Leather, Hair, and Feathers & 26 & 0.1 \\
Paper, Prints, Books, and Stationery & 153 & 0.4 \\
Textile Fabrics & 372 & 1.1 \\
Dress & 1,185 & 3.4 \\
Food, Tobacco, Drink, and Lodging & 468 & 1.4 \\
Gas, Water, and Electricity Supply, and Sanitary Service & 0 & 0.0 \\
Other, General, and Undefined Workers and Dealers & 114 & 0.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Occupations of female residents of Ilford aged 10 and over, 1911.}
\end{table}

\textit{Commuting Patterns and Ilford’s Local Economy}

In 1921, the census provided information as to workplace locations for residents of
different districts. Given that, with the exception of the aforementioned rise in female clerical
employment, occupational composition differed little between 1911 and 1921, commuting
patterns recorded in the latter year are likely to resemble what they were prior to the outbreak
of war in 1914. Figure 12 indicates where Ilford’s population who were in paid employed
worked in 1921.\footnote{197 Data taken from GRO, \textit{Census of England & Wales 1921. Workplaces}, pp. 6, 54.} The commonest place for Ilford’s residents to work was the County of
London, where 46.9% of those occupied in 1921 were employed. This included 26.0% who
worked in the City of London, while 4.1% worked in Westminster; other common sites of employment were Finsbury, Holborn, and Shoreditch on the fringes of the City, and the East End boroughs of Stepney and Poplar. Given these locations, it is likely Ilford’s commuters to London comprised most of the district’s residents employed in commercial, government and professional occupations. It is also likely that the share of residents working in London had been swelled by the rise in the share of men and then women living in the district employed in clerical roles.

Figure 12: Places where Ilford residents in paid employment worked, 1921.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilford</td>
<td>12,382</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Essex</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford RD</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>17,345</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>9,607</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsbury</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreditch</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in England and Wales</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside England and Wales</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fixed workplace</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace not given</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36,968</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1921, 33.5% of Ilford residents in paid employment worked in the district as well, including 28.5% of men and 44.7% of women. That it was higher for working female residents is unsurprising, given that 18.0% of Ilford’s female workforce were domestic servants at that time. Looking at the 1914 Kelly’s Directory of Essex gives a clearer picture of where people employed in Ilford would have worked, providing information as to institutions and businesses within the district.198 Some of those listed as public sector employees listed in the 1911 census would have worked at one of Ilford’s post offices, or its police station, or for the Urban District Council or one of the various institutions it operated, such as Ilford’s parks or electric

department. Those listed as professionals, meanwhile, might have been employed at one of Ilford’s churches, schools, or newspapers, while those listed as working on transport might have been employed at one of Ilford’s several stations, or by the council’s tramways department.

The directory’s commercial listings, meanwhile, demonstrate the assortment of self-employed individuals, small businesses and branches of larger businesses operating in the district. Ilford hosted professionals such as physicians, music teachers and solicitors; commercial travellers and insurance agents, as well as a number of banks; farms; builders and tradesmen such as carpenters, painters and decorators; food providers such as dairymen, butchers and grocers, as well as tobacconists, licensed victuallers and hoteliers; workers in dress such as tailors, milliners and shoemakers; printers and newsagents; and small-scale manufacturers and retailers of other products such as metal goods, vehicles and furniture. The district therefore possessed a diverse local economy providing employment for a large minority of its inhabitants across a range of sectors, although it seems likely based on perusing the directories that the significant numbers of Ilford’s residents employed in one of the professions, construction and related sectors, providers of food, drink and lodgings, clothes makers and sellers, and printing and stationery, transport, and local government were particularly likely to be locally based. Local businessmen clearly played an important role in the district’s public life: of Ilford’s 21 councillors in 1914, nine were listed in the trade directory for the area, working in sectors such as retail, food, farming, construction and property.

A third type of commuting that needs to be considered is inter-suburban. In 1921, 10.3% of residents of Ilford in paid employment commuted to other parts of Essex for work. This included 4.8% who travelled to West Ham, while the other most common sites of employment in the county beyond Ilford were East Ham and Romford. A further 1.6% of working residents were employed somewhere outside Essex and London (including 0.7% in one of Middlesex, Surrey and Kent), while 5.8% had no fixed workplace and 1.8 per cent did not give their place of employment’s location. The importance of inter-suburban commuting is further demonstrated by Figure 13, which indicates where the 19,894 people who gave Ilford as their place of work were enumerated on the 1921 census. Of these, 62.2% lived as well as worked in Ilford, but a further 28.2% commuted from elsewhere in Essex. This included 11.2% from neighbouring East Ham, while other surrounding suburbs such as West Ham, Leyton,

---

199 Data taken from GRO, Census of England & Wales 1921. Workplaces, pp. 6, 54.
Woodford and Romford also sent significant numbers of commuters to Ilford. A further 4.1% travelled a bit further from London, while 1.2% came from Middlesex.

Ilford was not unusual in that around two thirds of its residents in paid employment worked outside the district; a similar share of occupied residents of most populous Essex and Middlesex suburbs did the same at this time, although some other districts – particularly those with largescale local employment in manufacturing, transport, farming or (for women) domestic service – had bigger shares of their populations employed locally. The London bias among those commuting out of Ilford, meanwhile, was typical of other white-collar suburbs to the north-east and east of London. Ilford was also not alone in having high levels of inter-suburban commuting either: similar trends were even more evident elsewhere in Essex and Middlesex, with some suburban centres of employment (such as West Ham and Tottenham) having a noticeable pull for residents of neighbouring districts.200

---

200 A fuller comparison of Ilford’s commuting patterns with other Essex and Middlesex suburbs is provided in Figures 10 and 11 of the Appendix.
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Figure 13: Places where Ilford’s workforce resided, 1921.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilford</td>
<td>12,382</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Essex</td>
<td>5,605</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Ham</strong></td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Ham</strong></td>
<td>893</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barking Town</strong></td>
<td>628</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leighton</strong></td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romford UD</strong></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodford</strong></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romford RD</strong></td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London</strong></td>
<td>921</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in England and Wales</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,894</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Gender, Family and Lifecycle**

**Gender Balance and Marital Trends**

Women slightly outnumbered men nationally in the Edwardian period, accounting for 51.7% of the population of England and Wales in 1901 and 51.6% in 1911. The imbalance was higher in Ilford, where 53.8% of residents were female, rising to 54.4% in 1911. This cannot be attributed to the presence of domestic servants: the share of Ilford’s adult women who worked in this sector was actually below the national average. Rather, it was due to its popularity with married couples. In 1911, 65.2% of men aged 15 and over in Ilford were married, compared to 59.7% in England and Wales overall, and 58.9% in the County of London. As Figure 14 indicates, from the age of 25 onwards, men in Ilford were more likely to be married than their counterparts in the same age groups in London and in England and Wales overall, while the same also applied for women aged between 30 and 44. More than half of men and women in the district were married by the time they turned 30 and over three quarters by the time they reached 35.

This is borne out further when comparison is made with other suburbs. Marital rates among men tended to be higher in Essex and Middlesex suburbs than they were in the County of London or nationwide. There also appears to have been correlations between shares of suburbs’ populations who were female and the proportions of their adult male populations who were married, and also with suburbs’ rates of population growth over the 1900s. In short, suburban districts had significant appeal to newlyweds and marriage played a significant role in driving the suburbanisation process at this time.

---

204 Data taken from ibid.
205 Figure 12 in the Appendix provides comparative data on suburban marital trends.
Birth Rates and Family Sizes

Unsurprisingly, the suburb was also a popular site for raising children. This trend is illustrated in Figures 15 to 17.\textsuperscript{206} Figure 15 indicates the number of births occurring in Ilford every year from 1891 to 1914. Figure 16 shows the rate of change in the number of births in Ilford over the same period and how this compared to the rate of changing in the number of births in England and Wales as a whole. Figure 17 shows the ratio of births per thousand of the population in Ilford, London and England and Wales in 1891, 1901 and 1911.

In 1891, 308 children were born in Ilford. The number of births started to increase substantially from the mid-1890s, reaching 637 in 1893 and 1,522 by 1903, reflecting the rapidly rising number of people moving to the district and having children, with the rate of

increase in the number of births during this period drastically outstripping the national trend. This coheres with Heller’s own analysis of six streets built in Ilford in the 1890s, which found that in 1901 over three quarters of residents were either young couples with young children, or else were about to have children. \(^{207}\) Thereafter, growth in the number of births in the district increased on the whole at a slower rate to reach a peak of 1,705 in 1908, before dropping steadily to 1,492 in 1912, and then plateauing. From 1907 onwards, the rate of increase in the number of births in Ilford was generally behind the national rate. This to a large degree mirrored the slowdown in Ilford’s population growth from the mid-1900s. However, this was not the only factor. In 1891, Ilford’s birth rate (282 per 1,000 residents) had trailed both those for London (318 per 1,000) and England and Wales as a whole (315 per 1,000). By 1901, they stood at 289, 291 and 286 per thousand respectively, with Ilford bucking the national trend of sharp decline in the birth rate. Yet by 1911 the birth rate in Ilford had dropped far more sharply (to 204 births per thousand residents) than was the case in London or England and Wales (247 and 244 per thousand respectively).

Moreover, what is striking about suburban birth rates more generally is that they tended to be higher in older and/or less affluent suburbs, and lower in those more more lower middle-class or middle-class ones that had seen more recent escalation in population growth. \(^{208}\) This was partly down to higher shares of domestic servants, but it was also down to family size. In Ilford, 86.8% of households consisted of three to six people, while just 13.2% had more than that; the equivalent figures for England and Wales were 83.7% and 16.3% respectively. \(^{209}\) There was even greater variation between different suburbs, but a clear pattern emerges: small to medium-sized families were most common in relatively affluent suburbs, whereas larger families were more common in suburbs with larger working class populations; this is in keeping with Siân Pooley’s argument about the suburban lower middle classes leading the way in reducing family sizes. \(^{210}\) It also helps to explain why, even though many young adults were departing for the newer suburbs to start families, more children were being born in older, poorer suburbs that were not as attractive destinations for young married couples and where rates of population growth were on the whole now dropping.

---

\(^{207}\) Heller, ‘Suburbia, Marketing and Stakeholders’ (pp. 65–68).
\(^{208}\) Figure 13 in the Appendix provides comparative data on suburban birth rates.
\(^{210}\) Pooley, ‘Parenthood, Child-Rearing and Fertility’. Figure 14 in the Appendix provides comparative data on suburban household sizes.
Age Composition

The other factor linking human to suburban lifecycle was changing age composition. Figures 18 to 20 indicate the number of men and women in each quinquennial age group resident in Ilford in 1891, 1901 and 1911 respectively. In 1891, 49.6% of Ilford’s male population were under 20, as were 54.8% of its females. 28.7% of men were in their 20s and 30s, 15.5% their 40s and 50s, and 6.4% 60 and over; for women, the equivalent figures were 25.3%, 14.1% and 5.9%. Ten years later, the shares of men and women aged under 20 had fallen to 41.9% and 42.1% respectively, while the shares in their 20s and 30s rose to 35.7% and 35.2%. The proportions of men and women in their 40s and 50s also increased to 17.5% and 16.3%, while the percentage of men aged 60 or over fell to 4.9%, whereas for women it rose to 6.4%. Moving forward to 1911 and the picture had changed again, albeit more subtly. The proportion of men under 20 had only shown slight decline to 40.5%, while for women the fall was a bit sharper, to 38.4%. There were also fairly small reversals of the growth between 1891 and 1901 in the shares of men and women in their 20s and 30s, which fell to 32.3% and 34.3% respectively in 1911. The proportions in their 40s and 50s, by contrast, grew over this period, to 21.5% and 20.1%, while the shares in their 60s and older rose to 5.7% and 7.4%. That Ilford’s population aged somewhat between 1901 and 1911 is further emphasised by the fact that the shares of under-20s aged 10 and over and of the 20-to-39 group aged 30 and over all grew between these two dates.

This was partly a product of falling birth and mortality rates leading to the national population as a whole getting older. Yet taken in tandem with other statistical evidence for Ilford – the drop in demand for housing and the fall in numbers of births from around the mid-1900s, the tendency of residents of the district to marry between the ages of 25 and 35, the fact almost three out five households there had between three and five members, and that two out of five people born in Ilford lived somewhere else in 1911 – it suggests the flow of young couples moving to the district in droves during the 1890s and early 1900s had dried up by the late 1900s, and that a growing proportion of those already there were by 1911 middle-aged and

their children teenagers and young adults, many of whom subsequently moved onto other suburbs.

Figure 14: Shares of residents of Ilford, the County of London, and England and Wales who were married, in quinquennial age groups, 1911.

Figure 15: Births per year in Ilford, 1891–1914.
Figure 16: Annual increase in births per year in Ilford and in England and Wales, and the gap between them, 1891–1914.

Figure 17: Births per thousand residents of Ilford, London, and England and Wales, 1891, 1901 and 1911.
This pattern becomes clearer through comparison with other suburbs. Under-20s tended to be more numerous in more proletarian suburbs to the northeast and east of London, whereas in the more solidly lower middle-class and middle-class suburbs, numbers aged between 20 and 39 were disproportionately high. There was also a strong negative correlation between the rate of population growth in suburban districts between 1901 and 1911 and the proportions of men and women living there who were under 20 in 1911, and a strong positive one with the proportions of men and women in their 20s and 30s. This partly reflects the fact older suburbs were by now shedding middle-class residents and gaining increasingly large working-class populations (who tended to comprise larger families), and partly that adult men and women pouring into newer suburbs in the 1900s were less likely to have finished or even started having children as yet, meaning there was a higher ratio of them to under-20s. Ilford by 1911 was no longer at the forefront of this wave, its appeal usurped by newer suburbs, its population maturing as the flow of new young couples slowed.

Figure 18: Ages of residents of Ilford, in quinquennial groups, 1891.

---

212 Figures 15 and 16 in the Appendix provides comparative data on suburban age compositions.
Figure 19: Ages of residents of Ilford, in quinquennial groups, 1901.

Figure 20: Ages of residents of Ilford, in quinquennial groups, 1911.
SUBURBAN PUBLIC LIFE

Associational Culture, Commercial Leisure and Public Provision

This section provides an overview of Ilford’s social life, considering how it developed in relation to the district’s suburbanisation. Heller found 53 associations listed for the district by the Ilford Guardian for the period between 1898 and 1901 alone, as well as a further 11 in Ilford UDC’s promotional literature. For starters, the district boasted a diverse assortment of sport and leisure-oriented organisations. By 1914, these included clubs dedicated to cycling, football, cricket, golf, lawn tennis, horticulture, rifle-shooting and bowls, as well as brass bands and youth-focused organisations like divisions of the Boys’ Brigade and the Scouts, which combined militaristic training activities with more recreational ones. Some of these institutions were of reasonably long standing: Ilford Cricket Club, for example, was established in 1879, while Ilford Football Club was established in 1881. Others were established amid the rapid influx of new residents from the early 1890s through to the mid-1900s: the Convivial Social and Cycling Club and Ilford Chess Club were both set up in 1900, while Ilford Golf Club began life in 1907, and Seven Kings Methodists’ Cycling Club in 1908.

One particularly locus of associational culture in Ilford was the church. Directories listed six places of worship in 1855, rising to 11 in 1874, and 17 in 1894. From thereon they proliferated to the point that the 1911 Census gave the number of places of worship in Ilford as 43. With this growth came greater denominational diversity. In 1855 Ilford had Church of England, Wesleyan and Baptist representation; by 1914, there were also Catholic, Congregationalist, Presbyterian, Christadelphian, Quaker, Unitarian and Methodist places of worship.

213 Heller, ‘Suburbia, Marketing and Stakeholders’ (p. 77).
216 Ilford Guardian (14 Jul 1911); Ilford Chess Club, <http://ilfchess.tripod.com/> (accessed 2 Sep 2015);
worship, as well as numerous mission halls.\textsuperscript{219} Churches were also facilitators of other forms of associational life and social action. There were, for example, a number of cycling clubs affiliated to churches. Moreover, Charles Henry Vine, Minister of the Congregational Church on High Road, launched from it in 1901 the Ilford Men’s Meeting, a non-sectarian organisation which Vine’s son later estimated included one man in ten in Ilford among its membership at its peak, and from which subsequently sprung a number of other voluntary organisations, including a Sick Benefit Society, Horticultural Society, Holidays Club, Swimming Club and Tennis Club; the Ilford Literary and Debating Society was also founded from High Road Congregational Church.\textsuperscript{220}

Political activity and affiliation, broadly defined, also played an important part in Ilford’s associational life. Ilford by 1914 had Conservative Club and a Liberal Club, while there was also a separate Liberal Club for Seven Kings and Goodmayes, as well as a Conservative and Liberal Unionist Association, Liberal and Radical Association, a branch of the British Socialist Party, and a Fabian Society. There were also a number of organisations representing the interests of differing social and occupational groups with divisions in the district, including the Women’s Social and Political Union, the Worker’s Educational Association, and the National Union of Clerks; there was also a local trader’s association, and a number of ratepayers’ associations.\textsuperscript{221} These organisations illustrate how political ideologies and particular social group interests provided an avenue for collective identity and activism in the district.

By contrast, comparing directories over time does not illustrate a similar rate of increase in the number of public houses in the district. Six were listed in Ilford in the 1855 Kelly’s Directory, rising to 15 by 1882.\textsuperscript{222} The three primary sites of distribution were Barkingside, Chadwell Heath and along the Ilford High Road. Yet developers Griggs and Corbett were both strict temperance advocates who refused to allow public houses to be constructed on their estates.\textsuperscript{223} As a result, despite huge population growth in the interim, the 1911 Census recorded only 33 public houses, inns and hotels in the district.\textsuperscript{224} Their marginalisation as sites of local public life were further emphasised by the number of temperance organisations that sprang up in Ilford during this time.

\textsuperscript{221}Kelly’s Directories, \textit{Kelly’s Directory of Essex, Hertfordshire and Middlesex 1914,} pp. 341–353.
\textsuperscript{223}Jackson, \textit{Semi-Detached London,} p. 65.
However, other types of commercial leisure provision certainly did increase to meet demand from Ilford’s new residents, particularly from the late-1900s onwards. In 1909, the Ilford Hippodrome theatre opened, capable of accommodating 3,000 people, and in 1911 this was joined by the Ilford Biograph (capacity: 800), by which point Ilford also had its own music hall.\textsuperscript{225} Cinemas also began to arrive around the same time – although films had been displayed in non-purpose built buildings from an earlier date – and by 1914 Kelly’s Directory listed four for the district: the Cinema de Luxe (capacity: 600); the Empire Kinema (capacity: 2,000); the Premier Electric Theatre (capacity: 1,000); and Seven Kings Cinema (capacity: 1,500).\textsuperscript{226} The timing of the construction of these venues reflected broader trends. For example, the number of purpose-built cinemas in Greater London increased from 261 in 1910 to 383 in 1914.\textsuperscript{227}

One final public space to consider is parks and recreation grounds. In 1899, Ilford UDC acquired 29 acres of private land, which it opened as Central Park. The park was subsequently expanded in 1902, and then again in 1912, at which point it was known as Valentine’s Park, with a public area of 96 acres.\textsuperscript{228} The 32-acre South Park was also opened in Goodmayes in 1902. In addition to this, there were a number of recreation grounds dotted around the district, near Wanstead Park, and in Seven Kings, Goodmayes, Loxford and Barkingside.\textsuperscript{229}

\textit{The Remaking of Ilford’s Public Life}

Taken together, these are illustrative of how wholly suburbanisation transformed local public life. Prior to this, Ilford was a rural district with a smattering of churches, public houses and dining and tea rooms. While some of the institutions already in place sustained a central place in local communal life, as Ilford’s population rocketed they were soon supplemented and in some cases marginalised by a multiplying set of voluntary organisations engaged in a


\textsuperscript{227} McKernan, ‘Diverting Time’ (p. 131).

\textsuperscript{228} Jackson, \textit{Semi-Detached London}, p. 66.

widening array of activities, as well as a host of public leisure venues such as parks and subsequently theatres and cinemas. This was a community based around activities such as sport, churchgoing and charity, which were homosocial in some cases but in others mixed-sex and family-orientated, reflecting the prerogatives of those who migrated to the district. This strongly counters the stereotype of suburban life as above all intensely private and confined to the domestic sphere. Home-based leisure activities were almost certainly important in Ilford, as in other suburbs; homes in the district were, for example, uniformly appended with gardens. However, public life in the district built upon domestic relationships and activities; for example, the popularity of gardening fuelled associational culture in the shape of horticultural societies. The connection between private and public suburban leisure forms, and the blurring of lines between the two, is a trend similarly evident from other secondary literature on the topic.230

Many trends visible in Ilford could also be seen in other suburbs. For example, in 1911 there was one place of worship for every 1,907 residents in the district. This was a far higher concentration than found in most suburbs of east and northeast London, or in the County of London itself, but concentration was even higher in many suburbs further west within Middlesex.231 Similarly, as in Ilford, it is likely a large proportion of public houses in London’s Outer Ring during the early twentieth century were those originally built for rural communities and so remained fairly concentrated, in relation to population, where large swathes of area were as yet untouched by the suburbanisation process, although there also tended to be more public houses per head in suburbs with significantly larger working class populations.232

Within Ilford itself, public life was also subject to internal variations. Take, for example, the concentration of public houses in Barkingside compared to their absence from the Griggs and Corbett estates. Furthermore, community in different parts of the district centred on different sites and institutions, even if they did ostensibly fulfil the same functions. There were frequently separate sport and leisure clubs set up for the Goodmayes and Seven Kings area, for instance.233 Thus, social and geographic differences between wards and neighbourhoods were reinforced through associational culture and leisure activities, helping to fuel separate senses of local identity.

230 See for example, Gilbert, ‘The Vicar’s Daughter’; Preston, ‘Pastimes of the People’.
231 Figure 17 in the Appendix provides comparative data for suburban church concentration.
232 Figure 18 and 19 in the Appendix provide comparative data for suburban pub concentration and its relationship with population density.
At the same time, however, London’s extensive transport networks supplied opportunities for Ilford’s residents to travel elsewhere for their recreation. There were, for example, the 275 theatres and other places of amusement counted for the County of London on the 1911 census. Conversely, beyond the suburbs, the countryside offered pleasurable surroundings for activities such as cycling and rambling. Work by Geraldine Biddle-Perry and Michelle Johansen has demonstrated that suburban associational culture facilitated such sojourns. Ilford’s clubs and venues also faced competition from other suburbs: West Ham, for example, boasted 4,598 shops and 16 theatres and other places of amusement in 1911, thereby offering a far greater agglomeration of leisure sites than Ilford; its potency as a local competitor contributed to the decision of Ilford’s local tradesmen to organise a shopping week in 1913 to encourage residents to buy their goods more locally.

CONCLUSION

At the turn of the twentieth century, Ilford was transformed from a village into a populous suburb with active local government and extensive transport links, albeit while retaining a sizeable rural hinterland. Its residents were primarily a combination of the locally, relatively recently born (and a smattering of locally born of longer standing), and migrants from the County of London and from more inner-lying, mostly nearby suburbs, as well as a minority who moved there from outside Greater London. Its adult male population were frequently employed in white collar roles, especially clerical jobs, but a minority worked in the professions and in higher-paying commercial occupations, and others were employed in fields such as transport, retail, agriculture and construction. Most women in the district did not work; those who did tended to be domestic servants, or else employed in areas such as nursing, teaching, dress and clerical work. Many residents worked in London, particularly in the City, but many others were employed locally, or commuted to other nearby suburbs. Ilford’s population included slightly disproportionate numbers of females and married couples, who

234 Biddle-Perry, ‘‘Fashioning Suburban Aspiration’’ (pp. 187–204); Johansen, ‘‘Good Feeling and Brotherliness’’ (pp. 249–264).
had moved there to start families, but by the end of the Edwardian period its population growth had stalled somewhat and most of its residents were maturing into middle-aged parents and adolescent offspring. It also had a vibrant associational culture, and its residents also had access to commercial leisure facilities, both locally and in London and neighbouring suburbs. It cannot be classified as a representative, ‘typical’ suburb, because no such thing existed, but is perhaps best described as at the forefront of lower middle-class suburbanisation at the turn of the century, within a decade eclipsed by many of the more westerly lying Middlesex districts as the middle classes proper began dominating the suburbanisation process more.

The findings presented in this chapter help to frame the composition of the carnival’s organisers, participants and audience, as well as the ideas and identities expressed in and around it. The speed with which Ilford suburbanised helps explain the demand for a new hospital. Its varied associational culture and economy proved the backbone of the processions, and furnished its ethos of local, voluntary action. The carnival’s organising body had to integrate residents of different occupations, workplace locations, residential backgrounds, ages and sexes, providing them with opportunities for accumulating social capital, as well as incorporate both suburban and rural areas. Migratory trends and commuting patterns also help explain the geographically broader networks of participation in, knowledge about and attendance of the carnival. Occupational makeup and commuting patterns also provide a sense of where the carnival fitted in within the lives of residents temporally. Residential histories help explain the role the carnival fulfilled as a local ritual. The themes and forms of the carnival reflected the district’s leisure options, but also rival attractions from London and other suburbs. That Ilford’s population were relatively short-lived in the district generally also raises questions about the ideas of locality performed in the processions, and emphasises how expressing national identities may have provided a unifying language. Its make-up in terms of occupations, household structures and ages helps to explain the class and gender identities and relations performed in the carnival as well.
PART II

THE ANATOMY OF THE CARNIVAL MOVEMENT
CHAPTER THREE
LOCALITY AND NETWORKS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the Ilford Carnival’s geographies of organisation, participation and attendance. It firstly outlines the increasing integration of Britain, as well as of its capital city, through to the early twentieth century, and explains how locality remained important and was remade within this context. Subsequently, it discusses the relationship between the Ilford Carnival’s administration and local topography and political geography, and the challenges involved in organising a carnival in a suburbanising district, as well as the role of locality in participation in the carnival more generally. Finally, it highlights the geographically broader connections underpinning the carnival, including the spread of these events, inclusion of procession items from without the district, coverage in other local and national newspapers, and attendance from outside Ilford. The chapter therefore aims to contribute to the wider historiography on the place of local community in British life during this period, by demonstrating how it was constituted, performed and reconfigured within overlapping networks of differing spatial scales.

NATION, CITY AND LOCALITY

National and Metropolitan Integration

Britain became an increasingly integrated nation between the late eighteenth and early twentieth centuries, resulting from a series of space-time compressions of the type discussed
in the Introduction to this thesis. Travel across Britain was accelerated firstly by the rollout of new turnpikes and canals over the late eighteenth century, and then by the spread of railways from the mid-nineteenth – the latter also drastically increased the accessibility and speed of the postal service.\textsuperscript{236} At the same time, Victorians perceived the advent of telegraphy as annihilating time and space and making not just Britain, but the whole world, smaller.\textsuperscript{237} Governance also became increasingly national. The central state, despite its laissez-faire inclinations, incrementally intervened in a range of areas, including imperial administration, industry, housing, transport and welfare.\textsuperscript{238} Britain also transitioned towards mass democracy with a series of extensions of the suffrage widening responsibility for selection of government, while travelling political speakers and agitators from the Chartist leaders onwards helped to foment a national polity.\textsuperscript{239} Also hugely important in this respect was the emergence of a mass-readership press, with titles and sales proliferating following the mid-nineteenth-century repeal of taxes on newspaper publishing.\textsuperscript{240} The nationalisation of Britain’s ritual year was discussed in Chapter One, but other aspects of leisure were affected too. Sport tended to be organised along a four-nations rather than one-nation basis, but the tendency towards national codification and standardisation was evident, as with the establishment of the Football Association in 1863 to implement common rules for playing the game in England.\textsuperscript{241} Its authority was challenged by clubs in the North West and Midlands, who established the National Football League in 1888 – yet this too would by the 1920s have become a genuinely national competition.\textsuperscript{242}

Despite the pace of its population and physical growth, London also maintained and enhanced its cohesion as a single entity in a number of ways over the course of the nineteenth century. A number of bodies were tasked with aspects of metropolitan governance during this period. The Office of Metropolitan Building and Metropolitan Commission of Sewers, both

\textsuperscript{240}Kevin Williams, Read All about it! A History of the British Newspaper (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2010), pp. 99–100.
\textsuperscript{241}Adrian Harvey, Football: The First Hundred Years: The Untold Story (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 167–177.
established in the 1840s, were in 1855 amalgamated into the Metropolitan Board of Works, which would later take over management of London’s bridges and fire brigades, before being replaced with the directly elected LCC in 1889. Other public bodies set up with London-wide jurisdictions during this period included the Metropolitan Police (1829), the School Board for London (1870), and the Metropolitan Water Board (1902). In economic terms, London had numerous districts with local concentration of particular sectors, which served the capital as a whole (and beyond), such as financial services in the City, legal services around Holborn, or theatres and hotels in the West End; these were often also able to recruit staff living across London, due to the city’s extensive transport network. A glance at the 1914 Post Office Directory for London confirms that the organisation of other affairs there frequently gravitated towards a citywide scale, with numerous trade unions and associations, religious bodies, charities, and sport and leisure organisations all claiming a London remit.

The Persistence of the Local

Nonetheless, these processes of nationalisation and metropolitanisation were not tantamount to delocalisation. Diverse aspects of a particular field of activity might orientate towards different scales of organisation, resulting in accommodation or cooperation between different agents, rather than conflict. Miles Ogborn, for example, rejected a ‘zero-sum’ interpretation of central-local power relations within the nineteenth-century British state and instead emphasised that levels of state apparatus were interdependent, specific outcomes resulted from individual processes of negotiation between them, and the relationship remained dynamic within the operation of policy. Similarly, David Fletcher has demonstrated that the OS Boundary Survey conducted between the 1840s and 1880s was heavily reliant upon and respectful towards local administrators’ knowledge. Philip Harling, meanwhile, has highlighted how a number of key developments of the late Victorian and Edwardian period were pioneered at the local level, including tackling diseases, experiments in municipalisation,

and female and working-class participation in government.\textsuperscript{248} K. D. M. Snell has also stressed the centrality of the parish during this period, highlighting its significance to a range of social aspects, from welfare provision to marriage patterns.\textsuperscript{249}

Technological advancements that made communication and organisation at a national (and transnational) scale possible could also be utilised in ways that buttressed or redefined rather than diminished local fields of activity – something particularly pertinent to studying the suburb. For example, Michael Harris has found that 350 new newspaper titles emerged in Greater London during the 1880s and 1890s alone, including a number of suburban weeklies that sold around 4,000–5,000 per issue.\textsuperscript{250} Moreover, as Patricia Garside has noted, even the national press frequently afforded extended coverage to local and suburban affairs within London, as commercial pressures forced papers to become progressively more London-centric in their distribution and coverage.\textsuperscript{251} Another valuable example of how new technologies could remake and reinforce locality is the electric tram. Alan A. Jackson listed 105 separate tram services introduced by the LCC, local councils and private operators in suburban London between 1901 and 1914.\textsuperscript{252} These were shorter-haul than rail routes, but facilitated inter-suburban and intra-suburban commuting, including between railway stations and points of residence somewhat removed from them.\textsuperscript{253} Through these types of innovation, suburbs could function as a new type of locality: lower density, usually with relatively small local economies and most of their employed residents commuting away for work, and served with national cultural products – yet still capable of providing their residents with sufficient levels of social capital and a sense of place.
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LOCALITY AND THE CARNIVAL MOVEMENT

Locality and Carnival Administration

The development of the Ilford Carnival’s administration is illustrative of the extent to which organisation of affairs frequently occurred on a districtwide scale there. Campaigners for establishing the hospital saw Ilford as a natural vicinity for it to serve and included a medical society set up in accordance with its boundaries; and they established an administrative body for organising a carnival covering the same area. Other examples of carnivals in Greater London during this period similarly illustrated the importance of official demarcations of locality in shaping the boundaries of collective action – regardless of whether its objectives were local or national. In most cases, the scale of these events’ coverage cohered with the borders of the newly established metropolitan boroughs within the County of London and UDs in the Outer Ring. This was already visible in the 1890s with the establishment of carnivals covering UDs such as Tottenham and Wood Green, by cycling clubs similarly synonymous with these vicinities. Carnivals organised in the capital in 1900 to support Boer War-related charities covered areas either about to be constituted as metropolitan boroughs, like Lewisham, Camberwell, Hackney and Islington, or that were already UDs, such as Finchley, Barnet and Walthamstow. The pattern continued in the Edwardian era, in Ilford and in neighbouring Essex suburbs like West Ham, East Ham and Barking, and was also in evidence after World War One. New local authority areas related to ideas of place among the locally active at least, and in turn reinforced local identities to encourage continued communal action in line with their boundaries.

However, the Ilford Carnival’s administration also demonstrated the existence of a smaller, alternative but complementary geographic unit of organisation: the ward. In 1905, Ilford had only very recently increased its number of wards from three to seven, but these new administrative creations nonetheless each supported committees within which the carnival’s rank-and-file organisers worked and in which much of its administration took place, as is discussed in Chapter Four. The expansion of the Tottenham Carnival in 1901 also saw its previous committee of cycling club members supplanted with a new larger administration comprised of committees representing each of Tottenham’s six wards.254 Likewise, from 1907,

254 Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald (19 Jul 1901).
the expanded Finchley Carnival was run by ward committees and a general committee. The potency of wards as organisational frameworks lay in their smaller scales. Though in some cases relatively newly devised divisions, they generally related sufficiently to local topography and coherent social groups to encourage local residents to join committees bearing their names, and for these committees to subsequently successfully organise both procession contingents and fundraising initiatives within their environs.

Where local government structures did not reflect local topography, social relations and pre-existing identities, the boundaries of carnival organisation often did not adhere to them. For example, in 1900 the Kilburn wards of Willesden opted out of the Willesden Carnival to organise one with Hampstead instead. This development owed to the fact Kilburn, which overlapped the Willesden-Hampstead border, functioned as a more potent point for identification with and incubator of communal activity among its residents than Willesden did. Meanwhile, the decision of residents of Hornsey’s Harringay ward to arrange a Boer War carnival in tandem with Wood Green rather than the other Hornsey wards may well have reflected its physical separation from the remainder of the UD by the Greater Northern Line railway.

The continued presence of vast tracts of rural land among suburban developments posed a particular obstacle to establishing districtwide carnival administrations, due to the dearth of necessary transport networks and accessible meeting spaces to support regular interaction and collective endeavour. The concentration of most of Ilford’s built-up area and population in the southwestern quadrant of the district meant it existed sufficiently as an imagined and lived place for an Ilford-wide carnival to be held when much of its territory remained rural, although
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North Hainault was a notoriously difficult ward to organise, as the *Ilford Guardian* noted in 1907, because of its scattered population. Suburban development also eventually connected Finchley’s disparate points of settlement sufficiently that they could collectively organise carnivals; the 1900 Finchley Carnival’s treasurer, Stanley Wildash, described the event at the time as the first occasion on which North, East and West Finchley ‘so successfully and unitedly joined hands’. Yet elsewhere, the presence of large rural patches impeded the hosting of districtwide carnivals. The vast Enfield UD had two principal areas of settlement – Enfield Town in its centre, and a long built-up strip along its eastern flank – as well as smaller patches of suburban development, separated from each other by stretches of field. It was for this reason that despite occasional suggestions that a carnival covering the entirety of Enfield should be organised, processions held there during the late Victorian and Edwardian periods were limited in their area of coverage to only Enfield Town or, later on, Eastern Enfield, or else other smaller vicinities like Bush Hill Park.

**Locality and Communication**

Communication within Ilford about the carnival took a number of forms. Informal chitchat regarding these events between neighbours, commuters, co-workers and fellow businesspeople, schoolmates, and members of clubs and associations may have left almost no impression on the historical record, but unquestionably took place, and the local press made reference to idle gossip about the carnival. Within the carnival’s administration itself, the most important forum for discussion were committee meetings. The executive committee convened at the Town Hall (built in 1901), while ward committees met at an assortment of venues including schoolrooms, committee members’ business premises, offices at the *Ilford Recorder*, temperance lodges, and the Ilford Conservative and Liberal Clubs’ headquarters.

Suburbs such as Ilford, with their relatively low population densities and daytime populations,
may have lacked the opportunities for informal, haphazard street-based interaction along the same lines as London’s more crowded inner-lying districts.264 Yet a more formal version of community could be found in Ilford’s indoor public spaces – municipal, commercial, and associational – where residents congregated at prearranged times.

However, the most important means of communication beyond the committees appears to have been the local newspapers. The Ilford Guardian and Ilford Recorder advertised and reported upon meetings held in association with carnivals, and provided details of items secured for processions, and of other entertainments arranged to bolster funds. Information was disclosed as to procession routes, committee membership and amounts collected. Correspondence from both carnival organisers and the general public was printed in their letters pages. Finally, the carnivals themselves were subject to extensive reports. This illustrates how local community was imagined as a totality through the press, in Ilford and other London suburbs. These publications asserted their synonymy with specific districts, through their titles and the scope of their coverage, as an essential marketing tool. Potential readers were encouraged to view themselves as residents of a particular district and to consume news related to it. In this way, local newspapers functioned as vital unifying public spheres, connecting disparate goings on, individuals and organisations to a particular place, often helping to reaffirm organisations' own aspirations for synonymy with that particular place.

Organisational Life, Local Community and Carnival Participation

Locality was equally central to the organisation of the Ilford Carnival’s procession contingents. Large proportions of most ward contingents were internally sourced, with contributions from nearby schools, businesses, and voluntary sector bodies of varying types. In some cases these organisations were serial contributors, such as Barkingside Brass Band and Dr Barnardo’s Home in North Hainault, or the Abbott Bros dairy, Ilford Guardian, Ilford Post Office, and Loxford Ratepayers’ Association in Loxford. North and South Hainault tended to rely on vehicles from particular parts of these two wards. For example, South Hainault’s then

organiser Bertram C. Baylis noted in 1906 that most of the cars in its contingent for that year were drawn from the Corbett estates in Goodmayes.265

As an endeavour, the Ilford Carnival amounted to a performance of community, in which a complex mesh of interlinked groupings, networks and organisations – as detailed in the previous chapter – came together to raise funds and put on a show as a locality – both at district and ward level, building upon and intensifying longer-standing and more continuous collective performances and interactions through the arrangement of procession items and also fundraising initiatives. For example, in June 1907, staff at Ilford Post Office held a meeting, chaired by the postmaster, about assisting in the carnival, at which it was decided to organise a subscription list and provide a decorated car, and a committee was set up to make arrangements.266 In this way, businesses and public sector organisations and trade-based associations shifted their focus from their normal lines of work to charitable activity, and through it from accruing economic capital to accumulating social capital and displaying their cultural capital, while the local underpinnings of their occupational bonds were foregrounded.

Gender relations, formal and informal, were also components of the presentation of locality. Procession items involving a number of participants, whether that item was arranged by the participants themselves or by someone else, were in many cases either all-men or all-women affairs. These items reinforced a priori homosocial structures from which they arose, such as existing friendships, workplaces, and gendered voluntary organisations (such as the Ilford Men’s Meeting or Ilford Women’s Guild). Yet they also provided a forum for the heterosocial relationships forming in Edwardian London’s suburbs. Mixed-sex groups of friends participated collectively, while mixed-sex cycling, theatrical and musical clubs and collectives also contributed items featuring males and females.

The family was another important conduit to participation in the processions and to presenting community membership. In 1906, former ward organiser W. H. Ridgley wrote in his column for the Ilford Recorder of a Samuel Greenboys, who was roped into participating in the 1905 Carnival, but enjoyed himself so much that he would be doing so again that year.267 Evidence of similar cases can be found by browsing the procession lists, which contain occasional examples of husbands and wives parading together, as well as siblings taking part in the processions. There is in particular plenty of evidence of the participation of young children in the carnival, so much so that from the outset there were separate best costume award
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categories for under-14 boys and girls. Some children took part in multiple processions. In 1978, the *Ilford Pictorial* ran a short piece on local resident Alf Ealden, who had taken part in every procession between 1905, when he was just six, and 1914; he was the son of long serving Seven Kings ward committee member, Arthur James Ealden, and inherited his father’s dedication to local voluntary action, going on to run the 1st Seven Kings Scouts for 53 years – a further illustration of the relationship between family and associational culture.²⁶⁸ Youth-oriented organisations also played a key role in facilitating the participation of children. Local schools were regular contributors of cars for the processions, while boys also took part in the carnival en masse as contingents of local branches of the Scouts and the Church Lads Brigade.

**BROADER NETWORKS AND THE CARNIVAL MOVEMENT**

*Networks of Participation*

Yet the carnival also occurred at the nexus of networks of communication, participation and replication that spread significantly beyond Ilford. The proliferation of carnivals is a history of both short and long distance cultural dissemination was one case in point. As stated in Chapter One, the idea of carnival was borrowed from the continent and initially concentrated in parts of the southwest and southeast of England, before extending to other parts of the country as well. Having initially spread to a handful of London’s suburbs, carnivals followed an inter-suburban pattern of cultural transmission, with clear patterns of proliferation in suburban northeast London in the mid-to-late 1890s, and suburban east London in the mid-1900s. Sometimes connections were evident between carnival movements geographically further apart: for example, the decline of the Enfield Tradesmen Cycling Club’s Carnival prompted two correspondents to write into the *Enfield Observer* in 1910 to offer their opinions as to how it could be revived, offering the Ilford Carnival and the Woodford Meet respectively as models for reform.²⁶⁹

²⁶⁹ *Enfield Observer* (29 Jul 1910; 19 Aug 1910)
As well as inter-district replication, there was also collaboration. In some cases, districts under separate local authorities came together to arrange processions. Greenwich’s collaboration with Deptford in putting on a carnival in aid of the Widows’ and Orphans Fund in 1900 was one such example; Tottenham’s frequent collaborations with Edmonton, and later Walthamstow, in organising carnivals was another. Moreover, carnival processions regularly included a significant proportion of contributors from neighbouring and near-neighbouring districts. The Ilford Carnival, for example, included bands, fire brigades, cycling clubs and youth organisations, such as Scouts troops and Church Lads’ Brigade companies, from East Ham, West Ham, Leyton, Walthamstow, Barking, Buckhurst Hill, Rainham, Dagenham, Romford and Brentwood; the attached sporting events also involved participating clubs from other, mostly nearby, suburbs.

Businesses were similarly involved in the emergent metropolitan matrix of cultural flows embodied in the Ilford Carnival. From the outset, the procession included contributions from businesses based outside of Ilford, with their share of items growing particularly large in its latter years. Most of these contributors were major companies located in London’s commercial heartland, running between the City and the West End. Similar trends were visible in contemporaneous processions held in Tottenham, Finchley and Enfield, though not to the same scale as in Ilford. Some companies were very active in utilising processions in this way: for example, West End-based Palmer Cord Tyres’ “The Palmer Tyre” Postman Advertisement’ put in appearances in Eastern Enfield, Ilford, Woodford, West Ham, Barking and Walthamstow. Suburban markets were also targeted by companies based outside London entirely, such as Kilmarnock-based whiskey manufacturer Johnnie Walker, which entered cars in the Tottenham and Ilford Carnivals at different points in time – a reminder that centre-suburban economic relations should be contextualised within London’s broader relationship with the wider national economy. Moreover, inter-suburban marketing was also evident in London carnival processions. As suburban economies matured, increasing numbers of firms based along London’s rim developed broader ambitions as to markets they could reach. Some companies submitted items to processions held in neighbouring districts, or further afield. In 1907, Ilford-based dairy company Abbott Brothers entered a car not only into the East Ham Carnival, but also into a procession held in more distant Wood Green. Similarly, the 1904
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Tottenham Carnival, for example, included a vehicle sent by the Hackney Empire, while the Holloway Empire submitted a car into the 1907 Finchley procession.\textsuperscript{273}

\textit{Media Coverage and Attendance}

Press coverage was particularly important among the wider networks of communication and interaction at play in local carnivals, with events catching the attention of newspapers based in neighbouring districts and beyond. The Ilford Carnival was covered by the \textit{East London Advertiser} in 1907 and 1912, with the \textit{East Ham Echo} and the \textit{West Ham and South Essex Mail} also doing so in 1912.\textsuperscript{274} Ilford's local newspapers reciprocated, covering nearby carnivals in East Ham, West Ham, Dagenham, Woodford and Barking.\textsuperscript{275} Again, similar trends were evident elsewhere. \textit{The Islington Gazette, Hackney and Kingsland Gazette} and the \textit{Hornsey Journal} covered the Tottenham Carnival at different times.\textsuperscript{276} The \textit{Barnet Press} and \textit{Hendon Advertiser} did likewise for the Finchley Carnival, while the \textit{Weekly Telegraph for Waltham Abbey, Cheshunt and Districts} and the \textit{Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald} contained reports on carnivals held in Enfield.\textsuperscript{277}

The tendency to cover neighbouring districts' carnivals tended to correlate with a willingness to cover affairs in those areas more generally. Mary Lester has stated that while the lengthy full titles of local newspapers and the lists of areas where they claimed to be distributed often extended beyond administrative boundaries, coverage and real distribution were often far narrower.\textsuperscript{278} However, I would posit local newspapers' coverage of neighbouring districts' carnivals as expressing aspirations – of varying extensiveness – to become regional rather than local papers. It is unsurprising that the \textit{West Ham and South Essex Mail} – which purported to be ‘The Journal’ for numerous ‘South Essex Districts on the London Border’, including Ilford
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– and the *Islington Gazette* – full name *Islington Daily Gazette and North London Tribune*, and which claimed to circulate ‘throughout an area comprising upwards of a million people’ – covered the Ilford and Tottenham Carnivals respectively. Furthermore, the combination of newspapers facilitated the sharing of news and this played a part in disseminating information about the Carnivals more widely. For example, by 1912 *The East Ham Echo* was part of the *South Essex Mail* group and it carried exactly the same report on that year's Ilford Carnival as *The West Ham and South Essex Mail*, while the *East London Advertiser* was owned by *Ilford Guardian* owner Walter A. Locks and reproduced that newspaper's coverage of the Ilford Carnival.279

As a result of its scale, the Ilford Carnival also began to merit mention in the London-based national press, being covered in detail by *The Daily Chronicle* in 1908, while by the 1910s *The Daily Mirror* and *The Daily Sketch* regularly carried photos of the Ilford Carnival.280 Other London carnivals did not appear to receive the same level of consistent attention, although a scan of several major newspapers showed that processions in Hampstead, Camden Town, Tottenham and Woodford, to name but some, all caught their attention at one time or another.281 Broader coverage of the Ilford Carnival was surely encouraged by and further enhanced its wider renown and popularity. In 1906, an ‘E.R.’ from Eastcheap in central London wrote into the newspaper saying he had come to watch the procession on the invitation of a friend, while that same year ‘A visitor from Stratford’ wrote into the *Ilford Recorder* describing his experiences at the Carnival.282 With crowds estimated to have reached 250,000 by 1912, compared to Ilford's contemporary population of less than 80,000, it is clear that the event increasingly drew most of its spectators from further afield. This trend was not restricted to Ilford either: during the mid-to-late 1890s, Enfield Town’s Bonfire Boys' Carnival attracted thousands of passengers – mostly from Tottenham and Edmonton – via the Great Eastern and Great Northern railways.283

---
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CONCLUSION

In the wake of increases in national and metropolitan integration, the early twentieth-century suburb comprised a new, technologically enhanced type of locality. This chapter has demonstrated that this localness existed not merely in the extent of the built environment, or in official boundaries – influential as they both were – but was also continually performed through the circulation and interaction of people. The Ilford Carnival, and other carnivals in London’s suburbs during the late Victorian and Edwardian period, comprised particularly grand, overt performances of the local, drawing together myriad formal and informal groups such as colleagues, men, women, classmates, sportspeople, friends, families, and so on, and offering them the opportunity to invest their social capital in a local group that cut across these different affiliations.

This performativity rendered the local unstable, incorporating different geographic scales and overlapping areas, while advancements in communication also brought external players and audiences to the stage, facilitating the performance of broader suburban regions within Greater London as well, and of Greater London as a whole, while encouraging replications of performances of the local within it. These broader suburban regions and metropolitan connections were very similar to the migratory and commuting patterns and transport networks outlined in Chapter Two, which shaped the personal, collective and economic links brought to bear in the Ilford Carnival. As will become evident over the remainder of the thesis, the shifting geographies of organisation, participation and attendance greatly impacted upon ideas and identities projected in and around the carnival, and the manner in which they were received.
CHAPTER FOUR

COMPOSITION OF THE CARNIVAL COMMITTEES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the Ilford Carnival’s organising committees in greater detail. It firstly outlines how the carnival’s administrational structure operated and evolved over time, considering the activities undertaken by the different committees and their key officials, the identities of these key figures, and the extent of turnover in their positions and in the wider committee membership. Thereafter, it discusses members’ patterns and lengths of residence in Ilford, and their migratory pathways into the district. Thirdly, it looks at the different occupational groups on the committees, as well as their wealth and employment statuses. Finally, it considers the gender balance of the committees, the role of family ties, and the different ages of committee members. Throughout, the chapter highlights relationships between different factors – such as occupation and length of residence, or family ties and gender balance – considers which factors influenced likelihood to join and seniority within the movement, and stresses both differences between different wards and how the composition of the Ilford Carnival’s committee membership compared with that of carnival-organising bodies in Enfield, Finchley and Tottenham.

The primary reason for dedicating a chapter specifically to committee members is that it was they who made the carnival possible, and whose involvement would have lasted for several weeks prior to (and in some cases several months after) the event, and therefore they who the carnival provided with extensive opportunities for social capital accumulation. Yet they also provide a reasonably sized sample of residents whose individual lives can be looked at in a bit more detail, providing a microhistorical counterpart to the broader but also more distant statistical breakdown of Ilford’s population in Chapter Two. As stated in the Introduction to this thesis, most of the statistical analysis for this chapter involved crosschecking committee
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members from 1905 and 1911 against census returns from 1871 to 1911, as well as, where necessary, against contemporary directories. Not all members could be traced and for that reason, and also due to the smallness of the samples, findings are tabulated but discussed impressionistically, with care taken not to read too deeply into small variations, and headline data complemented with individual examples.

**COMMITTEE STRUCTURE, OPERATIONS AND PERSONNEL**

*The Evolving Structure of the Committee System*

It was at the meeting of the Ilford Emergency Hospital Committee arranged on 5th May to initiate the holding of a Hospital Saturday carnival, that the nucleus of a separate organising body of the Ilford Carnival emerged. An initial committee of twelve were selected by those in attendance to form a general committee, with power to add to their number, and responsibility for identifying organisers for each ward. It was then around each organiser that the ward committees accumulated, while the general committee eventually grew to 57 in total. The relationship appears to have operated in a similar fashion the following year, when the general committee was by now being referred to as the Hospital Saturday committee. At this point in time, the demarcation of power appears to have been as follows. At ward committee-level, decisions were made regarding local fundraising, the arrangement of ward procession routes, the compilation of a ward contingent, and the selection of a ward marshal. The general (or Hospital Saturday) committee was concerned with matters of central administration: circulating collecting boxes to the wards; producing stamps, badges and programmes to be sold around the district, selecting the main procession route and securing the UDC’s permission for the carnival to progress along it and into the park; the organisation of sports and a concert in the park; the appointment of judges to award prizes and the attainment of prizes to be awarded;

---
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the final calculation of total funds raised and their remittance to the hospital; and the organisation of post-carnival social occasions.

Yet in 1907, the balance of power within this organisational framework shifted, with the replacement of the Hospital Saturday committee by an executive one, comprising elected officials, the ward organisers, and representatives voted onto the executive by the ward committees. The wards’ willingness to try and exert their authority at executive level (and over each other) manifested that year during the election of the executive’s vice chair, when various ward delegates made what the *Ilford Guardian* described as ‘quite unnecessary remarks’ about their wards’ rights to be represented among the elected officialdom.

This was symptomatic of the growing importance and self-assurance of the ward committees – perhaps partly arising from the growth in their membership. Figure 1 indicates the sizes of Ilford’s ward committees in 1905, 1908, 1911 and 1913, as well as the ratio between committee membership and total ward population for 1911. On the whole, it appears that ward committee membership swelled in the Carnival’s earlier years, reaching 290 in 1908, before subsequently declining to 257 in 1911 and 243 in 1913. There were significant differences between membership of different wards, with Seven Kings’s and Cranbrook’s committees tending to be particularly large, especially in relation to their population sizes, whereas Clementswood’s membership was comparatively paltry, given that it was Ilford’s most populous ward. Individual committees’ memberships also varied between years, with particularly striking fluctuations in the case of Park and South Hainault.

---

**Figure 1: Sizes of Ilford Carnival ward committee memberships for 1905, 1908, 1911 and 1913.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1905 No. of members</th>
<th>1908 No. of members</th>
<th>1911 No. of members</th>
<th>Ratio to population</th>
<th>1913 No. of members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clementswood</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1:519</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>&gt;43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1:217</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1:362</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hainault</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1:285</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1:338</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Kings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1:152</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hainault</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1:464</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>&gt;228</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1:304</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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This growth facilitated the expansion of the procession, as more members attracted and contributed more items, and the growth of the carnival and its related activities in other ways too, reinforcing this diffusion of power from centre to wards. In 1911, for example, the executive decided that the task of judging the winners of a growing array of carnival day prizes was too arduous for the small existing band of judges, and voted to rationalise proceedings by delegating the awarding of prizes to individual judges for each ward, under the guidance of a chief judge. Moreover, the ward committees themselves ceased to be temporary bodies that formed before the carnival and subsequently dissolved, maintaining instead a continual existence and organising events and raising funds throughout the year, as well as ensuring the institutional memory that facilitated the carnival’s recurrence was more widely embedded. Nonetheless, the executive largely retained the responsibilities that its antecedent bodies had, and played a part in securing items for the carnival procession alongside the wards. In 1911, for example, the executive arranged nine bands for the procession, with the wards selecting the remainder; it is likely, therefore, that the executive had a particular role soliciting noteworthy contributors from outside Ilford.

Executive and General Committee Offices and Their Holders

The 12 men who formed the initial general committee in 1905 were physician and surgeon Dr Percy James Drought, company secretary Benjamin Henderson, travelling auditor William Brazier Martin, schoolmaster William Humm Ridgely, customs surveyor John Reynolds, teacher Edward John Stanley Lay, assistant schoolmaster Robert P. W. Rotherham; borough accountant William Maxfield Mead, head schoolmaster Arthur Denham, lithographic transferor Samuel Hillman, factory manager George E. Partington, and banker’s clerk Bertram C. Baylis. They were given power to add to their number, and resolved to co-opt Ilford Recorder editor Ethelbert Robert Fyson, assurance clerk Walter James Hartin, Ilford Guardian proprietor Walter A. Locks, and another schoolmaster, James Mein. This comprised the kernel of an organisational oligarchy, with many of these men obtaining and retaining high offices within the carnival’s administration, regardless of the aforementioned subsequent structural reforms.

---
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The majority of the organisational responsibilities that lay with the general and later executive committee were concentrated in the office of honorary secretary, who would in turn report at committee meetings on their interim activities, and also keep the local press abreast of centrally organised carnival-related activities. This post was held in the first instance by Benjamin Henderson, born in Northumberland but who had moved to Ilford, via Bow, in the 1890s, and made an impression in public life there partly through the local branch of the Primrose League, where he had recently ascended to the position of ruling councillor, as well as as secretary of the Ilford Emergency Hospital Committee. During the 1907 restructuring of the committee system, Henderson ceded this role, and Ethelbert Robert Fyson was elected to in his stead, remaining in the post until 1914.292 Fyson occasionally also took it upon himself to attend meetings of different ward committees in order to remain informed of arrangements at that level too.293

Responsibility for presiding over the general and then executive committee itself, particularly conducting its meetings, lay with the carnival chairman, who also oversaw the counting of all money collected on carnival day. The role was initially held by John Reynolds, who had recently moved to Ilford following a spell working for HM Customs in Liverpool (while living in the suburb of Liscard), and who also simultaneously sat on the Cranbrook, Loxford and Park ward committees. Reynolds was, however, approaching 60 at this time and did not resume the post in 1906, being succeeded for one year only by Benjamin Bailey, a local auctioneer and valuer, member of Ilford UDC since 1896. Bailey was an enthusiastic Liberal and advocate of active local government, who spearheaded the development of the council’s electricity provision, tramway system and the acquisition of Valentine’s Park; his other roles included becoming chairman of the Ilford Emergency Hospital, president of Ilford Football Club, and a local justice of the peace.294 In 1907, Benjamin Henderson was elected to the role, following on from his resignation as honorary secretary. This may indicate that the chairman’s work was considerably less arduous than that of secretary (which Henderson had felt no longer able to fulfil) and that his appointment to the former position was in part a somewhat symbolic gesture, bestowing recognition for his existing work in aid of the carnival, and his continued work on behalf of the Emergency Hospital Committee.

The chairman was assisted in his responsibilities by the vice chairman – a post originally held by William Maxfield Mead, the man often attributed as having come up with the idea of

292 Ilford Guardian (10 May 1907).
293 Ilford Guardian (26 May 1911; 2 Jun 1911).
holding the carnival in the first place. He was succeeded in 1906 by John William Godfrey, the governor of Dr Barnado’s Village Homes in Barkingside, who had served on both the North Hainault and Seven Kings ward committees the year before. James Mein, hitherto a member of the Seven Kings ward committee, was then elected to the post in 1907 – ahead of Clementswood ward committee member and architect Samuel Jackson – and continued to serve as vice chair through to 1914.295

The carnival’s treasurer held primary responsibility for maintaining the carnival’s accounts, initiating new central fundraising schemes, counting the total amounts collected on carnival day, and transferring money to the hospital fund. The role was initially taken by Thomas Hughes. Ireland-born Hughes had like Reynolds been working for HM Customs in Liverpool, before transferring to work in Whitehall and live in Ilford in the early 1900s. Nonetheless, he had been an active enough member of the community since moving there to be described by the Ilford Guardian that year as a ‘well-known worker in Ilford affairs’.296 Hughes retained the role in 1906, but in 1907 the new executive committee instead voted for Walter A. Locks, the Loxford ward organiser, to succeed him; however, Locks refused and said Hughes ought to be reappointed instead.297 Hughes thus regained the position, which he continued to fill in the ensuing years. From 1909, the role became split between Hughes and Allan William Hare, manager of the local branch of the London & Provincial Bank, who had assisted in counting the carnival day collections since 1906. Hughes eventually stepped down and Hare alone held the post from 1913.

Ward Committee Offices and Their Holders

The ward organiser was responsible for much of the work undertaken at that geographic scale. He was tasked with securing or providing premises for the ward committee’s headquarters; recruiting new ward committee members; recruiting collectors, and allocating collecting boxes, stamps and badges to them; recruiting contributors to the procession itself; selecting the procession route; keeping a record of funds raised and ultimately remitting them to the carnival treasurer; and communicating with the press on the ward committee’s behalf.

295 Ilford Guardian (10 May 1907).
296 Ilford Guardian (14 Jul 1905).
297 Ilford Guardian (10 May 1907).
Of the first 16 members of the 1905 general committee, six also took on responsibility for organising affairs in one of the wards: Ethelbert Robert Fyson in Clementswood, William Humm Ridgeley in Cranbrook, George E. Partington in Park, Walter James Hartin in Seven Kings, Arthur Denham in North Hainault and Bertram C. Baylis in South Hainault. An F. Saltmarshe took the role of inaugural organiser for Loxford, as well as serving on the general committee. On carnival day itself, oversight of the procession was entrusted to the ward marshal, who along with his assistants, had the duty of guiding it along the specified procession route while riding horseback. In Loxford, the position was taken by Corporal C. Smith of the Westminster Dragoons, assisted by local builder and contractor Freddy Wilmott. In Park, Partington combined the role with that of organiser, as did Denham in North Hainault.

Hartin and Baylis resumed the roles of Seven Kings and South Hainault ward organisers respectively in 1906, while Fyson took up the reins in Park. A George Thomas Rich took up the post in Cranbrook – following Ridgeley’s decision not to continue as organiser owing to illness – having sat on the ward committee the previous year.298 Harry Harriss, who had previously served on the committee for North Hainault – where he was a local headmaster, having moved to the district from Berkshire in the 1890s – as well as the general committee, succeeded Fyson as organiser for Clementswood, having recently moved to that ward. Walter Locks, having already served on the Loxford committee the year before, became organiser there. Walter Page, a Devonshire-born schoolmaster who had in 1905 served on the committee in Park, where he resided, took up the position of organiser for North Hainault, where he worked.

From 1907, the reorganisation of the carnival structure led to the creation of the new roles of ward chairman and often vice chairman, elected – like the ward organiser – by the ward committee, whose meetings it was their responsibility to preside over. The organiser, marshal and three other delegates – who might include the chair or vice chair – were also elected by the ward committee to represent them on the executive committee, thus holding the senior carnival officials to account in the ward’s interest.

In 1907, Luke J. Burke – a commercial clerk and later advertising manager who had moved to Ilford in the 1890s and served on the Clementswood ward and the general committee since 1905 – succeeded Harriss as Clementswood ward organiser. However, he was only in the post for a year, when Harriss returned as organiser, with Burke instead taking up the position of chairman. Harriss continued to serve as organiser until 1912, save for in 1910 when the post

298 *Ilford Guardian* (8 Jun 1906).
was briefly taken up by Donald S. Parsons, of the Ilford Reading Rooms. Having by then moved to Cranbrook, while working as headmaster of the recently built Uphall School in Loxford, Harriss’s involvement with the Clementswood committee had come to an end. His position as organiser was taken by Charles Albert Bowley, a commercial traveller from Birmingham who had moved to Ilford in the 1890s and who had been an ever-present on the ward committee since 1905. Burke, who by 1911 had moved to Cranbrook, was succeeded as chairman by bank clerk Albert Ebenezer Barnard, born in rural Essex and who moved to Ilford in the 1890s via West Ham and Leyton, and who served on Clementswood ward committee from the outset as well. Assisting him was another member of several years’ standing, Edwin C. Culling, a London-born railway clerk who had lived in Ilford since the 1870s. Barnard and Culling would later switch roles. The position of ward marshal, meanwhile, was held for a time by monumental mason L. A. Pilgrim, before he was succeeded in the position by Cornish builder and contractor Walter Stanley Mason, a resident of Ilford since the 1890s and a ward committee member since 1905.

The position of organiser in Cranbrook continued to regularly change hands. Local resident Arthur J. Magson took over from G. T. Rich in 1907 for one year only, though the following year he took up the position of chairman and would in subsequent years continue to serve on the committee. Arthur Newman, a local builder who had been a member of the ward committee since 1905, became organiser in 1908; again, he only remained in the post for one year, but also continued to serve on the committee thereafter. Walter Joseph Deeks, a commercial traveller for a stationery and office supplier, who had moved from East Ham to Ilford in the early 1900s and served on the committee since 1905, was organiser in 1909 and 1910, before becoming chairman in 1911. Succeeding him that year was Thomas Ashworth Richardson, American-born secretary to a horseshoe manufacturer who had moved to Ilford from East Ham in the early 1900s and served on the first Cranbrook ward committee; he remained organiser until 1913. His replacement was Luke J. Burke, who had joined the Cranbrook ward committee following his move there from Clementswood, and who had served as Richardson’s assistant before succeeding him. The ward committee also eventually developed a marshalling team of several men to oversee the procession; among those who led them was fruiterer A. G. Jarvis.

Walter A. Locks was voted to serve again as Loxford ward’s organiser in 1907 and proved so popular a success in the role that after the 1908 carnival he had to turn down overtures
for him to be elected ward organiser for 1909 a year in advance.\textsuperscript{299} Nonetheless, he continued in the post until 1912, after which he became ward chairman – a position previously held in Loxford at various times by carnival luminaries such as Thomas Hughes and Benjamin Henderson. Locks’s successor as organiser was W. J. Ealden, an assistant schoolmaster at Loxford School. The role of vice chair, meanwhile, was usually held by a member of Ilford UDC, such as dairyman Frank D. Smith in the carnival’s latter years, while the position of marshal was taken up briefly by William D. Golding, a licensed victualler who originally hailed from Poplar, and then from 1908 by Freddy Willmott, who had been assistant marshal for the ward during the first Ilford Carnival.

Following Fyson’s elevation to the role of carnival secretary, the position of Park’s organiser alternated from 1907 to 1913 between two men: Charles Smith, a manufacturer’s representative who had moved from Lancashire to Ilford at the turn of the century; and James Forrester, a Scottish commercial traveller. Both became veterans of the committee who served on it even when not carrying out the organiser’s responsibilities. Smith had been ward marshal in 1906 before becoming organiser the following year, while Forrester was committee chairman and ward delegate to the executive committee in 1911, when Smith was organiser. In the last year of the carnival’s existence, the position passed to a relatively recent arrival on the ward committee, an F. Kirby. Following Smith’s elevation to organiser, an E. Page took over as marshal in 1907, before Golding returned to the Park committee to fulfil that role for a number of years; he was eventually succeeded by Charles Pindard, a Lincolnshire-born plumber who had resided in Ilford since the 1880s, and served on the Park committee since 1905.

Hartin did not serve again as Seven Kings’s organiser in 1907, his place being taken by George Giston Hall, an insurance clerk who had moved to Ilford from Battersea in the 1890s. He was re-elected to the position in 1908, when he was aided by former South Hainault organiser Bertram C. Baylis (who actually lived in Seven Kings) in the role of chair, with assurance agent Arthur James Ealden, who had served on the committee since 1905, as vice chair. Hall ceded the role of organiser in 1909 to George J. Maggs, a General Post Office overseer who had only moved from Leyton to Ilford earlier that decade; Hall instead took up the post of chairman, with another clerical worker, Henry William Munson, who had also moved to Ilford in the 1900s, from West Ham, serving as vice chair. Maggs served as organiser until 1912, before himself becoming chairman (with Ealden resuming his position as vice chair).

\textsuperscript{299} \textit{Ilford Guardian} (31 Jul 1908).
chairman). Maggs’ initial successor as organiser was Frederick John Franklin, a printer’s compositor and former ward deputy marshal who had moved to Ilford from Tottenham in the 1890s. He in turn was replaced in 1914 by Leslie Henry Frost, a commercial clerk who had moved to Ilford from Forest Gate during the 1900s; he had also been a ward committee member for a number of years’ hence and was ward marshal in 1913.

Bertram C. Baylis was re-elected South Hainault organiser in 1907, agreeing to retain the post due to the lack of a successor. The following year one was found: William Berks, the owner of a steel and copper plate engraving business, who had been on the ward committee from the outset. Supporting him as assistant was Albert Ernest Clare, a commercial traveller who had moved from Leyton to Ilford in the early 1900s and had also served on the ward committee from the outset. Baylis instead was elected chair – the role he was also performing in Seven Kings simultaneously – while Arthur Sherren, a mercantile clerk who had moved to Ilford from Lambeth in the 1890s, was vice chair. Berks continued as organiser until 1911, after which Richard Tanner Smith, a warehouse keeper who moved from East Ham to Ilford during the 1900s and who had served as committee chairman in 1911, took over, retaining the post through until 1914.

In North Hainault, Walter Page remained as ward organiser until 1912, with the exception of 1909, when the position was temporarily occupied by local baker and grocer George Ingram. A W. L. Gillam then took over the role in 1913 and 1914, though Page continued to assist in the new position of ward secretary. Responsibility for chairing the committee, meanwhile, was occupied at various stages by lay Church of England reader John Willey; Dr Percy Drought; and commercial traveller Edward James Hawkins, while among those who filled the position of marshal was a Mr Edwards Junior, a farmer’s son.

In summation, it is clear that much of the work pertaining to the carnival’s organisation – both Ilford-wide and at ward level – was left in the hands of a relatively small number of officials. Many of them were men who had been involved in the carnival's organisation from the outset, enabling them to consolidate their influence within the movement. They tended to have skills, reputations and resources accrued outside the context of the carnival – whether in the workplace or other voluntary activities – that marked them out as suitable for their particular roles in the carnival's organisation. This included administrative backgrounds for those who became honorary secretaries or ward organisers, expertise in financial affairs in the case of
those who served as treasurer, or involvement in businesses that required access to and the ability to ride horses in the case of the ward marshals.300

Furthermore, at general and then executive level, there was striking continuity in the identity of the leading officials, the democratising of the executive structure seemingly having scant impact upon their authority. There was far more turnover in officialdom at ward level, but in this position too there were cases of longstanding service, as in the case of Locks in Loxford, or Page in North Hainault. The establishment of the ward committees as permanent entities almost certainly served to ensure greater continuity in positions of leadership than might have otherwise been the case. It is also striking how many individuals held a number of posts within the carnival’s administration over the event’s ten-year lifespan: ward officials who graduated to executive positions; ward marshals and chairmen who eventually became organisers; retiring organisers taking up the post of chair; executive officials who simultaneously took up chairing posts at ward level; and individuals who served as officers in more than one ward committee (again, sometimes at the same time). This may suggest the existence of a quickly emergent hierarchy within the carnival movement, of people recognised as possessing the necessary cultural and social capital to succeed in the role. However, this was not a closed shop – certainly not at ward level, where the arduousness of the organiser’s work and their resulting tendency to step down after a few years (if not a single year) in the position created space for comparatively new recruits to succeed them.

The Rank and File

The vast majority of people who served on ward committees each year never held any of these offices, but they still fulfilled a number of important roles. They attended weekly meetings at which they would initially elect their officials and delegates to the executive, and then subsequently provided oversight of their activities. Attendance could vary, especially between wards. In 1906, North Hainault organiser Walter Page claimed they rarely got more than three people along to meetings.301 In Park, by contrast, attendances at ward committee meetings in 1909 and 1910 at times approached or exceeded 50.302 Beyond the meeting room,
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committee members often helped the organiser in securing items for the procession – often from organisations that they worked for or had connections with – or else contributed items themselves, or participated in the carnivals either as processionists or collectors. They also initiated and arranged auxiliary fundraising schemes, often within specially established subcommittees.

There was continual churn in ward committee memberships, which helps to explain why their memberships fluctuated over time, as illustrated in Figure 1. Figure 2 demonstrates the extent of this turnover between base years. Around a quarter of ward committee members in 1905 were members of the same committees in 1908, two fifths of members in 1908 members in 1911, and over half of 1911 members were still on those committees in 1913. The particularly high level of turnover in the carnival’s early years almost certainly related to how these committees typically dissolved and reformed between carnivals. Yet even afterwards, it appears that on average just under one in five members left ward committees each year between 1908 and 1913, while a similar proportion of members had not been on the same committees a year previously. Migration into and out of the district and between wards within Ilford certainly form part of the explanation for this, as shall be discussed in the next section. There are, however, a number of other potential overlapping reasons: perhaps the work and responsibilities involved were more strenuous than some members expected, deterring them from serving multiple terms; perhaps some members were only very loosely involved anyway; and perhaps some used it primarily as a relatively short-term social capital building exercise. Again, there were also significant variations between different wards, although turnover rates generally fluctuated for all of them, with the exception of Seven Kings, whose success in retaining members between 1908 and 1913 helps explain why it maintained such a large ward committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1905 No. of members</th>
<th>1905 No. still members in 1908</th>
<th>1908 No. of members</th>
<th>1908 No. still members in 1911</th>
<th>1911 No. of members</th>
<th>1911 No. still members in 1913</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clementswood</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>&gt;43</td>
<td>≥11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hainault</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Kings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hainault</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>&gt;228</td>
<td>≥50</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These high rates of turnover mean the longevity of many officials in their posts was even more crucial to the carnival’s success, and also helps explain the apparent lack of competition for their positions. Yet it should also be conversely noted that there were certainly stalwarts who were a continued presence throughout the carnival’s history, with particular names cropping up time and again. It was they who were particularly inclined to contribute to the procession every year, or participate in fundraising initiatives. Tailor’s wife Elizabeth Younghusband, for example, whose name was listed among Cranbrook ward members for 1908, 1911 and 1913, annually contributed an elaborate decorated vehicle to the procession, and also became involved in organising an annual ball at Ilford Town Hall in aid of the carnival funds. Travelling oilman Ernest Patient, meanwhile, who had moved to Ilford from Chelmsford in the 1900s, served on the Loxford ward committee in 1908, 1911 and 1913, representing it as a delegate to the executive, and also serving as secretary of Loxford’s entertainments subcommittee. It is likely that these figures also served as bearers of institutional memory and provided vital continuity as old members left and new ones joined.

**RESIDENTIAL HISTORIES**

*Patterns and Lengths of Residence*

For the most part, committee members resided within the wards they represented. There were exceptions to this. Some members represented wards they worked in instead. Walter Locks, for example, lived in Wanstead, but the *Ilford Guardian*’s premises were in Loxford. North Hainault, meanwhile, relied on residents of other wards to assist in affairs on its committee, particularly during the carnival’s early years; this of course included its organiser Walter Page. By 1911, members were predominantly located either in suburban Newbury Park or the longstanding point of settlement in Barkingside. In South Hainault, meanwhile, the committee’s headquarters was in Goodmayes and this unsurprisingly is where most of the
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committee also resided, with very few living in the more detached Chadwell Heath area. There
do appear to have been some cases of residential clustering of committee members in other
wards too. In 1911, for example, several Cranbrook committee members lived very near each
other along Mansfield Road, as well as to the committee’s regular meeting place at Cranbrook
College. Yet for the most part, members were drawn from across wards, which were small
enough for committee headquarters to be easily accessible to members. Knowing each other as
neighbours may in some case have contributed to joining committees, but by and large, this
was a model of community rooted in association rather than proximity and thereby well-suited
to a suburban location.

Membership of the carnival's organising body provides a valuable insight into the
relationship between duration of residence in a suburb and participation in its affairs. Figures
3 and 4 indicate length of residence in Ilford for members of the 1905 and 1911 Ilford Carnival
committees respectively. Nearly three quarters of traceable committee members for 1905 had
been recorded as living in the district in 1901, while around a quarter had been enumerated in
Ilford in 1891, and less than one in seven in 1881. Given trends in population growth over this
period, it does appear that most recently arrived residents were underrepresented among
committee members – or at least those who could be traced – and those who had lived in Ilford
before it really became suburbanised overrepresented. Six years later, two fifths of traceable
members had been arrived in Ilford since the 1901 census, while a further half had come
between 1891 and 1901, and just one in ten were recorded in the district before that. By this
point, more recent arrivals therefore were eventually making their way onto the committees,
while numbers of the district’s pre-1891 population involved in organising the carnival appear
to have dropped.

If length of residence did indeed play a diminishing role in influencing likelihood of
becoming a committee member, it may be indicative of how sustained, rapid population growth
subsequently transformed Ilford’s social infrastructure. Individuals who had resided in these
areas before they became suburbanised may initially have had the advantage of being relatively
well-connected and belonging to pre-existing institutions, helping to ensure they retained
centrality within the growing community. However, the sheer volume of new arrivals would
have eventually dwarfed these existing social networks, and as seen in Chapter Two, prompted
the establishment of a welter of new institutions – like the Ilford Carnival committee system –
offering new arrivals more opportunities to accumulate social capital. This is perhaps reflected
by a letter that Cranbrook ward organiser Ridgely sent to the Ilford Guardian in 1905, in which
he described himself as one of the ward's oldest residents, but remarked that there must be
many residents in Cranbrook with processional experience whom he was not acquainted with and who would be willing to help on the ward committee; the inference being that his older personal networks were put into the shade by the continuing flow of newcomers.\textsuperscript{307}

Drawing comparisons with carnival committees in Enfield, Tottenham and Finchley indicates that composition in terms of length of residence in the district varied in relation to the broader histories of population growth for each suburb.\textsuperscript{308} Thus, carnival-organising committees in Enfield Town and Tottenham – neither of which had experienced the level of population growth seen in Ilford during the 1890s and 1900s – were dominated by residents of longer standing than their Ilford counterparts, and the roles they would have played as institutions for interaction and social capital building would have differed to a degree – perhaps consolidating existing networks and hierarchies in older, more settled suburbs, and helping develop nascent ones in districts like Ilford.

Dynamics also varied between Ilford’s wards. North Hainault, for example, was dominated by particularly longstanding residents in 1905, when over half of its traceable members had lived in Ilford for at least 24 years. This reflected the fact it had been relatively unaffected by suburban growth up until that point and much of its residential base remained settled and rural. By 1911, only a handful of these longstanding residents remained on the committee. Meanwhile, Loxford and Seven Kings – both of which were sites of sizeable new housing developments during the 1900s – had particularly heavy concentrations of post-1901 arrivals in 1911, although Loxford also had a smattering of pre-1891 residents on its committee as well. However, length of residence appears to have had relatively little impact upon seniority within the carnival’s organising body, as measured through membership of the 1905 general committee and 1911 executive, which exhibited a similar breakdown to that of the ward committee membership.

\textsuperscript{307} \textit{Ilford Guardian} (26 May 1905).
\textsuperscript{308} Names of Enfield carnival committee members were obtained from \textit{Meyers's Observer} (5 Oct 1894; 8 Nov 1895; 8 Nov 1901; 6 Sep 1901) and \textit{Enfield Gazette and Observer} (31 Jul 1914). Names of Tottenham Carnival executive committee members were obtained from \textit{Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald} (20 Sep 1901; 16 Sep 1910). Names of Finchley Carnival committee members obtained from \textit{Finchley Press} (6 Jul 1907). Names of committee members were then checked against the 1871 to 1911 censuses on Findmypast.co.uk (Accessed Jan–Mar 2012).
Figure 3: Numbers of 1905 Ilford Carnival committee members resident in district at census dates, 1871–1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>No. of committee members</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1871</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementswood</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>&gt;44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hainault</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hainault</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Kings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>&gt;239</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Numbers of 1911 Ilford Carnival committee members resident in district at census dates, 1871–1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>No. of committee members</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1871</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementswood</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hainault</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hainault</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Kings</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Migratory Backgrounds

Crosschecking Ilford Carnival committee membership against censuses also provides a valuable insight into migratory pathways into the suburbs in question, as can be seen in Figures 5 and 6, which illustrate these for 1905 and 1911 committee members respectively. For both years, at least half the members traceable by census had lived in the County of London area at some stage between 1871 and 1891. Roughly a third of traceable 1905 members lived there in 1881 and 1891, falling to less than one in ten in 1901. In the case of the 1911 Carnival, more than two fifths of traceable members had resided in that area in 1891, although this again fell to just over one in ten in 1901.

Figure 5: Locations of traceable 1905 Ilford Carnival committee members at census dates, 1871–1911.

It is also notable that nearly three out of ten traceable 1905 members lived elsewhere in the Outer Ring area in 1891, although this too fell to under one in ten or 1901, while around a quarter of 1911 members lived elsewhere in the Outer Ring area in 1891 and 1901. This is indicative of how many committee members had moved from inner London to other suburbs before settling in Ilford. Ilford was frequently the most recent location on an eastward route out of the city, often commencing in the East End. At least one in five traceable 1905 committee
members and one in six traceable 1911 committee members resided at some stage between 1871 and 1901 in the area that, from 1900 onwards, was covered by the metropolitan boroughs of Shoreditch, Stepney, Bethnal Green and Poplar. Moreover, at least a quarter for both years lived somewhere else in Outer Ring Essex before moving to Ilford, with West Ham, East Ham and Leyton featuring particularly prominently among former places of residence; so too did the older suburbs of Islington, Hackney and Tottenham, in London’s northeast quadrant.

Figure 6: Locations of traceable 1911 Ilford Carnival committee members at census dates, 1871–1911.

For example, engineer Thomas Boulton Kendell served on the 1905 Seven Kings ward committee. In 1871 he was recorded as living in Bethnal Green, in 1881 Shoreditch; by 1891 he had moved to Forest Gate in the Essex borough of West Ham, and he was still living in West Ham as recently as 1901. Park committee member Percy Bennett, a tea merchant’s clerk, lived in Hackney until early adulthood, but by 1901 resided in Ilford. In 1911, Arthur Carroll Browne – a wine manufacturer’s clerk – was a member of the Seven Kings ward committee; in 1881 he was living with his parents in Bethnal Green, but by 1891 he was in Hackney and by 1901 in Ilford. Personal migratory histories such as these cohere with the broader picture gleaned from census birthplace data in Chapter Two.

Yet other pathways to Ilford were more convoluted. Sidney James Belither, a commercial traveller for Quaker Oats who served on the 1911 South Hainault ward committee, had been
born in the southeast London suburb of Greenwich. By 1871 his family had moved to St George’s-in-the-East, a much more densely populated part of East London. Twenty years later, he was living in another south London suburb, Camberwell, before moving to Ilford before 1901. Then there were those originally from outside the London area who moved into inner London at some point before migrating to the suburbs, as in the aforementioned case of Ben Henderson.

However, it is also worth noting that a sizeable proportion of committee members were never recorded on the censuses as living anywhere else within Greater London before they moved to Ilford. Sometimes this was a pattern of inward migration from other parts of Essex; on other occasions, they had come from other parts of the country entirely. It appears that many of these new arrivals had come to Ilford specifically to work there. In 1905, local teacher Edward John Stanley Lee was a member of the Clementswood ward committee; he had grown up in Great Wakering in Essex, but by 1901 was living in Ilford. 1911 Loxford ward member and gasfitter Ambrose Charles Merchant had been born in Bath; by 1901 he had moved to Derby, before relocating to Ilford at some point in the following decade.

These individual narratives illustrate the variety of migratory pathways into the suburb behind more abstract datasets. The Ilford Carnival brought together people with histories of mobility, and cultural capital accumulated in a range of settings, to collaborate for the benefit of a new locality. 1905 general committee member William Maxfield Mead, for example, had previously served as treasurer for the 1900 Bow, Bromley and Poplar Carnival, held in aid of the Daily Telegraph Widows and Orphans’ Fund, prior to he and his family moving from Bow to Ilford. It is also notable that a significant number of committee members had earlier in life been resident in the South West, which, as noted in Chapter One, was a hotbed for carnivals.

Figure 5 also illustrates where members of the 1905 committees who no longer resided in Ilford six years later had moved to. Destinations were roughly equally split between other London suburbs and locations outside Greater London entirely. In both cases, this migration was still mostly within Essex, although some moved to other parts of the South East, notably Hampshire. Coastal areas were particularly popular among emigrants. For the most part, it appears departures from Ilford were work-related. For example, Charles Wade, who worked as a salesman for his father, a local tailor, served on the general committee in 1905; by 1911, he was running the Queen’s Head public house in Tendering. Loxford ward member Frederick
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John May, who ran a local saddling business, had by 1911 returned to Southend-on-Sea, where he had been born and raised, to take over his father’s dairy.\textsuperscript{310} Again, the high residential mobility of these individuals did not stop them from becoming communally involved during their stay in Ilford.

Comparing Ilford’s committees’ migratory histories with those of committee members in other districts again highlights the existence of chains of suburban migration from city to suburbs to new suburbs, as well as from outside Greater London entirely. Tottenham, for example, was fairly early on migratory pathways; members of its executive committees for 1901 and 1910 tended to have lived in the County of London at some point before moving there, whether directly from inner-lying parts of London like the East End, or from neighbouring suburbs just over the county border such as Islington and Hackney. Committee members involved in organising the 1907 Finchley Carnival, meanwhile, had in some cases migrated from older nearby suburbs like Islington, Hackney, Tottenham, Hornsey and Edmonton. However, it was just as common for them to have moved to Finchley having never lived with Greater London before. In some cases, they were moving further inwards from other parts of the South East, such as Woking and St Albans, but in many they had previously resided in further away places including Staffordshire, Yorkshire and Scotland just a decade before they could be found in Finchley. As with Ilford, in most of these instances, they appear to have moved to the suburb specifically to work there.

**OCCUPATION, EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND WEALTH**

*Occupational Composition*

The occupational groups represented on the 1905 and 1911 committees are tabulated in Figures 7 and 8 respectively. The job categories used in them are derived from those utilised by contemporary censuses, in order to facilitate comparison with the occupational composition of Ilford more generally. The downside of this is that job categorisation in these censuses somewhat amalgamated occupation type with sector; as a result, there are some committee...
members whose occupations do not easily slot into a sole job category. For this reason, these datasets are again complemented with more in-depth looks at individual committee members.

Figure 7: Occupations of 1905 Ilford Carnival committee members according to 1901 and 1911 censuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Total number of males</th>
<th>Total number of females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Government</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants, Agents, and Accountants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or Business Clerks</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers in Money and Insurance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance of Men, Goods and Messages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Works of Construction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, Prints, Books, and Stationery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Tobacco</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, Lodging &amp; Dealing in Spirituous Drinks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of committee members identifiable</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of committee members</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focusing firstly on men, who accounted for a substantial majority of committee members throughout, commercial occupations were heavily represented. There were large numbers of commercial and business clerks in both 1905 and 1911. The banking and insurance sectors were also represented, while numbers of merchants, agents and accountants appear to have increased markedly between 1905 and 1911, seemingly in excess of their broader presence in Ilford, with commercial travellers particularly prominent. Among professionals, male teachers were noticeably overrepresented (given that they only made up 1.4% of all adult men in the district in 1911), although the share of traceable members they accounted for did fall from 1905 to 1911. Indeed, professionals more generally were also overrepresented on the committees, accounting for almost a quarter of traceable male members for 1905, and nearly a sixth in 1911. There were several clergymen involved in 1905, but just one remained by 1911. There was a smattering of doctors in both years, unsurprisingly given the carnival’s objective.
Representatives of other professions – engineering, surveying, journalism, music, law, etc. – also numbered among male committee members, especially in 1911. There were several clergymen involved in 1905, but just one remained by 1911. There was a smattering of doctors in both years, unsurprisingly given the Carnival’s objective. Representatives of other professions – engineering, surveying, journalism, music, law, etc. – also numbered among male committee members, especially in 1911.

Figure 8: Occupations of 1911 Ilford Carnival committee members according to 1911 census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Total number of males</th>
<th>Total number of females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants, Agents, and Accountants</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or Business Clerks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers in Money and Insurance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance of Men, Goods and Messages</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Works of Construction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, Prints, Books, and Stationery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Tobacco</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, Lodging &amp; Dealing in Spirituous Drinks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of committee members identifiable</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of committee members</strong></td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public sector also accounted for a significant minority of committee members. National government employees – a mixture of Whitehall civil servants and General Post Office staff – were particularly prominent. Local government workers were less so, but this category did not include UD councillors (who worked in other sectors). They played a major role in the first carnival, 15 of them listed among committee members in 1905, but their part thereafter declined, with only six listed on Carnival committees in 1908, 1911, and 1913. Some other male committee members worked in the ‘conveyance of men, goods and messages’,
mainly on railways and in warehousing. Among other sectors, those employed in the construction industry played a significant part in 1905 and slightly less so in 1911, reflecting their declining share of the population total as a whole. Agriculture was also a notable employer of male committee members, as was provision of food, tobacco, drink and lodgings. Representation of the paper, prints, books and stationery sector was seemingly negligible in 1905, but far more considerable in 1911. Another striking trend in 1911 was the growing occupational diversity of the male committee membership, with dress, textiles and metalwork, among various other sectors, all more heavily represented than they had been in 1905.

The figures for women are less reliable than for men, as the proportion of female committee members traceable on the censuses was lower than for their male counterparts. Among those who could be found for both 1905 and 1911, around three quarters were not in paid work, in line with Ilford’s female population more generally. Those who did have occupations most commonly worked in clerical roles, as well as in teaching, food and lodgings, and dressmaking. The biggest employer of women in the district, domestic service, was perhaps unsurprisingly, not apparently represented.

Taken as a whole, then, Ilford’s lower middle classes dominated the organisation of its carnival, albeit with a significant minority drawn from more solidly middle class groups, and a smattering from skilled working class occupations. The social status of membership appears to have adjusted over time, with white collar dominance increasing. This is emphasised by the fact the share of committee members with domestic servants living in their household was a third for 1905 (as checked against both the 1901 and 1911 censuses), compared to just a fifth for 1911, which may be indicative of a slight decline in the number of wealthier local residents represented on the committee. The changing social composition of the committee is also demonstrated in Figure 9, which indicates the employment status of committee members. Between 1905 and 1911, the number of traceable members listed as workers increased significantly, whereas the number listed as employers or self-employed stayed roughly flat (and fell proportionally). The increasing prominence of the salariat over businesspeople, which may have reflected broader changes in Ilford’s occupational composition, also has significance in relation to workplace location. The vast majority of committee members who were employers or self-employed were listed in local directories as having premises in Ilford. By contrast, those who were employees were far more likely to have jobs outside of Ilford, although there were also white collar workers employed within the district in sectors such as local government, teaching, rail, mail, and retail.
Figure 9: Employment types of 1905 and 1911 Ilford Carnival committee members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of committee members</th>
<th>Traceable committee members</th>
<th>No. who were workers</th>
<th>No. who were employers or own account</th>
<th>Not in work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905 On 1901 Census</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 On 1911 Census</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupation, Residence and Seniority

The declining share of members who worked for themselves owed to the impact of migration into Ilford during the 1900s. Of the 38 traceable members of the 1905 committee listed as employers or of their own account in 1901, just three had not been enumerated in Ilford in that year, compared to 21 out of 89 listed as employees, while in 1911, just nine out of 33 traceable members who were employers or self-employed had lived in the district for less than a decade, compared to 45 out of 119 employees. Moreover, whereas only 14 out of 89 traceable employees on the 1905 committees and seven out of 119 on the 1911 committees had lived in Ilford in 1891, the same was true for 11 out of 42 traceable employer or self-employed members in 1905, and five out of 33 for 1911. On the whole, it appears that businesspeople initially played a role in the carnival movement that surpassed their presence among the population of Ilford more widely, owing to their greater longevity within the district, but that this was over time altered as increasing numbers of white collar workers who arrived in Ilford during the 1900s joined the committees as well.

Looking at the ward committees in greater detail also highlights occupational differences between their memberships, and how they changed over time. A large minority of Loxford members were local businessmen, whose wealth was indicated by their greater tendency to have servants. This contrasted with its reputation as one of Ilford’s poorer wards, but many of Ilford’s businesses were located in the ward along Ilford Lane and High Street. Loxford committee member Councillor John Bodger, for example, lived in Cranbrook but owned a drapery on Ilford High Road. Born in Clerkenwell, he had opened his first shop in Ilford in 1890, and both the 1901 and 1911 censuses listed him as having two domestic servants; he also
served on Essex County Council, and as a justice of the peace. The 1911 committee was also notable for its large share of presumably locally based white-collar workers, including General Post Office staff like overseer Robert Anderson, formerly resident in Twickenham and who had only moved to Ilford since 1901, inspector Francis Foulsham, a longstanding local resident, and Charles John Milligan, a sorting clerk and telegraphist originally from Yarmouth.

High Road also passed through Clementswood, and in 1905 that ward’s committee like Loxford had a number of local businessmen on it. They included Sussex-born blacksmith William Frederick Booker, resident in Ilford since before 1891, having previously lived in Mile End. However, it also included the likes of William Albert Jeffery, a clerk for a publisher and later an art dealer, who had only recently come to Ilford from Stoke Newington (having also grown up in Cornwall). By 1911, it was employees of various types who dominated the committee: from fire brigade superintendent John Woollard, originally from Lewisham but resident in Ilford since the 1890s, to local bank manager Allan William Hare.

Seven Kings ward committee had a significant number of locally based professionals in 1905: men like the Reverend James Henry Peabody, the fairly recently arrived curate at St John’s Church, or Dr Julius Hodgetts Smith, who had a surgery in the ward. By 1911, its members were far more likely to be clerical workers or assistants in local businesses, such as its vice chairman, Henry William Munson. Another clerk on the committee, John Alfred Chamberlin, who worked for an iron and steel warehouse, was like Munson born and raised in the East End, but was slightly longer resident in Seven Kings, having been there since the 1890s.

Cranbrook was, particularly in 1911, more likely to have members involved in finance. These included John Wilding Medland, a bank manager originally from Woodford who had moved to Ilford between 1891 and 1901, and Cecil Lewis William Juppa, a locally born stockbroker’s clerk. Park’s members seem to have been more likely to work in the public sector (again, particularly locally), such as Ilford UDC electric installation inspector Arthur John Blakeley, originally from Deptford and who had moved to Ilford in the 1900s via Limehouse.

The North Hainault committee in 1905 was dominated by farmers, clergymen and teachers, reflecting its predominantly rural nature. Members included William H. Wiskar, a longstanding resident of Barkingside who owned Dunsprings Farm; John Willey, the lay Church of England reader originally from Durham and previously resident in Islington; and Ernest Jago, a schoolteacher originally from Cornwall who had moved to Ilford in the 1900s
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via Canewdon in Essex, where he had also worked as a teacher. By 1911 membership had diversified somewhat and now included new residents of Newbury Park, like William Locker, a chemist’s assistant who had moved to Ilford from the East End via Tottenham and West Ham, and police constable George Pike, previously resident in Loughton, Essex, and before that Honiton, in Devon.

South Hainault ward committee had a noticeably high proportion of workers in commercial occupations, with commercial travellers a particularly significant minority in the case of the 1911 Carnival, as were businessmen; that members in these sectors were also more likely to have servants is apparently indicative of greater wealth, which is not that surprising given that Goodmayes (where most committee members lived) was one of Ilford’s more newly built-up and select neighbourhoods. Ward organiser and City business owner William Berks had a live-in servant; he had moved from Loxford to Goodmayes in the 1900s, having relocated to Ilford in the 1890s after living in Islington, and before that Clerkenwell. 312 Arthur Edwin Reeves was a commercial traveller for a tobacco manufacturer, and also had a live-in servant; he had been born in Stepney and thereafter lived in West Ham, before moving to Ilford in the 1900s. As well as serving on the ward committee, he also represented South Hainault on Ilford UDC.

Taken together, ward committee compositions appear illustrative of the highly stratified microgeographies of class visible in Ilford, and suburban London more generally, at this time, with individual neighbourhoods being attractive to particular occupational groups in set income ranges. It is also almost certainly indicative of the importance of individual workplaces, especially locally, in stimulating individuals’ involvement in the organisation of the carnival, as well as of occupational group ties more generally. The range of individual examples of committee members provided above furthermore illustrated the relationship between occupation, migratory history and residential location in Ilford.

Compared with ward committees, the general committee initially established to oversee arrangements for the 1905 carnival had strikingly high numbers of teachers and civil servants on them. The former included schoolmaster Arthur Denham; the latter treasurer and customs officer Thomas Hughes. Six years later, both occupational groups were again heavily represented on the executive, as were on this occasion commercial and financial sector workers, such as commercial traveller Albert Ernest Clare, and was born in Kilburn, previously enumerated in Ealing, Wanstead and Leyton, or insurance clerk George Giston Hall. Members
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of neither committee appear to have been more likely to have servants, or to have been employers or employees, than ward committee members.

Comparing Ilford Carnival committee members with organisers of carnivals held in other districts further highlights local differences. Analysing the make-up of the Tottenham Carnival executive indicates that they were more likely to be employers or to have been employed within the district in sectors such as teaching and local government. Similarly, analysing the occupational backgrounds of members of the committees organising the 1907 Finchley Carnival indicates that they too were largely a mixture of businessmen and employees of local organisations, as were those involved in organising carnivals in Enfield Town during the 1890s and 1900s. It is possible that the rapid rate of migration into Ilford and high share of commuters living there may have helped ensure individuals working locally did not dominate civic life to quite the same extent as they did elsewhere.

**GENDER, FAMILY AND AGE**

*Gender and Family Ties*

Figure 10 illustrates the gender breakdown of the ward committees individually and collectively for 1905, 1908, 1911 and 1913. The ward committees for the first Ilford Carnival were heavily male-dominated, with around one in seven known members being women. This climbed to around one in four for 1908, 1911, and 1913. Once again, however, there were significant variations between compositions of individual wards. In 1905, only two ward committees had female members: Cranbrook, where just over half of all known members were women; and Park, where they accounted for a third. Yet thereafter there was a significant shift. In 1908, 1911 and 1913, women accounted for somewhere between a quarter and two fifths of Cranbrook and Park members, but they also began to make their presence felt elsewhere too. Nearly half of Seven Kings’ 1908, 1911 and 1913 committee were women, while in 1908, nearly a third of Loxford members were female, though again they accounted for a significantly lower share in 1911 and 1913. Conversely, less than one in seven Clementswood members were female in 1908, but in 1911 and 1913 between a third and two fifths were. By contrast,
however, there were never more than one or two female members of the North Hainault Ward Committee for those base years, and none in South Hainault. Women were able to gain significant levels of representation on ward committees where the (mostly male) members in paid employment were usually in white collar occupations, whereas on committees with larger shares of employers of the self-employed among their members, women were usually absent or scarcely represented.

This is indicative of a close connection between gender, social class and marital and familial ties in influencing female participation in organising the carnival. In 1905, 11 out of 32 female ward committee members had a male namesake on the committee; in 1911, the proportion had risen to 31 out of 71, and by 1913 to 34 out of 65. In both 1905 and 1911, women appear to have been particularly likely to join the same ward committee as their husband or father if he was an employee. For example, the 1905 Cranbrook ward committee included Walter Joseph Deeks, who as noted above was a stationer’s commercial traveller. Joining the committee with him in 1905 were his wife Harriet, and his daughters Harriet and Lillian. In 1911, Seven Kings organiser and Post Officer George J. Maggs was joined on the committee by his wife Annie and daughter Mabel.

Only a handful of traceable 1911 female ward committee members lived in households whose head was an employer or self-employed, and he tended not to have joined with them, as with aforementioned Cranbrook stalwart Mrs Younghusband. Women were also seemingly more inclined to join ward committees without a male family member doing likewise if they were themselves in paid employment. Cranbrook ward committee also featured among its number Miss Mable Dorothy Ison, an assistant secretary born in Hackney but resident in Ilford since she was a child, and insurance clerk Miss Amy Edith Garrett, born in Liverpool but who had grown up in Walthamstow and East Ham before her family had moved to Ilford in the 1900s; their fathers were a master lighterman and goldmining firm’s clerk respectively, but neither served on the Cranbrook committee.

The significant number of female ward committee members in Ilford is all the more striking when comparison is made with other districts. For the Finchley and Tottenham Carnivals, separate ladies’ committees were established instead to perform different sets of tasks. In Finchley in 1900 for example, female committee members were responsible for arranging a battle of the flowers, while in Tottenham they regularly arranged separate collections and events.313 The work they did was valued by the main male administrators, who
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also made a point of granting them autonomy to organise themselves and conduct their affairs. Nonetheless, it is significant that neither opted for the mixed-sex structure that became the norm in Ilford, while the committees established to organise processions in Enfield Town and Eastern Enfield during this period were also uniformly male.

Figure 10: Gender breakdown of Ilford Carnival ward committee members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1913</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of males</td>
<td>Number of females</td>
<td>Number of males</td>
<td>Number of females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementswood</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hainault</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Kings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hainault</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This contrast with Ilford reinforces the earlier point about differences within the lower middle class in relation to female participation. The committees in Tottenham, Finchley and Enfield were dominated by the locally employed, whether small businessmen or staff of organisations based within the district, such as local government or, in the case of Eastern Enfield, factories. Theirs was a community forged in predominantly masculine worlds of work. The Ilford Carnival’s administration was somewhat different. It was far more reliant on local communities in which most households consisted of white collar commuters and their families, bound together not solely in their work but also in their spare time. Connected to a newer model of companionate marriage, in which the father played more of a role within the household, the associational culture of such districts was often, though far from entirely, mixed-sex, an extension of rather just an escape from domestic life, and the Ilford Carnival and its organisation was part of this. This is not to say that there was no gendered division of labour or hierarchy within the committees. The ranks of carnival officialdom remained entirely-male, although Clementswood’s decision to send two female delegates to the 1911 executive suggests at least some women were considered capable of fulfilling roles more commonly performed by men.
Age Relations

Age also influenced participation in the Ilford Carnival’s organisation, interacting with other factors in shaping the composition of the committees. Figure 11 indicates the age-based make-up of traceable committee members for 1905 and 1911, distinguishing between men and women (as, as shall be discussed below, there was a huge difference between the typical ages of male and female members). In 1905, young and middle-aged men dominated the committees. Around one in seven traceable male members were in their twenties, a third in their thirties, a similar share in their forties, and one in six in their fifties. There were no traceable teenage male committee members, and just seven aged sixty or over. Six years later, the balance of the committee had shifted slightly towards forty-somethings, who now accounted for around two fifths of traceable male members, while other shares remained roughly flat.

The picture for female membership was substantially different. Of the 16 traceable female committee members in 1905, three were teenagers, a further eight were in their 20s, two were in their 30s, one in her 40s, and one in her 50s. This picture of female committee membership as dominated by the young correlates with the fact that only a third of female members were married in 1905. By 1911, there had been a substantial shift. Whereas most female committee members had been aged under 30 six years previously, this had now fallen to around two fifths, while roughly half were in their 30s and 40s. Given the small numbers involved in 1905, it would be tempting to cast that year’s committee as a one-off, with the subsequent more than twofold growth in female membership being among those in their 30s and older. However, it is also notable that the share of female committee members who were married rose from around a third in 1905 and 1908, to half in 1911, and more than two thirds in 1913. When the increasing tendency of women to have male namesakes on the committees is also considered, it becomes apparent that the changing age balance of female committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. of committee members</th>
<th>No. of traceable committee members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflected the increasing tendency of wives to join their husbands on ward committees. The growing presence of the middle-aged on carnival committees partly reflected their increasing share of the local population more generally as Ilford matured as a suburb. Their dominance was reflected by the fact over half of all traceable general committee members in 1905 were in their forties and fifties, rising to nearly three quarters of the 1911 executive.

Age also related to other trends in committees’ membership. For example, of 31 traceable 1905 members who had resided in Ilford since before 1891, 15 were fifty or over, compared to 33 out of 153 of all traceable members. The combination of seniority of years and length of residence may have mutually reinforced these members’ place within their committees. In 1911, meanwhile, men in their thirties accounted for 26 out of 54 of all traceable male members who came to Ilford after 1901, compared to 42 out of all 144 male traceable members. Among the 82 traceable committee members who had resided in Ilford for at least a decade, by contrast, 40 were in their forties, whereas this age group comprised 57 out of 144 all traceable committee members. Of the 14 traceable male members who had lived in Ilford for 20 years, five were fifty or over (compared to 26 out all 144 traceable male members). Perhaps, then, the decreasing tendency of people to get involved in organising the carnivals once they reached their mid-50s contributed to the declining proportion of members who had lived in the district before suburbanisation got underway.

Age also tended to relate to employment status. In 1905, men who had been aged between 15 and 29 during the last census accounted for 26 out of 90 male traceable members who gave their employment status as workers, whereas 15 out of 36 who were employers or self-employed had been in their thirties at that point. In 1911, meanwhile, 53 out of 108 traceable male members who gave their status as workers in that year’s census were aged under forty, whereas 26 out of 35 who were employers or self-employed were forty or over. In short, those members who were employers or self-employed were increasingly likely to be older than their counterparts employed by someone else, and there was therefore an age dimension to class relations on the committees. Indeed, perhaps the fact so large a share of 1911 businessmen members were aged 50 or over – a point in life at which people tended to become less likely to be involved in organising the carnival – helps to explain why their share of male membership seems to have decreased between 1905 and 1911. When the issue of length of residence is factored in too, a picture does begin to emerge of committee membership as comprising a majority of mostly younger white collar suburbanites with a sprinkling of older businessmen who tended to have lived in the district longer. Among traceable female members, the minority
who were in paid employment were all uniformly under thirty, which is unsurprising given that
the vast majority older than that were married.

The interplay between these different demographics resulted in very different ward
committee makeups. In 1905, the average age of traceable North Hainault members was 44,
which was higher than for any other ward. Among its number were two 54-year-old
councillors, James Deveson and George William Gott, who had lived in Ilford for over 30
years; the former was publican at Chequers Inn in Barkingside, the latter owned the nearby
Fence Piece Farm. The average age of traceable Seven Kings ward committee members was
five years lower. They included insurance clerk Charles Richard Henry Lewis, then aged 25
and recently arrived in Ilford from Penge, and James Bernard Shapley, a 23-year-old recently
moved from Torquay, where he had been an assistant to a chemist and druggist, and who
subsequently became co-owner of a local chemist and photographic material retailing business.

In 1911, North Hainault again had the oldest traceable membership, with an average age
of 49, and eight out of 21 aged fifty or over. They included George Jarrard, a 71-year-old retired
carpenter resident in Ilford since at least 1891, and Benjamin Buck, a 59-year-old nurseryman
long resident in Mile End, who had moved to Ilford in the 1900s. However, there was younger
blood on the committee too, including Ernest Sidney Waters, the 27-year-old assistant manager
of an art shop, now living in Seven Kings having been enumerated in West Ham in 1901. In
Loxford, the average age of traceable members was 38 for men and 41 for women. Its vice-
chairman Edwin C. Culling was a forty-year-old railway clerk; joining him on the committee
were his 65-year-old Irish-born mother Margaret and 35-year-old sister Maud, neither of whom
were stated to be in paid employment and both of whom lived with him. In Park, the average
age of traceable committee members was 39 for men and 33 for women; they included the 54-
year-old self-employed master decorator Frank J. Barson, who had moved to Ilford from
Bermondsey with his family in the late 1890s, and his 16-year-old daughter Ethel, a waitress.

Drawing comparison with other districts raises both similarities and contrasts. Traceable
members of the 1907 Finchley Carnival committees demonstrated a similar age breakdown to
their Ilford counterparts, with the employers and self-employed among them tending to be
slightly older. However, despite the high shares of businessmen among the 1901 Enfield
Bonfire Boys in particular and to a lesser extent the 1901 Tottenham Carnival executive
committee, their memberships tended to on the whole be younger than men involved in
organising the Ilford Carnival. However, by 1910, just over half of traceable Tottenham
executive members were aged forty or over – a change that perhaps reflects a more general
ageing of the district’s population over the first decade of the twentieth century, as Tottenham itself matured as a suburb (and many of its younger residents perhaps moved to pastures new).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has tentatively presented some apparent overarching trends in the operation and composition of the Ilford Carnival’s organising body. Typically, somewhere between two and three hundred people joined its committees each year; some of these, particularly those who served as senior officials and undertook most of the organisational work, would be involved for a number of years, but a majority would have been participated for a year or two at most. In 1905, most traceable committee members had come to Ilford during the 1890s, with minorities who had resided in Ilford prior to its suburbanisation and who had arrived since the turn of the century, but by 1911 the balance had shifted, with the pre-1891 contingent much shrunken and far more post-1901 representation. While many committee members had moved to Ilford from London via other Essex suburbs, others had moved there directly from elsewhere in the county or other parts of the country. Many male members worked locally, either running their own businesses, or employed in institutions such as schools and post offices, but there were also sizeable numbers who commuted to commercial jobs, presumably in London. Women also increasingly joined the committees, often with their husbands and fathers, but frequently without them too. Men in their thirties and forties were also particularly well represented on the committees. There were a number of connections between these different demographic patterns. Men were more likely to join the committee with their wives and daughters if they were white collar workers, with committee membership frequently drawing upon middle-aged parents and their adolescent or young adult offspring, reflecting the wider makeup of the maturing district. Members who were employers or self-employed were more likely to have been resident in the district longer, and to be older, than others. Male members who moved to Ilford from outside London often did so specifically to take up work there.

Yet at the same time, this chapter has also striven to qualify and look beyond broad trends of this sort, to consider individual wards, streets, and most importantly members. Rather than solely turn them into sets of statistics, it has related their diverse personal histories, using census
and directory data, in order to connect human to suburban lifecycle. Taking a microhistorical approach, it has shown the variations between wards and between years, placing an emphasis on heterogeneity and changeability. From the details uncovered through this process, it is evident that some committee members would have known each other, as neighbours, fellow businessmen, or colleagues, but that others would have been fairly unknown locally when they first joined ward committees. Their meetings offered space for associates and strangers alike to plan and undertake new performances of local community – in spite of differences in occupation, gender, age, origins and length of residence – generating substantial economic, social and cultural capital in the process.
PART III

DIMENSIONS OF THE CARNIVAL
CHAPTER FIVE

WELFARE, CHARITY AND VOLUNTARY ACTION

INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines how the Ilford Carnival functioned as a charitable initiative in support of establishing a local hospital in the district. It firstly discusses the persistence of voluntarism and the proliferation of voluntary hospitals in Britain through to the early twentieth century, before more specifically outlining the establishment of hospitals to serve London’s expanding suburbs and the pressures population growth placed upon them. Thereafter, it explains how the Ilford Carnival functioned as a multifaceted fundraising initiative, with transactional as well as charitable elements, and the record of its various components in making money for the hospital. Thirdly, it explores the ideas of charity expressed in discourse around the Ilford Carnival and similar events, and why residents of these suburbs set store by voluntary forms of welfare provision. Finally, it examines how the Ilford Carnival connected community and hospital, and by way of comparison, how carnivals in Tottenham and Enfield functioned in this respect.

In his analysis of everyday performance, Irving Goffman highlighted the existence of ‘backstage’ regions, where performing individuals or teams can take respite and conduct concealed work necessary for sustaining their presentation frontstage, although he added that in practice there was often no clear division between these regions and that individuals continued to perform for their teammates backstage.314 The voluntary organisational aspects of the carnival could in one sense be considered a backstage to the procession itself: the hard work behind the scenes required for putting on a grand entertainment, in order to guarantee a financial return. Yet this chapter contends that this organisational voluntary action, and other forms of ‘backstage’ contribution to the carnival, were themselves performative and offered participants potential capital gains as well.

It is also a contention of this chapter that historians of charitable activity and welfare provision on the one hand, and of suburbia on the other, have rarely paid sufficient attention to how rapid suburban expansion during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries placed pressure on existing welfare provision, including hospitals, and how these pressures were responded to.315 This chapter seeks to help fill this gap by examining the role of suburban communities in financing the establishment and upkeep of hospitals on London’s periphery, and the place of these institutions within communal life. Moreover, through its localised perspective, it aims to contribute to understandings of the significance of voluntary action to suburban life more generally, and of why at a time when many aspects of the national welfare state were being expanded, hospitals persisted as popular voluntary organisations.

**VOLUNTARY HOSPITALS AND SUBURBANISATION**

*The Voluntary Hospital in Britain*

Growing concern in Britain over urban poverty and racial health from the late nineteenth century fuelled some disillusionment with traditional philanthropy as provider of key welfare services rather than the centralised state, culminating in the new Liberal government elected in 1906 introducing measures including steps to meet children’s nutritional and medical needs, old age pensions, labour exchanges, and health and unemployment insurance.316 Yet while elements of the voluntary sector, such as mutual aid organisations, trade unions and charities, often recognised the need for state intervention on grounds of cost efficiency and improved provision, they nonetheless resented interference in what they perceived as their spheres of activity.317 Many fields of voluntary welfare provision actually expanded during this period. Membership of friendly societies, for example, grew from 2.75 million in 1877 to 5.6 million

315 One notable exception is Andrzej Olechnowicz, Working Class Housing in England between the Wars: The Becontree Estate (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), which discussed shortfalls in Becontree’s local services – including the absence of a dedicated hospital – in detail.
in 1904.\textsuperscript{318} New philanthropic initiatives were also established and extended with a view to addressing social ills, such as university settlements in urban areas like London’s East End; their membership’s frequent involvement in local government is illustrative of the blurred line between public and voluntary sector at this time.\textsuperscript{319}

Another key area of voluntary sector growth was hospitals. During the 1860s, 87 general hospitals were opened in Britain, followed by 116 in the 1870s, 97 in the 1880s, 115 in the 1890s, 60 in the 1900s, and 46 in the 1910s. From the mid-Victorian period onwards, larger general hospitals were complemented by a growing number of cottage hospitals – vaguely defined institutions typically serving rural communities, small towns and suburbs and with no more than 40 beds; 164 institutions calling themselves cottage hospitals opened in Britain between 1860 and 1899.\textsuperscript{320} The number of hospital beds per thousand of the population rose from 0.5 in 1871 to 0.8 in 1911, although behind these figures there was significant local and regional variation in provision.\textsuperscript{321}

Driving this growth were a range of factors, including middle-class philanthropy – motivated by both moral and pragmatic considerations – and the expansion and diversification of the medical profession.\textsuperscript{322} Steven Cherry’s work has indicated that hospitals’ funding came from a range of sources, with ordinary income (subscriptions, small donations, workplace collections, and other regular fundraising along these lines) accounting for only part of their total income, and legacies, endowments, building funds and special appeals also playing an important role, as did investments.\textsuperscript{323} Again, there were significant regional variations within this: Hospital Saturday workplace collections, for example, accounted for negligible proportions of hospital’s income in some regions, but in others were hugely significant, demonstrating increased working-class willingness to invest in and sense of entitlement to healthcare.\textsuperscript{324} Some sources of hospital funding, meanwhile, involved mimicking commercial models of entertainment provision and drawing upon their talent pools. Catherin Hindson, for example, has shown that West End theatres raised significant sums for hospitals in the 1890s

\textsuperscript{321} Ibid (pp. 469, 474–475).
\textsuperscript{322} Ibid (pp. 467–468).
through organising bazaars and attached matinees, while Nick Hayes and Barry M. Doyle have argued that charitable entertainments (such as sporting events, concerts and parades) patronised by working-class communities supplanted traditional middle-class philanthropy as the primary source of income for meeting provincial hospitals’ everyday running costs during the 1920s and 1930s.\textsuperscript{325}

London itself had one of the densest concentrations of hospitals and beds in Britain.\textsuperscript{326} According to Keir Waddington, growing demand for hospital services (as they became increasingly associated with medical care rather than mortality) was met by hospital governors eagerly expanding their premises.\textsuperscript{327} They funded this by creating ‘a market for benevolent action and charitable giving’, drawing on subscriptions, donations, legacies, regular appeals, revenues raised from balls, dinners and other entertainments, and collections including in churches and workplaces, with requests for support couched in the language of both benevolence and self-interest; however, philanthropy only accounted for a minority of their total income, with the remainder coming from sources such as property investments, middle-class subscriptions and loans.\textsuperscript{328} Their management was dominated by the city’s traditional elites, who while ostensibly allowing regular subscribers and donors a greater say in hospital’s affairs, in practice remained firmly in control of their much narrower management committees – retaining a dominance they were no longer enjoyed in other increasingly democratic urban institutions at this time.\textsuperscript{329} Geoffrey Rivett has also characterised London’s hospital sector during the nineteenth century as beset by a lack of communication and coordination between themselves, resulting in unnecessary competition and uneven distribution.\textsuperscript{330}

\textsuperscript{326} Gorsky, Mohan and Powell, ‘British Voluntary Hospitals’ (p. 468).
\textsuperscript{328} Ibid (pp. 183–190).
Hospital Provision in London’s Suburbs

Figure 1 indicates the numbers of non-specialist hospitals (that is, general and cottage hospitals) opening in the Outer Ring from the mid-nineteenth century onwards.331 The first of these were set up in the Outer Ring from the late 1860s, mostly in districts such as Tottenham, Hornsey, Croydon, Bexley and Bromley, all of which did experience significant population growth from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. Yet the time taken to set up a local hospital meant their establishment often lagged some way behind suburban population expansion. This was particularly problematic in suburban Essex, where the rate of population growth was particularly sharp during the late nineteenth century. The first non-specialist hospital built there was the Walthamstow, Wanstead and Leyton Children’s and General Hospital in 1878, to serve districts which had first started to experience rapid suburbanisation during the 1860s. West Ham, whose population boom had begun even earlier, would not get a hospital until 1890. Between 1890 and 1914, 27 general and cottage hospitals opened in the Outer Ring; of these, 20 were located in either Middlesex or Essex, reflecting the general location of population growth, with hospitals again generally being built following local spikes in population, often some time afterwards. Acton’s population, for example, increased almost eleven-fold from 1861 to 37,744 in 1901, but it was only towards the very end of this period, in 1897, that it got a hospital.332 East Ham’s population, meanwhile, rose more than twentyfold from 1871 to 96,018 in 1901; it finally gained a hospital in 1902.333

The case of Ilford provides an illustration of why, despite demand, provision of hospital services often lagged behind suburban growth. The Ilford Medical Society initiated the hospital scheme in 1904, and within three years £2,750 had been raised for this purpose, but the cost of the project (exclusive of administrative costs) was an estimated £10,000, including £1,500 to acquire the hospital site.334 In July 1908, it was revealed that the first completed section of the

331 All data for London Outer Ring hospitals (e.g. years opened, bed numbers and occupancy rates, income) are – except where otherwise stated – taken from the Voluntary Hospitals Database, <http://www.hospitalsdatabase.lshtm.ac.uk/search.php> (accessed 1 Aug 2015).
hospital would have space for 23 beds, with it hoped this would eventually rise to 100; funds of around £4,000 had been accumulated at this stage. The foundation stone was eventually laid in February 1910, with the cost of construction set at £6,750. The King George Hospital officially opened in February 1912, eight years after the campaign for it was initially launched, equipped with 20 beds and admitting 247 inpatients by the end of that year, 193 for medical and surgical treatment and the remaining 53 for accidents. 54 of the hospital’s inpatients were private and 193 public; of the latter group, 88 received treatment free of charge, with the other 105 having paid according to their means, the majority of them contributing something between 5s and 20s a week. In addition to this, the hospital also treated 254 casualty cases.

Finchley, meanwhile, experienced slower, steadier (though still fluctuating) growth during the late nineteenth century, but the need for a local cottage hospital had already been identified by 1897. Eventually in 1904 the campaign to establish one got fully underway, with the cost of construction estimated at £5,000. Funds were raised towards this end by residents, businessmen, door-to-door canvassing, amateur dramatic performances, and ratepayers’ and workingmen’s associations. The initiative was bolstered by the support of local benefactor

Figure 1: Number of non-specialist hospitals versus population in Outer Ring, 1861–1911.
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335 Ilford Guardian (3 Jul 1908).
336 Ilford Recorder (18 Feb 1910).
337 Ilford Recorder (21 Feb 1913).
Ernest Homan, who alongside providing other financial assistance, acquired the site for the hospital. In 1908, the hospital was officially opened, with 20 beds. 338

Many of the other suburban hospitals were similarly rather small in scale. The Voluntary Hospitals Database gives numbers of beds for 21 Outer Ring voluntary hospitals in 1891; of these, only two hospitals had more than twenty beds in them: Croydon General (with 95) and the Deaconesses’ Institution and Hospital in Tottenham (107). Hospitals built in areas that thereafter underwent continued population growth often found their capacity and finances under increasing pressure. For example, Enfield Cottage Hospital opened in 1875 with just five beds, but Enfield continued to experience substantial population growth thereafter. The hospital was therefore expanded in 1887 and a new ward and operating theatre added, but by 1901, 12 of its 14 beds were occupied at any particular time on average. The hospital was again enlarged in 1906, and a children’s ward added, but usage also increased; in 1911, 18 of its 25 beds were typically in use at any one time. 339 The increased costs resulted in a shortage of funds which in 1908 the Enfield Observer warned could result in the hospital closing. 340

Similarly, the Deaconesses’ Institution and Hospital in Tottenham underwent considerable expansion during the 1880s, in response to the rapid growth of the surrounding district. This helped alleviate pressure on its services; in 1891, just over half of its 103 beds were occupied on average. In 1899, its voluntary deaconesses were replaced by paid nurses and, renamed the Tottenham Hospital, it became a general district hospital. This increased demand for its services, and the costs it had to shoulder: inpatient numbers rose from 530 in 1899 to 820 in 1902, while outpatient numbers increased from 9,687 to 17,053 per year over the same period; running costs were meanwhile around £500 per month by 1903, leaving the hospital £2,000 in debt. A further extension to its premises was opened in 1907, with the institution again renamed, this time as the Prince of Wales Hospital. 341 Nonetheless, pressure on the hospital’s services persisted: 113 of its 125 beds were occupied on average in 1911.

Other suburban hospitals also expanded in response to local population growth. Between 1891 and 1901, the number of beds rose from 20 to 32 at both Beckenham and Bromley and District Hospitals, from six to 35 at the Children’s and General Hospital for Leyton, Leytonstone, Walthamstow and Wanstead, from 16 to 30 at Norwood and District Hospital.

340 Enfield Observer (22 Jul 1910).
and from eight to 22 at Victoria Hospital in Barnet. Furthermore, between 1901 and 1911, bed numbers climbed from seven to 16 at Carshalton and District Hospital, from 14 to 22 at Chislehurst, Orpington and Cray Valley Hospital, and from six to 20 at Sutton and Cheam Hospital; by this point, 19 out of 37 hospitals that the Voluntary Hospitals Database gives bed numbers had room for more than 20 inpatients at any one time.

Rates of hospital bed provision in counties surrounding London remained among the lowest in the country during this period. In 1892, the House of Lords Select Committee on Metropolitan Hospitals published a report highlighting the over-concentration of hospitals in central London and the comparative dearth in east and south London in particular, and the suburbs more generally. Evidence presented to the committee divided London into five concentric districts and indicated that the most outlying of these (which covered a similar area to the Outer Ring) had one bed for every 2,482 residents, compared to an average of one bed for every 992 residents across the five rings. Yet the capital’s hospitals remained resistant to calls for more central regulation, and were reluctant to move away from communities where they already had established strong ties and a financial support base – the decision of Kings College Hospital to relocate to Denmark Hill in Camberwell being an exception to this trend.

**FUNDRAISING THROUGH THE CARNIVAL**

*Overall Fundraising Record*

The Ilford Carnival was part of a wider set of efforts to tackle the problem of hospital under-provision in London’s suburbs during this period. Ilford’s local press provided information about the funds raised by carnivals (and how, and in which wards) that is both extremely detailed in parts and perennially incomplete. Even allowing for these gaps in the record, these figures provide a fairly lucid picture of the financial aspects of the carnival. Figure 2 illustrates the total amounts (to the nearest pound) handed over by the carnival’s organisers.

---

343 Rivett, *Development of the London Hospital System*.
to the hospital funds between 1905 and 1914, both before and after inflation, and demonstrates a general trajectory of real-term growth in its effectiveness as a fundraiser, albeit with reversals in 1909 and 1911.\textsuperscript{345} In 1905, the total amount handed over to the fund was £445; this reached £828 in 1910 and £950 in 1914 (equivalent to £802 and £902 respectively at 1905 prices). However, as the scale of the carnival rose, so too did the expenses that ate into its takings. In 1908, for example, the organisers had to pay out £173, compared to £141 the year before.\textsuperscript{346} This figure continued to creep up: in 1911 it was £217, around £20 higher than a year earlier.\textsuperscript{347}

\textit{The Procession as Fundraising Device}

The only years for which a full breakdown of the Ilford Carnival’s final takings by the way in which they were accrued are available are from 1907 and 1908, as shown in Figure 3; however, figures for different aspects of fundraising are available for some individual years.\textsuperscript{348} As demonstrated in Chapter Two, the monetisation of entertainments has historically relied upon establishing barriers to sensory interaction with them, sometimes through the erection of physical boundaries, after which a fee can be extracted in exchange for the permitted bypassing on this barrier. To a degree, the carnival procession imitated this model, in that it differentiated between processionists and spectators, in which the performance of the former drew the latter, who could subsequently be solicited for contributions by collectors both at set points around Ilford and by those who formed part of the procession. Ward marshals and police ensured this separation was maintained spatially. Being mobile through outdoor space rather than confined to a fixed venue, however, a transactional relationship could not be enforced, although some individual items did allow the performer-audience demarcation to be bypassed for set fees: the South Essex Sanitary Steam Laundry’s ‘Crimean War’ car in the 1906 procession allowed people to take look at its interior for a price, for example, while the Aldborough Motor


\textsuperscript{346} \textit{Ilford Recorder} (2 Aug 1908).

\textsuperscript{347} \textit{Ilford Recorder} (23 Feb 1912).

\textsuperscript{348} \textit{Ilford Recorder} (8 Nov 1907; 2 Oct 1908).
Company charged people to ride in a motor car it entered in the 1905 procession, as did the Park Ward Committee with its coach in the 1909 carnival.  

Box collections were throughout the most sizeable component of the carnival’s revenues. During the first Ilford Carnival, £250 15s 8d was collected on the district’s streets, which was 44.5% of the £563 1s 5d the carnival was expected to bring in overall. In 1907, the £440 10s 8d raised through box collections accounted for 57.1% of the £771 15s 11.5d accrued by the carnival, while the amount raised through box collections rose to £465 11s in 1908, making up 52.2% out of total takings of £891 19s 8d. In 1911, the total amount raised through box collections was £545 9s 6.5d – 56.7% out of £962 1s 11.5d; by 1913 it had increased to £628. The share of the carnival’s revenues accounted for by box collections therefore remained stable over time, and did not increase in proportion to the rise in the number of people attending the procession. There are a number of likely reasons for this. The number of collectors did not increase in proportion to the size of crowds either, while only those at the front of the crowd would have been easily accessible to collect from during the procession. An illuminating anecdote in this regard came from the Ilford Recorder’s correspondent at the 1910 carnival,
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Figure 2: Total amounts raised for the hospital by the Ilford Carnival, 1905-1914.

Box collections were throughout the most sizeable component of the carnival’s revenues. During the first Ilford Carnival, £250 15s 8d was collected on the district’s streets, which was 44.5% of the £563 1s 5d the carnival was expected to bring in overall. In 1907, the £440 10s 8d raised through box collections accounted for 57.1% of the £771 15s 11.5d accrued by the carnival, while the amount raised through box collections rose to £465 11s in 1908, making up 52.2% out of total takings of £891 19s 8d. In 1911, the total amount raised through box collections was £545 9s 6.5d – 56.7% out of £962 1s 11.5d; by 1913 it had increased to £628. The share of the carnival’s revenues accounted for by box collections therefore remained stable over time, and did not increase in proportion to the rise in the number of people attending the procession. There are a number of likely reasons for this. The number of collectors did not increase in proportion to the size of crowds either, while only those at the front of the crowd would have been easily accessible to collect from during the procession. An illuminating anecdote in this regard came from the Ilford Recorder’s correspondent at the 1910 carnival,
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349 Ilford Guardian (2 Jul 1909).
350 Ilford Recorder (14 Jul 1905).
351 Ilford Recorder (23 Feb 1912; 18 Jul 1913).
who noted that one collector was equipped with a long pole and bag in order to receive donations from people watching the procession from windows and balconies, but that with this being an exception, spectators had to instead toss coins into the streets below for collectors to pick up.\textsuperscript{352} Moreover, the fact the crowd were increasingly drawn from outside the district means they were therefore unlikely to have the same level of affinity with the cause of establishing and maintaining a local hospital as residents of the district, and perhaps therefore less inclined to give money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Income</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box collections</td>
<td>£440</td>
<td>£465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badges</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamps</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of programmes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising in programmes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations to the prize fund</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds of the concert</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Breakdown of sources of income for the Ilford Carnival, 1907 and 1908.**

**Additional Entertainments**

Increasingly, adjunct events were also held in association with the carnival that did utilise strategies of enclosure for monetisation purposes, raising money primarily through ticket sales. These included the concert held after the carnival in Valentine’s Park, the ‘Comical Clown's Cricket Match’ and accompanying al fresco concert held every June by the Mayfield Cricket Club in South Hainault, and the annual autumn ball held at Ilford Town Hall, as well as myriad one-off events.\textsuperscript{353} These offered valuable supplementary income: the carnival concert, for example, raised between £9 and £12 each year between 1905 and 1911, rising to £17 9s 9.5d in 1912, £17 0s 9.5d in 1913, and £27 13s 6.25d in 1914, illustrating its capacity to capitalise on increasing turnout.\textsuperscript{354} Meanwhile, Mayfield Cricket Club raised £15 15s for the hospital in 1908, while that winter Loxford Ward Committee raised £25 by holding a series of

\textsuperscript{352} *Ilford Recorder* (15 Jul 1910).
\textsuperscript{353} *Ilford Guardian* (8 May 1908; 19 Jun 1908; 25 Jun 1909; 4 Jun 1909; 25 Jun 1909; 24 Jun 1910; 26 Jun 1914)
entertainments, while the same committee was reported in May 1911 to have recently achieved a profit of over £18 through holding whist drives and socials.355

These supplementary events were often held in public sites, particularly parks, and involved temporary implementation of financial boundaries to enter spaces that were otherwise theoretically free to access, and therefore dependent upon the willingness of local government to allow commercial practices on public land, with the Mayfield Cricket Club for example obtaining Ilford UDC's permission to host a concert, sell refreshments and take a collection at Goodmayes Park in 1909.356 This partly reflected the extent to which councils were themselves increasingly at ease with aping commercial practices in usage of their parks, as Carole O'Reilly has highlighted.357 On other occasions, they entailed utilising commercial venues for charitable purposes: for example, in 1909, a hospital concert was put on at Cauliflower Hotel in association with Park Ward.358

Adjunct entertainments were even more common elsewhere. In the case of Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club Carnival, the procession was solely one event amid numerous entertainments (also including bands, vocalists, dancing, puppetry, serious and novelty sports, military displays and even an eisteddfod) – the majority of which occurred on an enclosed green, with entry ticket only.359 In Tottenham, meanwhile, the tendency of ward committees to hold supplementary entertainments as part of their fundraising efforts in the weeks leading up to (as well as after) the Carnival was even more pronounced than in Ilford, including a number of large fetes held in local parks, as well as concerts, lantern exhibitions, plays and garden parties.

**Other Fundraising Sources**

Other means of collecting money through the Ilford Carnival similarly operated on a spectrum between transactional and benevolent, as with the sale of badges and stamps.
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357 O'Reilly, ‘‘We Have Gone Recreation Mad’’.
359 *Meyers’s Observer* (18 Sep 1896; 2 Jul 1897; 1 Jul 1898; 7 Jul 1899; 14 Jul 1899; 13 Jul 1900; 26 Jul 1901; 19 Sep 1902; 4 Sep 1903; 1 Jul 1904; 30 Jun 1905; 29 Jun 1906; 22 Jun 1907); *Meyers’s Enfield Observer* (26 Jun 1908; 9 Jul 1909); *The Enfield Observer* (6 Aug 1910; 30 Jun 1911; 21 Jun 1912); *The Enfield Gazette and Observer* (20 Jun 1913).
Acquiring and wearing a badge provided exemption from being solicited by collectors for donations.\(^{360}\) In 1905, 4,000 were produced, priced at a shilling each, and by the end of June were almost sold out.\(^{361}\) The following year, £181 7s 0d was accrued through badge sales, dropping to £104 16s 6d in 1907 (when two badges were available – one for adults priced at a shilling, and one for children at sixpence), climbed back again to £138 in 1908, and then dipped to £96 8s 0d in 1909, but by 1911 had climbed back over £100.\(^{362}\) Dips in badge sales tended to be accompanied by rises in stamp sales, and vice versa: the latter totalled £25 11s 1d in 1906, climbed to £68 8s 6d in 1907, slipped back to £47 2s in 1908, and then increased to £70 6s 8d in 1909; it would therefore appear that these two fundraising forms were effectively tapping into the same potential market, and contributors tended to select one or the other.\(^{363}\) Taken together, they raised £173 5s in 1907, which amounted to 22.5% of all funds raised, and £185 2s, or 20.8% of all funds accrued, in 1908. It appears their significance may have declined over time: in 1911, the amount of money raised through these two means was roughly in line with their 1907 and 1908 equivalents, whereas the total amount of money raised was substantially higher.

Information regarding donations is rather patchy, as they tended to continue to come in for several months after the carnival, and to be attributed in different ways from year to year within the complete figures that are available. These amounts fluctuated over time, raising £102 0s 9d in 1907, £169 9s 3d in 1908, £229 11s 1d in 1910, and £196 5s 3d in 1911, contributing to the reversal in the carnival’s takings that year.\(^{364}\) Immediately following the 1909 carnival, the *Ilford Guardian* provided a detailed list of subscribers and donors to date, as tabulated in Figure 4.\(^{365}\) Strikingly, more than half of the amount raised in this way came from one man: John Bethell, Liberal MP for Romford, the constituency Ilford formed part of, who donated a hundred guineas. Local councillor and builder W. D. Golding gave a further ten guineas, while an S. Spencer donated eight. The remaining amounts signed over ranged from 2s to £3 6s 8d. Some of these came from local businessmen – including those who, like Golding, were also involved in local government – while there were also donations from larger metropolitan businesses such as the *Daily Mirror*, *Daily Telegraph* and Nestlé’s (each of who gave a guinea); money was also raised by members of local voluntary organisations, like High Road Baptist
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\(^{360}\) *Ilford Guardian* (23 Jun 1905).

\(^{361}\) *Ilford Guardian* (30 Jun 1905).

\(^{362}\) *Ilford Guardian* (1 Aug 1906; 7 Jun 1907); *Ilford Recorder* (1 Oct 1909; 23 Feb 1912).

\(^{363}\) *Ilford Guardian* (1 Aug 1906); *Ilford Recorder* (1 Oct 1909).

\(^{364}\) *Ilford Recorder* (27 Sep 1907; 2 Oct 1908; 3 Feb 1911; 23 Feb 1912).

\(^{365}\) *Ilford Guardian* (16 Jul 1909).
Church, Ilford Conservative Club and Aldborough Lawn Tennis Club, as well as by school pupils, and employees of local businesses such as photography materials manufacturer Ilford Ltd. Though the scale of Bethell’s contribution was not characteristic of fundraising through the carnival, which tended to rely on far smaller scale acts of generosity and on the collecting endeavours of individuals and organisations, there were noteworthy individual donations in other years too, such as local builder A. M. Griggs donating over £50 in 1910.366

Programmes offered another increasingly important revenue stream, both through their sales and additional revenues from selling advertising space. Specific figures for programme sales are only available for 1907, 1908 and 1909, when they raised £28 16s 9d, £34 12s 1d, and £41 4s 5d respectively, no doubt reflecting rising crowd numbers.367 Revenue from advertising sales meanwhile, more than doubled from £9 3s 6d in 1907 to £18 12s 6d in 1908, but thereafter grew far more slowly, to £20 1s 6d in 1909, and £27 12s 6d in 1911.368 Revenue from programme sales and advertising accounted for 4.9% of all funds raised through the 1907 carnival and 6% in 1908; it is likely this share continued to grow in later years as programme sales continued to be bolstered by expanding attendances.

*Variation between Wards*

Within Ilford, there was significant variation in fundraising success between wards, as demonstrated in Figure 5, which shows ward totals for 1907, 1908, 1911 and 1912 (the four years for which complete figures are available).369 Cranbrook and Park were the two most consistently successful fundraisers. The most drastic improvement in fundraising capacity was South Hainault, which almost doubled the amount it raised from £78 10s 2.75d in 1907 to £142 17s 3d in 1908; Seven Kings and Loxford also saw more gradual improvement in their fundraising capacities between 1907 and 1912. By contrast, North Hainault continually accumulated the lowest total of any ward, followed by Clementswood, although the latter’s performance improved markedly in the 1910s. The totals raised are put into perspective in Figure 6 which calculates how much was raised per head in each ward in 1911. On this measure, Cranbrook again comes out top, followed by South Hainault and Park. At the other
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366 *Ilford Recorder* (23 Feb 1912).
368 *Ilford Recorder* (1 Oct 1909; 23 Feb 1912).
369 *Ilford Recorder* (27 Sep 1907; 2 Oct 1908; 23 Feb 1912; 18 Jul 1913).
end of the scale, North Hainault raised the least per inhabitant, although Clementswood also performed poorly on this measure.

**Figure 4: Donors to the 1909 Ilford Carnival funds (as of 16 Jul 1909).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor/Subscriber</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Donor/Subscriber</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Bethell MP</td>
<td>£105 0 0</td>
<td>Mr Bristowe</td>
<td>£0 11 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor W. D. Golding</td>
<td>£10 10 0</td>
<td>Aldborough Lawn Tennis Club</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Spencer</td>
<td>£8 8 0</td>
<td>Beehive Men’s Meeting</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Henniequin (and his dog, Bruno)</td>
<td>£3 6 8</td>
<td>Goodmayes School</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Gibson</td>
<td>£3 3 0</td>
<td>W. Berks</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Road Baptist Church</td>
<td>£3 3 0</td>
<td>Miss L. Clifton</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees of Ilford Ltd</td>
<td>£2 13 0</td>
<td>Mrs S. Fairweather</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of London &amp; County Bank</td>
<td>£2 2 0</td>
<td>Mr Gilchrist</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Radford</td>
<td>£2 2 0</td>
<td>Kenton</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sherren</td>
<td>£2 2 0</td>
<td>Mr Mobbs</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilford Conservative Club</td>
<td>£2 0 0</td>
<td>F. H. Taylor</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilford Post Office and Staff</td>
<td>£1 16 10</td>
<td>Messrs Freeman, Hardy &amp; Co.</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A. Barnard</td>
<td>£1 10 6</td>
<td>Misses Chalmers</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodmayes Tradesmen</td>
<td>£1 10 0</td>
<td>Mr Himer</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor W. P. Griggs J.P.</td>
<td>£1 6 6</td>
<td>Messrs Lilley and Skinner</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford Girls and Junior School</td>
<td>£1 2 0</td>
<td>D. Jackson</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>A. Partington</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>J. Wilson</td>
<td>£0 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestlé’s Milk</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>Mrs Goffin</td>
<td>£0 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor and Mrs P. E. Brand</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>R. E. Swindley (Canada)</td>
<td>£0 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. H. Clark</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>Messrs. Singer (per M. Tree)</td>
<td>£0 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. Magson</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>F. Hellier</td>
<td>£0 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobbett Mighell</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>Miss Sibley</td>
<td>£0 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sainsbury</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>Messrs Wheal and Crane</td>
<td>£0 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Smith</td>
<td>£1 1 0</td>
<td>W. I. White</td>
<td>£0 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Co-operative Society</td>
<td>£1 0 0</td>
<td>J. Coakes</td>
<td>£0 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodmayes Young Men’s Bible Class</td>
<td>£0 12 6</td>
<td>W. Lee</td>
<td>£0 2 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These divergences in fundraising effectiveness reflected variations in socioeconomic makeup and physical geography. Park’s and Cranbrook’s success for example owed much to their incorporating the majority of the final procession route, meaning they regularly outperformed the other wards on box collections. High donations totals, meanwhile, tended to reflect concentrations of wealth within the district. Cranbrook, which included some of Ilford’s most affluent neighbourhoods, led Park as the highest grossing ward in 1907 because its ward committee received twice the total of donations that their Park counterparts did, for example. South Hainault’s drastically improved performance thereafter, meanwhile, reflected its ward committee’s breakthrough in securing a huge rise in donations from its relatively wealthy, more
recently settled inhabitants. Loxford, by contrast, was one of Ilford’s poorer wards overall, yet it often topped the list for accruing donations and subscriptions because of the location of many of Ilford’s businesses and voluntary organisations there.

North Hainault, by contrast, fared poorly because its diffuse population were far harder to target through box collections; South Hainault, whose population outside of Chadwell Heath and Goodmayes was also fairly scattered, also performed weakly on box collections relative to other aspects of its fundraising. However, both wards tended to do well on badge sales, suggesting that many residents less likely to be reached by collectors on carnival day contributed in advance that way instead. Clementswood, by contrast, was Ilford’s second most densely populated ward, but its comparatively low fundraising totals – and particularly the dearth of donations received by its ward committee – reflected its status as one of Ilford’s poorer wards.370

Figure 5: Funds raised in each ward for the 1907, 1908, 1911 and 1912 Ilford Carnivals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementswood</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hainault</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Kings</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hainault</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Carnival’s Importance to the Hospital Movement

The carnival proved vital to the cause of establishing a hospital in Ilford. Ahead of the 1908 procession, the Ilford Guardian reported that a total of £4,000 had been raised to date for the hospital; of this, approximately 40% had been through the first three carnivals.371 At a reunion of carnival workers later that year, J. W. Godfrey – who would later serve as the Hospital Committee’s vice-chairman – described the carnival as the primary source of funds for the hospital.372 Although it was soon supplemented by other fundraising initiatives, such as the Ilford Hospital Cup football competition and the Ilford Hospital Bazaar, the carnival
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370 Ilford Recorder (27 Sep 1907; 2 Oct 1908; 1 Oct 1909; 23 Feb 1912).
371 Ilford Guardian (3 Jul 1908).
372 Ilford Guardian (27 Nov 1908).
remained a vital source of revenue for the hospital; of the £1,300 raised for the hospital in 1911, for example, more than half came from the carnival.\textsuperscript{373} It was vital to the hospital’s transition from aspiration to reality within a decade, for the most part drawing small contributions from a large number of residents whose awareness of and interest in the hospital movement it helped generate and maintain, as well as stimulating auxiliary charitable activities among the district’s voluntary bodies and businesses.

**Figure 6: Ward totals per head for the 1911 Ilford Carnival.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Amount raised per head (in pence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clementswood</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxford</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hainault</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Kings</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hainault</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the Ilford Carnival with similar events held in other districts is illustrative of its effectiveness as a philanthropic initiative, and of the strengths but also weaknesses of the processional carnival as fundraising method. In Finchley too, the carnival was felt to stimulate wider-than-usual financial support for the local hospital movement: following the 1907 event, the *Finchley Press* noted that of 31,026 coins collected during the procession, 21,114 were pennies, which ‘proves that the carnival succeeded in tapping sources that the General Committee could not, or had not reached’.\textsuperscript{374} In 1913, five years after the hospital had opened, the same paper lamented what it deemed to be local indifference to the institution, typified by poor attendance of its general meetings, and complained that it was only at carnival time that people remembered its existence.\textsuperscript{375}

The Tottenham Carnival typically raised between £500 and £600 during the early 1900s, and initially following its resumption earned £727 12s 11d for the Tottenham District Hospital in 1909 and £844 16s in 1910.\textsuperscript{376} Yet while these figures at first glance bear comparison with the success of the Ilford Carnival, there are several caveats. Firstly, Tottenham had a population approximately twice that of Ilford’s at this time. Secondly, while the Tottenham Carnival’s importance was regularly talked up by the hospital’s management and its abandonment during

\textsuperscript{373} *Ilford Recorder* (2 Feb 1912).
\textsuperscript{374} *Finchley Press* (6 Jul 1907).
\textsuperscript{375} *Finchley Press* (11 Apr 1913).
the mid-1900s was felt to have detrimentally impacted upon the institution’s finances, it simply was not as important to keeping the hospital – which was far larger than that eventually established in Ilford, served a broader district, and had a far higher income – running as the Ilford Carnival was to meeting the costs of setting up the Ilford Emergency Hospital. Thirdly, Tottenham’s procession was shorter and had a lesser profile than the Ilford one, a larger share of the funds raised coming from auxiliary entertainments and other schemes conducted over a longer period. The procession’s limitations as a method of accruing funds were pointed out early in its history by frustrated correspondents to the Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald, who castigated many in the watching crowd for not making contributions; one claimed in 1899 that if the Lord Mayor’s Show were to pass through Tottenham and everybody was charged 6d to see it, a majority would pay to watch, but that when a carnival procession of around a mile in length circulated the district, few people donated. Fourthly, the success of the carnival’s revival in the late 1900s proved short-lived: the 1911 event raised only £341 19s 1d, and the 1913 carnival – the last held in Tottenham before the war – only £149 0s 4d.

Enfield’s carnivals, meanwhile, mirrored the problems the two Hainault wards faced in raising funds from vast, mostly rural areas with concentrated pockets of suburbanisation within them. The Enfield Bonfire Boys Carnival usually raised between £30 and £80, breaking the £100 barrier in 1897 and 1899. Processions held in Enfield Town and other parts of the district typically raised under £100 as well. While the volume of different carnivals organised in Enfield meant they collectively earned substantial amounts for a number of local charitable institutions, ultimately Enfield’s physical layout curtailed not only the scale of carnival movements, but also the length of processional routes, and thereby their effectiveness as fundraising tools.

The Ilford Carnival’s demise highlighted shortcomings in its fundraising model: its inability to fully monetise crowds and optimise returns on its expenses. The event was abandoned in 1915 – partly from moral considerations, but also due to the likely practical difficulties of holding a carnival at that time – and replaced by house-to-house collections and
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377 Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald (13 Dec 1901; 18 Jul 1902; 22 May 1903; 2 Mar 1906). The Voluntary Hospitals Database gives the Prince of Wales Hospital’s ordinary income as £7,736 in 1907, £9,920 in 1909, £8,849 in 1911 and £7,951 in 1913.
378 Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald (28 Jul 1899).
379 Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald (13 Dec 1901; 18 Jul 1902; 22 May 1903; 2 Mar 1906). The Voluntary Hospitals Database gives the Prince of Wales Hospital’s ordinary income as £7,736 in 1907, £9,920 in 1909, £8,849 in 1911 and £7,951 in 1913.
379 Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald (28 Jul 1899).
380 Meyers’s Observer (9 Nov 1894; 8 Nov 1895; 20 Nov 1896; 12 Dec 1897; 11 Nov 1898; 17 Nov 1899; 29 Nov 1901).
381 Meyers’s Observer (14 Jul 1899; 23 Nov 1900; 13 Jul 1902; 26 Sep 1902; 4 Sep 1903); Enfield Observer (8 Sep 1911); Enfield Gazette and Observer (22 Aug 1913; 19 Sep 1913).
smaller-scale leisure events.\textsuperscript{382} This actually increased the profitability of Hospital Saturday: the collections alone raised £959 7s 4d in 1915, while a total of £1,512 19s 9d was raised in 1916, and £1,988 7s 3.5d in 1917.\textsuperscript{383} Even when higher wartime rates of inflation are taken into consideration, this was still a significant increase on peacetime fundraising, at a time when competition from war charities and the departure of some adult male residents to fight on the continent could have potentially hurt revenues, illustrating the greater effectiveness of more direct soliciting of local residents and charging of patrons in return for their amusement.\textsuperscript{384} Saturday Carnival Fund treasurer and Ilford Emergency Hospital secretary A. W. Hare told the \textit{Ilford Guardian} in 1915 that he preferred the holding of house-to-house collections as a means of fundraising, claiming people who had come to Ilford for the Carnival only arrived in the district in the evening and that street collections during the procession had raised relatively little.\textsuperscript{385} That the carnival was not revived after the First World War may help illustrate why Britain’s interwar carnivals tended to be more multifaceted than their predecessors, as they directed their resources and efforts towards more lucrative forms of hospital fundraising than just processions.

\section*{The Culture of Charity and Voluntarism}

\textit{The Language of Charity}

Discourse around the carnivals was unceasingly strident in reminding contributors and participants of the event’s rationale. The \textit{Ilford Guardian} and \textit{Ilford Recorder}, for example, regularly mentioned the cause of building the hospital in their coverage of the carnival, and how wider fundraising for and latterly construction on it was progressing, while speakers at public meetings held in relation to the event also regularly stressed the importance of the cause behind the carnival. The \textit{Ilford Guardian}, for example, referred to the ‘moving power of

\textsuperscript{382} \textit{Ilford Recorder} (26 Mar 1915).
\textsuperscript{383} \textit{Ilford Guardian} (16 Jul 1915); \textit{Ilford Recorder} (20 Jul 1917; 19 Jul 1918).
\textsuperscript{384} The amount raised in 1916 would have been worth £1,082 in 1905 prices, while the amount raised in 1917 was equivalent to £1,134 on the same measure.
\textsuperscript{385} \textit{Ilford Guardian} (16 Jul 1915).
Charity’ in its report on the 1906 carnival, while the following year the newspaper remarked that a ‘well-known French savant’ had deemed ‘voluntary contributions’ to be a key national characteristic of the British.\(^{386}\) What is particularly noticeable is that the hospital cause was associated above all with the district as an act of communal self-help; for example, in 1907, the *Ilford Guardian* commented that Ilford ‘has seriously determined to build itself a hospital, and not being a community of wealthy benefactors and benefactresses, the wherewithal has to be achieved through a common channel...It will be to pence rather than pounds that the institution will owe its existence’.\(^{387}\) The following year, the same paper claimed:

‘Ilford is not a wealthy community, and its democratic spirit is something to be admired; it possesses very little that it has not had to pay for, and it is therefore all the more proud of its possessions. Some towns have hospitals and such institutions thrust upon them in a fit of generosity by some old resident, but none of this sort of luck has come Ilford’s way.’\(^{388}\)

This rhetoric identified Ilford as unprivileged but self-reliant, and civically engaged. By slight contrast, the Cranbrook committee emphasised the concept of charity as altruistic and requiring selflessness, in an open letter to residents of the ward in 1914:

‘[We appeal] to the residents of the Cranbrook Ward for further help and support with a view to placing the ward in a favourable position with regard to final results, as at least those Wards which are not so much financially blessed as our own. Charity does not only mean self help, but also self-denial and sacrifice. A little of this so far as golf, cricket, tennis, etc. are concerned may materially benefit the Carnival funds for the hospital.’\(^{389}\)

In Enfield and Tottenham, meanwhile, raising funds for the hospital was more often (though far from solely) characterised as an act of munificence towards the local poor. This perhaps helps to explain why carnival organisers in Enfield were often open to donating to other institutions that also served the district’s poorer off.\(^{390}\) For example, in 1893, Enfield Bonfire Boys secretary William James Matthews, successfully convinced his co-organisers to allocate a portion of the funds raised by that year’s carnival to local soup kitchens on account

\(^{386}\) *Ilford Guardian* (20 Jul 1906; 19 Jul 1907).

\(^{387}\) *Ilford Guardian* (19 Jul 1907).

\(^{388}\) *Ilford Guardian* (17 Jul 1908).

\(^{389}\) *Ilford Guardian* (19 Jun 1914).

\(^{390}\) *Meyers’s Observer* (17 Nov 1893; 1 Jul 1904); *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* (13 Dec 1901; 26 Jun 1903; 30 Oct 1903; 4 Jul 1912)
of the growing hardship he had witnessed in the parish over recent months in his role as a vestry clerk, as a result of local factories laying off some of their staff.\(^{391}\) The programme for the 1904 Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club carnival, meanwhile, reminded attendees that the hospital was free to the sick poor of the district.\(^{392}\) In Tottenham, the growth and changing social composition of the district were regularly mentioned in explaining why the local hospital needed more funds. In 1910, for example, the then hospital director F. W. Drewett wrote in the carnival programme:

‘Oh! that Tottenham could attract some of the large legacies which are continually falling into the exchequers of the richer, but not one bit more worthy, institutions. But alas, the wealthy benefactors, many of whom were connected with this town in their early days, forget its teeming population, with its sorrows, its struggles and its needs.’\(^{393}\)

A unifying theme in support for local hospitals in Ilford, Tottenham and Enfield was a focus on their role in caring for sick children, which tied in with the emphasis on domesticity and childrearing at the heart of the suburban ideal, and combined charitable concern for the most vulnerable with the parent’s concern for the welfare of their own child. The 1908 Ilford Carnival procession, for example, included the ‘The Guardian Angel’ tableau, comprising a juvenile patient in bed attended by nurses and with the guardian angels of Truth, Charity, Purity and Harmony watching over them, and the ‘Hospital Ward Car’, which depicted a sick child being tended to by a doctor and nurse. Similarly, funds raised through the Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club Carnival were during the early 1900s specifically set aside for the Enfield Cottage Hospital’s Children’s Ward, as mentioned earlier, while in 1909 West Green’s ward committee expressed the ambition to use the funds it raised for the Tottenham Carnival to eventually endow a children’s cot at the district hospital.\(^{394}\)

\(^{391}\) *Meyers’s Observer* (13 Oct 1893).
\(^{392}\) *Meyers’s Observer* (17 Nov 1893; 1 Jul 1904).
\(^{393}\) *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* (16 Sep 1910)
\(^{394}\) *Tottenham and Edmonton Wednesday Herald* (27 Oct 1909)
Voluntarism as Practice and Ideology

Suburban commitment to charity, and voluntary action more broadly, functioned as an embedded practice almost unto its own end. In Ilford, locally based charities or philanthropically concerned voluntary organisations, such as Dr Barnardo’s Homes, the Ilford Toy Fund, and the Ilford Men’s Meeting, regularly contributed decorated vehicles to the procession. Moreover, the participation of leisure-focused organisations in carnivals in Ilford and other suburbs, is illustrative of the link between local associational culture and philanthropy, whereby those engaged in voluntary organisational activities supporting their own leisure and that of their club mates frequently extended their unpaid work into charitable fundraising as well.

This was partly driven by the capacity for investment of economic, cultural and social capital in carnivals to generate additional social capital in return. Ward committee membership, for example, provided opportunities for making new contacts within one’s ward or, if elected to the executive, within Ilford more broadly. Such contacts could prove particularly useful for those engaged in local business or politics, while leadership roles within one organisation could pave the way to senior roles in other bodies: Ben Henderson, for example, had been elected ruling councillor of the local Primrose League before his selection as the inaugural carnival’s honorary secretary. Particularly heavy involvement in the carnival movement or an especially generous donation also often brought communal recognition. Both were liable to lead to individuals being singled out for mention in the local press; some actively sought such attention, writing into newspapers to state that their names had been omitted from or misspelt within lists of contributors. Moreover, in addition to prizes given routinely in Ilford and elsewhere to each year’s most effective collectors, some individuals were given special recognition for providing vital service to carnivals over a number of years, such as William James Matthews who received an illuminated address at the Enfield Bonfire Boys’ 1896 smokers’ concert for his work as honorary secretary, while the Tottenham Carnival’s general secretary Charles Edward Newling was given a gold chain and pendant in 1904 as a token of gratitude for his work on behalf of the carnival.
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Newspapers and their readers were well aware of the possibility of individual self-interest taking priority as a motivation for involvement in the carnival, and chastised those suspected of doing so. In 1909, the *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* was moved to assert:

‘We have heard complaints that in our report last week we left out some names that should have been made prominent. We left out hundreds, though every man and woman did his or her level best to help the Hospital. We trust it that charity, and not self-glorification, was at the bottom of all their efforts.’

That same year, the *Ilford Guardian*’s ‘Whispers & Echoes’ column defended John Bethell from allegations his donation of a hundred guineas to the carnival fund might have been politically motivated. It is also noteworthy that Griggs’s large donation to the hospital in 1910 came a few months before he stood against Bethell in the Romford constituency.

Concerns over ulterior motives for charitable activity, and the perceived inadequacies of voluntary contributions as a means of supporting hospitals, prompted some to respond to carnivals by advocating public funding of hospitals. In Ilford in 1910, an F. Schutze of Seven Kings described the carnival as ‘a most extravagant way to maintain Hospitals, which should have been Nationalized years ago.’ Two years later, when Ethelbert Fyson, speaking on behalf of the carnival committee, remarked at the annual meeting of the Ilford Emergency Hospital in 1912 that the time might come that hospitals become state-funded, the comment was met with applause. Similarly, Alfred James Wrampling, a member of Edmonton UDC and secretary for Edmonton’s ward committee, on more than one occasion during preparations for the 1904 Tottenham Carnival publically called for hospitals to be rate or state-funded.

Yet advocacy of retreat from the voluntary ethos was regularly challenged, due to the emphasis placed on charitability and voluntarism as virtues in themselves. In 1903, for example, the Reverend H. Wase Whitfield, chairing at a concert put on by the West Green ward committee, noted that the Bishop of Stepney had advocated putting hospitals on the rates, but remarked that he himself felt their ‘glory was in their being voluntary institutions’. Six years later, ‘Rover’ wrote into the *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* to criticise those who
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attended the carnival but did not give money to collectors and, claiming to have heard one fellow crowd member argue that the hospital should be put on the rates, asserted:

‘…put all the hospitals on the rates and all would have to contribute, rich and poor alike; the doctors would not feel called upon to serve the public free of charge any more than the grocer or coal merchant. Why should they? All our Hospital gets from the districts it serves does not come to a penny per year per head. Where would be the sense of refusing the gifts of the rich and spreading the burden over the backs of all, whether they can easily afford it or not, when there is no necessity to do so? Let us all do what we can though; many who could well afford shillings do not give one penny.’

Unsurprisingly, then, any perceived moves towards individuals taking on non-voluntary, transactional carnival work drew severe criticism. In 1902, Lower ward representative William Crusha proposed at an executive committee meeting that they take on a paid secretary, but withdrew the motion in the face of pronounced opposition; similarly, in 1909, Edmonton Poor Law Union guardian Henry Crane alleged that the hospital’s official collector was receiving a ten per cent commission on all funds raised through the carnival, drawing a sharp rebuttal from hospital director Frederick W. Drewett in a letter to the Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald. Both the Ilford Guardian and Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald also at times refuted claims tradesmen were making a profit through their fundraising activities.

Yet at the same time, a degree of leeway was provided with regard to adjunct events involving partnership between carnival committees and commercial institutions. In Tottenham in particular, businesses sometimes participated in the provision of entertainments in return for a percentage of the takings. In 1909, for example, Lower Ward Committee organised a fete at Bruce Castle Park, at which the London-based company James Pain & Sons put on a fireworks display in exchange for 60% of the event’s revenues. That same year, the People’s Palace cinema put on a bioscope, during which carnival prizes for Middle ward were distributed, with the £10 of takings for the event being split equally between the venue and the ward committee, while in 1911 Alexandra Palace charged the executive committee a £50 rent for a fete to take place there in 1911. The apparent lack of comment on this practice is a striking paradox;
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perhaps, we might speculate that it was pragmatically accepted – out of the same libertarian mind-set that emphasised voluntarism in support of welfare institutions – that businesses were also free to openly exchange their services for financial reward within the context of charity provision, providing they offered value for money.

By contrast, there was controversy in Ilford in 1909 when Ilford UDC’s education committee refused to grant the Ilford Carnival’s organisers free usage of Christchurch Road School for counting the contents of collection boxes. The situation was resolved through an individual donor paying the fee required, but the incident sparked furious criticism from the Ilford Guardian, which commented:

‘The Ilford Emergency Hospital will be an institution for the benefit of the whole town, and it is farcical to ask payment for accommodation which, in any other town, would be free for the asking, under similar circumstances. The sum of money involved is small, but it is the feeling which refused to help calls forth that is to be deplored. Members of the Education Committee were anxious to repudiate any want of sympathy with the hospital, but they will have some difficulty, after this, in convincing the general public that the hospital movement commends itself to them.’

Taking the frequency with which councillors served on Ilford’s carnival committees into consideration as well, it is likely that this reflected a perception local government should readily extend its help to philanthropic initiatives when asked as a logical extension of its responsibility for local welfare. By contrast, unrequested public sector encroachment could spark resentment. The Ilford Guardian reported following the 1911 Coronation fete organised by Ilford UDC that it had received a number of angry letters, which:

‘…indicate very strongly that the inhabitants have a very poor opinion of officially planned festivities…The general complaint is that the Council kept matters so much to itself and left the arrangements to so late a date that any display of enthusiasm on the part of the public was out of the question’.
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CARNIVAL AND COMMUNITY-HOSPITAL RELATIONS

Ilford, the Carnival and the Hospital

In some cases carnivals were utilised to finance the establishment of new hospitals to serve expanding new communities, and in others to support existing charitable causes, and this distinction had ramifications for the way relationships between suburban communities and their hospitals played out through carnivals. In the case of Ilford, it appears the hospital cause was at first not uniformly popular, due to suspicions over the motives of the Ilford Medical Society. At the public meeting at which the hospital carnival was initiated, chair Rev. H. W. E. Molony and the society’s Dr Houghton denied it was to be built and run by the district’s doctors with public funds for their own benefit, the latter also highlighting the presence of laymen on the hospital committee.\(^\text{411}\) It seems likely the carnival helped transform the hospital movement in the eyes of many Ilford residents, turning it into a local cause celebre and giving them a stake in it; certainly, there was no mention in the local newspapers of any hint of antipathy towards the idea of having a hospital in the district during the build-up to subsequent carnivals.

As of 1907 the carnival’s administration was established as a wholly separate body from the Ilford Emergency Hospital Committee, with Ben Henderson resigning as the carnival’s secretary so he could focus on his responsibilities as secretary to the hospital itself.\(^\text{412}\) Yet close ties between the two bodies and overlap in personnel remained evident thereafter: six of the ten men elected hospital governors in February 1911 were subsequently involved in organising that year’s carnival (five as executive committee members), while A. W. Hare served as both carnival and hospital treasurer.\(^\text{413}\) Seven hospital governors were also involved in organising the 1913 carnival.\(^\text{414}\) Similarly, in Finchley, Edward Danby, who in 1904 hosted the first meeting regarding establishing a local cottage hospital in the district and subsequently became one of the hospital’s committee members, was in the interim involved in organising the 1905 and 1906 cricket match and carnivals in North Finchley and as of 1907 served as vice chairman on the general committee for the Finchley Carnival proper.\(^\text{415}\) In these two cases, carnival and
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hospital management remained closely intertwined, and involvement in the former could provide a springboard to a role in the latter.

**Fractious Relations: The Case of Tottenham**

In most other cases touched upon in this thesis, however, the carnival followed rather than preceded the establishment of a local hospital. For example, Wood Green Cycling Club held its first carnival in aid of the district’s Passmore Edwards Cottage Hospital in 1896, the year after the institution opened, while the first East Ham Carnival took place in 1907, five years after the opening of the local hospital. In other cases, carnivals were launched to support hospitals that had been open for some time. The Enfield Bonfire Carnival was first held in 1890, 15 years after the Enfield Cottage Hospital was opened, while the first carnival organised in Tottenham was in 1898, 31 years after its local hospital was opened, and the first West Ham Carnival was put on in 1904, 14 years after the West Ham and East London Hospital first opened. The proliferation of carnivals across outer north and east London during this period thus intersected between following local and national trends and responding to the need of institutions for funds as they served swelling suburban populations.

The case of Tottenham illustrates how the dynamics in a relationship between a carnival movement and local hospital differed when the hospital was long-established rather than not yet built. The Ilford Carnival, having sprung out of the hospital movement, successfully enlisted the support of the district’s existing voluntary organisations. The first Tottenham carnivals, by contrast, were the initiative of local cycling clubs seeking to raise funds on the hospital’s half. The distinction mattered: while the Tottenham Hospital’s management repeatedly expressed their gratitude to carnival workers for the funds they raised, both through open letters to the press and on occasion in person at the carnival’s executive committee meetings, the issue of carnival representation in the hospital’s administration strained relations between the two organisations over the first half of the 1900s.

In 1900, William Jubb, retired ironmonger, local councillor, and chair of the Tottenham Carnival executive committee, first broached the subject of a carnival representative being
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given a seat on the management board, which he claimed would enable the public to feel in
closer touch with the hospital. He was told by hospital chairman Cory Francis Cory-Wright,
chairman of major coal and oil shipping firm William Cory & Sons (and soon to become a
baronet) that it was not within his power to accede this request, but that the executive committee
could attain a seat on the board at the next annual general meeting if they secured enough
votes.419 Yet the issue resurfaced the following year: Jubb told Cory-Wright no elections took
place at the AGM, with places on the board all pre-allocated; Cory-Wright replied that by
nominating someone to hand the cheque for the carnival’s takings over to the hospital, the
executive committee could secure 80 votes for that person at the board elections (one vote
being offered in exchange for each £5 donated).420 Still representation was not forthcoming
and tensions continued to manifest: in 1902, the hospital was criticised at an executive
committee meeting for only naming one bed after Jubb, who had passed away since the
previous year’s carnival, bequeathing £6,000 to the institution.421 In 1904, the executive
nominated its general secretary, tobacco pipe maker Charles Newling, to represent the carnival
on the hospital board. Once again, no place on the board materialised and in 1905, following a
heated executive meeting at which Newling decried the hospital governors’ treatment of the
carnival movement and called for all funds raised by that year’s event to go to the local
dispensary instead, the carnival was discontinued, only resuming in 1909 in response to
worsening pressures on the hospital’s finances.422

This sequence of events appears to cohere with Waddington’s argument that traditional
elites covertly marginalised other groups in hospital management, with the local businessmen
and officials who led the Tottenham Carnival movement and aspired to greater involvement in
running the local hospital finding their ambitions thwarted in the bureaucratic processes of an
institution run by men drawn from a higher social stratum than themselves. By contrast, in
Ilford at this time, the hospital movement – though initiated by local doctors – was nascent
enough, as a belated response to a fairly sudden mushrooming of the local population, and in
sufficient need of supporters as to facilitate some lower middle class leadership in setting up
and governing this institution, as well as in raising funds for it through the carnival. This in
turn offers a microcosm of how the speed of Ilford’s suburbanisation produced a relatively
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fluid public sphere in which recent migrants of ordinary standing (by the standards of this predominantly white collar suburb) and an inclination towards voluntary action could attain prominent positions within the community.

The Philanthropic Market: The Case of Enfield

Enfield exhibited an often looser relationship between its disparate carnival movements and a number of charities. The Enfield Bonfire Carnival was, for example, started to support Enfield Cottage Hospital and throughout its duration the majority of its funds were turned over to this institution. However, in 1897 the Bonfire Boys decided to donate a quarter of the money raised by that year’s carnival to the Tottenham District Hospital, given that it often treated residents of Ponders End and Enfield Highway and that much of the money it expected to collect during the procession was from inhabitants of Tottenham and Edmonton; small proportions of the funds were also handed over to the Enfield Philanthropic Society and Nursing Fund.\textsuperscript{423} Takings were also split between the Tottenham and Enfield Hospitals in 1898 and 1899 (£5 was also given over that year to the Ruth Elliot Home of Rest for Poor Children, after the Bonfire Boys received a letter pleading for its help).\textsuperscript{424} In 1901, the Bonfire Boys decided to allocate £5 each of the funds they raised to the Enfield Philanthropic Society, the Ruth Elliott Home, and the Church School of Industry, with the balance given over to the Enfield Cottage Hospital; it subsequently opted to hand over the £5 originally earmarked for the School of Industry to a local branch of Soldiers' and Sailors' Families' Association instead.\textsuperscript{425}

The Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club were even more focused on the Enfield Cottage Hospital, allocating the vast majority of funds their carnival raised for it; yet it also gave some of its takings from the 1900 and 1901 carnivals to the Enfield School of Industry.\textsuperscript{426} Further eastward, the Enfield Highway and Ponders End Carnival held during the early 1900s shared its takings between the Tottenham and Enfield hospitals, while the Albany Park Cycling Club Carnival focused on the Tottenham Hospital but also split the remainder of the funds raised
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between the Enfield and Cheshunt Cottage Hospitals. A decade later, the Eastern Enfield Carnival supported both the Ponders End, Enfield Highway and District Nurse Fund and the Enfield Cottage Hospital. Elsewhere in Enfield around this time, the Bush Hill Park Carnival focused on financing the establishment of a dispensary in that part of the district. In Enfield, then, holding carnivals became a fashionable and embedded practice, the particular cause which takings went to becoming an afterthought in some cases. Carnival organisers found competition existed for the funds they raised, debated the most suitable charities to donate to, and were on occasion actively solicited by smaller organisations for a portion of their takings.

There was a geographic dimension to the relationship between communal voluntary action and welfare institutions within this philanthropic market. Firstly, the spheres of influence of individual institutions varied in scale and overlapped. So whereas the Enfield Cottage Hospital and movements to establish hospitals in Finchley and Ilford were delimited to those districts, the Tottenham hospital was larger and served a broader area, and so could inspire philanthropic action not only in Tottenham, but also in Enfield, Edmonton and Walthamstow. In the case of Enfield, the district’s vastness meant the appeal of individual causes varied between different localities within it. Thus carnivals held in Enfield Town were particularly concerned with Enfield Cottage Hospital, located in Enfield Town itself, as well as to a lesser extent with other Enfield-focused charitable causes; by contrast, in Eastern Enfield, Enfield Cottage Hospital vied for support with the Cheshunt and Tottenham hospitals, which were also located outside the immediate area but nonetheless served local residents. Then there were smaller scale causes with a much more local appeal, such as the Ponders End and District Nurses’ Fund or the Bush Hill Dispensary.

Charitable institutions therefore played an important role in community formation through voluntary action, the vicinities they served being rooted in pre-existing conceptions and embodiments of place that they might reinforce or amend. Thus, the movements to set up hospitals in Finchley and Ilford reflected and enhanced the perception and performance of these two UDAs somewhat unified communities, while the Tottenham Hospital facilitated initiatives within suburban northeast London that traversed local government boundaries. Meanwhile, Enfield’s fragmentariness was partly informed by the particular combinations of philanthropic institutions that appealed to its different localities, although the decision of the Enfield Bonfire Boys to for several years also support Tottenham’s hospital because of the
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service it rendered to residents of Eastern Enfield, and of organisers of carnivals in Eastern Enfield to raise funds for the cottage hospital located in Enfield Town, illustrates that charitable concerns could overcome as well as maintain the district’s geographic splits.

CONCLUSION

While many London hospitals in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries relied on wealthy benefactors and investments for their upkeep, Ilford’s rapid population growth and dearth of existing local provision compelled its residents to take financing hospital provision into their own hands – as happened to varying degrees in other London suburbs in this period. They did so through a carnival that combined reliance on benevolence with offering services (entertainment, advertising, etc.) in exchange for money for the cause, and which proved vital to funding the hospital’s establishment, despite the procession’s fundraising shortcomings. Underpinning this was a commitment to establishing the hospital as an act of collective local self-help, but also to charity as virtuous in and of itself, and to voluntarism as a way of doing things. The Ilford Carnival moreover served as a conduit between local community and the planned hospital, with many involved in organising the carnival subsequently becoming active in the management of the hospital itself, in a way that did not occur in the case of the larger and longer-established Tottenham hospital.

Through a detailed local study and comparison with other districts, this chapter has also hopefully offered insights into why – at a time when state welfare provision was being expanded, and hospitals were frequently appealing for funds – voluntarism persisted as the primary model for arranging and funding hospital care in Britain at this time. It offered a potential means to liberty and potency of individual and local collective agency, promising diverse social groups within a both unequal and increasingly nationalised society greater control over their own wellbeing, through action at a geographical scale familiar and concrete to them – even though in practice their aspirations were frequently frustrated by the urban elites that dominated the established hospital sector. Different groups within Ilford and other suburbs had capital invested, with expected returns, in the ideology of charity and voluntarism. For the Ilford Medical Society, the carnival offered an avenue to establishing an institution in which
they could accrue additional work, experience and influence. For carnival workers, organising the event was not only backstage activity, but a performance in itself unto each other and – via newspaper coverage – the broader local community, through which they could expand their own social networks and influence, including in some cases within the hospital itself. Engaging in the language and actions of charity offered Ilford’s residents both a sense of self-worth and rectitude, but also of group belonging through rallying to a common local cause. The suburban setting was central to all this, in that it provided an as yet fairly adaptable and unfilled space for pursuing these objectives relatively freely, as well as within which accessible ideologies and discourses such as charity were necessary for attaining social capital.
CHAPTER SIX

SPECTACLE, INVERSION, ADAPTATION AND COMMODIFICATION

INTRODUCTION

This chapter concentrates more specifically on the carnival procession as multifaceted performance and spectacle. It contextualises the carnival procession within the broader revitalisation of processional culture in the modern western city, before discussing the particular dynamics of the Ilford Carnival procession, including its combination of sincerity and inversion and its adaptation from diverse other source materials, as well as how its more potentially transgressive aspects were negotiated. It then considers how this spectacle was commodified by newspapers, filmmakers and advertisers, as well as the extraction of financial gain by other individuals and groups performing within the carnival as well. If Chapter Five was about the nominal backstage of the carnival – its organisational dimension – then the procession was very much the frontstage, yet the appetite for and responses to the procession and some of its more challenging aspects were heavily informed by its charitable and voluntarist rationale, as will be demonstrated through the remainder of this chapter.

INVERSION AND ADAPTATION IN THE PROCESSION

Processional Culture in the Modern City

The procession underwent a revival in its popularity during the nineteenth century in cities across Britain, its dominions, and indeed other countries. In this context, it offered a
visualisation of urban social order against the backdrop of increasingly complex cities in which familiar existing social structures and the relations binding them together were displaced by forces such as economic change and inward migration. Simon Gunn for example, has argued that civic processions in Victorians provincial cities offered a vision of order, ritual and bodily discipline that contrasted strongly with the usual disorderliness of the streets they traversed. On the other side of the Atlantic, Mary Ryan has identified the rise of the parade in the US during the mid-nineteenth century as meeting a need for symbols of public order amid population expansion, increasing ethnic diversity and industrialisation.

Municipal authorities played a key role in organising these events, but the participation of a range of other organisations in processions ensured they also involved contestation of the spaces through which they paraded, as different groups vied for recognition as a legitimate part of the social order. According to Ryan, the genius of the American parade was it allowed a city’s contending constituencies to line up without confronting each other and was ‘much like the social world in which it germinated – mobile, voluntaristic, laissez-faire, and open. Like a civic omnibus, the parade offered admission to almost any group with sufficient energy, determination, organizational ability, and internal coherence to board it’. Gunn has likewise noted that in Britain civic procession order was indicative of authority and social relations and therefore fiercely contested. Across different cities and countries, the working classes and ethnic and religious minorities asserted their own legitimacy and synonymy with the locality by participating in large scale municipal processions, or else by staging their own.
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Dynamics of the Carnival Procession

Suburban street carnivals of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries generally possessed a far less formalised structure than the processions described above. Responsibility for arranging contingents for the procession itself lay with individual ward committees, who could exclude items they deemed unsuitable. While they appear to have erected few barriers to entry in practice, they did nonetheless request processionists register for the occasion in advance and produced a programme detailing exactly who was participating and in what guise. Yet despite a well-defined exoteric framework, there was little by way of internal order in carnival processions' composition, barring their being led by marshals and their assistants, and perhaps prominence of place being given to ward committee cars. Otherwise, they were a tangled miscellany of individual and institutional entrants.

As a result, the Ilford Carnival combined serious ritual and inversion, reflective of the prerogatives of different participating individuals and groups. All treated carnivals as occasions of relatively singular import, but used them unto dissimilar ends. Some organisations, such as the Scouts or the local Army regiment, used the carnival as opportunity to earnestly stake their place within the new suburban social order, parading in their ordinary uniforms. Many other contributors, again particularly organisations, opted for sincere expressions of ideals and identities. The 1905 Ilford Carnival, for example, included a number of vehicles with medical themes, in keeping with the event’s prerogative, such as the South Essex Steam Laundry Company’s mock-up ambulance accompanied by two nurses, the ‘Hospital for Toys’, ‘Surgeons and Physicians’ and ‘The Convalescent’ cars provided through local charity the Ilford Toy Fund, and Alex Mead and his daughters’ ‘Ilford Hospital Car’. Yet many entrants, especially individual processionists and collectors, opted for costumes or decorated vehicles intended to be humorous or exotic. The same institutions that were celebrated in the carnival might also be mocked. The 1911 carnival for example, included Elmhurst Football Club’s ‘Billy Smiff and Co in the Army’, and the Bon Tons’ ‘The Backbone of England’ tableau, which parodied the Scouts.

Yet as well as being polysemous as a collective, individual items were often themselves marked by tensions between expressing and inverting normative values and actions. Donning fancy dress was in itself not normative, and only socially sanctioned by the occasion. The vast majority of costumes selected by processionists and collectors easily fell outside the range of apparel permitted by everyday dress codes, and would in other contexts have been considered
at best eccentric. They involved temporary partial or full concealment of one's own identity and adoption of an alternative one, even if that identity too was in keeping with the values the individual and their broader community normally adhered to. Engaged in an act of pretence, their performance rested on their embodiment of and the crowd's acceptance on one level of the facade presented to them, and simultaneously their shared knowledge of its falseness, reinforced through the existence of programmes revealing the true identities of each processonist.

At the same time, individual instances of inversion possessed their own nuances. These will be explored in greater depth in Part IV of this thesis, but it is worth here considering their potential motivations and interpretations more abstractly. Inversion could involve mocking values that residents of suburbs admired, but that were strenuous to maintain and be measured against, thereby offering momentary relief from this pressure to performer, and vicariously fulfilling the viewer’s hidden desire to abandon performance of those values as well. In relation to social conflict, procession items could draw upon these sources of friction in order to light of them, helping to alleviate concerns and perhaps providing an alternative to more bitter social conflict; alternatively, they could also serve as a public channel for continuing to wage rivalries, their barbs all the more potent and memorable for their humorousness. Imitations of otherness, meanwhile, could at the same time draw attention to the falseness of this imitation, thereby reinforcing in-group boundaries, or they could highlight the permeability of those same borders. It is also possible that ephemeral concealment of one's true identity could be a way of stressing individuality; that the long term impact of their performance was to impress upon their circle of family, friends and acquaintances their humour, imagination and outgoingness.

Alternatively, for those who participated in ensemble procession items, individuality was often sacrificed within the performance, as they instead filled a role selected collectively by the group, or even by a superior (a teacher choosing the costumes donned by pupils on a school-contributed car, for example). The capacity for individual self-expression through fancy dress was further mediated by a duty to appeal to and entertain the crowds, which delimited potential for demonstration of values and personality. There were also choices to be made between whether to make one’s own costume or to hire or buy one (or almost certainly in many cases to compromise between the two) – a tension between creativity and convenience. The Finchley Press privileged the former in its report on the 1912 Finchley Carnival:

‘A girl of taste – and almost every girl has taste – can adorn herself with a few simple flowers and ribbons with a greater personal effect than if she resorted to meaningless...
fal-lals which have done duty, perhaps, for dozens of wearers before. That is why the young ladies of Finchley and the neighbourhood, in their personal adornment on such occasions, provide something which is pleasant to see, because it is the work which they fashioned in accordance with their own ideas.¹⁴³⁵

Yet whether acquired or homemade, costumes frequently adhered to a limited typology, while for all their diversity, decorated vehicles also frequently adhered to particular common themes, highlighting the dialogical relationship between performers and with their audiences: the projection of shared cultural capital in order to expand social capital.

**Adaptation in the Procession**

In particular, just as the Ilford Carnival’s organisers appended the Ilford Carnival with other entertainment forms, so performers in the procession itself often copied elements from other cultural forms in their items. The stage was one particularly important inspiration. Tableaux vivants had originated in nineteenth century London theatres, for a start, and many in the carnival were theatrical in inspiration: for example Leytonstone Ferndale Cycling Club’s ‘Mikado’ tableau, based on the operetta of the same name, in 1905, or the ‘Hamlet and Ghost’ cycle tableau in 1914.⁴³⁶ Throughout the event’s history individual processionists and collectors dressed as figures from Shakespearian plays like *Romeo and Juliet* and *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, as well as characters from popular musical comedies. There were also frequent imitations of the American vaudeville traditions such as minstrelsy and Wild West Shows.

Literature also frequently provided source material for procession items, such as the ‘Village Blacksmith’ car in the 1908 procession, based on the 1840 poem of the same name by American Henry Longfellow, and the Dickens Tableau put on by Mr Fred West’s Concert Party in 1910 (as shown in Figure 1).⁴³⁷ Fairy tales, children’s books and nursery rhymes were particularly influential. The 1914 procession alone featured Chadwell Heath Wesleyan Juvenile Temple’s ‘Palace of the Sleeping Beauty’ car, an ‘Alice in Wonderland’ decorated motor car, a depiction of ‘The House that Jack Built’, the Junior Department of Highland
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School’s ‘Grimms’ Fairytales’ tableau, and a group dressed up as characters from Cinderella. Numerous processionists and collectors entered the carnival over the years as characters including Little Bo Peep, Little Red Riding Hood and Little Boy Blue. In addition, there were myriad cars and individual processionists and collectors portraying fairies, and other mythical creatures like goblins and elves; even if no particular tales were referenced in these items, their borrowing of non-specific motifs from children's fiction is clear. Popular cartoons were also recreated in the Ilford Carnival. Numerous individuals dressed as Ally Sloper and his wife in 1908, while the 1908 and 1911 Carnivals included processionists and collectors dressed up as characters from Illustrated Chips, another comic magazine. This was in addition to allegorical figures regularly represented in political cartoons, such as John Bull, Britannia and Uncle Sam.

Some procession items took up sporting themes. There were ‘British Sports Cars’ entered in the 1905 and 1908 Carnivals, with the latter also featuring Cleveland Boys School's ‘Sports Tableau’, representing cricket, tennis, rowing, association football, rugby football, hunting, boxing, angling and running. Moreover, the 1908 and 1911 processions included the ‘Ilford Football Club Car’, displaying the latest trophies the team had won. Music too had a part to play. There were for a start the military and brass bands who marched in the processions; eight bands were listed as part of the 1905 procession, rising to 11 in 1908 and 17 in 1911. There were also cars carrying musical performers, and travelling concert parties, such as the East Ham Athletic Club's pierrot troupe, which put on short concerts at intervals during the 1908 Carnival.

**Figure 1: Mr Fred West’s Concert Party’s ‘Dickens’ Tableau’ in the 1910 Ilford Carnival.**
These instances of adaptation drew upon a national and in some cases increasingly global mass culture, produced and disseminated by industries frequently agglomerated in central London, as with publishing houses and West End theatres. These sources offered an invaluable range of reference points for performers and audience alike, the former being able to illustrate their cultural capital in their knowledge of them and also in their skill of replicating them, the latter’s own cultural capital enabling them to appreciate both. At the same time, processionists liberated imagery from a range of media from their overall narrative structures in representational (though not receptive) terms within the relative taxonomical disorder of the procession. While these performances were inversionary in that they involved adopting non-everyday guises, they were also frequently extensions of a more regular suburban culture of explicit performance, undertaken by a range of voluntary organisations including amateur dramatic groups, sports clubs and bands; what was atypical about this occasion was their relocation from their usual sites of performance to the suburban streets themselves.

**Legitimising Transgression**

The Ilford Carnival contained entries dedicated to entertainment with no apparent uplifting element and that in some cases transgressed behavioural norms. Their facilitation and toleration owed a great deal to the charitable rationale underpinning the occasion, in which the raising of funds for the hospital trumped other considerations. Luke Joseph Burke, a prominent member of the Clementswood and later Cranbrook Ward Committees, unsuccessfully suggested early in the Carnival’s history that it be replaced with a pageant, which would have the additional benefit of combining entertainment with erudition. Reflecting back on the incident in 1910, the *Ilford Guardian*’s ‘Whispers & Echoes’ column remarked: ‘Fortunately, this suggestion was never adopted, and carnival workers have been content to leave education to other people, and to confine their efforts to providing an excellent show and raking in the sheckles.’

The local press engaged with carnival inversion in their reports by recognising the event's transformative aspects on the one hand, while denying any implications of transgression, partly through reference to its philanthropic dimension. *The Ilford Guardian’s* report on the 1906...
procession for example, claimed that ‘King Carnival “ran riot”, although decorously to a degree; there was no excited “Danse de l’ours” as might be expected at a Carnival in a remote Pyrenean valley; it varied from any preconceived ideals of what the Carnival would be like in great Roman Catholic communities.’ Such language highlighted the continuing need to negotiate with and emphasise distinctness from carnival’s continental roots, particularly in a community like Ilford, where evangelical Protestant denominations had gained a strong hold. The following year, the same newspaper assured its readers that ‘it must not be imagined by outsiders that this carnival is a form of saturnalia, and that its real object is subjugated to its desire to riot and revel. Ilford does not enter this annual event in that spirit’; its true objective, rather, was fundraising for the hospital. Such narratives had been characteristic of the suburban local press more broadly from the outset of the carnival boom. In 1892, Meyers’s Observer stated in its report on the Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club’s 1898 carnival that:

‘King Carnival held riot in the streets. Not but what it was, after all, an orderly riot, and throughout its progress the chief actors therein never lost sight of the main object, which was to cast the net wide and draw in all the shekels possible to the coffers of our Cottage Hospital.’

The following year, the Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Press said of the nascent Tottenham Carnival that ‘There is virtue in the ridiculous, when it is practiced in the sweet name of Charity. Thus do we approve that which under other circumstances we condemn.’

Yet there were recognised limits as to who could transgress and how. The gathered crowds were expected to fulfil the role of generous spectators, and any other conduct was frowned upon. Two elements of this, excessive drinking and thieving, will be discussed in Chapter Nine. It will suffice here to discuss another common form of carnival day mischief-making, which went unpunished by the police but drew the attention, and criticism, of the local press: the placement of objects other than British currency in collecting boxes during the procession. Among the items found in boxes after the 1908 Ilford Carnival, for example were safety pins, buttons, steel washers, a bone disc, advertisement discs, ancient tokens, a post office time plate, and several foreign coins These actions were deemed beyond the pale because
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they appeared to mock or show meanness towards the carnival’s philanthropic goal. The *Ilford Guardian*’s ‘Whispers & Echoes’ column rebuked:

‘And these articles were given in the name of charity! The whirligig of time brings its revenges and I could not help wondering, when I looked upon this strange collection, if the generous givers, should they ever have the misfortune to be inmates of the Ilford Emergency Hospital, will remember their contributions to the Carnival funds in the year 1908.’

This form of misbehaviour was more geographically widespread: in 1900, for example, W. P. Wood, chairman of that year’s Hornsey Carnival, was severely critical of individuals who had placed items including tram and rail tickets, buttons and in particular broken glass in collection boxes, which might have cut those tasked with counting their contents. These instances also, however, illustrate the desire of members of the crowd to create their own amusement, and willingness to thumb their nose even at the event’s philanthropic agenda, perhaps motivated and emboldened to do so by the carnival context, and the anonymity offered by membership of the crowd.

The limits to tolerance of carnival were further illustrated by the outbreak of war in 1914. Prominent among the reasons for cancelling the carnival the following year were the sense that it was inappropriate to hold ‘a festive pageant’ (in the *Ilford Recorder’s* words) at a time of conflict, when many households were concerned about the fates of loved ones serving on the front, and with it unclear what direction the war might take before July. Yet fetes and concerts continued to be held on Hospital Saturday each year, illustrating that the transgressive potentials of the carnival were considered greater than other leisure forms. This is demonstrative of the contingency of carnival’s occurrence, and coincides with the broader national picture of carnivals being cancelled and its language being avoided during wartime, highlighted in Chapter One.
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COMMODIFYING THE CARNIVAL SPECTACLE

Newspapers and the Carnival

While the carnival’s organisers drew upon commercial entertainment models, and entrants into the procession imitated imagery from commercial popular culture, commercial organisations also frequently commodified the procession for their own financial gain. Newspapers transferred the spectacle of the carnival from public sites to their pages. Their coverage sensationalised the event through references to scale, announcing the size of the crowds and amounts of money raised in headlines and subtitles, as well as to the lengths of the final procession and the crowdedness of its route as spectators flocked to see it. In doing so, they subjected the carnival to new meta-narratives, holistically binding together aspects of an event that could only be experienced in part, and whose thrills were underscored by a philanthropic moral. This was far from unique to Ilford; it was also a pattern of coverage followed (albeit with variations in level of extensiveness) by the local press in relation to carnivals in Tottenham, Finchley and Enfield too. This coverage clearly tapped into demand among residents (a large proportion of whom would have attended the event in person) to re-consume the event in this new format. The issue of the Ilford Guardian covering the 1907 Ilford Carnival sold record numbers, compelling the newspaper to print three editions of it.\textsuperscript{447} That same week, the Ilford Recorder was also published on a Thursday instead of on a Friday as per usual so that readers could see the Carnival report earlier; in 1908, meanwhile, the Carnival issue of the newspaper sold out early in many newsagents by the Thursday evening.\textsuperscript{448}

Local newspapers’ carnival coverage was enhanced by inclusion of photographs taken at the event, usually of individual items, or of posing processionists and collectors. The Ilford Recorder did so from the outset, while the Ilford Guardian as of 1908 started including a photographic supplement on special paper to mark the occasion, as shown in Figure 2.\textsuperscript{449} Some of the photographs used by the Ilford Recorder and the Ilford Guardian were sent in by readers, with the Recorder regularly asking them to do so; a practice that again entailed the commodification of visual reproductions initially produced for personal reasons.\textsuperscript{450} In many
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other cases, they obtained photographs from national newspapers *The Daily Mirror* and *The Daily Sketch*, whose appeal to a mass readership lay in their photo-heavy reporting. The colourful, three dimensional moving spectacle of the Carnival was through these reproduced as black and white, flat, still imagery. Elsewhere, the *Finchley Press* also began to photograph the Finchley Carnival, and by the 1910s *The Enfield Gazette and Observer* did likewise for processions held in Enfield.\footnote{Finchley Press (5 Jul 1912); Enfield Observer (28 Jun 1912).}

Returning to Ilford, the aspects of the carnival recaptured were therefore dependent on the selection choices of the photographers who took these pictures. However, the meanings they carried were also partly dependent upon how they were rearranged within the newspapers. In the cases where photography was inserted in among reports, which was the strategy adopted throughout by the *Ilford Recorder* (see for example Figure 3) and eventually by the *Ilford Guardian* too, the imagery was assumedly intended as illustrational evidence of the narrative imposed upon the event by the newspapers' accounts of it, although being far more immediately accessible as carriers of meaning than densely packed text, it is likely that they would have resonated disproportionately with readers and come to dominate their reception of these reports.\footnote{Figure 3 taken from *Ilford Recorder* (14 Jul 1911).}

By contrast, the *Ilford Guardian’s* photographic supplements were more separate from the narratives propagated by carnival reports. The images they contained were ordered, bound with borders and demarcated by brief descriptions, but nonetheless together composed a partial, fragmented reproduction of the procession that was a composite spectacle in itself, as highlighted by its usage of a different, glossier paper type. A third image-assembling strategy was the photo-collage approach used by photo-heavy tabloids like the *Mirror* and the *Sketch*, whereby the semblance of order was abandoned and a kaleidoscopic, fragmented reproduction of the procession offered instead, a presentational form designed to induce excitement through visual overload.\footnote{Daily Mirror (11 Jul 1910); Daily Sketch (10 Jul 1911).} These photographs interacted with similar collages of imagery relating to other events, as part of a reconstruction of the wider world as at essence a compilation of exciting spectacles. The *Ilford Guardian* and *Ilford Recorder* often imported these photo-collages, as showcased in Figure 4, although in doing so slightly changed their meaning, reattaching them to their own far more text-heavy accounts of the procession – and thereby partly sedating them – while also re-localising the spectacle.\footnote{Figure 4 taken from *Ilford Recorder* (14 Jul 1911).}
Figure 2: The Ilford Guardian’s ‘Hospital Carnival Supplement’ for the 1908 Ilford Carnival.
Filming the Carnival

As Andrew Horrall has already illustrated, London’s parades were a popular subject for early filmmakers, and the Ilford Carnival and similar events held elsewhere were no exception. The Stratford Empire filmed the 1907 Ilford Carnival for a bioscope, while in 1911 Ilford's own Cinema de Luxe advertised film footage of that year's recently held Carnival as its headline feature (ahead of George V's visit to Dublin, the investiture of Prince Edward, and films produced at Gaumont Studios). Similarly, cinemas in Finchley screened footage of its 1912 and 1914 carnivals, while the 1912 Bush Hill Carnival in Enfield was also filmed. Publicising its screening of footage of the 1912 Finchley Carnival, the East Finchley New Picturedome exhorted potential punters to 'COME & SEE YOURSELF & YOUR FRIENDS ON THE SCREEN'. This relatively new medium was utilised to target specifically local markets: individual suburbs, with their growing numbers of relatively affluent consumers. Despite the rapid development of film as a cultural form during this period, the prospect of seeing oneself on screen was still perceived by exhibitors as fresh enough to attract audience members on its own merit.

As well as cinema exhibitors, national film production companies like Gaumont also sought to tap into enthusiasm for suburban street processions. Surviving footage of its coverage of the 1911 Ilford Carnival (a still from which is shown in Figure 5) illustrates the reproductive strategy of this medium in relation to the carnival spectacle. Filmed from an elevated position, lens fixed on a specific point along the route, the minute-and-a-half-long newsreel showed a portion of the procession going by and responses of spectators lined along the road to it. Unlike the visually fragmented, but districtwide, narrative propagated through local newspapers, this was closer to a brief replication of an individual spectator’s perspective on the day, from an advantageous position but without the same capacity for peripheral gazing, and in black and white, flatter form. Its appeal presumably lay in that of the procession as a recognisable form and its equally familiar content in this case, albeit as experienced through a relatively new medium and dislocated from the procession itself in space and time.
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Advertisement and the Carnival

Trade cars were a significant component of the Ilford Carnival procession. The 1905 event included numerous decorated vehicles submitted by local businesses, at least some of which had an advertising purpose. That year also saw American company Quaker Oats contribute a car featuring the Quaker Man figure from its advertisements – an early example of a larger, non-locally based business using the Ilford Carnival as a marketing opportunity. Three years later, the procession’s scale had grown substantially, and along with many smaller local businesses, several major companies, including Bovril, Imperial Disc Record Company,
the *Daily Mirror*, soap manufacturers E. Cook & Co, matchmaking firm Bryant & May and Bluebell Polish, contributed cars. As the crowds flocking to see the Carnival increased, so too did the numbers of big businesses contributing cars. The 1914 procession featured a whole host of these, including the Anglo-American Oil Company, E. Cook & Co, cigarette manufacturer Carreras, Oxo, H. J. Heinz & Co, General Electric, Siemen's Bros, and many more. As well as businesses, some locally-based public sector bodies like Ilford's Post Office Ilford UDC's Electricity Department aped commercial marketing strategies and throughout the procession’s existence, likewise used as an opportunity for advertising their products and services.

Figure 4: The *Daily Sketch*’s montage of photographs of the 1911 Ilford Carnival, as reprinted in the *Ilford Recorder*. 
Some cars with an advertising purpose had the product itself at the heart of their spectacle. There were, for example, instances of businesses contributing motor vehicles to the processions, assumedly with the intention of advertising them to wealthier local citizens and tradespeople, including central London-based companies like Palmer Tyre Ltd and the British Petroleum Company, as well as the locally based Aldborough Motor Company, and Leytonstone's East London Engineering Works. Dairy companies like Messrs Abbott and Loxford Farm Dairies meanwhile contributed travelling dairies selling glasses of milk on behalf of the carnival funds, thereby offering local residents an opportunity to sample their produce. Other carnival vehicles presented the consumer items they sought to market with grossly exaggerated dimensions, as well as in some cases anthropomorphising them. In 1908, the Ilford Post Office contributed a postal-themed tableau on foot, shown in Figure 6, which included individuals dressed as a letter found open and officially sealed, a parcel post (eggs with care), a rejected letter, a rejected parcel, and a newspaper.\footnote{Figure 6 taken from *Ilford Recorder* (17 Jul 1908).} That same year, the
Richmond Stove and Ilford Gas Companies entered a car featuring a ‘Monster gas cooker with attendant cooks’, as shown in Figure 7. Though often deliberately comical, these items were also visually arresting and sought to fetishise their products by blowing them up into full-scale spectacles in their own right.

Larger businesses located outside Ilford, by contrast, predominantly utilised advertising based around branding in their procession items. The Quaker Oats car in the 1905 procession featuring the character from its adverts was followed in later years by a ‘living representation’ of Bovril's ‘Alas! my poor Brother’ ads (in which a bull looked forlornly at a jar of Bovril), various vehicles submitted by Carreras Ltd based around the ‘Black Cat’ brand of cigarettes it manufactured, and Johnnie Walker’s ‘A Long Stride 1820–1911’ car based on the company's familiar poster. This reflected a broader modernising trend in advertising of creating brand imagery that was easily recognisable and imbued with personality in and of itself, as identified by Matthew Hilton in relation to cigarette advertising during this period. Procession vehicles based around branding took this to a new level, turning normally small-scale two-dimensional imagery into large scale, three dimensional spectacles in themselves, far more capable of seizing the attention of potential customers, albeit while drawing upon the existing ubiquity of those brands to ensure the watching crowds recognised them and the products they covered. As shown in Figure 8, biscuit manufacturer Peek, Frean & Co.’s car in the 1911 Carnival, which contained giant models of the teddy bear that featured on its products and advertising, was a good example of this.

Reassembling the carnival spectacle within the pages of local papers gave added weighting to its advertising component. The Ilford Guardian’s carnival supplements included adverts for local businesses alongside imagery from the procession. For example, the 1908 supplement carried adverts for fancy draper and milliner F. Henry, furniture makers Harrison Gibson & Co. and the South Essex Sanitary Steam Laundry. The laundry’s advert, shown in Figure 9, depicted its contribution to that year's Carnival: ‘This was our show last Saturday in the procession...but our permanent show is in Roden Street, Ilford. Please come and see it’.

The 1909 supplement featured a similar advert for the laundry, consisting of the man in Indian dress accompanied by a model elephant, which it had entered in the procession; the copy for
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the advert read: ‘Krinakranannebeahabonacrisarkranayanda and the elephant. This was one of our entries in the Procession last Saturday. Can you pronounce the name? If not please call at the Laundry in Roden Street, Where it will be done for you – and at the same time you may inspect this up-to-date steam laundry, or ring us up on the ‘Phone’.” For local businesses, advertising within the carnival supplement or in close proximity to reports on the carnival had the added benefit of associating their products and services with this event as part of a fused spectacle, in which geographical boundaries between the streets in which the procession took place and the commercial premises of the businesses in question were dissolved within the shared space of the newspaper (subsequently disseminated throughout Ilford). In the case of the South Essex Steam Laundry, this association was augmented through direct reference to its contributions to the procession, connecting advertising in the procession with its subsequent mediation.

Figure 6: Ilford Post Office’s tableau on foot from the 1908 Ilford Carnival, standing in front of the ‘Good News from Home’ car, also submitted by the Post Office.

For much of the carnival’s history, the advertising component was largely accepted and encouraged. The Ilford Guardian celebrated the involvement of tradesmen’s vehicles in the 1905 carnival, adding that while some might claim they participated so purely for advertising purposes, ‘that is an added compliment to the tradesman’. However, the proliferation of trade
cars by the carnival’s latter years did provoke some vocal criticism. In 1913, an individual calling themselves ‘Carnival’ wrote into the *Ilford Recorder* to complain about the inclusion of undecorated or poorly decorated trade vans in the carnival.\footnote{Ilford Recorder (18 Jul 1913).} That same year, the *Ilford Guardian*’s ‘Whispers & Echoes’ column warned that ‘the advertising element in the carnival is growing unduly. This is a pity, as if we once allow the commercial aspect to overwhelm the artistic, public interest in the event would probably wane’. It called for those tradesmen who did wish to participate in the procession to be required to make a contribution to the funds in order for them to be permitted to do so, and do justice to those tradesmen who did ‘contribute liberally’, citing Abbot Bros as an example.\footnote{Ilford Guardian (18 Jul 1913).} This issue was not restricted to Ilford. Following the 1899 Tottenham Carnival, held to raise funds for the Tottenham Hospital, one correspondent wrote into the *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* complaining that the event ‘seemed to me to savour a very cheap advertisement for the local tradesmen, the poor Hospital was quite in the shade’.\footnote{Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald (28 Jul 1899).} A decade later, a H. Waters wrote into the newspaper after the 1909 Tottenham Carnival complaining about a dairy farm car that he claimed was barely decorated and had along the route given away free samples of milk and handed out handbills.\footnote{Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald (8 Oct 1909).}

![Richmond Stove Co. & Ilford Gas Co.’s ‘Monster Gas Cooker with Attendant Cooks from the 1908 Ilford Carnival.](image)
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These comments shed light on the relationship between the philanthropic rationales behind the Ilford and Tottenham Carnivals and the utilisation of the processions by businesses. Those involved in organising the carnivals tolerated and even participated in their exploitation for marketing purposes, providing it enhanced the event’s appeal as a spectacular form of entertainment, thereby drawing larger crowds and increasing takings. The fact that a large minority of committee members in Ilford were themselves local business owners (some of whom contributed trade cars) also explains their relaxedness with the presence of advertisement. Yet some commentators did feel by the early 1910s that the advertising component’s extensiveness and naked aggression rendered the Ilford Carnival less attractive and harmed its chances of raising funds, while the Tottenham Carnival’s dwindling popularity was even partly attributed in some quarters to the ugliness of the trade vehicles it contained. These commentators did not necessarily characterise capitalist practices as inherently incompatible with a philanthropic initiative, but simply expressed opposition where the former was perceived to be having a detrimental impact upon the latter.

Yet projection of imagery relating to brands and consumer products was not solely the preserve of businesses, for individual processionists and collectors also donned costumes that did likewise. Over the duration of numerous Ilford Carnivals, girls and women entered as Dolly’s Tints and Dyes, Home Notes (a magazine), Camp Coffees, the Daily Mirror, Waldon’s fashions, Parma Violet (a brand of sweet), a powder puff, Globe and Blue Bell polish, Reckitt’s
Blue (a brand of soap) and Ogden's Guinea Gold (a brand of cigarette), while boys and men entered as Bluebell's Polish, a Michelin tyre, the Daily Mirror, a Wills Gold Flake Cigarettes, Edwards Desiccated Soup, Oxo, an Indian with Stowers Lime Juice, ‘The Human Postage Stamp’ and ‘cigarette boys’. In some cases, it appears likely that there was a connection or arrangement between the individuals in question and the product or brand they evoked. Cecil Juppa, for example, who collected for the 1911 carnival dressed as a clown costume while bearing the message ‘TODAY ILFORD HOSPITAL...EVERY DAY DAILY CHRONICLE’ on his trouser legs, as indicated in Figure 10, had almost certainly been recruited in some capacity to advertise for the Chronicle on the day.471

Figure 9: South Essex Sanitary Steam Laundry’s advert in the 1908 Ilford Guardian carnival supplement.

471 Figure 10 taken from Ilford Recorder (14 Jul 1911).
However, it is by no means clear that all of the examples cited above involved this type of arrangement, and in some cases the individuals in question were children, as Figure 11 shows. If some individuals dressed as brand images or consumer products entirely of their own volition, it may well have been because, within the context of an expanding metropolis and of the rapidly growing and changing suburb, adopting the guise of a brand image or product, which composed part of national mass culture already targeted at increasingly affluent suburban lower middle class consumers, offered easily recognisable reference points through which to communicate their collective values.

Figure 10: Cecil Juppa wearing his Daily Chronicle ‘Pierrot’ costume during the 1911 Ilford Carnival.

Figure 11: Lily Mason dressed as ‘Bovril’ for the 1910 Ilford Carnival.

Rewarding Processionists

The carnival’s organisers themselves engaged in the commodification of the procession, through material reward of some processionists. One way in which this occurred was through

472 Figure 11 taken from Ilford Recorder (15 Jul 1910).
judges selecting the best entries across a range of categories, and awarding prizes for them. In the 1905 procession, awards were made for best decorated houses, decorated cars, cycling club turnout, costumes (with separate prizes for men, women, and boys and girls under 14) and decorated cycles (again with separate prizes for men and women). By 1911, there were prizes available for best decorated houses, decorated business premises, trade cars, decorated cars, tableaux on foot, cycle club turnouts, decorate cycles, and costumes (with separate categories for men, women, boys and girls); in most cases now, individual prizes were awarded for each ward contingent. In some cases, this was simply a certificate; in others, it was monetary, or a consumer product. For example, in 1905, prizes of 10s 6d were awarded to the best fancy dress for boys and girls aged under 14, and for the best decorated house in each ward. In 1908, meanwhile, the prizes given included a range of household (and particularly kitchen) goods, such as breakfast cruets, cake dishes and salt cellars, as well as other products like silver watches, pipes and magazines. Similar practices were also evident elsewhere: in the case of the 1899 Tottenham Carnival, for example, £40 worth of prizes were on offer.

Ilford Carnival chairman Ben Henderson claimed in 1905 that ‘Although the prizes are not of high intrinsic value, it is hoped that there will be considerable competition for the honour of winning them’. In this interpretation, they functioned as a form of institutional cultural capital, offered as validation of performances of cultural capital – and in a consumerist, capitalist society, the most obvious currency of recognition was often money or consumer goods. Yet clearly many of the prizes on offer were of economic as well as symbolic value, and this may have functioned as an additional attraction for potential entrants. This was effectively conceded in Tottenham when in 1912, as the local carnival's popularity flagged, one executive committee member recommended increasing the amount spent on prizes to reverse its decline in fortunes. Sometimes, in keeping with the wariness of individual gain arising from what was supposed to be a selfless act that was highlighted in Chapter Five, the practice of prize-giving drew criticism. Following the 1899 Tottenham Carnival, one correspondent wrote a critical letter to The Tottenham and Enfield Weekly Herald querying what awarding a prize for the best tradesman’s cart had ‘got to do with charity’, with another writing into the paper the following week to assert that money used for prizes could have been used to swell
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the carnival's funds instead. Yet the continuation and ubiquity of the practice speaks volumes of the organiser’s recognition of the financial rewards indirectly gained through this investment.

As well as these enticements, carnival organisers in some districts often went further and directly offered participants remuneration. For example, the *Meyers's Observer*'s report on one 12-year-old torchbearer sustaining an injury during the 1901 Enfield and Ponders End Carnival revealed he had been paid sixpence to fulfil this role. The previous year, the committee organising that event spent £11 5s on bands’ fees, while in 1907, the *Finchley Press* reported that the Finchley Military Band were playing in that year’s carnival for a ‘nominal fee’ and East Finchley Wesleyan Band were ‘practically giving their services’; likewise, in 1909 a friendly society band offered its services to the Tottenham Carnival organisers at a price of £3 3s, a portion of which it promised to return as a donation. There were no instances of this practice mentioned in press coverage of the Ilford Carnival and its organisation, but that is not to say it did not definitely occur there as well. That payment of bands was practiced and tolerated was perhaps class-related: as James Walvin has noted, bands were an important part of working class life during this period but participation cost members time and money, which was partly reimbursed through payment for public performances. Given the apparently small amounts being asked for in some cases, perhaps as with prizes the value of the fee was also symbolic: a recognition of the band’s cultural capital, and of their social value. Yet such incidents are nonetheless again indicative of the limits of charity and of where voluntary action could frequently shade into commercial transactions instead.

**CONCLUSION**

The Ilford Carnival procession functioned as a spectacular and inversionary collective, but not cohesive, performance, with participants benefiting from their involvement. All
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procession items effectively operated on a spectrum between artifice and sincerity, and frequently were open to multiple interpretations, while many also drew upon commercial popular cultural sources due to their accessibility to their audience. The carnival spectacle was reproduced for commercial gain by newspapers and filmmakers, and that within it was commodified by trade cars using a range of visual marketing strategies to promote their products and brands; the transactional elements of processions also extended to rewarding some entrants with prizes, with there being recorded instances of direct remuneration in some other carnivals too. Both the carnival’s potentially more transgressive elements, and its commodification, were accepted as far as they were seen as aiding the event’s philanthropic objective, and drew public criticism when they were seen as threatening it.

Performance in the procession, or re-presentation of it through other media, involved accrual and investment of different forms of capital, but with the promise of potential returns. For contributing individuals or organisations, it involved spending money on costumes and cars, utilising personal connections or institutional membership to provide a cast for the performance, and drawing upon popular cultural knowledge and design skills, attainment of which would have involved some prior expenditure. Yet there were also rewards to be had. Participation may have contributed to the longer-term maintenance and enhancement of bonds within friends, families, or groups. Showing off one’s skill and inventiveness brought recognition, from watching crowds and potentially from judges, with added material or financial gain; moreover, for membership-based organisations, the showcasing of their social and cultural capital may have bolstered recruitment, while for businesses, it enticed potential customers to invest their cultural and economic capital in the company’s brands and products. For newspapers and filmmakers, meanwhile, expenditure on covering the carnival enabled them to monetise this performance for themselves. These diverse agents brought multiple, and sometimes contradictory, meanings, values and agendas to the occasion. They were not the sole scripters of their performances, for the parts they played had already been partly prewritten across a broad range of other cultural forms. Yet they had license to choose and interpret their source material, to perform it straight or subvert it, and in doing so engaged in performances that simultaneously masked and projected their individual and collective identities.
CHAPTER SEVEN

MODERNITY, RITUAL AND LEISURE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the interpretations and arrangements of time evident in the Ilford Carnival. It firstly examines how performers in the carnival negotiated modernity and tradition in their procession items, within the broader contexts of the relationship between modernity, tradition, spectacle and popular culture. Secondly, it considers the carnival as an attempt to create a new suburban ritual, and as indicative of the continued relevance of the calendar year in the organisation of human affairs at this time. Finally, it addresses the carnival as a leisure occasion, and its place within the London economy and a competitive metropolitan market for people’s spare time. The past two chapters analysed the carnival and its organisation as the backstage and frontstage aspects of a multifaceted collective performance motivated by quests for different forms of capital. It is the contention of this chapter that this performance occurred at the intersection of three different temporal schemata – linear time, the ritual year, and the working week.

PERFORMANCE, SPECTACLE, MODERNITY AND TRADITION

Popular Culture, Modernity and Tradition

While all cultural forms are an amalgamation of old and new in some way or other, Bernhard Rieger and Martin Daunton have argued that modernity in British during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was marked by a tendency to highlight this connection
between past and present.\textsuperscript{482} Stephen Kern has also highlighted how many new technologies introduced in this period, such as the phonograph and film, as well as newly established organisations, like the National Trust, operated to preserve the past in the present, while contemporary psychologists, writers, and others thinkers likewise became preoccupied with memory and its centrality to how individuals behaved in and experienced the present.\textsuperscript{483} Contemporarily popular cultural forms like pageants similarly operated around narratives of progress from past to present, as Paul Readman and Mark Freeman’s work has demonstrated.\textsuperscript{484}

At the same time, however, novelty and up-to-dateness were also central to popular culture in Britain at the turn of the twentieth century, as Andrew Horrall has shown in the case of music hall artistes’ routines, and Len Platt for musical comedy.\textsuperscript{485} Kern, meanwhile, has stated that art and literature of that period encapsulated a sense of simultaneity arising from advancements like wireless telegraphy, modern journalism, the telephone and cinema.\textsuperscript{486} Often, beneath this sheen of modernity were adaptations of older cultural forms, ensuring audience expectations were simultaneously fulfilled. Simon Popple and Joe Kember, for example, have highlighted how early film showings drew upon older exhibitory practices, and how as filmmaking became more advanced, it increasingly demonstrated the influence of the nineteenth century novel’s narrative style and content.\textsuperscript{487}

Modernity through to the early twentieth century had a strongly visual dimension. The long-term trends of growth in printing and literacy increased sight’s importance vis-à-vis hearing as the sense through which verbal information was received, while sight’s prominence as a means of information intake was heightened further within the chaotic, expanding urban environment.\textsuperscript{488} New technologies such as gas and electric lighting, the camera, and film enhanced and transformed the seeing process, increasing what could be seen and when; lighting was also central to nineteenth-century urban reforms designed to expose the city’s previously

\textsuperscript{482} Bernhard Rieger and Martin Daunton, ‘Introduction’, in Rieger and Daunton (eds.), \textit{Meanings of Modernity}, pp. 1–21 (pp. 5–12).
\textsuperscript{486} Kern, \textit{Culture of Time and Space}, pp. 67–81.
hidden quarters to scrutiny.\textsuperscript{489} This is not to deny the continued importance of other senses within the experience of life, and urban life in particular, at this time, nor the importance of sight in the premodern sensory assemblage; rather, it is to stress the particular emphasis placed on visual culture in what was interpreted as modern at the time, particularly within the realm of popular entertainment.

\textit{Modernity and Tradition in the Ilford Carnival}

The emphasis on the visual and the up-to-date was evident in the procession’s inclusion of numerous figures drawn from contemporary visual culture. Examples of this include the aforementioned Ally Sloper, or Miss Hook of Holland, the eponymous heroine of a musical comedy that first appeared on the London stage in 1907.\textsuperscript{490} Modernity were also often communicated directly through apparel: the 1911 carnival, for example, included female collectors dressed as ‘Modern Fashion’ and ‘Up-to-Date Girl’. Numerous items in the procession down the years also made reference to the main issues of the day, such as the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, the Entente Cordiale (see Figure 1), the Licensing Act, industrial disputes, suffragettes, and the 1911 budget.\textsuperscript{491} These items provided symbolic synopses of current affairs, with a view to generating a range of responses from the watching crowds, but always reflecting the role of the visual in connoting the immediacy and tangibility of the present. This immediacy was also encapsulated in the \textit{Ilford Guardian}’s entries in the 1905 procession: its ‘Guardian Car’, on which occupants wore dresses and suits featuring newsprint from that week’s \textit{Guardian}, and ‘Ye Ilford Guardian Printeries’ decorated car, featuring a working printing press that produced and distributed literature en route. These items had as their subject the news itself as a product, the modern technologies utilised to mass produce it, and the contemporariness this facilitated.

Technology was also used to connote modernity in the procession. Motor cars were an increasingly significant component of the Ilford Carnival. They were a comparatively rare presence on Britain’s roads at this time and, as Sean O’Connell has demonstrated, were heavily

\textsuperscript{491} Figure 1 is taken from \textit{Ilford Recorder} (17 Jul 1908).
associated – both positively and negatively – with modernity, their visual aesthetic appeal, as well as hint of danger, captured in contemporary fiction and cinema.\textsuperscript{492} That they were a draw in themselves is emphasised by the way they were entered in earlier processions with no or minimal decoration, as exemplified in Figure 2.\textsuperscript{493} The Finchley Press’s response to the planned inclusion of one in the 1907 Finchley Carnival is perhaps indicative of some of the wider responses their presence encouraged: ‘It is to be none of your out-of-date horse-drawn vehicle, but, if you please, a twentieth-century petrol-propelled show.’\textsuperscript{494} New advancements in air travel were also represented in Ilford Cycling Club’s ‘Flight of the Airships’ cycle tableau in 1908, and in the Daily Chronicle’s ‘Union Jack and Aeroplane’ decorated car in 1911. While some items reflected the present, others anticipated the future. Developments in flight allowed the imagination to wander onto the prospect of space travel, even if it was with tongue firmly in cheek: the 1908 Carnival included the ‘Sikhi’ car – a model airship offering ‘journeys to Mars and back’ for 4d – and the 1911 procession ‘The Two Insect Dwellers of the Moon with their Gigantic Didoojaberwcockosaurus’, displayed in Figure 3.\textsuperscript{495}

\textbf{Figure 1: The ‘Entente Cordiale’ car from the 1908 Ilford Carnival.}

\textsuperscript{492} There were 16,000 motorcars in Britain in 1905, rising to 132,000 in 1914. Sean O’Connell, \textit{The Car in British Society: Class, Gender and Motoring, 1896–1939} (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1998), pp. 14–19, 187–190, 194–198, 203.
\textsuperscript{493} Figure 2 is taken from Ilford Guardian (16 Jul 1909).
\textsuperscript{494} Finchley Press (1 Jun 1907).
\textsuperscript{495} Figure 3 is taken from Ilford Recorder (14 Jul 1911).
Figure 2: The Star and Morning Leader’s florally decorated motor car from the 1909 Ilford Carnival.

Yet often, the carnival was the latest in a series of adaptation processes, whose visual bent kept often quite longstanding source material seeming fresh. The processional literary representations discussed in Chapter Six involved conversion of the textual into the spectacular, following on from the earlier move from oral culture towards a more print-centred culture. In the case of figures from children’s fiction, they made their way into the procession by way of pantomime. This connection is emphasised by the fact many male heroes of such stories and songs were played in the carnival, as in pantomime, by women (something whose significances will be discussed further in Chapter Nine). The conversion towards spectacle was further highlighted by the production of picture book versions of these children’s stories, and later by their adaptation for cinema. Another instance of the Ilford Carnival building on earlier stage adaptations of literature was the Walthamstow-based Amateur Operatic Company’s ‘The Only Way’ tableau in the 1911 procession, for example, based on the 1899 play of the same name.

497 Zipes, When Dreams Came True, p. 158.
which was itself based upon Charles Dickens' 1859 novel *A Tale of Two Cities*. Meanwhile, Longfellow’s ‘Village Blacksmith’, portrayed by a decorated car in the 1908 Ilford Carnival, had previously been turned into a picture book by London-based publisher Griffith, Farran & Co. in 1885, and would subsequently be made into films by studios in London and Hollywood in 1917 and 1922 respectively.

Figure 3: ‘The Two Insect Dwellers of the Moon with their Gigantic Didojaberwockosaurus’ from the 1911 Ilford Carnival.

---


These were accompanied by a wide assortment of representations of historic figures and periods more generally. The ‘Jottings from History’ tableau in the 1914 procession, for example, featured children playing Lord Nelson, the Duke of Wellington, Sir Walter Raleigh, Charles Stuart, Robin Hood, Joan d'Arc, Florence Nightingale, Flora MacDonald, Maid Marian, Queen Elizabeth, Guy Fawkes and King Alfred. The significances of different historic representations in the carnival will be considered in greater depth in Part IV, but it is worth here estimating what their more general role might have been. Firstly, the active engagement of Britons with the past, for diverse reasons, ensured that historical knowledge retained value as a form of cultural capital within this context, offering a readily recognisable set of figures for imitation. At the same time, embodying the past in this way would have offered an inversionary experience for performers and audience alike, within the broader transformation of public space by the carnival.

**LINEAR TIME, RITUAL AND THE CALENDAR YEAR**

*Carnival, the Ritual Year and the Negotiation of Linear Time*

The popularity of the Ilford Carnival, and similar contemporary events, owed much to the reassuring circularity they promised in part-contravention of linear conceptions of time, and within an era of swift and potentially alienating change. For a start, the event was held every July for a ten-year period. Secondly, while there was continuous turnover in ward committee membership, there were a minority of individuals involved in organising the carnival each year over a number of years. There were also a number of people and organisations who regularly took part in the carnival – even donning the same costumes, or entering the same decorated vehicle. This emphasis on repetition underpinned local press discourse about the event. Reports regularly re-encapsulated the Ilford Carnival’s history, situating that year’s carnival within this context. By 1913, the *Ilford Recorder* was moved to claim that ‘Being always held on the second Saturday in July, [the Carnival] is coming to be
regarded as fixed a festival as Easter, Whitsun, or even Christmas itself. It is possible this remark was made with tongue firmly in cheek, but the comparison nonetheless highlighted a sense of continuity and reliability that stemmed from so large scale an event being held for nine consecutive years. This informed the largely optimistic narrative that also marked the local newspapers’ coverage of the event, as they confidently predicted that each year’s carnival would surpass those held in previous years, particularly in terms of amounts raised.

The suburban setting was integral to the carnival’s ritual dimensions. While festivals help to bring meaning to the passing of time in a general sense, regular, site-based events connect time and place to imbue both with significance. Memory and tradition are essential components of place formation. The former helps define individual and collective relationships with a particular geographic entity; the latter helps weave those memories into recurring narratives about that entity, identifying it as a site where something has occurred and will happen again, engendering familiarity with it in the present and offering greater certainty about its future through the promise that it will to a degree resemble its past. This was all the more significant within a district like Ilford where most residents were relatively recent arrivals, who had relatively few memories of Ilford from which to build a sense of place, and a minority more longstanding inhabitants, for whom sites they once attached reminiscences to had now been radically altered. As early as 1907, the Ilford Recorder remarked that ‘the carnival has now become a settled institution. It is three years old, which is quite a respectable age in a youthful community such as Ilford’. This evinces a localised sense of time, partly distinct from the chronology of city and nation, in which the suburb’s ‘newness’ gave greater significance to a duration of a few years. An annually recurring event could therefore add historical weight to the relatively recent past, offering a clearly visible pattern within it.

Similarly, the word ‘annual’ featured recurrently in Meyers’s Observer (and in successor publications) and Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald coverage of local carnivals, which also frequently reflected back on the relatively short histories of these events. The yearning to establish new traditions within rapidly expanding suburbs was encapsulated by the Meyers’s Observer’s coverage of the first Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club Carnival in 1896, in which it remarked that ‘on every hand one heard the wish expressed that it may become an annual event’. The desire for new traditions was also visible in events held in association with the Ilford Carnival. The Ilford Guardian remarked in its report on the 1907 fete held in Manor Park

500 Ilford Recorder (11 Jul 1913).
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to add to that year's carnival funds that ‘the hope was expressed on all hands that it would henceforth become an adjunct to the carnival proper’. \(^{503}\) Three years later, it described the ball held in connection with the carnival as ‘one of those “annuals” which go to brighten the winter season’. \(^{504}\)

In his landmark essay on the subject, Eric Hobsbawm described ‘invented traditions’ as:

‘…a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with a suitably historic past...they are responses to novel situations which take the form of reference to old situations, or which establish their own past by quasi-obligatory repetition.’\(^{505}\)

Hobsbawm’s definition can only partly explain the ritual role of carnivals in suburban place-formation. Certainly, organisers and press coverage sought to stress the annual and recurring nature of carnivals as a form of boosterism for the events and the host districts, in response to the potentially disorienting impact of suburbanisation.

Yet Hobsbawm also distinguished between ‘tradition’ and ‘custom’ (on the grounds that the former is invariant and the latter evolutionary) and between ‘tradition’ and ‘convention’ (the former ideological, the latter technical). \(^{506}\) These demarcations, I would argue, are somewhat false: firstly, no tradition is entirely unvarying, and customs may evolve into traditions by becoming more rigidly and regularly observed, while retaining elements of their customariness, in that they continue to serve as guides unto action; secondly, all traditions have their ideological and pragmatic aspects, which continually reshape each other. With specific reference to suburban carnivals, beneath the lofty rhetoric that often accompanied them, these were practices of habit as well as symbols for celebration, orchestrated but also organic in their repetition. They were performances based on effective precedents, collectively undertaken by individuals pursuing diverse but overlapping agendas, the most important of which was (usually) a charitable one. They evolved as they recurred, because no performance was quite like the last, and so new precedents could be set, and the values and norms being inculcated were liable to change over time as the performers changed and relations between them and
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\(^{503}\) Ilford Guardian (2 Aug 1907).

\(^{504}\) Ilford Guardian (29 Apr 1910).
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their audience did so too. Thus many of the practices of carnival day in Ilford were dropped after war broke out, although its charitable dimension was retained, while in Tottenham the much lauded tradition of holding the carnival proved fragile once relations between hospital and carnival organisers broke down.

The Continued Importance of the Natural and Calendar Year

Carnivals in Ilford and elsewhere were also illustrative of the continued significance of the calendar year as a means of temporal organisation. As noted above, the fixedness of the Ilford Carnival’s date was integral to its success as a ritual, lending its recurrence a predictability and perceived naturalness. The same conclusion can be drawn from the earlier Enfield Bonfire Carnival, and indeed from other fairly longstanding carnivals held elsewhere in the country around Bonfire Night. The Tottenham Carnival took place in July every year was between 1898 and 1904, save for in 1901, when it took place in September; by contrast, from its 1909 revival until 1913 it was held in September, save for in 1912 when it returned to July. The Enfield Tradesmen Cycling Club was initially far less consistent in the timing of its carnival, taking place at different points in June, July and September between 1896 and 1903, although this did not prevent it from becoming an annual event, nor from it being interpreted in such terms by the local press. As of 1904 until it ceased in 1913, the carnival was held in late June every year save 1909, when it took place in early July instead. Across the suburbs and more widely, carnival organisers strove to find an optimal time to hold their event and to keep to it if possible.

This demonstrates that while urbanisation might have substantially decoupled seasonal change from economic patterns by the turn of the twentieth century, meteorology continued to condition leisure patterns more generally, deeply influencing the timing of outdoor activities like festivals, as well as others such as tourism and sport. Carnivals were particularly common between May and September as organisers sought to maximise their chances of sunshine and a good turnout (although August tended to be avoided, most likely to avoid a clash with the holiday season, when potential patrons might be out of town). For this reason, the 1907...
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507 The Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald explained in both 1899 and 1902 that the carnival was being held in July rather than later for this very reason. Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald (14 Apr 1899; 18 Jul 1902).
Finchley Carnival, initially scheduled for May, was delayed until June in the hope of ensuring better weather.\(^{508}\)

However, the British weather’s unpredictability even in midsummer remained a vital variable in a carnival’s success or otherwise. The 1909 Ilford Carnival, for example, was held in adverse conditions, and the trend of year-on-year growth in the event’s revenues temporarily halted accordingly. Though carnivals tended to persist in the face of bad weather, associated events were sometimes cancelled for this very reason, while in 1902 the processional portion of the Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club Carnival was postponed for a week due to rain.\(^{509}\)

Perhaps the lack of guaranteed sunshine in summer, and culture of persisting with processions in the face of adverse weather was why other procession organisers took the gamble of holding their processions later in the autumn. Seasonal variations in weather conditions and natural light levels would also have shaped participants’ and attendees’ experiences of the procession. The Ilford Carnival and the torch-lit Enfield Bonfire Carnival were likely to have been markedly different experiences in this respect, for example. The latter event, and other Bonfire Night carnivals held elsewhere in London’s suburbs and beyond during the late Victorian and Edwardian period, were indicative of the influence of a calendar shaped by humans rather than nature, and that was also increasingly national.

**CARNIVAL, LEISURE AND METROPOLITAN TEMPORALITY**

*Time and the Ilford Carnival Experience*

For many of Ilford’s residents, the sense of anticipation ahead of the carnival would have been greater than for more regular leisure activities. This escalation of excitement in the run-up to the carnival was reflected and kindled by local newspaper coverage of preparations for the event from roughly two months in advance; similar patterns could be detected to varying degrees in local press coverage of carnivals in Enfield, Tottenham and Finchley. Whether this growing sense of anticipation was broadly shared by the wider local populations is a matter of
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\(^{508}\) [Finchley Press](13 Apr 1907).
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speculation, but it seems likely that it was to varying degrees. The build-up to the Carnival would have been unavoidable within Ilford, with various schemes for collection already going on, shops selling associated ephemera such as badges and, a few days ahead of the event, programmes, while it is also likely that other publicity materials would have been posted. Furthermore, the sheer scale of the turnout for the procession, and the practice of decorating homes for it, suggests many people did actively look forward to it; the increased sales local newspapers experienced in carnival week also appear to have vindicated their strategy of heavily trailing the event beforehand. Anticipation would have been particularly high for local residents involved in putting on the Ilford Carnival, including regularly attending meetings and undertaking preparations for the procession. Hundreds more who entered the procession also had to make their own arrangements for the occasion, such as choosing costumes, decorating vehicles and enlisting other participants. The amount of time, work and effort they people put in means it is likely the ever-growing success of the carnival and the experience of participating in the procession would have deeply gratified those involved.

Carnival day itself, meanwhile, was by its relative brevity – a single day out of the year – in marked contrast to the increasing availability of regularly apportioned leisure occasions described in Chapter One. The event’s greater licenses for inversion were understood and sanctified in terms of a perceived temporal opposition to the everyday. Former ward organiser W. H. Ridgely, for example, wrote in 1906 that it was ‘a day when domestic arrangements are thrown out of gear’, while the Ilford Guardian described the carnival in 1907 as ‘the one occasion in the year when Ilford “let’s itself go”’.\textsuperscript{510} At the same time, however, many participants would have been engaged in similar forms of performance (theatrical, musical, sporting, and so on) on a far more regular basis – the difference from the everyday was one of degree, rather than complete distinction.

For the carnival’s organisers, meanwhile, the length of their involvement extended as the range of fundraising initiatives put on in accordance with the carnival spread later and later beyond the summer, and eventually into the following year. For committee members, this activity would have become part of their weekly routines, with meetings (usually scheduled for weekday evenings) fitted in around their paid employment or, in the case of most female members, housework. This activity also blurred the margin between work and leisure, being both voluntary and yet organisational, motivated by the need to secure economic capital for the hospital, but also generating social capital as a by-product. Related activities also extended to

\textsuperscript{510} Ilford Recorder (6 Jul 1906); Ilford Guardian (19 Jul 1907).
include the purely recreational, highlighting how carnival committees had a continued place in their members’ leisure lives. The 1905 carnival’s primary officials wrote into the *Ilford Guardian* shortly after the event, stating that ‘Our cause has drawn together an admirable band of workers and friends’ and revealing plans for a reunion later in the year ‘to consolidate those new friendships just referred to’. 511 In November 1908, around 200 carnival workers attended a similar reunion, whose entertainments included music and dancing. 512

Reproductions of the Ilford Carnival – and of other carnivals held elsewhere – allowed for the occasion to be partially ‘relived’ after it had concluded. People could read narratives of the event, and re-witness some of its sights, several days later in the local press. They could also head to their local cinema to see footage capturing the event being shown again and again. In this manner, the carnival became part of the more continuous leisure fare cultural industries offered to increasingly regularly time-rich consumers. Of course, the carnival-based products they turned out were themselves deeply ephemeral: the local newspapers printed a new issue a week later and the cinemas soon changed the films they screened; the carnival’s commodified afterlife therefore persisted only briefly before it was jettisoned to be replaced by other occurrences and sights, as editors and exhibitors alike continuously sought to keep their product relevant as they competed for consumer’s precious time and money. The camera, on the other hand, offered the possibility of capturing and possessing the likeness of the carnival indefinitely, a visual aid to reliving the occasion in one's memory long into the future. The *Ilford Guardian* appears to have appreciated the commercial opportunities that this desire represented in providing its own more durable pull-out photographic supplement.

**Carnival within the London Week**

The Ilford Carnival’s local ritual significance was tempered and shaped by its relationships with metropolitan temporality. Firstly, as a leisure activity, it had to find accommodation within the rhythms of London’s working week. The carnival was always scheduled to take place on a Saturday afternoon-through-to-evening. This might have owed partly to its aping of the ‘Hospital Saturday’ fundraising initiatives held throughout London more broadly at this time, but elsewhere it tended to entail collections in the workplace. It

---

512 *Ilford Guardian* (27 Nov 1908).
seems likely then that Saturday was also chosen as the day for the Ilford Carnival – rather than Thursday, which was early closing day within the district – because of the large number of residents who commuted to the city centre and finished work early on Saturdays instead.\(^{513}\) It therefore fitted in with a growing pantheon of other popular leisure and social opportunities in Ilford that residents employed outside the district could participate in during their spare time, and thereby helped reinforce the connected temporal-spatial distinction between work and leisure, with the latter becoming identified with the suburb, thus bringing meaning to ‘suburban time’ within the context of the weekly routine, as well as of the ritual year.

The timing within the week of the Ilford Carnival flags up a contrast between it and other suburban carnivals, and the relationship it showcased between individual suburbs’ temporal rhythms, their occupational composition, and their place within the wider metropolis. In Enfield Town, the dominance of small businessmen and other locally based workers over carnival organisation was evident in their timing. The first two Enfield Bonfire Carnivals took place on 5 November itself, a Wednesday and Thursday respectively, but in 1892 the fifth fell on a Saturday, when the district’s shops would have been at their busiest; that year’s carnival was therefore postponed until the Monday.\(^{514}\) The 1893 carnival was again moved to Monday the sixth, again to suit local traders, while on 1894 Bonfire Night itself fell on a Monday. In 1895 and 1896, the carnival was held on 5 November (which fell on a Tuesday and Thursday respectively), but from 1897 through to 1899 it was again rescheduled for the first Monday after 5 November, while the last Bonfire Carnival took place on Wednesday the sixth – Wednesday being early closing day in the district. The continual shifting of the timing of the Enfield Bonfire Carnival comprised an ongoing negotiation between the national ritual year and the local working week, between custom and commerce.\(^{515}\)

The Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club Carnival, meanwhile, always took place on Enfield’s early closing day. Likewise, the Finchley and Tottenham Carnival both tended to take place on a Thursday, which was early closing day in those two districts. However, in 1912, the Tottenham executive committee overwhelmingly voted to move the carnival to a Saturday, the Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald reporting that while this might deter local traders from participating, it was hoped that locally based factory workers would more than take their


\(^{514}\) Meyers’s Observer (11 Nov 1892).

\(^{515}\) Meyers’s Observer (7 Nov 1890; 6 Nov 1891; 11 Nov 1892; 10 Nov 1893; 9 Nov 1894; 8 Nov 1895; 6 Nov 1896; 12 Nov 1897; 11 Nov 1898; 10 Nov 1899; 8 Nov 1901).
place. This reflected Tottenham’s changing economic and social structure, more businesses having relocated to the district from inner London, as did growing numbers of the capital’s working classes when the LCC constructed a council estate at White Hart Lane, with the result that the district became more closely integrated with London’s economy more broadly, and its temporal rhythms followed suit.

It is likely the Ilford Carnival’s taking place on a Saturday contributed to the scale of its popularity, attracting commuting clerical workers and their families from other suburban districts as well. However, it does not necessarily follow that it was a particularly special occasion for all who witnessed it, particularly if they were only visiting for the day. Rather, these spectators would have spent other Saturday afternoons engaging in a range of pastimes, many of which, as noted, the carnival would have drawn upon and shared elements with. As for the connected events, while some did clearly did evolve into ritual occasions, it is again quite possible that for most of those who attended there was little to distinguish between the concerts, fetes, sporting events and garden parties held in association with the carnival and the myriad similar events that took place in Ilford, and other suburbs, that were in no way connected with the hospital. Likewise, the numerous smaller scale, more localised carnivals held in Enfield, which were in some cases organised by individual organisations, at times struggled for primacy within a competitive local leisure market, and even with each other. In 1900, the saturation of carnivals in the district and neighbouring suburbs prompted the Bonfire Boys to cancel their annual procession, while the Enfield Observer reported that crowd sizes at the 1911 Bush Hill Carnival were detrimentally affected by it clashing with other popular local events.

The increasing number of entertainments organised in conjunction with the Ilford Carnival are not only illustrative of how ward committees tapped into the leisure preferences exhibited by suburbanites to raise funds for the hospital, but also of their appreciation of the temporal rhythms of contemporary engagement in leisure. They diversified their offering beyond the carnival in order to compete with a multitude of other leisure offerings in the metropolitan market for people’s spare time and money, knowing that capturing a mere fraction of it delivered an additional financial boost to the hospital. This trend would intensify post-World War One when ‘carnival weeks’ became increasingly common. While these in one sense may have harked back to the longer carnival seasons of the early modern period, their diverse
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ranges of entertainments, held over a number of days, enabled people to patronise them when they had the time and when the particular entertainment caught their interest.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has highlighted the different temporal dimensions of the Ilford Carnival. It illustrated that participants in the event frequently drew upon novel elements of contemporary popular culture and technology, from musicals to motorcars, but that their adaptive drive towards spectacle at times concealed the extent to which their source material was rehashed, while history and tradition were also readily embraced as themes. It demonstrated that the carnival functioned as a ritual, arising both as a precedent for continued action and as a consciously constructed tradition in response to the newness of the suburb, while also highlighting the continued significance of the year, both natural and human, as a temporal unit for organising human affairs around. Yet while the carnival itself may have been contrasted with everyday activity, through mediation, committee membership and additional fundraising activity, for many it became a longer standing, regular part of their lives; furthermore, it had to acquiesce to metropolitan work patterns, and compete within a citywide leisure market.

Temporality therefore configured the Ilford Carnival as a performance and capital-attaining exercise in a number of different ways. Performers in the carnival, and the watching crowds, relied on internal and shared taxonomies of time to gauge what was of value and what was not: what was modern and what was traditional, what should be retained and what discarded. Time was the experience carnival helped ritually negotiate, the system of determining which performances were appropriate and which capital should be staked or pursued, and the commodity invested in the accrual of all forms of capital. It was also the determinant as to who performed and who was present to witness them, with time-space compression through advancements in transport and communication, the scheduling of paid work, and the scheduling of other leisure options, respectively increasing, delimiting and encouraging their mobility, whether that be towards Ilford or elsewhere.
PART IV

IDENTITIES IN THE CARNIVAL
CHAPTER EIGHT
LOCAL, SUBURBAN AND CLASS IDENTITIES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines projections of local, suburban and class identities in the Ilford Carnival. It firstly discusses the strategies different classes used to legitimise their entry into and control over urban spaces in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Thereafter, it examines expressions of local, class and suburban identities in the Ilford Carnival procession and surrounding discourse, examining it as a medium for reimagining Ilford as both fairyland and rural settlement, for waging local, class-based rivalries, and for transgressing sartorial and spatial boundaries of class. Subsequently, it examines the carnival procession route, considering it in relation to the development of mapping, before discussing how carnival organisers selected and amended routes through their districts as they underwent rapid physical change, as well as speculating as to how processionists and spectators might have experienced the carnival route. The chapter emphasises that displays of local, suburban and class identities in the carnival were performative and were specific to this event and the particular agendas it served, albeit in dialogue with other interpretations and representations of class and suburbia.

PERFORMING LOCAL, CLASS AND SUBURBAN IDENTITIES

Class, Performance and Urban Space

Discussing the impact of post-structuralism on the historiography of the middle class in Britain, Alan Kidd and David Nicholls highlighted the extent to which, over the course of the
1990s, studies of the subject had shifted away from Marxist grand narratives and analysis of the middle classes’ economic and social basis, to focus instead on issues of identity, the relationship between class and gender, and meanings attached to spaces and places.\(^{519}\) The spatial turn in the history of social relations was likewise summarised by Simon Gunn, who noted that historians had come to see social identity formation in general as deeply bound up with concepts of space and place and in contests over the boundaries, ownership and meanings of places.\(^{520}\) For example, Kate Hill’s work has demonstrated how the established middle classes sought to maintain control over urban civic and cultural spaces, such as local government buildings, museums and galleries, but found their dominance increasingly challenged by both the lower middle and working classes.\(^{521}\) More recently, Richard Dennis has highlighted contemporary unease over the presence of some social groups, such as costermongers, in London’s public spaces during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as well as how the working classes frequently took control over prominent official and retail locations such as Trafalgar Square and the West End during political protests over this period.\(^{522}\)

Class and occupational groups utilised a range of strategies to legitimise their entrance to or control over urban spaces, or to manifest their status within them. These could involve reshaping the built environment, as with the clearance of slum districts and erection of new landmark civic and commercial buildings in mid-nineteenth century Manchester, for example, as Gunn has shown.\(^{523}\) Other approaches included the formation of public or voluntary organisations designed to give particular groups the ability to police or at least gain a stake in the control of urban space. Hill has demonstrated that ratepayers’ associations, for example, allowed the lower middle classes to challenge established middle-class hegemony over civic sites, and enforce reductions in expenditure on them.\(^{524}\) John Lowerson, meanwhile, argued that sports clubs provided sites for the middle classes to meet and display a shared public

\(^{519}\) Alan Kidd and David Nicholls, ‘Introduction: History, Culture and the Middle Classes’, in Kidd and Nicholls (eds.), \textit{Gender, Civic Culture and Consumerism}, pp. 1–11 (pp. 2–8).


\(^{524}\) Hill, ‘‘Thoroughly Embued with the Spirit of Ancient Greece’, p. 106.
identity, while controlling access to these spaces through selective membership policies.\(^{525}\) Other strategies comprised performances intended to communicate social position to onlookers within the expanding and rapidly changing city. The procession, as discussed in Chapter Six, was one of these. According to Gunn, other important, more frequent and less spectacular rituals, during which conduct was intended to signify status, included commuting and weekend promenading.\(^{526}\) Dress codes were also vital in this respect. For example, Chris Breward has highlighted how references to clothing were often used as a means of marking boundaries between different districts of London, amid contemporary concerns over the blurring of former social demarcations between them.\(^{527}\)

As noted earlier in this thesis, suburbanisation was one strategy used by the lower middle classes to safeguard their status, with financial disincentives to permanent entry for the poorer off. Yet these could not prove uniformly successful, with a degree of class heterogeneity persisting in the suburbs, while lower middle-class residents still frequently travelled from the suburbs into the city centre (or out of the city entirely) for work and leisure purposes. For this reason, they implemented additional performative strategies for safeguarding their status and that of their suburb. Again, clothing was vital in this respect. As Breward has also demonstrated, the suburban lower middle classes had to adhere to strict dress codes in the workplace, but also used more relaxed leisurewear to express their taste and individuality as well.\(^{528}\) Building on his work, Geraldine Biddle-Perry has shown how suburban cycling club uniforms in late Victorian London connoted both fashionable consumerism and the status of club and member while out cycling.\(^{529}\) In the case of Ilford, moreover, the UDC passed a number of local byelaws to help maintain the status of town, including restrictions on behaviour and recreational activities in parks, as well as bans on indiscretions such as spitting, swearing, drinking, smoking and even inappropriate dress on the tramways, which Michael Heller has argued were intended to maintain ‘a social habitus which appealed to white-collar workers’.\(^{530}\)


\(^{526}\) Gunn, *Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class*, pp. 72–78.

\(^{527}\) Christopher Breward, ‘Sartorial Spectacle: Clothing and Masculine Identities in the Imperial City, 1860–1914’, in Felix Driver and David Gilbert (eds.), *Imperial Cities: Landscape, Cities and Identity* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1999), pp. 238–253 (pp. 239, 242–243)


\(^{529}\) Biddle-Perry, ‘Fashioning Suburban Aspiration’ (pp. 192–196).

\(^{530}\) Heller, ‘Suburbia, Marketing and Stakeholders’ (p. 75).
Lower-Middle Class Identity and the Reimagining of the Suburb

The Ilford Carnival's significance as a source of and focus for expressions of pride in Ilford was evident in discussions surrounding it, particularly in the district's press. The *Ilford Guardian* described the 1906 Carnival as ‘an essentially Ilfordian event, representative of Ilford's life, amusement, business and enthusiasm combined with the moving power of Charity’.\(^{531}\) It also frequently championed the Ilford Carnival by comparing it favourably to those held in neighbouring suburbs such as East Ham and Woodford.\(^{532}\) Similar tendencies were evident in local newspaper coverage of carnivals in other suburbs: for example, in 1899 the *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* emphasised the nascent Tottenham Carnival's primacy over processions previously organised in nearby districts including Wood Green and Enfield.\(^{533}\) These representations reflected a desire to demarcate and exalt the host district, engendering and expressing a sense of community and place within it, against a backdrop of rapid immigration and equally swift transformation of its built environment. For local newspapers, local identity was also a sound marketing strategy, expressing and encouraging identification specifically with the district in question, in order to prompt residents to consume news about it.

More grandiosely still, former ward organiser W. H. Ridgely claimed in 1906 in his ‘Incidents in Suburban Life’ column for the *Ilford Recorder* that ‘The Lord Mayor’s Show was a travelling circus compared to the Hospital Procession last year’, adding that there were rumours the Lord Mayor would send representatives to view that year’s carnival, ‘so that the greatest city in the world may not be behind an outlying although a flourishing, progressive suburb’.\(^{534}\) References to the carnival in the national press were also gleefully repeated in Ilford’s local newspapers, while the *Ilford Recorder* was moved to call the event ‘the one pageant of the kind in which Ilford rightly claims supremacy over the rest of the United Kingdom’.\(^{535}\) Discussions of the transformative capacity of the carnival often contrasted this with the suburban everyday. Ridgely claimed in 1906 that the carnival had disrupted the ‘calm, quiet, monotonous life of our suburb’.\(^{536}\) The *Daily Chronicle*’s 1908 feature on the carnival concluded that ‘Ilford seemed indeed to have transported itself from the fringe of London to

---

\(^{531}\) *Ilford Guardian* (20 Jul 1906).

\(^{532}\) *Ilford Guardian* (14 Jul 1905; 26 Jul 1907).

\(^{533}\) *Ilford Guardian* (20 Jul 1906; 26 Jul 1907); *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* (14 Jul 1899).

\(^{534}\) *Ilford Recorder* (6 Jul 1906).

\(^{535}\) *Ilford Guardian* (17 Jul 1908); *Ilford Recorder* (15 Jul 1910; 7 Jul 1911; 11 Jul 1913).

\(^{536}\) *Ilford Recorder* (6 Jul 1906).
the heart of fairyland’, while similarly the following year the Ilford Guardian claimed that that ‘the drab suburban streets were metamorphosed into a veritable fairyland’ during the procession. This polarity was employed in the discussion of carnivals held in other suburbs too: the Finchley Press, for example, praised the organisers of the 1908 Finchley Carnival ‘for doing something to relieve the dull monotony of suburban life’.538

Within the context of the carnival, commentators could playfully temporarily reimagine Ilford’s place within metropolis and nation, depicting it as culturally central, rather than geographically peripheral. Fleeting as the district’s moment in the wider limelight was, the carnival still offered a ritualised opportunity for local self-aggrandisement that formed part of wider place-making narratives. These narratives adopted the contemporary negative stereotypes about suburban ennui and lifelessness discussed in the Introduction to this thesis, but only to invert them and exaggerate the uncommonness of the carnival, as part of a wider tendency to use hyperbolic coverage to attract and retain readers. For Ilford’s press, this trumpeting of the suburban locality may therefore have – consciously or unconsciously – functioned as a riposte to condescension towards the lower middle classes and their place of residence by more solidly middle-class commentators employed in central London and writing for a metropolitan or national audience.

Rurality and the Reimagining of the Suburb

Another popular trope drawn upon by both procession items and discourse around the procession was that of the suburb as rural haven. In 1906, and again in 1908, local stonemason Walter Parsons secured the ‘Fairlop Boat’ for Loxford's contingent of the Ilford Carnival.539 It was a relic from Fairlop Fair, held in Hainault Forest during the nineteenth century, and for which boats were decorated and set on wheels before being taken there from the East End.540 This history was related to the Ilford Guardian’s readers in the newspaper’s ‘Whispers and Echoes’ section, which remarked that ‘Ilfordians who were children in the Barking hamlet of “Great Ilford”, who were youths in the village of Ilford, and have grown up with the great town

537 Daily Chronicle (13 Jul 1908).
538 Finchley Press (26 Jun 1908).
539 Kelly’s Directories, Kelly’s Directory of Essex 1902, p. 249
540 For Fairlop Fair, see Cunningham, ‘The Metropolitan Fairs’, p. 168.
of to-day, will remember the last efforts to retain the Fairlop Fair. In 1913, Ilford Liberal Club steward J. Wilson submitted a poem entitled ‘Queen Carnival’ to The Ilford Guardian, whose verses included:

‘Oh Ilford’s Lanes are beauty's shrine
For Nature’s Garb is best
Its loveliest sheen of gold and green
Its meadows sweet are drest

‘Still tower aloft the stately oaks
Linked with the days gone by
Where children met and still do meet
And gambol merrily…’

These presentational and rhetorical strategies connected rural past with suburban present, and in Wilson’s case conflated them. They offered spectators and readers, most of who were not natives of the district, a sense of local place with a tangible past that they could buy into, including through referencing of old traditions. There were similar examples in other districts: the 1901 Bonfire Boys Carnival in Enfield, for example, included a representation of a longstanding but now disused nearby landmark, the ‘Old Windmill’.

Rurality was also portrayed in a host of other procession items. Agriculture was represented in the guise of milkmaids, shepherdesses, farmers and harvests, as exemplified in the ‘The Gleaners’ car entered in the 1910 carnival and shown in Figure 1. Village life was also depicted in a number of instances, including an assortment of occupations – blacksmiths, woodmen, parsons – and frequent evocations of May Day. Then there were depictions of fairy tales and nursery rhymes with strongly rural overtones, such as Little Bo Peep, Little Boy Blue and Robin Hood. This idealisation of country life was not a solely suburban phenomenon, but it was central to wider contemporary depictions of suburbia, as evident in developers’, local authorities’ and railway companies’ promotional materials, press coverage of suburban issues, and suburban-set popular fiction.

541 Ilford Guardian (22 Jun 1906).
542 Ilford Guardian (18 Jul 1913).
543 Meyers’s Observer (8 Nov 1901).
544 Figure 1 taken from Ilford Recorder (15 Jul 1910).
At times, this imagery was evoked by local businesses seeking to transform their means of production into a rural spectacle in its own right. In 1905, for example, F. W. Brooker, who owned a local shoeing forge, contributed the ‘Gretna Green’ car, described by the *Ilford Guardian* as ‘a rustic smithy on wheels’, while Messrs Langdon & Clark contributed a car containing a full-sized carpenter’s bench with their staff working on it. Similarly, in 1914, the Green's Stores trade car exhibited old and new ways of making coffee, with a woman roasting coffee over a fire contrasted with a man making coffee using modern machinery. There was also Abbot Bros’ ‘Ye Olde Travelling Dairy’ (exhibited in Figure 2), a recurring feature of the carnival, from which milkmaids under a thatched roof sold milk, thereby idealising the means of distribution; moreover, Abbott Bros and other dairies also contributed decorated milk floats, which turned the practical means for distribution of milk into a branding image.\(^{546}\) These items attempted to promote a form of popular capitalism, whereby small businesses presented themselves as part of the social and cultural fabric of the local community; this also provided the ideological basis for branding in which their operations were reconstituted as visual entertainment, particularly in the case of the regularly appearing Ye Olde Travelling Dairy. It was for this reason that these cars often harked back to the idealised rural village, and sought

\(^{546}\) Figure 2 taken from *Ilford Guardian* (16 Jul 1909).
to present the contemporary suburban local economy in these terms, although at the same time, they also often emphasised the advanced nature of their goods and services in order to appeal to the suburban audience's enthusiasm to remain up-to-date in their own consumption habits.

---

Figure 2: Abbot Bros’ ‘Ye Olde Travelling Dairy’ during the 1909 Ilford Carnival.

---

These projections of rurality operated between the poles of sincerity and artifice, and were both in keeping with wider understandings and experiences of the suburb, and yet specific to the carnival context. As noted earlier, the association of Edwardian suburbia with the rural was hardly unjustified, with residential areas sat in close proximity to fields and forestry. Moreover, representations of rural trades in carnival processions were often contributed by individuals or organisations operating in these sectors: for example, the Ilford Farmers’ Association contributed a decorated car to the North Hainault contingent of the 1911 Ilford Carnival bearing the motto ‘God Speed the Plough’ and containing a variety of their vegetables and produce. People residing and working within the diminishing rural patches of increasingly suburban parts of Essex, and other counties surrounding London, thus continued to contribute to the culture of these rapidly changing districts and to influence their self-perception, through channels such as local carnivals. Nonetheless, the vision of suburb as rural idyll was also highly selective, and its embodiment on carnival day highly temporally specific. Those who donned traditional country wear were dressed in a way they normally did not; those who adopted the guise of rural workers were for the most part pretending to have a job that they actually did not. The values they embodied in all likelihood resonated with the watching crowds, but equally on another level they were aware of and expected to enjoy the pretence.

Floral themes were also plentiful in the Ilford Carnival. Female collectors and processionists often adorned their costumes with flowers, with roses especially prominent,
while bluebells, daffodils, poppies, buttercups, chrysanthemums, sunflowers and various other specimens also provided themes for fancy dress; vehicles were likewise frequently floral decorated, as the Cranborne Visitation of the Primrose League’s ‘Justice with Peace’ tableau in the 1908 Ilford Carnival, displayed in Figure 3, exemplifies. The garden on the one hand can be characterised as part of suburbia’s faux rurality, a tamed imitation of nature. Yet in another sense, it was also a sign of suburbia’s receptiveness to modernity and significance as a site for new social trends. Advancements in transportation, in the construction industry and building design all combined to help expand access to these sites, where a growing number of Londoners could engage in healthy outdoor recreation and individual acts of creativity. The garden allowed for nature to be abstracted from the countryside into the domestic sphere, to serve as a beautifying facet and additional leisure space – a practical blending of town and country. The usage of flowers in carnivals entailed a further phase of abstraction and relocation, from garden to costume and vehicle, from the suburb's domestic spaces to its public ones, where they again served a beautifying role. The values being celebrated were therefore thoroughly conformist, although the particular means of celebration – extensive public self-adornment with flowers – was to a degree specific to the occasion.

Figure 3: Cranborne Visitation of the Primrose League’s ‘Justice with Peace’ tableau in the 1908 Ilford Carnival.

Figure 3 is taken from Ilford Guardian (17 Jul 1908).
Carnival and the Waging of Local Rivalries

Carnivals also offered a forum for waging and negotiating local rivalries. It was oft-stated in Ilford and elsewhere that one of the rationales for ward committee systems was that they generated a motivational friendly rivalry between wards. Sometimes, however, competition was hardly amicable. The Ilford Guardian, based in Loxford and of course owned by that ward’s organiser, remarked in 1906 that items which should have ended up in its contingent had been included in that of neighbouring Clementswood – an accusation also levelled by an angry correspondent in the Ilford Recorder – while the Ilford Guardian’s criticism of Park’s contingent in the 1908 carnival drew an angry response from that ward’s organiser, E. C. Smith.\footnote{Ilford Guardian (27 Jul 1906; 17 Jul 1908; 31 Jul 1908); Ilford Recorder (26 Jul 1907).} Similar disputes arose elsewhere. The system introduced in Tottenham in 1911 of having three committees uniting two wards each ran into immediate difficulties when High Cross representatives sought to disassociate from their St Ann’s counterparts due to the latter’s perceived lack of interest in the carnival.\footnote{Tottenham and Edmonton Wednesday Herald (21 Jun 1911).} In Finchley in 1912, a letter to the Finchley Press attributed the East Finchley tradesmen’s lack of interest in that year’s carnival to the lack of courtesy they had allegedly been shown by tradesmen in other parts of Finchley.\footnote{Finchley Press (14 June 1912).}

Within the processions themselves, some items used humour to address local conflicts. In 1908, members of the UDC’s Tramway Department submitted ‘The Ante-Vibrite and Dustless Motor Bus’, as part of Park Ward’s contingent. Dangling in front of this vehicle was a black coffin inscribed ‘Cranbrook Trams’, while water cans were attached to its wheels and other curiosities also connected to the vehicle; its passengers included boys and girls, characters dressed as tickets past and present, a Chinaman, the ‘Cranbroke’ conductor and others in fancy dress. This vehicle referred to the rollout of motor bus services to Cranbrook, sounding the death knell for plans to extend tramlines into the ward, which had for a long time been held up by the opposition of local residents fearful of lowering the tone of the area.\footnote{Jackson, Semi-Detached London, p. 69.}

The following year, the Loxford Ratepayer’s Association entered its ‘Park Ward Disowned’ car into the procession, which made reference to the longstanding problems
surrounding waste disposal in Ilford. According to the *Ilford Guardian*, it was ‘a model of the famous – or should I say infamous? – dust destructor, which Park ward won’t have at any price, but which all the other wards are anxious to see planted down near the Electrical Works’. The newspaper later informed readers that the car would show ‘Mr and Mrs Mavin and Mr and Mrs Ben Ali at tea, the similarity of the names of these fictitious characters with certain well-known personages around the town will arouse a certain amount of curiosity’. Mr Ben Ali was almost certainly Ben Bailey, the well-known Liberal Park ward councillor and carnival’s former chairman. In 1914, the same association submitted its ‘Justice’ car, containing numerous derisive depictions of Ilford UDC and figures associated with it, as shown in Figure 4. According to *Ilford Guardian*, these included Dr Cornelius Stovin (the recently dismissed medical officer for Ilford) receiving his notice from the UDC chairman William James Oliver Sheat a drainpipe which onlookers were told not to tamper with, a tramp manager ‘with his £8 a week’, a conductor with his ‘nether garments much the worse for wear’, an electrical engineer with his motor and a telescope looking for vacant land in Loxford and advertising that firewood from fences was cheap. The *Ilford Guardian* noted that ‘Needless to say, it did not get first prize!’

These cars all utilised a highly referential form of comedy, making a wide range of in-jokes and relying on the audience sharing the local reference points they riffed on. The extent to which they succeeded is questionable. The *Ilford Guardian* remarked of the ‘Justice’ car that ‘There was only one thing lacking and that was a handbook explaining all this to the public. In their anxiety to do enough, the promoters slightly overdid it and there was not that directness of thrust which would have been apparent if there had been fewer people in the car.’ That the majority of people watching the 1914 procession would not have been from Ilford makes it even more likely that the joke was unintelligible to most of the crowd. This perhaps helps to explain why for all the localist rhetoric around the carnivals, specifically local representations were comparatively rare within the procession itself, with depictions of the rural far more

---

556 Figure 4 taken from *Ilford Guardian* (17 Jul 1914).
557 As noted earlier, full committee membership for the 1914 carnival is unavailable, but Sheat did serve as chairman of the Cranbrook ward committee in 1913. Additional information about him and Stovin taken from Kelly’s Directories, *Kelly’s Directory of Essex, Hertfordshire and Middlesex 1914*, pp. 110, 324
558 *Ilford Guardian* (17 Jul 1914).
559 *Ilford Guardian* (17 Jul 1914). While Figure 4 is not very clear, it is indicative of the car’s visual complexity.
widely accessible and appealing as a shared idealisation of suburbia. Nonetheless, items with local reference points did receive recognition on occasion from the procession judges, illustrating the esteem within Ilford that such entries could attain. In 1907, for example, first prize for best boy’s fancy dress went to H. H. Grey for his representation of Ilford Golf Club, while ‘Ye Olde Horns Village’ was selected as the best tableau in the North Hainault contingent, and Walter James Hartin – assurance clerk and former Seven Kings ward organiser – was given the prize for most humorous character for his representation of the aforementioned ‘Dust Nuisance’.⁵⁶⁰

Figure 4: Loxford Ratepayer’s Association’s ‘Justice Car’ in the 1914 Ilford Carnival.

It is possible items of the sort entered by the Tramways Department and the Loxford Ratepayers’ Association had a cathartic role, drawing upon recognised sources of local friction but making light of them, helping to alleviate concerns and perhaps even providing an alternative to more bitter social conflict. Likewise, rivalry between wards in the Ilford Carnival and other carnivals may have allowed local tensions to be channelled in a positive direction. Yet this alone is a deeply unsatisfactory explanation of the relationship between local identities

⁵⁶⁰ Ilford Guardian (19 Jul 1907).
and enmities and the role of suburban carnivals. Rather, it is patent that these occasions also served as particularly attractive opportunities for waging local rivalries, in both the processions and in print, involving individual instances of dispute and disparagement within longer running battles, as well as instigating and exacerbate such conflicts. They also highlight the connection between wards’ social composition and hostilities between them. Loxford Ratepayers’ Association, for example, was by its remit inherently set in opposition to the UDC. The Tramways Department’s jibe at Cranbrook, meanwhile, signified a difficult relationship between the wealthy commuters of that ward, and the local public servants of Park, which was in many ways the seat of local government in the district.

These tensions were evident in debates around the carnival too. In 1905, carnival secretary Ben Henderson wrote into *Ilford Guardian* to deny rumours that certain tradesmen were being sold hospital badges at nine shillings for a dozen to then sell on at a shilling each. He remarked sardonically:

‘This has been a question which I understand has been exercising the minds of some of the gentlemen occupying certain favoured corners of that somewhat wonderful institution, the 8.29 a.m., to Liverpool Street, and I'm sorry to think they do not seem to realize that even a shopkeeper may occasionally do something for nothing; also, that those who take up voluntary or charitable work do not always make something of it for themselves’

Meanwhile, the revival of the Tottenham Carnival in 1909 prompted a W. C. Bishop, who described himself as ‘one of the thousands of Tottenham ratepayers whose waking hours are mostly spent out of the district’, to write to the *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* to complain that:

‘No sooner is the Hospital mentioned than in run the usual crop of Councillors and would-be Councillors, who must keep themselves before the public, and who will use the efforts of hard-working but more modest supporters of the Hospital as pegs to hang their election addresses on…The man on the train is taking a livelier interest in this year's Carnival, and would like, if he had the time, to take some part of the management out of the hands of those whose chief desire seems to be self-glory. Why does the ordinary ratepayer allow these “Councillors” to boss even his charities?’

The letter provoked a sarcastic response from John H. Endean, a local councillor and leather dealer and member of the carnival executive committee, who queried, ‘What should we do without our Locomotive Legislators?’, before extending to Bishop ‘and the members of his perambulating parliament a cordial invitation to come out of their railway retreat, and help us. Workers, not whiners, we want.’\(^{563}\) Exchanges such as these are illustrative of the split between those employed locally (whether in public service or enterprise) and who were therefore more likely to become engaged in local institutions and initiatives, whether that be a council or a carnival, and commuting white collar workers required to lend their financial support, through rates or donations, to these endeavours, despite their sense of marginality to them.

The drink question was also a source of contention in the Ilford Carnival. In 1908, the Newbury Park-based Willing Workers Juvenile Temple of temperance organisation the International Order of Good Templars (IOGT) had intended to show its support for the Liberal government’s licensing bill – which aimed to reduce inebriation and its consequences by reducing the number of public houses – through its proposed ‘Less Beer and More Boots’ car, which would depict the destitution of drunkards’ children.\(^{564}\) The *Ilford Guardian* remarked: ‘The idea will be applauded by many, but inasmuch as the licensed victuallers of Ilford are among the most stalwart supporters of the hospital scheme, it would be a pity to introduce an inharmonious note on Saturday by parading a car of this description.’\(^{565}\) In the event, the temple opted to withdraw the item so as not to cause offence, instead entering a car carrying its young members in full regalia.\(^{566}\) The North Hainault ward, as noted previously, contained within Barkingside a number of public houses at this time, including Chequers, whose landlord sat on the ward committee. That same year, ‘A Seven Kingsite’ wrote into the *Ilford Guardian* after the carnival to complain about a brewer’s van in the procession advertising its beer and handing out glasses of it to people along the route.\(^{567}\) Seven Kings did not contain any public houses at this time, having been mostly developed by Griggs; it did, however, contain a number of churches belonging to evangelical denominations, and its own IOGT lodge, which occasionally contributed a car to the carnival. Again, this is illustrative of the performative nature of local community as expressed in the carnival, and its inability to wholly mask schisms between remnants of the pre-suburban economy and new arrivals who sought to carve out their own moral universe in the same space.

\(^{563}\) *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* (27 Aug 1909).
\(^{565}\) *Ilford Guardian* (10 Jul 1908).
\(^{566}\) *Ilford Recorder* (17 Jul 1908).
\(^{567}\) *Ilford Guardian* (31 Jul 1908).
Working-Class Impersonation and Presence in Suburban Space

There were a number of cases of representations of lower-class stock figures in the carnival. The most common of these was the tramp, imitated by individual male collectors, as well as among assemblages of other stock figures in some procession vehicles, and in some instances as the central subject of comic displays. The 1905 procession, for example, included local tailor George A. Chambers and milliner Tom Wright entered as tramp motorists in 1905, and again in 1908.568 There were also representations of costermongers and pearly kings and queens, replicating their impersonation on the music hall stage, including of ‘‘Arry and ‘Arriet’, the protagonists of music hall artiste Albert Chevalier’s ‘The Costermonger’s Serenade’.569

These representations may have worked on a number of different levels. Perhaps, given their own consciousness of social status, the tramp's intrinsic comic value to residents may have stemmed from his reassuring patent social inferiority: shabbily dressed when they valued decorum in appearance; jobless and homeless when they valued security of occupation and tenure. Reinforcing this humour was the incongruity of the tramp within this setting. Processionist or collector and the watching audience alike shared the knowledge that the adoption of the guise of tramp was a sham, with the absurdity at times heightened by the situating of the tramp in an unlikely context, such as a motor car. In dressing as tramps, and other stereotypes drawn from working-class London life, processionists were operating within a chain of objectification and appropriation for capital gain. The music hall artiste made their living by providing an approximation of the lower orders on stage. The lower middle-class patron expended their economic capital to view this impersonation and subsequently transferred it to the suburban streets, demonstrating their own accrued cultural capital and representational power over Londoners of lesser social standing, in order to make money for the hospital and garner prestige for themselves.

Yet it is also possible that for lower middle-class males, tramps and pearly kings may have on some level gratified a desire to be less bound by dress codes indicative of status and

568 Data as to their occupations taken from Kelly’s Directories, Kelly’s Directory of Essex 1902, pp. 250, 256.
clothe themselves more individualistically (in the wake of the advent of mass clothing production) and spectacularly, and this was, as mentioned earlier, an aspect of how this social group dressed for leisure more generally. Furthermore, as Gareth Stedman Jones has demonstrated, representations of cockney figures such as the costermonger during the 1890s and 1900s were increasingly affectionate if patronising, indicating a relaxing – following the labour unrest of the 1880s – of attitudes to London and its poorest, and an acceptance of their place within the nation; they were also emblems of an increasingly democratic mass culture that lower middle classes and working classes alike patronised.\textsuperscript{570} As with representations of the classless-cum-lower middle-class popular cultural figure Ally Sloper, the imitations of costermongers and pearly kings may have demonstrated a degree of cross-class affinity, imbued in ‘everyman’ types with strong class markers but simultaneously possessing a shared masculinity familiar to all and (in their representations on stage and in print) equally familiar with an array of social worlds.\textsuperscript{571} Indeed, the structure of the procession followed this logic, involving placement of tramps and costermongers among higher status figures such as royalty and military, albeit only for a short time. Cross-class masculine identification was also occasionally demonstrated in more deliberately emblematic procession entries, such as Seven Kings Men’s Meeting’s ‘Brotherhood’ decorated car in the 1905 carnival, which the Ilford Guardian described as featuring characters who ‘toil with their hands, labourers, smiths, etc’.

The matrix of representation and interpretation would have been further complicated by the growing presence of outsiders to the district, drawn from a wider array of social backgrounds, at the carnival, potentially facilitating very different understandings from those intended.

Forms of associational culture also facilitated working-class self-representation in the processions as well. Sought out to perform for the occasion, brass bands from Ilford and other neighbouring districts such as East Ham, Dagenham and Rainham represented locality and presumably class too through music and uniform. Barkingside Brass Band, for example, was a regular participant in North Hainault’s ward contingent, which also year on year featured the Oak of Essex court of the Ancient Order of Foresters and the King Charles and Hainault lodges of Oddfellows – friendly societies marching with banners and full regalia. Such displays were part of broader performative strategy for displaying working-class respectability and community membership, emphasising their own place in the emergent suburban public sphere.

\textsuperscript{570} Ibid, pp. 290–309.

\textsuperscript{571} Peter Bailey identified Sloper as a figure initially characterised as semi-criminal working class, but thereafter as classless and always apparently at leisure, but also as a resident of lower middle-class Battersea. Bailey, Popular Culture and Performance, pp. 58–72.
their self-presentation earnest and consistent, but deliberately communicative. Working-class presence in carnivals was also unsurprisingly evident in more proletarian districts. The 1901 Ponders End and District Carnival, for example, included items contributed by the Enfield Highway Co-operative Society and the Eastern Enfield Workmen’s Housing League, while the 1910 Tottenham and Edmonton Carnival contained vehicles submitted by the Edmonton Co-operative and staff at the Gothic Works, an Edmonton-based factory that manufactured gas meters and stoves.\(^{572}\) In all of these cases, collective action and a commitment to local charity offered opportunities for a scale and visibility of participation to individuals who alone would have lacked the resources to make their presence felt.

There was also, however, a less welcome dimension to the working-class presence on carnival day. The *Ilford Guardian* claimed in 1906 that as that year’s carnival had only been advertised locally, ‘The gangs of London's undesirables, who delight in visiting crowded fetes, did not know of the opportunities offered by watches and ladies’ purses in that crowded High Road and Broadway at the time the procession was to pass along’.\(^{573}\) Yet as the carnival grew in renown in later years, so did numbers of arrests for pickpocketing at them. In 1910, for example, Mike Melie, a labourer from Newington Butts, John Harris, a job-buyer from Bethnal Green, and Henry Ridley, a carman from Limehouse, were all apprehended at the carnival for this crime.\(^{574}\) Three years later, the *Ilford Guardian* listed five men detained for stealing: George Taylor of Walthamstow, William Davis of Hoxton, John Davis of Hackney, and William Holland and Harry Benson, both of no fixed abode. Each year’s carnival also tended to be marked by a handful of arrests for drunkenness. Bricklayer Edward Morgan of Ilford Lane was arrested for this on carnival night in 1905, as were three people during the 1910 carnival, and William Smith, a 24 year-old labourer from Barkingside, during the 1914 event.\(^{575}\) While numbers of arrests were small given the size of the gathered throng, they are worth recording as instances of illegitimate working-class performance, of deceptive or intemperate conduct (and in the former case, clandestine illicit capital acquisition) that challenged lower middle-class ideas of respectability and property and as illustrative of the limitations to suburbia’s social segregationist capacities, its incapacity to dictate entirely on its own terms its relationship with the inner city.

\(^{572}\) *Meyers’s Observer* (18 Oct 1901); *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* (16 Sep 1910).
\(^{573}\) *Ilford Guardian* (20 Jul 1906).
\(^{574}\) *Ilford Guardian* (15 Jul 1910).
\(^{575}\) *Ilford Recorder* (9 Jul 1915).
THE PROCESSION ROUTE AND THE PERFORMANCE OF LOCALITY

Mapping the Suburbs

Urban expansion and related health and social problems during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries prompted diverse attempts to map the city. John Pickles has stated that ‘[a]t the heart of the territorializing practices of modernity is a cartographic impulse, comprising mapping practices that contribute to and draw upon the coding of nature, space and social life in terms of metric and parametric models of space and the emergence of capitalism and the state’. Studies such as Pamela K. Gilbert’s work on mid-Victorian public health maps, Lucy E. Hewitt’s on the Civic Survey of Greater London undertaken during the First World War, and Richard Hornsey’s on Harry Beck’s 1933 London Underground map have highlighted this governmental tendency within maps of metropolitan spaces. Yet as Pickles has also argued, mapping goes beyond standard cartography, and maps contain multiple meanings. Maps are intertextual, produced through compromises and conflicts over time. Moreover, as Hornsey has noted, historians of cartography now recognise that maps should be considered not merely as representations of space, but in terms of negotiations between map, user and terrain, through understanding ‘dynamic environments’, and how historic subjects are likely to have mobilised the map.

Urban and suburban expansion, mapping and processions were connected procedures through which spaces were envisaged, embodied and experienced as places. Changes to the built environment inspired new mental and physical maps of it, which enabled visualisation and execution of new construction projects. Maps were also precursors of processions, enabling organisers to plot courses through built environments for participants to proceed through. Mapping this guided and facilitated occupation and usage of the built environment, in turn

578 Pickles, A History of Spaces, p. 91
579 Hornsey, Listening to the Tube Map, pp. 675, 685–690.
adjusting individual and collective mental mappings of it. All of these were performances of place that subsequently served as scripts, to be re-performed and adapted accordingly. We can trace this relationship from the development of Ilford and other suburbs through to their hosting of carnivals. Pre-suburban physical environments often played a primary role in shaping suburban morphologies. In Ilford, suburbanisation concentrated around the original village of Ilford, before spreading out from there, although there were also isolated points of development elsewhere in the urban district. Likewise in Enfield, Tottenham and Finchley, development initially focused on existing points of settlement and longstanding roads – their pre-eminence enhanced by the locating of railway stations near them from the mid-nineteenth century onwards – before extending as nearby rural estates were sold off and built upon. As swift as suburbanisation often was, therefore, developers and builders did not begin with a blank page. Nor did they work alone on the redraft, for they had to anticipate and respond to changes in transport networks and population movements.

Further adaptations came from those who sought to represent these suburbs in word and image, reflecting and stimulating a desire for spatialised knowledge about them. In some cases, this process was explicitly cartographic; in other instances, it involved relaying information whose attainment and interpretation was interwoven with formation of mental maps. Suburban areas were repeatedly mapped by the OS, for example. Maps of the case study districts were also included in suburban directories published annually by London-based Kelly & Co.’s from the 1880s onwards, along with other information such as lists of addresses and details of local institutions. Builders and developers also tended to use estate maps and birds’ eye view images in their marketing. There were, moreover, guides for suburbanites who wished to explore their district and its environs. Country Rambles by Field Path and Road in and around
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Ilford and Rambles around Enfield, for example, stressed the pleasantness of these suburbs’ rural surroundings, provided itineraries for walks and cycle rides taking readers through the local countryside, and included local maps relating key roads and landmarks to assist their progress. Histories of suburban districts and personal reminiscences of longstanding residents were also common. Suburban histories sometimes contained historic and contemporary maps too. More generally, histories and reminiscences took a microgeographic approach to their subject, dwelling on the significances of particular buildings and natural features, accompanied by illustrations and photographs of them.

Surveying this material highlights aspects of how and why the suburbs were mapped, mentally and literally. New maps and histories were often based on older ones, while books frequently reproduced visual sources derived from elsewhere. They were often drawn from personal experiences of movement through suburban space, and/or acted as cues to movement. They historicised local geography and reanimated the pre-suburban past in the suburban present. They emphasised suburban districts’ rurality, albeit while also engaging with their expanding built environments. Commercial motives stimulated mapping, which in many cases was undertaken by stakeholders in suburbanisation effectively advertising their product, while publishers also sought to profit from producing guides; yet these co-existed with other causal factors, such as writers seeking to educate residents about their district, or encourage healthy perambulation of it. Surveyance of suburbs was often undertaken by centrally-based agents with requisite resources, such as OS and Kelly’s, but also by locally-based writers and organisations. These various, continual attempts to render the geography of the suburb reflected, and were prompted by, the rapidity with which it changed. OS maps soon became outdated; directories each year updated lists of streets and residents; reminiscences and histories captured a physical environment now partially lost; and rural rambling routes disappeared beneath bricks and mortar.

584 George Edward Tasker, Country Rambles by Field Path and Road in and around Ilford (Ilford: South Essex Recorders, 1910); Walker Round (pseud.), Rambles around Enfield (Enfield: Walker Round & Co., 1905).
586 Whittaker, Urban District of Enfield.
Plotting the Procession Route: Scripting the Locality

The Ilford Carnival procession’s structure involved each ward committee selecting routes through the ward for their contingent to pass along. The different contingents then joined together for the final procession route – selected by the General and subsequently executive committee – later in the evening, along which most spectators gathered. The main procession route initially led along Ilford High Road, then northward along Cranbrook Road into Central (later Valentine’s) Park. As of 1907, under the local council’s orders, the procession turned off of Cranbrook Road into Melbourne Road, entering the park through a different entrance, before the sporting entertainments and concert took place. Routes for the 1905, 1907 and 1909 Ilford Carnivals are outlined in Figures 5, 6 and 7 respectively. The use of ward processions set the Ilford Carnival apart from the Tottenham and Finchley Carnivals, which by and large stuck to the structure of a unified procession marching along a single route through the district; the 1904 Tottenham Carnival and 1914 Finchley Carnival routes, depicted in Figures 8 and 9 respectively, were fairly typical in this respect.587 In Enfield, meanwhile, the tendency was for processions to cover single areas of settlement within this vast district, as indicated for 1901 and 1902 in Figure 10.588

In compiling these procession routes, carnival organisers composed narratives of their district by identifying primary roads and sites for inclusion, while omitting others, thereby making meaning from and imposing order on suburban ‘sprawl’. This was the by-product of their more prosaic ambition to guide processions through areas where large crowds were likely to gather to watch, so money could be collected through them, thus aping cartographers and commercial leisure providers in monetising space. Organisers drew up procession routes in communication with both the suburban physical environment and mapping processes discussed earlier, composing, adjusting and manifesting broader mental maps of their districts. This intertextuality highlights hidden layers of authorship within procession routes. If committee members did not compose them with local maps to hand, then some would have seen such maps before, helping to mould their local geographic knowledge. Yet limits to what maps could

587 Routes taken from *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* (24 Jun 1904) and *Finchley Press* (8 May 1914). These were plotted against the 1896 OS map of Tottenham and the 1912–1915 OS map of Finchley, obtained through Digimap (Accessed Oct 2012).

588 Routes taken from *Meyers’s Observer* (18 Oct 1901; 1 Nov 1901; 19 Sep 1902). These were plotted against the 1896 OS map of Enfield, obtained through Digimap (Accessed Oct 2012).
tell them, and their being quickly rendered out-of-date by rapid suburban development, meant committee members would have had to rely on experienced local geographic knowledge too. Many employed locally – like council employees, estate agents, builders, postal staff – would have dealt with maps and travelled the district extensively for work purposes. This is illustrated on Figure 11: a map of Ilford marked by its medical officer to show the incidence of certain infectious diseases, as part of his report to the UDC.589 However, the procession route’s composition must also be understood as a specific recurrent mapping practice in itself, reflecting the particularity of the carnival context, and ritualisation of its organisational aspects.

Suburban developers, and the natural and manual forces that fashioned the pre-suburban environment before them, were also creative forces within these texts’ evolution, providing raw materials carnival organisers could employ, but were simultaneously constrained and challenged by. Ilford’s main procession route favoured longstanding roads that long preceded suburbanisation. For example, High Road, integral to the Ilford Carnival’s final stretch, possibly dated back to Roman times. Similar tendencies could be found elsewhere. The Hertford Road central to Eastern Enfield carnival routes, for example, dated back to at least the thirteenth century, while the Tottenham Carnival route likewise tended to centre upon a main network of roads that had been almost fully in place since the early seventeenth century.590 This was pragmatic and financially sound practice: these roads were generally the best known and widest in the district, and therefore best suited to carrying processions. Yet continuity in procession routes were also a product of institutional memory. Despite turnover in membership, committees served as retainers of geographic knowledge, and on balance kept to older narratives of place. This perhaps also reflected these streets’ prominence within the lives of the mostly male, lower middle-class committee members, who often worked along or commuted via them.

Where the Ilford Carnival differed, however, was that it contained no single ‘master narrative’ of Ilford, but rather several more localised narratives prior to a unifying conclusion. Concentrating on smaller vicinities, Ilford’s ward processions covered far more residential streets than carnivals in other suburban districts, and were eventually amended in response to new developments. As can be seen from Figures 5–7, North Hainault’s 1905 route, for example, did not include Newbury Park, but its 1907 and 1909 routes did. Likewise, the Loxford

589 Figure 11 is taken from Ilford UDC, Annual Report of the Medical Officer for Health and School Medicine Officer for Health for the Year 1911 (Ilford: South Essex Recorders, 1911).
procession of 1905 did not cover the Uphall development, which was completed that year, but the 1907 and 1909 processions did, while the 1909 Seven Kings contingent were to visit the new Seven Kings Estate, construction on which had been begun two years earlier, if they had the time.

**Figure 5: 1905 Ilford Carnival procession route, plotted on the 1920 OS map of the district.**

---

Streets covered by ward processions

Final procession
Figure 6: 1907 Ilford Carnival procession route, plotted on the 1920 OS map of the district.
Figure 7: 1909 Ilford Carnival procession route, plotted on the 1920 OS map of the district.

—: Streets covered by ward processions
→: Final procession
Figure 8: 1904 Tottenham Carnival procession route, plotted on the 1896 OS map of the district.
Figure 9: 1914 Finchley Carnival procession route, plotted on the 1912–15 OS map of the district.
Figure 10: 1901–1902 Enfield carnival procession routes, plotted on the 1896 OS map of the district.

→: 1901 Enfield Bonfire Boys' Carnival
→: 1901 Enfield Highway and Ponders End District Carnival
→: 1902 Enfield Tradesmen's Cycling Club Carnival
The Ilford Carnival’s structure also exemplifies tensions inherent in selecting procession routes. In 1906, senior figures in the Clementswood and Loxford Ward Committees advocated that ward processions be scrapped as most residents did not come out in numbers to watch them, instead gathering to see the full procession at the finale. Nonetheless, ward processions 

591 *Ilford Guardian* (13 July 1906).
must have had their supporters too as they were retained until 1914; financial considerations came second to administrative inertia, and maybe committee members’ wish that processions visit their streets too. Tottenham offered similar instances of procession routes as negotiations between pragmatics and local identity politics. In 1900, Park Lane tradesmen contributed a decorated vehicle in exchange for the route being altered to pass through their street. The following year, the Lower Ward Committee promised to raise £10 if the procession passed through its vicinity; it failed to do so, and the procession therefore controversially did not travel the ward as advertised. Such disputes are again indicative of street and ward-based identities’ existence alongside districtwide ones.

Most Ilford wards were extensively covered by their processions, but largely rural North Hainault was not; its organiser Walter Page remarked in 1906 that the ward ‘was complete country, with fewer houses to cover in the distance than other wards’. A similar pattern could also be witnessed in other suburban carnival procession routes: though these sometimes passed through short stretches of countryside in travelling between centres of development, they generally marginalised rural areas (in contrast with the rambling routes discussed earlier). This is unsurprising, given potential donors there were far scarcer and roads lesser in quantity and quality. Yet it still illustrates the complex position the rural occupied within suburbia: central as an abstract notion to ideas of place, but more peripheral as a physical space within personal geographies.

By contrast, parks were frequently processions’ starting and/or ending points, often hosting associated events too. Valentine’s Park in Ilford is one such example. Similarly, Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club Carnival entertainments originally held in the grounds of Enfield Court were relocated to the new Town Park from 1903, while the Eastern Enfield Carnival held from 1912 onwards commenced at the recently opened Durants Park. These relatively democratic sites epitomised new suburban councils’ self-confidence in acquiring private land for public health and leisure. As Carole O’Reilly has argued, provision of municipal parks from the Edwardian era reflected local authorities’ desire to take responsibility for local inhabitants’ wellbeing and inculcate them with new ideas about citizenship. The park also typified suburbia’s relationship with the rural, substituting agriculture and wilderness with tamer, demarcated green spaces for new residents’ pleasure. Suburban carnival processions reiterated
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592 *Tottenham and Edmonton Weekly Herald* (15 Jun 1900).
595 *Meyers’s Observer* (4 Sep 1903; 27 Jun 1913).
596 O’Reilly, “We Have Gone Recreation Mad” (pp. 114–117).
these spaces’ symbolic centrality and values within their narratives of place. The transferral of the Enfield Tradesmen’s Cycling Club’s fete from Enfield Court, granted access to them by a General Somerset, to Town Park embodied a shift from local elite patronage to collective ownership and rights to access (through municipal gatekeepers). Likewise Valentine’s Park in Ilford: former manorial grounds; opened as a public park in 1899; subsequently the finale for the Ilford Carnival’s own narrative of (physical, cultural and charitable) progress.\textsuperscript{597}

\textit{Animating the Procession Route: Performing and Interpreting the Locality}

Local and suburban place was scripted through the selection of the carnival route, but performed by those who paraded along it, and those who came to watch them. David Crouch has argued that streets are conduits through which people organise their ideas of their locality, dotted with sites representative of practices and memories for individuals, as well as spaces of interaction.\textsuperscript{598} Alan Mace, focusing on London’s present-day suburbs, has illustrated how suburbanites have invested their built environments with ‘dreams’ of an idealised future and ‘ghosts’ of past trauma and loss, with the passing of time helping individuals develop a sense of home, but also of alienation in the event of too much change.\textsuperscript{599} Drawing on these interpretations of relationships between communities and their built environments, and on insights gleaned earlier from fin-de-siècle maps and guides to suburbia into how people related to the changing suburban built environment, we can make three assumptions about experiences of suburban carnival procession routes. Firstly, they would have differed between processionists and spectators, and between residents and visitors. Secondly, they would have been amalgamations of collective interpretations of place and personal meanings rooted in individual lives, influenced by wider social, cultural and economic forces. Published personal reminiscences of suburbanites hint at this, discussing particular sites’ significance within the

\textsuperscript{597} ‘The Borough of Ilford’.
Thirdly, sites would have had connotations of past, present and future, relating particularly to their suburban context. Processionists’ and spectators’ movements on carnival day illustrate how plotting routes functioned as cues to action. The former’s trajectories were largely preordained, enacting place as a medley of streets, experienced from start to finish. By contrast, spectators’ movements were more idiosyncratic. A route’s planners delimited where the procession could be seen, and the built environment itself (along with the positioning of fellow carnival-goers) determined the best vantage points, but spectators ultimately chose specifically where to watch the procession, as part of their own personal itinerary for that day. Procession routes’ associations for residents would have related to their own ordinary routines. For those in paid employment (therefore mostly men, but also increasingly some women), routes would have intersected with their daily commutes. Perhaps proprietors of businesses along these streets had a particularly strong sense of ownership and security within them. Other sites along procession routes, such as shops, parks, schools, pubs and churches would also have held particular meanings for residents, although their precise nature would have depended upon class, gender and age, as well as personal factors. Ilford’s ward routes would also have taken processionists along more concentrated tours of their own areas, through familiar streets they may have associated with friends and acquaintances residing along them, or else that they lived along themselves and associated with home, although in some cases they would also have introduced them to newer, less familiar local neighbourhoods too. By comparison, longer routes like those of the Tottenham and Finchley Carnivals possibly took them to parts of the district they had never or rarely visited before, giving them a broader picture of local place than daily routines normally allowed.

The carnival context is integral to understanding the procession route as an experienced space. It converted selected streets into spaces for individuals, groups and organisations to publically project, seriously and playfully, various social identities. It would also have affected individual experiences of procession routes. Processionists travelled along some of these same streets regularly, but not usually in fancy dress while huge crowds watched on. Likewise, spectators usually used those streets to pass through, rather than congregating to watch processions. As multisensory experiences involving multiple sights and sounds, not to mention long walks for those processionists on foot and heavy crowding for spectators, carnivals would have altered how suburbanites related to their surroundings, perhaps rendering them less

---
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familiar, or less noticeable. Conversely, carnival day may have affected suburbanites’ long-
term engagement with their surroundings. Perhaps it turned space into place by imbuing streets
that, for many residents, were relative memorial vacuums, with positive specific temporal
significances, providing subtexts to future narratives of place. Moreover, given that these
events often occurred annually and seasonally, and involved fairly consistent routes, it is likely
with time processions came to function not as atypical experiences of the built environment,
but as seasonal ones, offering local residents reassuring continuity and circularity as time
passed and suburbs matured.

Yet many who watched and participated in carnivals were not local residents; this was
particularly the case for Ilford. Carnival day therefore turned networks of suburban streets,
which ordinarily accommodated fairly localised social and economic activities, into tourist
sites within a broader metropolitan leisure economy. Visitors’ trajectories were generally
longer than residents’, often via interconnected transport networks such as railways, which
might have compressed their sense of distance from points of departure to arrival, or
disembodied them from the physical geographic connections between them. For first-
time visitors, their new surroundings would have been unfamiliar, although their existing
preconceptions about the district and commonalities in suburban architecture may have aided
them in relating to the new built environment, with the associations they formed almost
certainly being shaped by other factors such as class, gender, age, their own place of residence,
and so forth, as well as by their experience of the carnival itself. Those who enjoyed themselves
may have left having formed a positive impression of place that encouraged them to return at
a later date, perhaps for another carnival. Yet many drawn from neighbouring suburbs would
not have been first-time visitors. Many would have worked there, or have travelled there in the
past for leisure purposes. Perhaps they had friends and family there, or were even themselves
past residents. Like current inhabitants, their engagement with the physical suburban
environment on carnival day was coloured by past associations and might have altered their
subsequent associations with it.
CONCLUSION

This chapter has demonstrated how ideas of the local and the suburban were projected, interpreted and negotiated during the Ilford Carnival. This event offered opportunities not only to celebrate Ilford, but to reimagine it as well: to enhance its standing and centrality within city and nation; to invert stereotypes about suburban dullness; and to reanimate its rural past. It furthermore facilitated and stimulated local rivalries, expressed vehemently but also frequently playfully, with some processional performances drawing upon local affairs as a source of comedy. These illustrated tensions between different sections of the lower middle class, as well as a multifaceted relationship with the working classes, real and imagined. The plotting of the procession route, meanwhile, required the carnival’s organisers to engage with the local suburban built environment and previous representations of it in order to raise funds for the hospital, compiling new narratives of locality suitable for the occasion in the process. Processionists and spectators alike then engaged with these itineraries, but would have brought their own preconceptions of place to their interpretations of it, although their carnival day experience and usage of suburban space would have been specific to the occasion, and perhaps reshaped their sense of place in the longer term.

The carnival’s organisers, processionists and observers’ possessed specifically local and suburban forms of cultural capital, in their knowledge of local affairs and geographies, as well as in their capacity to evoke more general ideas about suburbia. They utilised this primarily to raise funds for the hospital, but – reflecting the social heterogeneity of the carnival movement – also for other diverse agendas, from advertising their wares to mocking and marginalising local opponents, all within the public spheres created through and around the carnival. These performances and applications of their cultural capital were adaptive of existing sources of local knowledge and formed part of a longer continuum of projections of both Ilford specifically and suburbia more broadly, and yet were also particular to the carnival, with the license and stimulus it offered to inversion, thereby playing both a reinforcing and reforming role in local and suburban identity formation, and in instigating and exacerbating cleavages within that. Yet among those spectating, the increasingly abundant non-residents of Ilford – who may have shared a generic suburban cultural capital but not the same local reference points – would in likelihood have interpreted the material presented to them in a manner somewhat different to the original interpretations behind the performances they witnessed.
CHAPTER NINE

GENDERED NATIONAL, IMPERIAL AND RACIAL IDENTITIES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses the expression of national, imperial and racial identities in the Ilford Carnival, and their close relationship with both gender identities and the suburban context. It firstly outlines connections between ideas of nation, empire, race and gender at the turn of the twentieth century, and how these were shaped by the particular circumstances of the Edwardian period, before discussing London’s strong imperial cultural ties, and the place of the suburbs within the imagined geographies of nation and empire. Within this framework, it analyses expressions of national and imperial identity in the carnival, and the connections between them and internationalist sentiments also expressed in the procession. It then highlights the essentially performative nature of everyday national, racial and gender identities by demonstrating how these performances were inverted through acts such as blackface and crossdressing. This chapter also aims to contribute to the body of work on London as an imperial city, through an exploration of transient performances of national and imperial identity on the urban periphery. It contends that the expression of these ideas owed much to the need for a common currency of cultural capital in the new suburban public sphere, as a route to social capital accumulation, but that the carnival also provided a space in which these could be safely negotiated and overturned.
Symbols and Uses of Nation and Empire

This section aims to stress the symbolic power – visually and linguistically – of ideas of nationhood and empire for communicating diverse ideas about politics, economics, society and culture, and as particular spheres in relation to which agendas could be conceptualised and enacted. This is not to downplay the emotive power of patriotism and imperialism in and of themselves, nor to imply cynicism on the part of all who referred to them, but rather to stress the extent to which they were intrinsically related to other issues, and the pragmatic reasons for their espousal and adherence.

Before doing so, however, the relationship between ideas of England, Britain and Empire does need to be unpacked somewhat. Ben Wellings has argued that the British state predated nationalism, but that the forces facilitating its expansion also helped generate a sense of British national identity, expressed not through imposition of unified legal and institutional systems upon its constituent four nations, but rather built upon commonalities such as Protestantism and Empire. Nonetheless, an explicitly English identity would have posed a threat to Britain, and so Anglo-British identity was expressed through ideas of governance, statism and imperialism, as well as national character. He noted, however, that there were periodic tensions between Englishness and Britishness from the 1870s, the former bound up with ideas of rural southern England, the latter with Empire, although even within these discourses the two were inherently connected.601 Krishnan Kumar, meanwhile, has characterised the English as an imperial people in way they initiated firstly the inner empire of Britain and then provided the culture and institutions of the empire beyond that. He defined Englishness as an imperial nationalism, which could celebrate its empire but not itself, in order to enable the colonised to feel the empire is theirs also, and that was also based on the notion of great projects that extended beyond the nation.602 Continuities between British and imperial identity were evident in a series of proposed schemes for a political union of ‘Greater Britain’ (comprising in its
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differing manifestations the entire Empire, Britain and its settler colonies, or the English-
speaking world) during the late nineteenth century, as highlighted by Duncan Bell.\footnote{Duncan Bell, \textit{The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900} (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007).}

Symbols and language of nation and empire incorporated these multiple layers, and were
malleable enough to be mobilised for a range of purposes, as a brief survey of the applications
of different state institutions indicates. David Cannadine, for example, has argued that the
monarchy during this period was celebrated as above politics, emblematic of the entire nation

Nick Groom has demonstrated that the Union Jack during the nineteenth century could signify
the unity of Britain's constituent nations, or be depicted as English, as well as associated with
Britain's imperial mission.\footnote{Nick Groom, \textit{The Union Jack: The Story of the British Flag} (London: Atlantic Books, 2006), pp. 211–226, 239–241, 246-250.} In the case of the armed forces, as Jan Rüger has illustrated, the
Navy during the Edwardian period became an increasingly visible emblem of British national
and imperial identity, representing the country’s technological might and masculinity and

Fictional, allegorical, mythical and historic figures were also frequently useable in these
ways. Peter Mellini and Roy T. Matthews have argued that Britannia had by the mid-nineteenth
century come to appear in magazine illustrations as a classical matriarch representing values
of justice, liberty and Empire; they contrasted her with John Bull, stating that whereas the
former stood as an abstraction of patriotic virtues, the latter was a country squire figure
representative of middle class prosperity and respectability and came to stand for the national
personality.\footnote{Peter Mellini and Roy T. Matthews, ‘John Bull’s Family Arises’, \textit{History Today}, No. 37 (1987), 17–23, (pp. 19–20, 22–23).} Miles Taylor, however, has highlighted the continued availability of John Bull
since his first appearance in the eighteenth century to both radical and conservative
interpretations of the national character; he concluded that Bull has signified the British
economy above all else over the course of his iconography, although his own quantitative
analysis of Bull’s appearances in \textit{Punch} magazine indicates that between 1900 and 1914, Bull
was rather more synonymous with national defence.\footnote{Miles Taylor, ‘John Bull and the Iconography of Public Opinion in England c. 1712–1929’, \textit{Past & Present} (1992), 93–128 (pp. 94–100).} Stephanie Barczewski, meanwhile,
argued that the legend of King Arthur was during the nineteenth century linked predominantly with an outward-looking national identity based on the idea of Britain as a seafaring and imperial nation, whereas the Robin Hood legend was associated with an inward-looking identity, rooted in the concept of the forest as a site of liberty; Hood could also be characterised as both defender of national institutions and vaguely radical figure, as well as emblematic of a pure Saxon racial heritage. Similarly, Paul Readman has highlighted the celebration of a specifically English pre-Union, pre-imperial past at the turn of the twentieth century, through events such as pageants and the 1901 King Alfred millenary. 

Readman has also demonstrated the political value of patriotic and imperialist symbolism in the 1900s both as an expressive language through which to advocate policy solutions and as an electoral tool. He explained the Unionist landslide victory in the 1900 General Election through their candidates’ platforming on the issue of the ongoing Boer War, associating themselves with the Army and leading generals and emphasising their concern with the grand issue of Empire and their masculinity in being willing to stand up to the Boers, while portraying Liberals as pro-Boer, petty-minded in their focus on domestic issues, and effeminate. During the 1900s, the Liberals advocated policy positions on issues such as free trade and land reform with reference to pastoral ideas of England, as well as in racial and imperial terms; this, according to Readman, helped them recover to take their own landslide victory in the 1906 election, but also reflected a genuine conceptualisation of nationhood that transcended class, while seeing the Conservatives as genuine practitioners of class interests. Andrew S. Thompson has also emphasised the resonance of Empire to the British labour movement in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as well, both as providing increased employment opportunities and competition from cheap labour, while controversial instances of persecutory legislation or force being used in the colonies were viewed as setting dangerous precedents for potential state oppression of the working class domestically.

Ideas and images of nation and empire were also heavily commodified during this period. Anne McLintock has highlighted the usage of imperially themed advertising featuring heavily

610 Readman, ‘The Place of the Past’ (pp. 183–190)
racialised and gendered imagery to sell household goods such as soap.\textsuperscript{614} Penny Summerfield has demonstrated how late nineteenth-century music hall made topical use of imperial conflicts in song and spectacle, with narratives built around soldier and sailor heroes, and stressing British racial superiority and the righteousness of British imperial rule.\textsuperscript{615} Tori Smith, meanwhile, has highlighted how a single event – Queen Victoria’s 1897 Diamond Jubilee – was commodified by newspapers, publishers, music halls, souvenir manufacturers and advertisers, using imagery and hyperbolic language and drawing on ideas of Victoria as both imperial and maternal figure.\textsuperscript{616}

\textit{Imperial Metropolis, Degenerate Suburbs?}

Rather than displacing local affinities, national and imperial identities during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries frequently built upon and reinforced them. Both Readman and Mark Freeman have stressed the manner in which pageants wove the locality into national historical narratives.\textsuperscript{617} Furthermore, a number of studies have explored the close and particular relationships between some individual cities or regions and Empire. Thompson has highlighted Cornish miners’ high levels of migration to and return from South Africa.\textsuperscript{618} Brad Beaven has analysed how local and imperial identities were connected through diverse channels such as newspapers, education, civic ceremonies and popular entertainments in Coventry, Leeds and Portsmouth between the 1870s and 1930s.\textsuperscript{619} Jim Tomlinson has examined Dundee’s imperial past, and John M. Mackenzie has done the same for Glasgow.\textsuperscript{620} Yet it is unquestionably London’s imperial connection that has garnered the most attention from historians. David Gilbert and Felix Driver, for example, have argued that ‘imperial

\textsuperscript{614} Anne McClintock, \textit{Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest} (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 207–231.
\textsuperscript{617} Readman, ‘Place of the Past’ (pp. 176–179); Freeman, ‘Splendid Display; Pompous Spectacle’ (pp. 428–437).
\textsuperscript{618} Thompson, \textit{Empire Strikes Back}, pp. 60–61.
\textsuperscript{619} Beaven, \textit{Visions of Empire}.
centrality’ was inscribed into London both through sites of imperial display and official state architecture, with different parts of the capital having their own particular relationship with Empire, from the marketing displays and processional sites of the West End, to East London’s docks.\textsuperscript{621} Jonathan Schneer, meanwhile, provided an in-depth consideration of the place of Empire in metropolitan affairs in the year 1900, such as the Kingsway redevelopment, or that summer’s dock strike.\textsuperscript{622}

The London suburb’s relationship with Empire around this point in history was a complex one, and closely connected with issues of race and gender. In her analysis of the suburban-set fictions of Arthur Conan Doyle, Keble Howard and John Galsworthy, Lynne Hapgood identified the separation of city from suburb, and suburbanite from responsibility for urban problems, as key themes; in these works, the protagonist sought personal contentment in suburbia and the economic realities of their reliance on the commute to the city was also denied.\textsuperscript{623} Stephen V. Ward has also found that marketing of suburban developments at this time similarly identified the suburb as a place where a man could achieve his masculinity, his family role and his true agrarian nature away from world of work, with women’s place in this advertising imagery restricted to that of housewives looking after young families.\textsuperscript{624} Lower middle-class male leisurewear during this period, according to Christopher Breward, reflected the ‘masculine celebration of the domestic sphere, its alliance with the sentimental and romantic features of the heterosexual suburban imagination and its concordance with the ‘wholesome’ sporting atmosphere of an idealised suburban life’.\textsuperscript{625} Within this outlook, the urban was associated with the masculine world of work, while women were intrinsically linked with the tamed natural world of the suburb – and yet this also served as an appropriate site for male activity too.

These stereotypes masked the far greater complexity of gender relations in the suburbs, as discussed earlier in the thesis. Yet they both responded to and fed into festering fears about the state of Britain. As Daniel Pick has demonstrated, the notion of racial degeneration gained impetus in Britain from the late Victorian period in response to fears over the urban environment, expanding democracy, the poor health of many recruits in the Boer War and the growing economic and military threat posed by Germany. While these ideas were often

\textsuperscript{623} Hapgood, \textit{Margins of Desire}, pp. 39–43.
\textsuperscript{625} Breward, \textit{The Hidden Consumer}, p. 200.
robustly countered by a classical liberal tradition, their influence was illustrated in the medicalisation of social and political discourse, and concerns over British racial health frequently prompted legislative responses, including feeding into the creation of the new welfare state.626

The suburban lower middle classes offered a scapegoat for these intertwined discontents. Charles Masterman, for example, lamented their tendency to limit family sizes as starving the nation of potentially good racial stock when the working classes bred more readily, while also perceiving their conservatism, individualism and lack of vision as a barrier to greater social reform.627 Thomas Crosland, meanwhile, skewered female domination of suburbia, in the absence of commuter husbands, and suburban man’s subservience to his wife and children.628 This running debate on the state of the suburban middle classes, and its imperial context, was also evident during tours of London by rugby and cricket sides from the dominions, as Geoffrey Levett has demonstrated, with some writers attributing the relatively poor showing of the home sides to the apparently monotonous suburban environment in which their class increasingly dwelt and its implications for their mental and physical state.629 These were in many ways disavowals of the classic liberalism that fuelled suburbanisation, although this was in itself an outcome of the same concerns with the urban environment that many of their critics possessed.

Yet as a number of studies have shown, the suburb had its own imperial sites, official and unofficial, ephemeral and concrete. Anthony D. King, for example, has highlighted the Indian roots of the suburban bungalow.630 Andrew Hassam and Deborah S. Ryan have both examined imperial aspects of the Crystal Palace in Sydenham, examining its botanic hothouses and its hosting of the heavily Empire-themed 1911 Pageant of London respectively.631 Ward, meanwhile, argued that suburban marketing incorporated imagery of a return to rurality but also covertly appropriated the language of colonisation.632 The suburb was, therefore, imbued with these connected but competing ideas of nationhood, rural England and imperial Britain.

This is borne out by a glance at the list of road names in Ilford.\(^633\) Several roads constructed in Seven Kings during the Boer War were named after scenes of key battles from the conflict, such as Ladysmith, Kimberley, Colenso, and Glencoe. Elsewhere in the district, numerous roads bore the names of other colonial cities, such as Colombo, Brisbane, Toronto and Dunedin. Yet it was even more common for roads to be named after other places in Britain. Often, these were clearly resonant with salubrious, historic and national relevance, such as Windsor and Eton; in other cases, they almost certainly reflected the roots of their developer, as with the case of Dalkeith, Elgin and Balfour Roads, built by the Scottish developer, Archibald Corbett. Then there were those with vaguer, rural or floral connotations, as with Oakwood and Vine Gardens, as well as older roads bearing their original, pre-suburban monikers, such as Horns Lane. From these miscellaneous reference points – local, English, British and imperial – was the nomenclature of place assembled in the Edwardian suburbs.

**PERFORMING NATIONAL AND IMPERIAL IDENTITY**

*Representing Britain in the Carnival*

Expressions of national identity in the Carnival took a variety of manifestations. The figures of Britannia and John Bull made repeated appearances, for example – frequently as part of wider collectives of symbolic figures. For example, the Cleveland Road Boys' School submitted a ‘John Bull and His Workers’ car to the 1908 procession, featuring children dressed as John Bull and as representatives of various trades, while the South Hainault Ward Committee contributed a ‘Britannia’ car to the 1911 procession, which contained women dressed as Britannia, as well as England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales. This representational format offered a simplistic personification of Britain, its constituent nations and social groups, rendering the idea of nationhood easier to identify with, and communicated ideas of the nation in a visual language through symbolic and easily recognisable figures. These cars characterised the nation along the lines of a family, with Bull or Britannia at the head.

This has additional significance for the numerous representations of Scotland, Wales and Ireland in the Carnivals. It was popular for women in particular to parade or collect in costumes given designations such as ‘Highland Lassie’ or ‘Irish Colleens’. When considered in connection with the larger scale vehicles representing Britain and the aforementioned systems of representation they use, these could be considered as cases of English people dressing as representatives of the other three home nations in a gesture of British unity. Such feelings would have been enhanced by the presence of significant numbers of residents with roots outside of England, as highlighted in Chapter Two. Yet on the other hand, these individuals who dressed as Scottish, Welsh and Irish characters should also perhaps be considered among the myriad representations of other countries (discussed in greater detail below). In dressing as representatives of Britain’s other constituent nations, these participants assumed the identities of figures who were perceived as kin and yet, to a degree, exotic in their Celtic-ness. The latter dimension is borne out in the picturesque names (and assumedly styles) of the costumes themselves and – to gazing males among the crowd – by the fact that most of the masqueraders in question were young women (as can be discerned by their usually being listed with the title ‘Miss’ in the Carnival programmes), as exhibited, for example, in Figure 1.

Specifically English national identities in the carnival tended to be connected with culture, landscape and history. Procession items such as the ‘Olde Englishe Coaching Party’, representative of Stuart England, in the 1908 Carnival, an ‘Old English Morris Dancer’ in 1911 and an ‘Early English Girl’ in 1914 tended towards insularity and retrospection, evoking a pre-Union nationhood. They formed part of a wider collection of procession items and costumes that similarly projected ideas of Englishness, albeit without necessarily referring to it by name.

634 Figure 1 taken from Ilford Guardian (17 Jul 1908)
and often centred on depictions of pre-modern monarchs. The Uphall Boys School contributed a ‘King Alfred and the Cakes’ car to the 1911 procession and the 1914 carnival featured a mounted tableau of ‘The Return of Richard le Coeur de Lion’; the 1911 procession also saw two assistant marshals in South Hainault dress as Kings John and Henry VIII, with a third entered as the slightly more recent figure of George II, as shown in Figure 2. Again, these items harked back to a specifically English national past and while there is no evidence this was a conscious uncoupling of Englishness from Britishness, it does make clear the appeal of the former’s deep historical roots.

Figure 2: Marshals dressed as Henry VIII, George II and King John in the 1911 Ilford Carnival.

In dressing as old kings, processionists were assuming an alternative identity, which while central to the national narratives their senses of identity were rooted in, nonetheless involved transgressing temporal and class order, to play at being something they were not, to overturn the linearity of time and hierarchy of social structure in a manner they could not outside this particular framework. No doubt the spectacular potential of historical royal themes
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635 Figure 2 taken from Ilford Recorder (14 Jul 1911).
for costumes and cars also owed something to their evocation of the picturesqueness of the past and the opulence of the monarchy, lending them a quality of otherness within present-day, lower middle-class Ilford, while simultaneously offering shared semiotics for projecting ideas and identities between those parading and those watching.

The inversionary dimension of this practice – and how far it was permissible – was illustrated by the dearth of representations of either Edward VII or George V, the late Victoria or any other living members of the Royal Family. It appears likely that this would have been considered improper; indeed, it was only in 1937 that bans on Victoria’s representation on stage or screen were lifted, the by then deceased George V having stated he did not wish for her to be depicted in either medium during his lifetime. Nonetheless, contemporary monarchy were celebrated in relation to the carnival. The Coronation was a ubiquitous point of reference in the 1911 procession, in which several female collectors participated dressed as ‘Coronation Girls’, for example, while there were it appears even representations of the current royal couple, in the Willing Workers’ Temple’s ‘Miniature Coronation’ car, but it is likely such impersonation was only permissible because it was by children. As well as expressing shared patriotic feeling, the appeal of these items would also have lain in their contemporariness. Beyond the procession itself, badges were sold in association with the event twinned the cause of the hospital with the recent crowning of George V, with the event also dubbed ‘the Coronation Carnival’ by the Ilford Guardian.

This connection of locality with nation was also sometimes explicitly made visible in the procession. For example, in 1905 the Seven Kings Ward Committee contributed its ‘The Heptarchy – The Seven Kings’ Car’, with individuals representing the historic kingdoms of Essex, Wessex, Sussex, Northumbria, Kent, Mercia and East Anglia; its car for the 1914 procession also represented the ‘Seven Kings’ after whom the ward was allegedly named. Local, English and British identities were also expressed in the processions through the prism of items with a military theme. In the 1908 procession, Uphall School sent its ‘Man-o-war’ manned by boys in sailors’ uniforms, while the West Ham Philanthropic Naval Brigade contributed its ‘Ashore and Afloat’ tableau, comprising a troupe with a model battleship and field gun, and the Ilford Church Lads’ Naval Brigade also made an appearance, as shown in Figure 3; three different naval brigades also contributed to the 1911 procession. These
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638 Figure 3 taken from Ilford Recorder (17 Jul 1908).
brigades were forerunners of the Sea Cadets, which following a 1910 reorganisation became affiliated to the Navy League, with 27 established nationwide by 1914. The 1905 Ilford Carnival included a band sent by the 3rd Essex Voluntary Battalion, who were headquartered in nearby West Ham. In 1908, following the establishment of the new Territorial Force, detachments from its 4th Battalion Essex Regiment (along with band and machine gun) and the 8th Battalion Essex Regiment Cyclists, both of which had companies in the district, participated in the procession; the 4th Battalion again sent a band in 1911. These brigades and battalions highlighted the importance of national identity as a force in fomenting local voluntary action, their localness re- emphasised by their appearance in the carnival.

The carnival context is also important to the performative elements of these institutions and the presentation of military identities in the procession more generally. Firstly, they had clear value as spectacle. The exploits of soldiers and sailors, embellished with the ocular appeal of men in uniforms and large scale, modernistic machinery of war, had already proven lucrative material for music hall, the illustrated press, and other highly visual media and therefore offered a tried and tested crowd-pleaser to the carnival’s organisers. Secondly, for the brigades and battalions, this comprised part of a wider continuity of military pageantry designed to engrain their wider cultural resonance. For men dressing as soldiers and sailors in the procession, the performance of the values of bravery, masculinity and patriotism were marked by a dimension of artifice, for however much stress they personally placed on those values (and sought to express them to a watching crowd), they were nonetheless mimicking professional roles in stark contrast to the realities of suburban white-collar employment, although not wholly in contrast with suburban lower middle class masculinity more broadly, to which vigorous outdoor activities (often undertaken in sporting uniforms) were central. In the instance of young boys dressing as soldiers and sailors, in which they were performing not only virile patriotic masculinity, but also adulthood; in the case of the brigades, this was again a more regular performance.

These entries were on one level illustrative of the outward-looking nature of British identity, celebrated in the four nation-unifying guise of the armed forces whose reputations had been developed in the field of colonial conflict and expansion. The presence of naval themes in the procession was a reminder of Britain’s relationship with and mastery of the sea, crucial
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to its status as both island nation and world power. The inclusion of model ships and real life machine guns, meanwhile, were also reminders of its technological superiority and advancement that staked a place for Britain at the zenith of the global racial and national hierarchy. Yet again, this needs to be interpreted within the context of the shaking of British self-confidence by both war in South Africa and the growing prospect of war in Europe. Military displays in the carnival may have served to reassure as well as tapping into a sense of national pride.

Figure 3: Ilford Church Lads Naval Brigade at the 1908 Ilford Carnival.

Nation, Empire and World

Imperialist sentiments were evident in a number of showpiece vehicles in the processions. In 1905, developer W. P. Griggs submitted the ‘Ye Cranbrook Car’, also titled ‘Sons of the Empire’, which featured individuals dressed as Britannia, England, Scotland, Wales, John Bull, an admiral, a general, a New South Wales Lancer, an artilleryman, a 17th Lancer, a hussar, a Royal Marine, an able seaman from the Royal Navy, a Highlander, and members of the Essex Yeomanry, the Canadian Artillery, a West Indian regiment, the Indian Cavalry, and an Essex regiment. Similarly, in 1911, the South Hainault Ward Committee entered the ‘British Empire Car’, peopled by characters such as Britannia, John Bull, an Indian
raja, an Indian soldier, a Canadian man in furs, a Canadian soldier, an Australian sailor, a New South Wales Lancer, a New Zealand colonist, a New Zealand khaki soldier, a South African colonist and a South African rough rider.

The close connection between national and imperial identities here is evident, particularly in the system of representation used: as patriotically themed vehicles utilised a collection of symbolic figures to represent Britain, so imperially themed ones used a wider array to represent a united Empire. The carnival offered evidence of grassroots enthusiasm for the notion of a Greater Britain: it contained anthropomorphised interpretations of governmental structures in which Empire was presented as a form of extended family barely divisible from Britain itself. While this focused to a large extent on the dominions with their populations of British heritage, it could also be extended to include the non-white natives of India; a sense of racial unity alone therefore cannot wholly explain feelings of imperial unity. The utilisation of military figures to represent these territories was also significant, characterising imperial concord as derived from the idea of cooperation between the Empire's armed forces.

The relationship between national, imperial and military identities was also evident in other suburban street carnivals. The 1901 Enfield Bonfire Boys' Carnival, for example, included a ‘United in Joy and Sorrow’ tableau, featuring representations of the Navy, Army and colonies, some in a state of grief at Victoria's death, others in joy at the accession of Edward VII. That year’s Tottenham Carnival, meanwhile, included a number of items that combined militaristic and imperial themes include a processionist dressed as Bugler Dunne (who had sounded the advance of the Dublin Fusiliers at the previous year’s Battle of Colenso), a Red Cross Nurse and Soldier tableau, and a contingent of local volunteers returned from South Africa. These examples also illustrate the chronological specificity of particular dimensions of expressions of national and imperial identity, partly due to the importance of topicality in procession items. The ‘United in Joy and Sorrow’ tableau’s linkage of armed forces and Empire with the royal family, though hardly uncommon at earlier or later periods, related to the specific context of that year’s change in monarch, while the three exemplars cited from Tottenham all reflected the particular resonance of the ongoing Boer War and sense of connection with a particular theatre of colonial war (at a time before continued British involvement in the conflict had become a source of consternation rather than national and imperial pride).

641 Meyers's Observer (19 Jul 1901).
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A further characteristic of some procession items was the extent to which they sought to recreate imperial spaces within domestic ones, thereby unifying the two, as in the case of the aforementioned ‘British Empire Car’, which was adorned with the fauna of various different colonies. Indeed, some vehicles explicitly celebrated the way advancements in communications bridged the vast distances between Britain and its Empire. The Ilford Post Office’s ‘Good News From Home’ car in the 1908 procession was preceded by a squad of telegraph messengers and carried a model North West Canadian log cabin with ranchers reading post and newspapers. Three years later, Cranbrook Ward Committee member Edith Younghusband contributed a vehicle bearing the same name; in this case the car was divided into two halves – one representing women in an English homestead, the other a colonial bush scene with scouts in camp, one of whom was pointing out good news in a copy of the Ilford Recorder to his colleagues, thereby symbolically eliminating the space between (an idealised rural) homeland and colonies, and deliberately connecting locality to Empire.

This is illustrative of how imperial and introspective versions of national identity were connected and gendered, and linked with suburbia. Within this ontology, imperial space was associated with masculinity and military service (although obliquely, as shall be discussed a little further below), whereas rural England was a refuge from that world, frequently (though not exclusively) associated with women. In this respect, this interpretation of the relationship between Empire and England resembled that between imperial London and its suburbs. The significance of the floral in relation to ideas of the suburb have already been illustrated in this thesis, but it is worth noting its national and gendered meanings too. As Anne Helmreich has stated:

‘…it is useful to conceive of the garden as embodying a collection of ideologies, sometimes contradictory, bundled together and put to numerous uses. At the turn of the century, the latter included counterbalancing fears of change, accentuating desires for an alternative way of life, harmonizing and smoothing over differences, or accentuating them. Through these processes, the garden became constitutive of national identity.’

This is not to argue that when female collectors, or female-occupied vehicles, paraded in garlands, it was necessarily intended to represent nationhood or interpreted in that way, and
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that the suburb itself was inevitably conceived in those terms. Rather, this gendered representation of a domesticated nature could be easily mobilised in service of national identity – Figure 4 providing a particularly good example of the conflation of national and floral symbolism – not least because the nation was now the predominant geographic scale on which culture was perceived, particularly in light of European and imperial tensions during this period. Evocations of national identity also had particular performative value in the context of the suburb, in which its different layers of meaning could be encoded and communicated in the assumption that their aesthetics and resonances would find an appreciative audience.

Examining the lists of procession prize winners underlines the effectiveness of this strategy. In 1905, the award for best decorated car went to Griggs’s ‘Ye Cranbrook Car (Sons of Empire)’ with ‘Seven Kings – The Heptarchy’ coming second, while a ‘Britannia’ car was among those highly commended, and a Nurse Lynch also won the women’s best decorated cycle prize for her ‘National Roses and Laurel’ ensemble. Six years later, the list of prize winners included a ‘Rhodesia’ decorated car, West Ham Philanthropic Naval Brigade’s ‘Ashore and Afloat’ tableau, a Miss Seymour and her ‘English Rose’ decorated cycle, and Ilford Church Lads Naval Brigade. Patriotically and imperially themed entries were perhaps the most significant component among the earnestly didactic items discussed in Chapter Six, being large-scale piece items contributed in the main by organisations seeking to further ingratiate themselves within local civic society, and in the cases of businesses, to market their products. For example, in 1908, various local businesspeople collaborated on the ‘Commerce of the Empire’ car, showcasing the produce of Britain's various colonies and dominions, while local butchers W. J. Pearson & Son contributed a cart decorated in red, white and blue and driven by man in butcher's dress. Meanwhile, Edward Cook & Co., manufacturers of Throne Soap, entered its ‘Throne’ car in the 1908, 1911 and 1914 processions; this comprised a replica of the Coronation Throne and of a giant bar of soap. Items like this not only reflected the development of a national culture, but also actively sought to promote a sense of nationhood and associate their products with it. In a suburban context, it may have been used to communicate businesses' integrity to potential customers relatively newly resident in Ilford.
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644 Figure 4 taken from Ilford Recorder (15 Jul 1910).
A number of carnival items extended their outlook further to express ideas of international unity. These were often centred round Britain's alliances. In 1905, the Ilford Toy Fund contributed an Anglo-Japanese Alliance Car featuring characters representative of Britain and Japan, while representations of the Entente Cordiale were also frequent throughout the Carnival's history, usually focusing on figure representative of Britain and France such as ‘John Bull’ and ‘La France’. The 1908 procession meanwhile contained a waggonette, contributed by the secretary of the Loxford Ratepayers Association, entitled ‘John Bull and Some of His
Friends’, in which John Bull was accompanied by characters representing the US, France, Japan, Spain, Austria and two of the Colonies, while the 1910 procession included the Ilford Men’s Meeting’s Peace Car, shown in Figure 5, intended as a tribute to the recently departed Edward VII, ‘the peacemaker’, and featuring, alongside young ladies representing Peace and her attendants, were individual men representing a Belgian, Dutchman, Englishman, Frenchman, German, Russian, Italian, Spaniard, Scandinavian, Greenlander, American, Chinese man, a Red Indian, and African native.\textsuperscript{645} The 1914 Ilford Carnival, meanwhile, was marked by two vehicles expressing enthusiasm for international projects for achieving greater good, less than a month before Britain would enter the First World War. The Ilford Men’s Meeting’s tableau ‘Britannia and the Brotherhood’ featured Britannia, England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, America, India, South Africa, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Germany, France, Belgium, and two sailor boys, accompanied by the flags of the various nations represented; it also carried the mottoes ‘Support out Hospital’, ‘I.M.M. for God and Humanity’, ‘John Bull’, and ‘Let Brotherly Love Continue’. The South Essex Band of Hope Union, meanwhile, contributed a car titled ‘Total Abstinence for All Nations’, its passengers costumed as Britannia, England, Ireland, Japan, India, Italy, Holland, China and America (represented by a Red Indian).

Figure 5: Ilford Men’s Meeting’s ‘Peace’ car in the 1910 Ilford Carnival.

These items therefore shared a representational syntax with those procession entries celebrating nationhood and Empire, using an extended version of the same collective, anthropomorphic format in order to portray international allegiances, the microcosmic British

\textsuperscript{645} Figure 5 taken from \textit{Ilford Recorder} (15 Jul 1910).
community being expanded to take in a variety of other nations. The continued
Anglocentricism of this international ontology was patent: representatives of Britain and its
constituent parts remained central; local, national and cosmopolitan sentiments were conflated
(especially in the case of the ‘Britannia and the Brotherhood’ tableau); and depictions of
Empire and other compilations of nations overlapped in some cases sufficiently to blur the
boundary the two. Yet the intended and potential inferences contained within these common
emblematic forms were potentially transgressive of each other, celebrating or tacitly
disavowing the specialness of racial and imperial ties. They also frequently incorporated their
own institutional agendas, such as temperance of pacifistic masculinity.

However the continuity between these different representations of nation and the world
beyond was more than just formal. Even representations of imperial soldiers were notably
unbelligerent, with depictions of actual combat apparently absent; this was in marked contrast
to the multiple recreations of battlefield scenes during London’s earlier Boer War carnivals.646
Ilford had, as noted earlier in this thesis, a strong nonconformist presence and a Liberal MP in
John Bethell, elected in 1906 with Ilford reportedly strongly supportive of him, and retaining
his seat in both 1910 elections too.647 The carnival might therefore be read as illustrative of
Ilford’s liberal relationship with nation and empire, rooted in conceptions of the strength of
individual character (embodied in procession items in which nations were represented as
individuals) and notions of voluntary public service, reflected in its parading reservists and
naval cadets. The broader veneration of the Navy (over that of the Army) in the procession was
also in keeping with this; as Matthew Johnson demonstrated, navalism could be and frequently
was interpreted as fully in keeping with liberal principles, seen as an unoppressive, non-
conscripted, primarily defensive wing of national security and guarantor of free trade.648 Within
their particular historic moment, furthermore, evocations of imperial and international unity
may have also been meant and interpreted as reassuring. Given the threats to Britain’s global
standing and domestic security, depictions of imperial and international alliances that were
specifically military would have stymied any feelings of British isolation, while conversely
explicitly pacifistic or utopian exhibitions of imperial and international friendship expressed
continuing hopes of avoiding conflict even as European tensions worsened.
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Yet it is also necessary to highlight further ambiguities inserted into these expressions of imperial and international relations by their situational context. For a start, for individuals and institutions contributing items themed along these lines, they carried the advantage of contemporariness (particularly references to specific, fairly recently formed alliances) and recognisability that made them effective for appealing to and ingratiating themselves with the watching crowds. Secondly, these items were marked by impermanence and pretence. However deeply the contributors and processionists felt the ties of kinship to Empire and beyond, their imitation of other peoples for these items was precisely that: a temporary act whose artifices the watching crowds were fully aware of. Once the carnival ended, they reverted into Englishmen and women. Moreover, the manifestations of Empire and world that had manifested in the suburban street as soon evaporated. These practices, although specific to the carnival, highlighted the essentially performative nature of imperial and cosmopolitan identities more broadly, and the need to consistently rematerialise physical facades of Empire and world in domestic spaces as antidote to geographic distance.

**TRANSGRESSING NATIONALITY, RACE AND GENDER**

_Crossing National Boundaries_

Alongside earnest expressions of nationhood and imperialism were more playful, usually but not solely individual, performances of alternative nationality. Many processionists and collectors dressed as inhabitants of other western European countries, particularly France, Holland, Italy, Spain and Switzerland. Others opted for further flung climes: there were also representations of Asiatic nationals such as Turks, Indians, Japanese and Chinese; of Americans, including white American stereotyped figures like the cowboy, but also the ‘Red Indian’, the Mexican and the Brazilian; and of people from further flung corners of the globe, such as South Sea Islanders and Eskimos. Gipsies were also heavily represented (see for example Figure 6). Finally, and ubiquitously, there were blackface impersonations.
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649 Figure 6 taken from *Ilford Guardian* (16 Jul 1909).
The intersection between gender and racial representation here was noteworthy. Dressing as Europeans was particularly, though not solely, popular among women processionists and collectors. They also appear to have predominated among participants who costumed themselves as characters hailing from the Near, Middle and Far East, and among those who dressed as gipsies. The exhibition of an exotic sexuality was frequently inherent to this. Most of these participants were clearly younger women, being usually titled ‘Miss’ rather than ‘Mrs’ in the carnival programmes, as was re-emphasised in their assumed personas also frequently being labelled as ‘girls’ or ‘maidens’. The linkage of orientalism in particular with sexuality was clear in the designation of women as harem or Geisha girls, foregrounding sexual
availability within the representation of the oriental woman, and assumedly therefore sexualising processionists within the gaze of some spectators. Other women participated under monikers such as ‘Spanish dancer’ and ‘Indian dancing girl’ drawing attention to the female physique and its display and again equating this with foreignness.

Men meanwhile frequently entered as representations of martial, or more primal, foreign warrior figures whose exoticism was linked to dimensions of masculinity. They often opted. There were for example those who entered dressed as Austrian and Hungarian hussars. Other guises listed in carnival programmes included an Italian brigand, a Viking, a Bedouin Arab, an Assyrian chief and numerous Mexican cowboys and Red Indians. These representations connect to the linkage between British and imperial identity discussed above, whereby a male, militaristic British national identity is dependent upon exotic, overseas spaces (which are markedly different from idealised domestic spaces such as the respectable domesticity if the suburb) in which to fulfil itself. Likewise, male processionists were drawn towards dressing as foreign individuals connected with war, frontiers, wildernesses and travel, embodying both the qualities the British perceived in themselves and the overseas contexts in which they could be realised, even as they impersonated nationalities and races other than their own.

Representations of other peoples were also often attached to social categorisations. There were for example representations of peasants from Germany, Normandy, Switzerland, Russia and Norway. Others involved positions of power, as hinted above: American Indian chiefs, Indian maharajahs, South Sea Island kings. These representations were marked by a picturesque exoticism, emphasised by their referencing pre-modern social structures. This in turn reinforced notions of British superiority over other peoples. Yet paradoxically the vague recognisability of those hierarchical social structures may have served to augment the legitimacy of notions of hierarchical social structures more generally, including in Britain, as well as fulfilling fantasies of sitting at the apex of such structures.

On one level, exotic fancy dress can be interpreted as buttressing existing power structures, in a way bearing some resemblance to imperial exhibitions of the time. The myriad of foreign figures represented in these events constituted the knowledge and taxonomising of the wider world as a means to dominating it. Being able to impersonate the foreigner, and then discard their identity, took this further, turning them from autonomous subject into object of the imagination, an extension of the self through which fantasies could be lived out, but with which identification was ultimately ephemeral. For the crowds that gathered to watch, meanwhile, the inclusion of foreign figures in the procession facilitated the assertion of national power by gaze, designating Briton as watcher and ‘foreigner’ as watched.
Yet the boundaries of national identity were also destabilised in the carnival. While the influence of existing Anglo-centric taxonomies of imperial and global order was evident in the procession, it was not always respected. Alongside elaborate cars paying homage to Empire, there were also more freewheeling ones like the Uphall Schools’ ‘Boys in Fancy Costumes Car’ from 1908, which included an Indian, clowns, navvies, soldier, sailors, tramps, a Brazilian, Boy Blue, a ‘nigger’, a Russian, a coster, and a blacksmith, thereby interspersing recognisably British figures with foreign ones. Moreover, for individual participants the wearing of foreign clothes may also have offered, an opportunity for escaping the Englishness of suburbia and the constraints it involved. The carnival offered a sanctioned space for rejecting class-based and gendered dress codes and to costume oneself as something altogether different. The result was the projection of new identities, still gendered but freed somewhat from specifically national (and lower-middle class) gender codes: for women, this meant instead performing an exotic picturesque attractiveness or alluringness; for men, it meant throwing off the domesticated masculinity of suburbia to adopt a more assertive, aggressive, often primitive one.

An additional inversionary dimension was the manifesting of the foreigner within the domestic, national space of the suburb. The image of alien transgression of British space was a potent one at the time. Firstly, the invasion scare story had since the late Victorian era become a staple of both fiction and latterly the popular press, stoked by worsening rivalry with Germany, with attacks on the Home Counties by invading forces a salient theme of works such as George Tomkyns Chesney’s The Battle of Dorking.650 Secondly, immigration had become a salient issue, with the arrival of Eastern European Jews several miles away in the East End prompting a nativist backlash in the formation of the British Brothers’ League.651 The carnival thus echoed in jest and unreality what had become an unnerving and emotive narrative in other aspects of British popular culture and political debate.

Particularly striking in this regard is the case of the representation of gipsies, given that the actual presence of travellers in the district appears to have been a source of frequent consternation, with Ilford’s Medical Health Officer Dr Paul Stovin remarking in his 1909 report to the UDC that ‘These people again gave us a significant amount of trouble’, noting their tendency to set up camps on presently disused building land, before concluding that ‘it is quite

time the Legislature adopted some stringent measures to prevent these people trespassing upon private lands, living in squalor and under insanitary conditions, and allowing the children to remain uneducated.” Stovin’s words illustrate the partialness of the suburban liberalism discussed elsewhere in this thesis, with some social and ethnic groups deemed excludable through state intervention in order to maintain the freedom of other suburban residents from perceived nuisance, as well as the continual becoming of the suburb, and the realities of wastelands and construction sites behind the rural façade. Yet procession items such as the ‘Gipsy Camp’ depicted in Figure 6, which appeared in the carnival in the same year as Stovin’s diatribe, are indicative of how, within this medium, these alien figures could be exoticised and simultaneously appropriated for the suburb, the squalor of the camp on the building site exchanged for picturesque, feminine costumes and floral decoration, temporarily but cyclically.

Transgressing Racial Boundaries

A further dynamic that must be recognised is that in the case of non-European characters, the performance went beyond the adoption of an alternative ethnicity through dress to the adoption of an alternative race through make-up; cultural markers of difference were complemented by faux-biological ones. This reached its epitome in the myriad of blackface items in the procession. The 1908 Carnival, for example, included men dressed as ‘Negro’, ‘Golliwog’, ‘Nigger’, ‘The Dandy Coloured Coon’, ‘Zulu Chief’, ‘Somali Chief’, and ‘White Eyed Coon’, women dressed as ‘Picaninny’ and in ‘Moorish costume’, and cycling tableaus entitled ‘The Last of the Golliwogs’ and ‘Last of the Chilligowallabadores’. As these item titles suggest, blackface in the Ilford Carnival involved a combination of deeply stereotyped representations of imperial subjects and African Americans.

Michael Pickering has argued that blackface minstrelsy ‘operated as a symbolic homeopathic remedy for alien cultural contact. The implicit recognition of the black that minstrelsy made was countered by a parodic blackface identity accomplished, in an exorcistic ritual, through the reiteration of black racist stereotypes’, but that this was ‘always ambivalent because what was repudiated in the form of racial mockery was at the same time desired’.

Blackface ‘constructed a particular image of the black, a preferred version of blackness that involved a stereotypical fixity for those impersonated, while granting for those performing a theatrically defined interval of license to be other than what was racially defined and identified with whiteness.’\footnote{Michael Pickering, \textit{Blackface Minstrelsy in Britain} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 101.} Pickering therefore identified blackface as ‘a ritualistic vehicle’ which facilitated a temporary journey to and return from a space set aside from ordinary world, ‘a dreamlike realm that at once upturned many features of ordinary, workaday social life, and at the same time stabilized Britain’s standing and sense of itself in the world order’. He argued that it also allowed an escape from Victorian middle class Englishness (with its emphasis on work ethic, moral order, propriety, self-restraint and denial of gratification), with which the minstrel figure wholly contrasted.\footnote{Ibid, pp. 104–105.}

This may essentially hold true for blackface in the carnival as well, which commodified blackness as something white lower middle-class suburbanites could appropriate as consumers, through acquisition of make-up, and then subsequently abandon to continue lives of relative privilege. Furthermore, the perceived comicality of this impersonation lay firstly in the identification of blackness as funny in itself, tapping as they did into a broader set of stereotypes that mocked the ascribed physical and behavioural features of black people; and secondly in the incongruity of white people pretending to be black, thereby inviting collective humoured dismissal of the breaching of racial boundaries and reinforcing a profound sense of difference. Yet it is simultaneously possible that adopting blackface offered the processionist a sense of liberation from the perceived burdens of whiteness, which decreed a sense of duty in both individual behaviour and (connected to it) in engagement with other races, whereas the imputed characteristics of blackness by contrast may have appealed as liberating from constraints of ordinary conduct, within limits.

There were, however, also specificities of context. As an entertainment form, blackface had gathered a rather cross-class appeal, and was performed in a multitude of sites, from music halls to seaside promenades. Yet these were overtly performative sites, with specifically employed entertainers. What the carnival did was turn suburban public space, in which the more common but understated performance was of implicitly white English lower middle-class respectability, into one where representations of blackness, of an imputed lower stratum within the hierarchy of races and Empire, could be made within a space implicitly defined against that of Empire. Furthermore, it is possible – given the prominence bestowed upon the threat of
racial deterioration in contemporary debates – that blackface operated on some level as a parodying and negation of this very threat, among a group identified in some quarters as emblematic of it.

The multiple instances of individuals donning blackface for the processions also highlighted the relationship between Americanisation and racial appropriation. Minstrelsy was a practice borrowed from American theatrical entertainment traditions, these roots being further emphasised by the fact that many participants in the Carnival had labelled themselves as 'Coons' – an American-English derogatory term – for the Carnival programme. The same was true of the substantial number of individuals who participated in the Carnivals dressed as cowboys and Red Indians, an instance of which is demonstrated in Figure 7.\(^{655}\) This acquiescence to American cultural infiltration reflected these representations' compatibility with British ideas of race and conquest. Robert W. Rydell and Rob Kroes, in their analysis of Buffalo Bill's Wild West show's success in Britain and Europe during the late nineteenth century, noted that the show had advanced the message that white Anglo-Saxon civilisation had tamed savagery, turning Native Americans into a source of amusement and ethnographic study, inspiring a shared white racial consciousness and blurring the story of the American West with that of European imperial expansion.\(^{656}\) Western-themed items in the Ilford Carnival similarly offered the cowboy as a figure for identification with and idolisation of, suggesting a feeling of kinship with white Americans that was implicit in the country's regular inclusion in Carnival items expressing British friendship towards other nations. Impersonation of African and Native Americans was therefore both an appropriation of external racial characteristics and of American cultural practices.

**Transgressing Gender Boundaries**

A linked form of potentially transgressive but also inherently conservative performance in the carnival was that of crossdressing. This occupied an uneasy position in British society during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, constituting a not wholly uncontroversial but widely accepted and regular component of theatrical entertainment, but a far more disquieting activity beyond that. Its meanings and interpretations owed much to

\(^{655}\) Figure 7 is taken from Ilford Recorder (15 Jul 1910).

Christopher Breward has stated of contemporary music hall male impersonator Vesta Tilley that she, ‘whatever the precise nature of her costume, utilised its attractive features in combination with the hidden promise of her own body to expose the ambiguity and essential decadence of the male consumer’s gaze, while simultaneously shoring up its reactionary political and sexual prejudices’, and that she incorporated anxieties regarding the feminising effect of consumerism on men ‘into the open secret of her disguise, representing a split in the masculine psyche between the pleasures of consumer culture and its disavowal’. In the case of late Victorian pantomime, with its far more mixed-age audience, Peter Holland has stated that the crossdressing figures of the principal boy and pantomime dame comically mimicked male and female gestures and dress respectively and yet tended to steer clear of implying any underlying gender confusion or transgressive sexual desires. In the context of the First World War, moreover, while female impersonators publically propositioning men were robustly persecuted by the authorities, male impersonation not just of female costume but also of feminine figure and female sexual desire was a common feature of all-male performing troupes behind the frontlines, in what David A. Boxwell has described as instances of ‘mimesis’ rather than ‘mimicry’, which ‘ritualistically desublimated and resublimated the array of inhibitive repressions structuring male bonding during the war’.

Figure 7: Christchurch School children as ‘Cowboys and Indians’ in the 1910 Ilford Carnival.

In the Ilford Carnival, male processionists dressed as women was a recurring feature. The 1908 procession, for example, involved men dressed as ‘Lady Madcap’, the ‘new woman’, ‘A Modern Merveilleuse (or the Feminine Craze)’ (shown in Figure 8), ‘Charlie’s Aunt’, and in a number of instance suffragettes. Crossdressing of this sort both upheld and blurred the lines of gender. On the one hand, it functioned as a disciplining gesture. Some processionists targeted fashion as a form of female aspiration to modernity, relegating women to a subordinate position due to their perceived preoccupation with the apparent and ephemeral. The attacks on the suffragettes were particularly consistent and derisory. One costumed participant had punningly adopted the title of 'Sufferingyet' for the 1908 Carnival; another wore a costume bearing the motto ‘Votes for Women’, while leading a donkey dressed in a Union Jack and trousers. The intention, it would appear, was to reinforce the maleness of the national body politic and to mock those women who desired the vote as unfeminine, delegitimising their aspirations and re-sanctifying gender boundaries through the ludicrousness of their permeation.

Yet there is a flipside to this. The Ilford Carnival also provided suburban, lower middle class men, for whom dress codes were a vital means of expressing status and masculinity, designated time and space for escaping these confines, and for adopting alternative attire in order to publically perform womanhood. Similarly, women also (though to a lesser extent than men) also engaged in male impersonation in the processions, often as the fairy tale or nursery rhyme figures adapted by pantomime for the position of principal boy, such as Prince Charming or Little Boy Blue; men for their part occasionally did likewise, representing characters such as Widow Twankey from Aladdin. The overt (or implicit) referencing of pantomime as precedent for male and female crossdressing in the carnival helped to legitimise what might have been otherwise widely read as a transgressive act, given contemporary concerns over the potentially emasculating effects of suburban life. Furthermore, the carnival procession was a sufficiently open space as to incorporate that which was also mocked, with the Ilford Women’s Social and Political Union also contributing to the procession, entering a ‘British Heroines’ car in 1911, as well as one depicting ‘Queen Philippa of Hainault Saving the Burghers of Calais’ – vehicles presumably intended to emphasise historic female participation in the spheres of heroism and of national politics, in order to assert their right to entry of spheres designated as male in the present day.

660 Figure 8 is taken from Ilford Guardian (17 Jul 1908).
Local newspapers provide a good example of the legitimating narratives that surrounded cross-dressing in the Carnival. One regular carnival day female impersonator was Lewis J. Juppa, who collected annually at Ilford Railway Station dressed as ‘The Ilford Pet: A Jem of a Girl’, shown in costume in Figure 9, with his photo regularly adorning press coverage of the event. In 1911, the *Ilford Recorder* remarked that ‘Mr Juppa makes a passable, even a good looking damsel’, except for the size of his feet, while also suggesting that he shave next time. This description mocked Juppa’s female impersonation, emphasising its falseness through reference to his tell-tale male features. A year earlier, the *Ilford Guardian* had carried a short
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661 Figure 9 taken from *Ilford Recorder* (15 Jul 1910).
662 *Ilford Recorder* (14 Jul 1911).
piece on A. G. Breen, who collected during the Carnival as ‘Miss Snooks’: ‘As “she” danced her way down the Ilford High Road, broad grins were everywhere followed by uproarious laughter, and many a copper was thus won which would otherwise have been lost to the cause’.  Again, the comicality and artifice of the act of female impersonation was emphasised, while the reference to the funds it raised used the philanthropic rationale of the Carnival to justify the act.

Not all of Ilford’s residents accepted this narrative. Following the 1910 carnival, the Ilford Guardian quoted the Vicar of Ilford, the Rev. Arthur Wyndham Ottaway, as having written in St Clement’s Parish Magazine, that ‘It was unfortunate that a good procession, with very many pretty and admirable features in it, should have been so marred by exhibitions of vulgarity and low taste’, adding that ‘so worthy a cause as a hospital should not be connected with such incidents’. He called on the carnival’s organisers to advertise beforehand in future ‘that men masquerading in women's clothes, or women in men's, would not be tolerated’. Such public criticisms were seemingly rare, and crossdressing continued to be tolerated and practiced in later processions, suggesting that the Vicar’s stance placed him in a minority and that the interpretation espoused by the newspapers was shared far more broadly. One Ilford Guardian reader wrote in the following week accusing the local clergy of trying to police the procession, adding, ‘I could see nothing immoral in men dressing up in women’s dress.

Yet even if the Vicar’s view was that of a minority, it does highlight the extent to which carnival inversion could be problematic, particularly in church-replete Ilford, and why the newspapers felt the need to negotiate it in their coverage. Visual evidence also suggests that some elements of procession costumes did obscure the sex of crossdressing processionists, even if others emphasised them. Figure 10, for example, shows a Miss Klingelhöfer dressed as a ‘Gamekeeper’ at the 1914 carnival, for which she was awarded a prize. While her boots and pigtails signposted her femaleness, her tunic de-emphasised her bust in a manner that made her appearance more sexually ambiguous; the Ilford Guardian described her as ‘one of the most striking figures in the carnival’.

663 Ilford Guardian (15 Jul 1910).
664 Ilford Guardian (29 Jul 1910).
665 Ilford Guardian (5 Aug 1910).
666 Figure 10 taken from Ilford Guardian (17 Jul 1914).
667 Ibid.
CONCLUSION

Gendered ideas of national, imperial and racial identity were presented and inverted within the Ilford Carnival. Through commonly used systems of representation and visual emblems – historic kings, flags, flowers, military uniforms, and anthropomorphised nations – contributors projected multi-layered ideas about nation, Empire and the wider world that collectively signified a liberal patriotism based around attachment to home, with its connotations of the rural and female, and an internationalist perspective. Yet processionists also engaged in potentially transgressive practices such as blackface and crossdressing, in which usual performances of nationality, race, class and gender were temporarily abandoned for new ones, in ways that both reinforced boundaries and yet simultaneously emancipated the
performer in a ritual comic manifestation that closely mirrored contemporary fears about racial and male deterioration in the suburbs.

Earnest expressions of national and imperial identity constituted performances of cultural capital, valued for their capacity to generate social, institutional cultural and economic capital within the nascent suburban public sphere, functioning as ideals in themselves and as vessels into which other ideals could all be inserted. Within the context of the suburb, they were perhaps the most important reference points for a sense of place and community, providing a platform through which the local could be constructed. The nation, its armed forces, colonies and alliances were also forms of security into which Ilford’s residents had invested their social, cultural and economic capital, offering psychic reassurance that their liberty to exchange and accumulate of these quantities within the spatialised groups of which they were members – particularly the suburb itself – would not be jeopardised by external threats.

Yet the carnival also comprised a moment when that usually at some level othered in the assemblage and presentation of the self could be reconciled with and reincorporated, however superficially and for whatever agenda. Impersonation at times entailed identifying the self with historic figures, denying one’s own contemporariness for a heightened performance of the national. In some instances, it involved denying one’s membership of the national inner group (England) as part of a collective performance of broader outer groups such as Britain, the Empire, or international alliances. Even the most evidently transgressive performances were conservative in overt intent, displaying power in race and gender relations through public objectification and derision, and reinforcing difference by rendering its transversion ridiculous. However, carnival also revealed and alleviated the strain of maintaining more regular performances of nationhood, race and gender, illustrating how they could be reversed in socially sanctioned times and spaces. It allowed parts of the self normally concealed, or qualities which were covertly desired but not ordinarily accepted as part of the self and its projection, to be appropriated and showcased; in this respect, the carnival could be interpreted as the backstage to everyday presentations of self. Yet more than this, because the everyday was and is made up of a series of performances, of which carnival was one, national, racial and gender impersonation involved for performer and audience a reworking of which performances were acceptable when and where, in a manner that might be incorporated into future, apparently normative presentations. Within the fluidity of the suburban public sphere, therefore, carnival could reify or challenge the bases of these interlinked taxonomies, just as life in the suburb more broadly could both confirm and confound what it was more widely understood to be a white English man or woman in this period.
CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

Thesis Overview

This thesis has utilised the Ilford Carnival to examine suburban life at the start of the twentieth century, and explain the continued significance of a longstanding cultural form like carnival within this context. Part I illustrated how carnival was adopted in Britain firstly as an abstract concept to connote ritual, revelry and spectacle, often for commercial purposes, and subsequently as a fundraising event primarily centred on a procession but becoming increasingly multifaceted over time. It also framed the Ilford Carnival within the setting of Ilford itself, which expanded rapidly from village to London suburb over the 1890s and 1900s, attracting former residents of London and its older suburbs along with inhabitants from further afield. Ilford possessed a mainly lower middle-class population, whose residents in paid employment were predominantly, though not solely, commuters; it was also a popular site for young couples to start families in, although by the second half of the 1900s its population was starting to mature. It also had a flourishing associational culture, abetted by new forms of commercial leisure provision.

Part II of the thesis was concerned with the anatomy of the Ilford Carnival movement and the broader networks that supported it. The carnival’s organisational framework was rooted in the district’s administrative geography, and, with the aid of new communication networks, individuals and organisations were able to engage in a collective performance of local community; however, the carnival also drew participants, press coverage and spectators from other parts of the metropolis too, particularly neighbouring suburbs. Examining the carnival committees’ composition in greater detail illustrated that while longer standing residents may have been overrepresented and new arrivals underrepresented in 1905, this was no longer the case by 1911. Men employed in local public service and enterprise were prominent among committee membership, but so too were commuting white-collar workers, who also
increasingly joined alongside their wives and adult children, reflecting Ilford’s maturing population and the relationship between familial relationships and suburban associational culture.

Part III of the thesis considered the carnival’s different dimensions. The event proved essential to supporting the construction of a hospital following Ilford’s drastic population growth, despite shortcomings in the processional fundraising model, with enthusiasm for it rooted in ideological commitment to charity and a culture of voluntary action in which considerable cultural, social and economic capital was invested, while the carnival also helped strengthened ties between community and local hospital. The procession itself functioned as an inversionary spectacle – with all entries operating on a spectrum between sincerity and artifice, and drawing upon other popular cultural sources to ensure they appealed to the watching crowds – whose entertainment and potentially transgressive aspects were justified through reference to its charitable rationale. The carnival was itself commodified through media coverage, businesses advertising in the procession, and different schemes of rewarding and even paying processionists. The carnival embraced novelty and tradition and provided a new ritual around which a sense of suburban place could be built, but also adhered to broader arrangements of work and leisure time in London.

Finally, Part IV of the thesis considered the different identities projected in and around the carnival. The Ilford Carnival offered an opportunity for reimagining the district, both as site of enchantment and cultural centrality and as timeless rural haven; for waging local rivalries, revealing tensions between commuters and the locally employed, and between remnants of the pre-suburban economy and new residents; and for both respectable and transgressive working-class performances. The plotting of its procession route also required ward committees to compile narratives of locality through engagement with the suburban built environment, as well as influencing processionists’ and spectators’ own perceptions and enactments of suburban place. Procession items projected national and imperial identities too, using common forms of symbolic communication that, while possessing their own nuances, evoked a shared liberal patriotism that was both outward-looking and built around gendered ideas of home, illustrating shared values that a sense of community could be built around and bringing contributors recognition for their performances. Yet at the same time, national, racial and gendered identities were frequently inverted by blackface and crossdressing processionists, who while often conservative in intention were nonetheless freed through the act from everyday restraints on conduct and appearance.
Structure of this Conclusion

This Conclusion demonstrates the wider significances of these findings by drawing insights from them in relation to two broader historical themes. Firstly, it considers them in connection to the wider history of carnival, discussing how it illustrates carnival’s development in the wake of industrialisation and the expansion of commercial leisure provision, and of the transformation of both global and urban geographies by advancements in communication. Secondly, it frames the thesis’s findings within the history of London’s suburbs, using the Ilford Carnival to shed light on how these emerged as a new stage in the history of urbanism, how the impact of and challenges to traditional liberalism and voluntarism were embodied and experienced there, and how ideas of the nation helped to create a shared sense of suburban place and provided suburbanites with a source of cultural and social capital.

THE ILFORD CARNIVAL AND THE HISTORY OF CARNIVAL

Carnival and Modern Leisure

Carnival was rooted in a premodern circular conceptualisation of time, based around the natural and Christological year. By the nineteenth century, time in Europe had not only come to be perceived as linear, but also as undergoing irrevocable technological, social, cultural and political change. Furthermore, amid spreading urbanisation and industrialisation, the dominant temporal cycle was increasingly the week, around which work and spare time were subsequently organised. Yet in this same period, carnival not only underwent a revival in some places, but in others was introduced for the first time. The different agendas the Ilford Carnival fulfilled help explain this paradox. Firstly, in the face of irrevocable technological, social, cultural and political change, carnival offered a ritual that could be interpreted as a fixed institution whose repetition was guaranteed. As shown in Chapter One, such meanings were
frequently applied to other annually recurring leisure events in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Britain. Conversely, carnival could also function as unique counterpoint to the drudgery of everyday life, facilitating conduct that might be deemed as transgressive at other points in time. The Ilford Carnival was regularly interpreted in this way, and its singularity as an occasion served as a bulwark against conservative critiques of its inversionary elements. As well as its rich lexical resonance of ritual and revelry, carnival’s longevity might just as easily be attributed to its lack of formal rudiments. Carnival has been adaptive and adaptable; local custom and adjacent example might strongly influence content – hence the ubiquity of the procession – but organisers and participants have been able to integrate their own leisure preferences into it and eschew those elements that no longer appeal. In the case of Ilford, this entailed both appending the procession with other entertainment forms, as well as drawing on other media for costume and vehicle themes, thereby blending a ‘tradition’ (that was really rather new) with ‘contemporary’ elements (which in some cases were really rather old) in a manner somewhat typical of turn-of-the-century modernity and its negotiation. Furthermore, carnival has endured because, at its base, it has always entailed the accumulation of people together in set times and spaces, facilitating accumulation and exchanges of capital (social, cultural and increasingly economic) through transactional and quasi-transactional relations. In the case of Ilford, as well as elsewhere in Britain during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, that made it a valuable, if imperfect, fundraising tool for charitable causes.

The Geographies of Carnival

It was argued in the Introduction to this thesis that the history of carnival illustrated how imperial expansion and advancements in communication facilitated the development of a global, but disjointed and adulterated, Catholic culture. The history of carnival in Britain, which had repudiated and divested itself from that same culture during the early modern period, draws attention both to carnival’s Catholic-ness, and to how this was hybridised within different local and national contexts. The expansion of the press and of international travel facilitated the development of a European sphere of cultural dissemination through which Britain became increasingly familiar with carnival and yet its own sense of national distinction from continental Europe, rooted to a large degree in religious difference, heightened its recognition
of carnival’s Catholic foreignness, and the need for persistent rhetorical gymnastics in order to domesticate Britain’s own emerging carnival tradition, as visible from some of the examples given in both Chapters One and Six. Furthermore, the historic absence of carnival from Britain rendered its traditional place in the Christological calendar an irrelevance there, hence the diversity of dates on which carnival was held, influenced rather by local and secular circumstances in the case of Ilford, or in the instance of Bonfire carnivals, ironically by a national tradition previously marked by expression of anti-Catholic sentiments. This emphasises the importance of religious context and of the existence (or not) of medieval and early modern precedents in determining where, when and how carnival has been held in modern history.

Carnival and suburbanisation were partly facets of and partly reactions to urbanisation. Both arose from accumulating numbers of people being drawn to cities by expanding urban economies. Yet whereas carnival historically manifested a desire for public congregation in the city for revelry free from the constraints usually in operation there (such as work, judgement by others, and so forth) and to invert existing social hierarchies and values, suburbanisation owed much to a desire to escape the crowdedness of the city while continuing to access its employment opportunities, and to protect and enhance status. In this respect, carnival’s appearance in London’s suburbs from the late Victorian period onwards might appear something of an anomaly, but in fact it points to a more nuanced interpretation of carnival and its place in the modern city. Firstly, the desire for privacy and domesticity manifested in suburbia at this time did not entail a rejection of congregation per se, providing it was on the suburbanite’s own terms. Organising, participating in and spectating at carnivals thus continued to offer opportunities for accruing and exchanging social and cultural capital. Secondly, while some of the examples of inversion discussed in this thesis appear somewhat tame or apolitical in comparison with common conceptions of carnivals in early modern Europe or the contemporary Americas, their transgressive aspects ought not to be dismissed. Carnival inversion ought to be interpreted in terms of the society that hosted it; in the case of Ilford, its carnival involved public breaches of norms of dress and conduct that would not have occurred outside carnival time. If the most blatant forms of inversion appear to have been conservative, targeting groups such as the working class, women and non-whites, and thereby serving to preserve rather than challenge class, gender and racial hierarchies, this

was true also of carnival in late medieval and early modern Europe, and the potentially multilayered meanings of ostensibly crude stereotyping ought not to be ignored either. Thirdly, the rapid pace of suburbanisation meant that, as at earlier stages in the history of urban development, carnival fulfilled a vital communal function as a nascent public sphere in which relative newcomers could perform and expand their social networks, and develop a sense of place. Fourthly, the manner in which the Ilford Carnival was organised to cohere with the wider organisation of work and leisure time in London is illuminative as to how the relationship between local carnivals and metropolitan temporalities functions depending upon the locality’s level of integration with the broader urban economy, and how carnivals more generally have had to compromise with the temporal schemata of networks beyond the host district or city that nonetheless impact upon it.

THE ILFORD CARNIVAL AND THE HISTORY OF LONDON’S SUBURBS

Suburbia and the Metropolis

The Ilford Carnival provided insights into Edwardian suburbia’s relationship with the city more broadly. The suburb was a new configuration of the urban, but also a post-agricultural space, in which land formerly given over to primary production now provided a site of consumption – residential, with attached service sector – that was developed, marketed and represented as a leisured approximation of its former guise, in which economistic elements were denied or converted to spectacle. The domestic garden in its suburban ubiquity was illustrative of this, with residents being allocated land to work, but primarily for leisured, economically non-productive purposes. The carnival evinced how suburban residents and businesses engaged with and participated in this presentation of suburban life, through adaptation of rural and floral themes, as well as picturesque caricatures of the rural economy, often with a view to advertising the actual suburban service economy.

669 In many ways this prefigured the process beginning at the tail end of the twentieth century in which parts of inner London were likewise given over to consumptive and decorative use once they were no longer economically viable as industrial sites in the face of overseas competition.
Yet despite this disavowal of the urban, and by association, work, the suburb also functioned as a productive metropolitan location, if production is defined not in reductive economic terms, but in the theatrical sense, as a performance in which disparate elements are woven together in a new presentation, in which cultural capital is invested and through it transmitted. In this respect, the demarcation between consumer and producer breaks down, as capital of varying forms is exchanged and attained through transactional interpretations and performances. Reinterpreting the metropolitan geography of production in this light, we are required to recalibrate the Edwardian suburb’s position, from spatially peripheral and economically dependent, to greater centrality as a maker of meaning, a generator and evaluator of capital. The Ilford Carnival was illustrative of this, in the way it used direct and mediated cultural flows from metropolitan industries to generate economic capital for the hospital, social capital for its organisers and recognition for the cultural capital of its processionists; the coverage of the carnival by the national media, meanwhile, entailed a commodification of suburban cultural capital and yet also served to bestow broader recognition upon that cultural capital, and in doing so facilitate higher returns on it during subsequent carnivals through greater attendances.

Suburbia and the Revision of Liberalism

London’s suburbs were a physical manifestation of classical liberalism but also of its limitations and discontents. It was partly an outcome of the lower middle classes’ desire to carve out a social space for themselves in which they could construct a moral universe from their own value systems and grow their social networks, and partly of relatively unconstrained market forces. Yet inequality of access to the suburb reflected broader inequality in London and Britain more generally, as well as strategies of exclusion by property and transport providers. Furthermore, the exodus to the suburbs was also a response to dissatisfaction with earlier facets of the liberal city, including health and sanitation problems and the free intermingling of different classes.

At the same time, attacks on the suburbs by writers and intellectuals were also partly in response to the erosion of their own privileged position within a liberal society. The suburb was itself therefore also a product of declining inequality, the decreasing value of rural land central to the incomes of the wealthiest and rising real wages enabling the expanding lower
middle classes to acquire it for residential purposes. Suburban associational culture was illustrative of this group’s increasing organisational confidence, also evident in their involvement in suburban local politics. Britain’s growing popular cultural industries also catered to this group, increasingly equipped time and money to spare, with the result that the valuation and quantities of their cultural capital was elevated too. Rather than being a site of declining civic responsibility, the suburb was a harbinger of a more democratic society and active citizenship, in which allocation of increasing volumes of land for better quality housing (often on or beyond the urban periphery) for a growing share of the population was a key component.

The Ilford Carnival embodied this – a liberal space within a liberal space. The event’s ward committees likewise had no ostensible barriers to entry and generated new opportunities for social capital accumulation. There was also no set cost of entry or attendance of the procession, donations being solicited but not compulsory, and no overarching theme imposed on the procession, with entrants possessing relative freedom to perform as they wished. It was, therefore, a space in which suburbanites could express their own cultural capital as evaluated in their own terms. Yet there were also covert barriers to entry and constraints on performance, with larger scale items requiring significant investment in terms of time, resources, and social and cultural capital, while the performance implicitly required the sanction of the ward committee organising the contingent in question. There were further incentives to expected performance through crowd reaction, media coverage and prize categories. Nor within this public sphere, with a relationship between performers and audience that approached the transactional but was still voluntary and reliant upon moral obligation, could the former rely on the latter to adhere to their expectations in contributing liberally and spectating law-abidingly.

These tensions and transitions in liberalism were most apparent in relation to welfare. Despite expanding state provision during the Edwardian period, hospitals remained voluntary institutions and suburban carnivals offer evidence why this state of affairs was not more vigorously challenged, as well as to seeds of change already being sewn. Discourse surrounding these events stressed the value of charity as virtuous in itself, as well as sometimes warning
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670 For a discussion of property and its distribution during this period, see Harris, Private Lives, Public Spirit, pp. 96–122.
671 For long-term trends in changing ideas of citizenship during this time, see Beaven and Griffiths, ‘Creating the Exemplary Citizen’. For the subsequent suburbanisation of the working classes, see Olechnowicz, ‘Working-Class Housing in England between the Wars’ for the interwar period, and Clapson, Brave New Towns for the post-Second World War era.
against the loss of altruism inherent in any shift to state funding. Yet this rhetoric did not wholly reflect reality. Firstly, these events formed part of a wider culture of voluntary action, welfare-oriented or not, through which social capital could be accumulated – an investment of work and effort, rather than a sacrifice. Secondly, financing the establishment and maintenance of suburban hospitals was often more an act of collective self-interest, as local hospital provision came to be seen as a necessity, than of selfless giving. In its first year of operation, the Ilford Emergency Hospital treated significantly more paying than non-paying patients. For the suburban lower middle classes, furthermore, fundraising for these new or growing institutions provided a potential conduit through which they could become involved in the governance of hospitals and ensure their influence over healthcare provision. Finally, carnivals entailed a move towards a transactional fundraising model, with reliance on benevolence decreasing further with the shift from processions towards ticketed leisure provision. They constituted, like insurance and subscription schemes, a move away from charity as traditionally understood, in turn paving the way for the establishment of the National Health Service in the 1940s.672

Suburbia and Nationhood

By the onset of the twentieth century, Britain possessed a culture that was increasingly national, or at least conceived in this way, and a sense of itself as a national community bounded by shared characteristics, reinforced by ideological investment in a project of imperial expansion and emergent ideas of race and racial hierarchy. It also provided a richly connotative array of imagery into which a number of ideas could be packed. The case of the Ilford Carnival illustrates how important this was in a suburban context, with conceptions of national (and imperial) community and identity providing a base for establishing and presenting notions of local community and identity within a district whose population had mostly spent only part of their lives living there and whose adult male residents were often employed in roles entailing regular contact with national and imperial administration and trade.

This thesis does not quite follow Richard N. Price’s reduction of lower middle-class jingoism to a need for patriotic consensus in the face of internal and external challenges as a

---

672 For the transition from a voluntary system of healthcare provision towards nationalisation, and the role of middle-class support in this, see Paul Bridgen, ‘Voluntary Failure, the Middle Classes, and the Nationalisation of the British Voluntary Hospitals, 1900–1946’, in Bernard Harris and Paul Bridgen (eds.), Charity and Mutual Aid in Europe and North America since 1800 (Routledge: New York and Abingdon, 2007), pp. 212–36.
means of staving off status and socioeconomic insecurities. For a start, it has rather sought to highlight this group’s status consciousness but also their security, confidence and assertiveness, possessing high levels of social and cultural capital as they perceived it. Secondly, and perhaps owing to the different intellectual currents of the Edwardian period, the national identity expressed in the Ilford Carnival was more nuanced, possessing military and pacifist elements, with concepts of domesticity and rurality projected among representations of security and solidarity among Britain’s four nations, it wider empire, and international alliances. Nonetheless, however sincerely held these ideals were, examining their expression through a suburban carnival is illustrative of how their expression could also demonstrate righteousness and conformity to the values of their audience, and the additional benefits this might bring in public life more widely, as well as the additional emphasis on visuality and playful inversion encouraged by the medium. This emphasises the need to interpret national identities more broadly within their local and performative contexts, as a means of understanding why so much store is set by them, why they persist over time, and yet why their nuances fluctuate.

**CONCLUSION**

Carlo Ginzburg characterised microhistory as marked by emphasis on context and by the study of ‘the anomalous, not the analogous’. This is certainly true of how this thesis has treated the Ilford Carnival, and hopefully it has justified this approach. ‘Carnival’ and ‘suburbia’ might appear to make for unusual bedfellows, but that paradox is what make it valuable as a subject for analysis. A carnival, because of its inversionary aspects, in relation to time, space and presentation, provides an insight into the nature and contingency of normalcy, revealing to the historian that which is dominant and yet hidden in plain sight within a host culture, and in what circumstances and to what extent it could be abandoned. Yet carnival also

---

675 Ginzburg, ‘Microhistory’ (p. 33).
demonstrates the specific, performative nature of the expression of even the most apparently normative values, illustrating the omnipresence of performance and the particularities of each individual case, and in turn reveals that carnival is perhaps not so opposed to the everyday as it first appears, nor the everyday so anodyne. In this respect, the Ilford Carnival gives lie to the stereotype of the dull, anonymous suburb, providing an insight into early twentieth-century suburban life in all its richness and diversity.
Figure 1: Populations of the County of London, the Outer Ring and Greater London, 1801–1921.\textsuperscript{676}

\textsuperscript{676} Data for Figure 1 is taken from GRO, \textit{Census of England and Wales 1921. County of London. Tables (Part I)}, p. 1.
Figure 2: Rates of population growth in Middlesex (Outer Ring), Essex (Outer Ring), the Outer Ring, and the County of London, 1851–1921.\textsuperscript{677}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.png}
\caption{Rates of population growth in Middlesex (Outer Ring), Essex (Outer Ring), the Outer Ring, and the County of London, 1851–1921.}
\end{figure}

Figure 3: Birthplaces of residents of Outer Ring Essex UDs with more than 50,000 people enumerated there, 1911.\(^{678}\)

Figure 4: Birthplaces of residents of Middlesex UDs with more than 50,000 people enumerated there, 1911.
Figure 5: Places of enumeration for individuals born in Outer Ring Essex UDsWith more than 50,000 people enumerated there, 1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>West Ham</th>
<th>East Ham</th>
<th>Ilford</th>
<th>Leyton</th>
<th>Walthamstow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in England and Wales</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex, Hertfordshire, Surrey and Kent</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Essex</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Blue: Elsewhere in England and Wales
- Orange: Middlesex, Hertfordshire, Surrey and Kent
- Gray: Elsewhere in Essex
- Brown: London
- Purple: Within district
Figure 6: Places of enumeration for individuals born in Middlesex UD's with more than 50,000 people enumerated there, 1911.
Figure 7: Detailed breakdown of occupations of residents of Ilford aged 10 and upwards, 1911.679

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATIONS AT AGES 10 YEARS AND UPWARDS</th>
<th>Total Males</th>
<th>% of Males</th>
<th>Total Females</th>
<th>% of Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OCCUPIED AND UNOCCUPIED</td>
<td>27,675</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>34,450</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired or Unoccupied</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>26,050</td>
<td>75.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in Occupations</td>
<td>21,565</td>
<td>77.92</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. GENERAL OR LOCAL GOVT. OF THE COUNTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National Government</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local Government</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. DEFENCE OF THE COUNTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Army (at Home)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Navy and Marines (Ashore and in Port)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. PROFESSIONAL OCCUPATIONS AND THEIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBORDINATE SERVICES</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clerical</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergymen, Priests, Ministers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Legal</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barristers, Solicitors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Clerks</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Medical</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians, Surgeons, Registered Practitioners</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwives, Sick Nurses, Invalid Attendants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Literary, Scientific, and Political</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engineers and Surveyors</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 8. Art, Music, Drama, etc.</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. DOMESTIC OFFICES OR SERVICES</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Domestic Indoor Service</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Hotels, Lodging, and Eating Houses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Domestic Indoor Servants</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Domestic Outdoor Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Service</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, Institution, &amp; Benevolent Society Service</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Girls, Day Servants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charwomen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Workers, Washers, Ironers, Manglers, etc.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

679 Data for Figure 6 is taken from GRO, Census of England and Wales, 1911. Vol. X.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. COMMERCIAL OCCUPATIONS</th>
<th>5,833</th>
<th>21.08</th>
<th>942</th>
<th>2.73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Merchants, Agents, and Accountants</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Travellers</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commercial or Business Clerks</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4. Dealers in Money ; Insurance</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers ; Bank - Officials, Clerks</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life, House, Ship, etc. Insurance - Officials, Clerks, etc.</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. CONVEYANCE OF MEN, GOODS, AND MESSAGES</td>
<td>2,537</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. On Railways</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway - Officials, Clerks</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On Roads</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachmen (not Domestic) ; Cabmen</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsekeepers, Grooms, Stablemen (not Domestic)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Car Drivers (not Domestic) ; Motor Cab, Motor Van, etc. – Drivers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen, Carriers, Carters, Wagoners (not Farm)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van, etc. - Guards, Boys</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On Seas, Rivers, and Canals</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In Docks, Harbours, etc.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In Storage, Porterage, and Messages</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messengers, Porters, Watchmen (not Railway or Govt.)</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. AGRICULTURE (On Farms, Woods, and Gardens)</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, Graziers ; Farm Workers</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labourers, Farm Servants</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners (not Domestic) ; Nurserymen, Seedsmen</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. FISHING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. IN AND ABOUT, AND WORKING AND DEALING IN THE PRODUCTS OF, MINES AND QUARRIES</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Workers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dealers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. METALS, MACHINES, IMPLEMENTS, AND CONVEYANCES</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2. Iron, Steel, etc. Manufacture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General Engineering, and Machine Making</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironfounders</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths, Strikers</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erectors, Fitters, Turners (including Labourers)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Electrical Apparatus</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8. Tools ; Dies, etc. ; Arms ; Misc. Metal Trades</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ships and Boats</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vehicles</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle and Motor Car - Makers, Mechanics</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dealers</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. PRECIOUS METALS, JEWELS, WATCHES, INSTRUMENTS, AND GAMES</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. BUILDING, AND WORKS OF CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. House Building, etc.</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builders' Labourers</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters, Joiners (including Labourers)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayers, Bricklayers' Labourers</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons, Masons' Labourers</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters, Decorators, Glaziers</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other Works of Construction, and Roads</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navvies, etc. ; Paviours, Road Labourers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. WOOD, FURNITURE, FITTINGS, DECORATIONS</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Makers ; French Polishers ; Upholsterers</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workers in Furniture, Fittings, etc.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in Wood and Bark</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. BRICK, CEMENT, POTTERY, AND GLASS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. CHEMICALS, OIL, GREASE, SOAP, RESIN, ETC.</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. and 3. Colouring Matter ; Drugs, Chemicals, etc.</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemists, Druggists</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explosives and Matches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Oil, Grease, Soap, Resin, etc.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. SKINS, LEATHER, HAIR, AND FEATHERS</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Skins and Leather</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Saddlery and Harness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hair and Feathers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dealers in Skins, Leather, Hair, and Feathers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. PAPER, PRINTS, BOOKS, AND STATIONERY</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Box, Bag-Makers ; Stationery Manufacture</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers, Lithographers</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookbinders</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers, Booksellers, Stationers, Newsagents, and other Dealers</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. TEXTILE FABRICS</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5. Textile Manufactures</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bleaching, Printing, Dyeing, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dealers (Drapers and others)</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX. DRESS</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmakers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirt Makers, Seamstresses</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot, Shoe, Slipper, Patten, Clog - Makers</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wig Makers, Hairdressers</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. FOOD, TOBACCO, DRINK, AND LODGING</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Food</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milksellers, Dairymen</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers, Meat Salesmen</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread, Biscuit, Cake, etc. – Makers</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers, Confectioners (Dealers)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocers ; Tea, Coffee, Chocolate - Dealers</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dealers</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tobacco</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Manufacture</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacconists</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Makers of Spirituous Drinks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Board, Lodging, &amp; Dealing in Spirituous Drinks</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee, Eating, Lodging, Boarding – Housekeepers</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inn, Hotel - Keepers ; Publicans, etc.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellarmen ; Beer Bottlers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barmen</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiters (not Domestic)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others in Inn, Hotel, Eating House, etc. – Service</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine and Spirit - Merchants, Agents</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI. GAS, WATER, AND ELECTRICITY SUPPLY, AND SANITARY SERVICE</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gas, Water, Electricity</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sanitary Service</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII. OTHER, GENERAL, AND UNDEFINED WORKERS AND DEALERS</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General - Shopkeepers, Dealers ; Pawnbrokers</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costermongers, Hawkers, Street Sellers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News - Boys, Vendors (Street or undefined)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Labourers</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine - Boys, Vendors, Stokers, Firemen (not Railway, Marine, or Agricultural)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII. WITHOUT SPECIFIED OCCUPATIONS OR UNOCCUPIED</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>26,050</td>
<td>75.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired (not Army or Navy) ; Pensioners</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Means</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others aged 10 years and upwards (including Scholars and Students)</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>24,399</td>
<td>70.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 8: Occupations of male residents aged 10 (as percentages) of Middlesex and Outer Ring Essex UDs with populations of over 20,000, 1911.\(^\text{680}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Barking</th>
<th>Ilford</th>
<th>East Ham</th>
<th>Leyton</th>
<th>Wanstead</th>
<th>West Ham</th>
<th>Acton</th>
<th>Chessington</th>
<th>Ealing</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Finchley</th>
<th>Hendon</th>
<th>Hatton &amp; Keyworth</th>
<th>Hounslow</th>
<th>Sandall</th>
<th>Southgate</th>
<th>Tooting</th>
<th>Twickenham</th>
<th>Willesden</th>
<th>Wood Green</th>
<th>Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired or Unoccupied</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General or Local Government</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence of the Country</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Occupations and their Subordinate Services</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Outdoor Service</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Indoor and Other Service</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants, Agents, Accountants; Banking, etc.; Insurance</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial or Business Clerks</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Railways</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Roads</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Seas, Rivers, and Canals</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock Labourers, Wharf Labourers, Coalheavers; Coal - Porters, Labourers</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messengers, Porters, Watchmen (not Railway or Government)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others in Conveyance of Men, Goods, and Messages</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture - On Farms, Woods, and Gardens</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal and Shale Mine - Workers (including Mine Service)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others working in and about, and in the products of, Mines and Quarries</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Engineering, and Machine Making</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 2.8 | 7.5 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 2.9 |
|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Electrical Apparatus          | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| Ships and Boats               | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| Cycles, Coaches, and other Vehicles | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 5.5 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Precious Metals, Jewels, Watches, Instruments, and Games | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| Building, and Works of Construction | 8.1 | 5.4 | 8.6 | 8.3 | 10.8 | 6.8 | 9.8 | 8.7 | 9.8 | 11.6 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 9.6 | 5.9 | 10.7 | 6.6 | 11.7 | 10.2 | 11.7 | 10.3 | 7.6 | 6.9 |
| Wood, Furniture, Fittings, and Decorations | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 5.1 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 1.9 |
| Brick, Plain Tile, Terra-Cotta - Makers | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Earthenware, China, Porcelain, Glass - Manufacture | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Chemicals, Explosives, Oil, Grease, Soap, etc. | 10.5 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| Skins, Leather, Saddlery, and Harness | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 |
| Printers and Lithographers | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 0.9 |
| Others in Paper, Prints, Books, and Stationery (excluding Stationers, Booksellers, Publishers, Newspaper Agents, and other Dealers) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| Textile Manufactures | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 2.9 |
| Textile Bleaching, Printing, Dyeing, etc. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Tailors | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 0.9 |
| Boot, Shoe, Slipper, Patten, Clog-Makers | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Other Workers in Dress | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.6 |
| Drapers, Linen Drapers, Mercers, and Dealers in Dress | 0.7 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| Food, Tobacco, Drink, and Lodging | 6.4 | 7.0 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 7.4 | 9.4 | 8.2 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 8.5 | 7.1 | 8.7 | 6.5 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 9.3 | 6.7 |
| General Labourers; Factory Labourers (undefined) | 4.7 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 2.2 |
| All Other Occupations | 14.3 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 6.1 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 7.4 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 4.5 |
Figure 9: Occupations of female residents aged 10 (as percentages) of Middlesex and Outer Ring Essex UDsWith populations of over 20,000, 1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Acton</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Finchley</th>
<th>Hendon</th>
<th>Heston &amp; Heston</th>
<th>Hendon</th>
<th>Ickenham</th>
<th>Sandal</th>
<th>Southgate</th>
<th>Tottenham</th>
<th>Twickenham</th>
<th>Willesden</th>
<th>Wood Green</th>
<th>Enfield</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>England and Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired or Unoccupied</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service, Telegraph, Telephone -</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal, Parish, etc, Officers, Hospital</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Institution Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwives, Sick Nurses, Invalid</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary, Scientific, Political, Art,</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Hotels, Lodging, and Eating Houses</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Domestic Indoor Servants</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charwomen, Day Girls, Day Servants</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry and Washing Service</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others engaged in Service</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial, Bank, Insurance and Law</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture: On Farms, Woods, and Gardens</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals, Machines, Implements, and</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyances (including Electrical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makers of Jewellery, Watches, Instruments, and Tackle for Sports and Games</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Furniture, Fittings, and</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals, Explosives, Oil, Grease,</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

322
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skins, Leather, Saddlery, and Harness</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair and Feathers</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, Prints, Books, and Stationery (excluding Stationers, Booksellers, Publishers, Newspaper Agents, and other Dealers)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Manufactures (including Dyeing, etc.)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapers, Linen Drapers, Mercers and Dealers in Dress</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoresses</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliners</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmakers</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staymakers, shirtmakers, and seamstresses</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot, Shoe, Slipper, Patten, Clog-Makers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workers in Dress</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-Workers</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food-Dealers, General Shopkeepers, and Dealers</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee, Eating, Lodging-House Keepers</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Occupations</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service, Telegraph, Telephone - Service</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal, Parish, etc., Officers, Hospital and Institution Service</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwives, Sick Nurses, Invalid Attendants</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary, Scientific, Political, Art, Music and Drama</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Hotels, Lodging, and Eating Houses</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 10: Locations of workplaces of residents of Outer Ring Essex UDAs with populations of over 20,000, 1921.\textsuperscript{681}

Figure 11: Locations of workplaces of residents of Middlesex UDsWith populations of over 20,000, 1921.
Figure 12: Married shares of male residents aged over 15 enumerated in Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex suburbs with populations of over 50,000, 1911.\textsuperscript{[682]}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure12.png}
\caption{Married shares of male residents aged over 15 enumerated in Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex suburbs with populations of over 50,000, 1911.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{[682]} Data for Figure 12 is taken from GRO, \textit{Census of England and Wales, 1911. Vol. VII}, pp. 1–2, 13–14, 52–56, 97–100.
Figure 13: Births per thousand residents of Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex UDsWith populations of over 20,000, 1911.\textsuperscript{683}

Figure 14: Distribution of households by numbers of members in Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex UDs with populations of over 20,000, 1911.\textsuperscript{684}

Figure 15: Ages in decennial groups of male residents of Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex UD\s with populations of over 20,000, 1911.\footnote{Data for Figures 15 and 16 is drawn from GRO, Census of England and Wales. 1911. Vol. VII, pp. xlix, liii, lix, 52–56, 97–100.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>0 to 9</th>
<th>10 to 19</th>
<th>20 to 29</th>
<th>30 to 39</th>
<th>40 to 49</th>
<th>50 to 59</th>
<th>60 to 69</th>
<th>70 to 79</th>
<th>80 to 89</th>
<th>90+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finchley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totterden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wondersden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16: Ages in decennial groups of female residents of Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex UDs with populations of over 20,000, 1911.
Figure 17: People per place of worship in Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex UDs with populations of over 20,000, 1911.

Figure 18: People per pub, hotel or inn in Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex UDs with populations of over 20,000, 1911.

Figure 19: People per acre (y-axis) versus people per pub, hotel or inn (x-axis) in Outer Ring Essex and Middlesex UDhs with populations of over 20,000, 1911.687
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