

A New Feminist Venture: Work, Professionalism and the Modern Woman

Time and Tide made its first appearance before the public on 14 May 1920 and attracted a high degree of media interest; both national and provincial newspapers complimented the new weekly on its independent outlook, its interesting and readable content, and its fine list of contributors.¹ Curiosity in the new venture was aroused particularly by its all-female board of directors; as one contemporary reader later recalled, '[a]s a journalistic innovation made exclusively by women the experiment intrigued us' (Brittain 1940: 142). This perception that *Time and Tide* was doing something new in contemporary journalism is important. According to its founder, Lady Rhondda, *Time and Tide* was 'a paper of a class that has never been run by women before', and from the outset it sought to distinguish itself not only from mainstream organs of the press but from other feminist periodicals too.² Yet, for all its appearance as a new feminist venture, in the history of feminist publishing *Time and Tide* in fact drew on a long tradition of periodicals run by women, including 'movement and advocacy papers, avant-garde periodicals, literary reviews aimed at feminist readers, and more' (Green 2009: 191). The early years of the twentieth century saw an upsurge of feminist periodicals published in association with the women's suffrage movement, and many of *Time and Tide*'s first contributors were drawn from these periodical networks. As this chapter will show, *Time and Tide*'s early promoters were keenly aware of their competitors in the feminist periodical market and savvy in their use of existing traditions at the same time as they departed from them. Michael North reminds us that '[t]o innovate is, in Latin at any rate,

to renew or to reform, not to start over afresh', and arguably periodicals have a particularly strong purchase on what North describes as 'the complex nature of the new' (2013: 3; 69). As Faith Binckes discusses:

The very periodicity of magazines implies a textual culture with an almost infinite capacity to renew itself and an equally prodigious capacity to reproduce itself. It is hard to imagine a form more suited to the construction of newness, but a newness consistently contested, competitive and remade. (2010: 55)

Time and Tide was remarkably adept at reinventing itself over the course of its long lifespan; during its first two decades, this modern feminist magazine repeatedly updated and renewed its image, and worked competitively to extend into new markets. In the opening section of the present chapter I examine *Time and Tide's* 'construction of newness' in the context of early twentieth-century feminist print culture, and explore the ways in which it established its modern identity as a successor to an earlier feminist press. In particular, I begin to grapple with the paradoxical idea that the 'new' thing that *Time and Tide* was doing was to disavow identification with the 'feminist' or 'women's periodical' category at the same time as it remained both of these things. Ambitious to compete with the leading intellectual weeklies of its day (papers such as the *New Statesman* and the *Nation and Athenaeum*) *Time and Tide* succeeded in overtaking its immediate competitors in the feminist periodical market, and worked actively from the outset to address male as well as female readers. Discussing women's suffrage print media Maria DiCenzo has argued that 'the tendency to focus on a "separate press" that spoke to and for women has obscured how actively these publications sought to address a wider readership which included men' (2011: 83), and in the second section of this chapter I examine the editorial and textual strategies through which *Time and Tide* expanded its reach beyond female and feminist audiences. The chapter concludes with reference to a series of articles contributed pseudonymously by the periodical's new editor in 1926, and demonstrates just how sophisticated *Time and Tide* was in exploiting modern media forms and techniques to circulate its name more widely, and make its own interventions in public debates about work, professionalism and the 'modern woman'.

Feminist networks and cultures of the new

In its first leading article *Time and Tide* stated that: ‘Only one thing surely can justify the production of a newspaper – that those responsible for it are convinced that there is a definite gap in the ranks of the Press which none of the present organs are able to fill.’ It went on:

TIME AND TIDE has, in the view of its promoters, come into being to supply a definite need. The great whirlwind which has just passed has left us standing in a new and unknown world. It follows naturally enough that those who have served us as guides in the past are in certain directions ill equipped to help us understand our strange surroundings, or to supply the new needs which we find ourselves to have acquired. This is perhaps specially true of the Press; bred for the most part in Victorian or Edwardian days, tethered inevitably to its own past, it would often seem to find great difficulty in interpreting the changed conditions that lie – still but half realised – around us. (14 May 1920: 4)

In this bold, declarative paragraph *Time and Tide*’s ‘promoters’ announce the paper’s arrival in the periodical marketplace in rhetoric resonant of the manifesto.³ The language used is very modernistic (‘new’, ‘unknown’, ‘strange’, ‘half realised’) and registers the political and social uncertainties of a landscape defamiliarised by the First World War. Occupying a world still traumatised by the ‘great whirlwind’ which has just passed, *Time and Tide* stakes its claim to ‘supply a definite need’ by asserting its newness against the existing Press which, ‘tethered [. . .] to its own past’, is stuck in outworn Victorian or Edwardian attitudes and conventions. Through this act of differentiation *Time and Tide* constructed its newness. But the leader was much more circumspect about the most obvious thing that set *Time and Tide* apart from other organs of the press: the fact that it was controlled, edited and staffed entirely by women. Asserting that there is ‘a demand to-day for a more independent Press’ it continued:

That the group behind this paper is composed entirely of women has already been frequently commented upon. It would be possible to lay too much emphasis upon the fact. The binding link between these people is not primarily their common sex. On the other hand, this fact is not without its significance. (4)

The see-saw rhythm of this prose reveals a key tension at the heart of *Time and Tide*'s first address to the public and one that the periodical would continue to negotiate over the next two decades: a tension between its unavoidable identification with women and its desire to escape the limitations of that category.

Unpublished evidence reveals that considerable work went into striking the right balance with this first leader in order not to lay 'too much emphasis' on women. In a letter to Elizabeth Robins dated 30 April 1920, Margaret Rhondda enclosed a draft of the leader asking her to 'please deal firmly with it from every point of view' and explaining that she was most concerned about 'whether I have stressed women too much at the end'.⁴ Four days later Rhondda thanked Robins for correcting the leader which, revised further 'with a view to less emphasis on women', had now met with the general approval of the Board.⁵ *Time and Tide*'s decision not to emphasise women was a significant departure from earlier feminist and suffrage periodicals such as the *Woman's Leader* and the *Englishwoman* which, as their titles indicate, deliberately framed their identities and goals in terms of representing women's interests and concerns. Deliberately avoiding the 'feminist' or 'women's' tag the leader constructed *Time and Tide* as a paper which, as it went on to state, 'is in fact concerned neither specially with men nor specially with women, but with human beings' (4). However, this framing of *Time and Tide* in gender-neutral terms also reveals the periodical's connections with suffrage print culture. As Cheryl Law summarises: 'Suffragists had struggled to escape from the confinements of the "woman's sphere" and establish that the interests of men and women were identical in order to accord women the right to an equal place in the world. This had been the purpose of the feminists' insistence on their designation as "human beings" in order to claim their rights' (1997: 166). *Time and Tide*'s assertion of newness is thus carefully balanced with an awareness of the actual heritage of feminist periodical publishing it was building on. Both participating in and distancing itself from the women's movement and a separate press for women, from the start *Time and Tide* navigated a difficult tension over its feminist designation, one that it would continue to negotiate well into its second decade.

Time and Tide's direct debt to the women's suffrage movement was manifest at multiple levels of the periodical's first issue. Among the seven directors listed on the back of its opening number was one of the most inspirational figures of the women's suffrage campaign, the aforementioned Elizabeth Robins. Rhondda had also been an active member of the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU),

as had another of *Time and Tide*'s first directors, Helen Archdale, a Scottish militant who had worked previously on the WSPU paper, the *Suffragette*, and would become *Time and Tide*'s editor until 1926.⁶ Another veteran of the women's suffrage movement, Cicely Hamilton, joined *Time and Tide*'s board of directors in 1921; Rebecca West, one of the best-known names in feminist journalism and literary editor before the war of the avant-garde feminist magazine the *Freewoman*, joined the Board in 1922.⁷ Many of the periodical's early contributors were also drawn from suffrage networks. Among those listed in the contents bill of the first issue were the poet and essayist Alice Meynell, and Christopher St John (Christabel Marshall), co-author with Cicely Hamilton of the famous suffrage play, *How the Vote Was Won* (1909). A significant amount of creative work published in *Time and Tide* was contributed by writers who had been active in the women's suffrage movement (Clay 2009: 21–2), including male supporters of the cause such as Laurence Housman and Gerald Gould. In appearance and content, too, *Time and Tide* had much in common with the official suffrage organs. Its strong feminist mandate was evident in the prominence afforded in its pages to the ongoing campaign for equal franchise as well as other feminist issues (ranging from education, employment and equal pay, to the rights of married women, child welfare and birth control) and even more minor features in the paper point to feminist intertextual relationships.⁸ 'Time Table', a weekly calendar of political and cultural events, echoes Robins's collection of writings on the women's movement, *Way Stations* (1913) which was organised under section headings 'Time Tables'. 'In the Tideway', a weekly news comment column in the style of titbits, first appeared as 'Under the Clock', recalling the famous 'Votes for Women' clock outside the WSPU's flagship shop at 156 Charing Cross Road (Murray 2000: 206–7), then as 'Echoes and Re-Echoes', literally reproducing the title ('Echoes') of a regular column in the *Englishwoman*.

Time and Tide thus drew extensively on the networks, material cultures and iconography of women's suffrage. At the same time, further unpublished evidence shows that from the start *Time and Tide* sought to do things differently by reducing the emphasis on women seen in the former suffrage organs. For example, with reference to its regular 'Personalities and Powers' feature which used the illustrated biographical sketch to discuss 'women as well as men of achievement' (14 May 1920: 7), Rhondda stated explicitly in a letter to Robins that 'we don't want only women'.⁹ Another regular feature from the first issue, 'The World Over', created space for an international feminist

perspective but this feature was not always focused on women.¹⁰ That *Time and Tide* deliberately sought to differentiate itself from what its directors perceived as the narrower, propagandist slant of the official suffrage organs is thrown into sharp relief when we compare the Prospectus of *Time and Tide* with that of its chief competitor in the feminist periodical market, the *Woman's Leader*. The first issue of the *Woman's Leader* appeared just three months before *Time and Tide*, in February 1920, and was successor to the *Common Cause*, the official organ of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) which had been reconstituted in March 1919 as the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship (NUSEC). Rhondda had served on the board of the *Common Cause* from 1918, but resigned early in 1920 after criticising the way the paper was run (Tusan 2005: 223). By this time her own plans for a rival publication were well underway, and in February 1920 *Time and Tide*'s Prospectus was being fully discussed by its board of directors.¹¹ Meanwhile, the *Woman's Leader* was reframing its agenda, and in its Prospectus declared that the 'official connection' that existed formerly between the *Woman's Leader* and the NUWSS/NUSEC had been 'discontinued by mutual agreement in order that the paper may reach a wider public' (16 Apr 1920: 256). As DiCenzo notes, the *Woman's Leader* was one of several periodicals which 'began as suffrage organs, but went on to embrace issues beyond enfranchisement' (2011: 45). However, the unofficial connections that remained between the *Woman's Leader* and the NUSEC are precisely what *Time and Tide* renounced in the way that it framed its own identity and goals. While the Prospectus of the *Woman's Leader* went on to explain that the journal would 'continue to promote the objects and programme of the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship' and 'follow its general lines and policy on those questions which affect the status and opportunities of women' (256), *Time and Tide*'s Prospectus made no reference to women as a special category, stating simply that it would 'deal with all interesting topics of the day in Politics, Industry, and Art' (14 May 1920: 24).

In the initial framing of its identity and goals, therefore, *Time and Tide* deliberately neutralised the strong connections it actually had with the women's movement. However, within months of its first issue the periodical's directors changed direction following a decision made in the summer of 1920 to 'make a more definite appeal to women, be more frankly feminist than we have yet been'.¹² The prime motivator for this change of editorial policy was financial, with the running costs of the magazine (far in excess of initial forecasts) necessitating a drive to increase circulation.¹³ But, as Rhondda's letters to

Robins reveal, *Time and Tide*'s core collaborators had already been discussing a 'Women's Programme' which Rhondda hoped would give the periodical 'a big boom'.¹⁴ This 'Programme' was made public on 19 November 1920 in a leading article which outlined 'six much needed reforms, which especially concern women as women, and which they themselves must press for if they want them settled' (560). As *Time and Tide* later confirmed, the 'Programme' was the genesis of the Six Point Group (SPG), Britain's leading equal rights feminist organisation of the interwar years.¹⁵ Drawing much support from readers it provided *Time and Tide* with a clear feminist manifesto absent from early numbers of the paper, and played a crucial role in increasing *Time and Tide*'s readership base.¹⁶ Winning the support of twenty-four major women's organisations including the National Union of Women's Teachers and the Federation of Women Civil Servants (Eoff 1991: 70), the programme also attracted attention in the national press.¹⁷ *Time and Tide*'s change of direction is evidence of the periodical's ability to capitalise on the dynamism of the interwar women's movement through effective feminist marketing; the Six Point Group appears to have provided the magazine with an identifiable 'cause' to sell to potential feminist audiences. It is also evidence of *Time and Tide*'s rivalry with other feminist periodicals. As Johanna Alberti remarks, Rhondda 'must surely have known that the NUSEC was also working towards six points, and that there was a striking similarity in the two programmes' (1989: 139). In June 1921 Rhondda faced-off a proposal from Ray Strachey, editor of the *Woman's Leader*, to amalgamate the two journals, and, in a revealing glimpse of the competition between feminist periodicals, concluded: 'I'm all for carrying on as we are. I believe we can beat Mrs Strachey every time.'¹⁸ Rhondda was right. The *Woman's Leader* struggled to increase its subscription base and over the next few years gradually shrank in size and circulation as *Time and Tide* increased in prestige and influence.¹⁹

Overtaking the *Woman's Leader*, *Time and Tide* thus emerged as the leader of the feminist periodicals. The *Englishwoman* also appears to have been squeezed out of the market at round this time; it published its final issue in January 1921.²⁰ A large part of *Time and Tide*'s success was its ability to appeal to women representing a wide range of political and personal interests. The early agenda of the Six Point Group programme brought together two major strands in the post-war women's movement, equal rights and welfare feminism, and alongside this *Time and Tide* deployed tactics from the commercial end of women's periodical publishing in order to make

its 'more definite appeal to women'. For example, on 19 January 1923 *Time and Tide* launched a series of Six Point Group Supplements, and in the same issue introduced a new competition feature with cash prizes, a staple of mass-market women's magazines.²¹ In May 1923 *Time and Tide* reported 'a continual and steady rise in its circulation' (11 May 1923: 487), and by the mid-1920s the journal had become very attractive to advertisers who saw *Time and Tide's* largely middle-class female readership as a lucrative target group for marketing a range of commodity products (Clay 2011). With the addition on *Time and Tide's* board of directors from 1926 of Miss Marion Jean Lyon, advertising manager of *Punch*, *Time and Tide* became increasingly savvy in marketing itself among new and larger audiences, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.²² But what also emerges from an analysis of *Time and Tide's* early years is that its core target audience was an expanding class of professional working women, and arguably even more important than the links *Time and Tide* sustained with women's suffrage periodical networks were the new connections it created with what Alice Staveley (2008) identifies as an as yet virtually unexplored genre of women's interwar publishing, the women's professional magazine.

Print organs of women's employment organisations, women's 'professional' or 'trade' magazines flourished after the 1919 Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act opened up the professions for the first time to women. They include such titles as the *Woman Teacher* (1919) of the National Union of Women Teachers (NUWT), the *Woman Clerk* (1919) of the Association of Women Clerks and Secretaries (AWKS), and *Opportunity* (1921) of the Federation of Women Civil Servants (FWCS). *Time and Tide* actively promoted itself in these magazines, advertising in their pages, and forming alliances with the organisations they represented. For example, an advertisement in the *Woman Teacher* for *Time and Tide's* special Programme number in January 1921 bore the strapline 'Women Teachers – Support the Paper which Supports You' (21 Jan 1921: 128), and, in an article printed in its organ *Opportunity*, the FWCS agreed to advise the Six Point Group on 'all matters connected with equal pay and conditions in the Civil Service' (Mar 1921: 27). Perhaps the most striking relationship is that which was established between *Time and Tide* and the *Woman Engineer* (1919), the quarterly organ of the Women's Engineering Society (WES), and arguably the most 'professional' product in this market.²³ The WES was founded in 1919 to protect the right to work of all women employed in the engineering trades during the war who were being routinely dismissed to make way for returning male

engineers under the government's Restoration of Pre-War Practices Bill.²⁴ Its magazine was edited by the Society's secretary, Caroline Haslett, who as one of the first executive members of the Six Point Group inhabited the same feminist networks as Archdale and Rhondda. For several years the two periodicals regularly exchanged advertisements, suggestive of a far more symbiotic relationship than that between *Time and Tide* and any other women's professional magazine.²⁵ In the examples that follow I show how the *Woman Engineer* promoted *Time and Tide* in acts of representation which differentiated it from other organs of the feminist press, and offered a particular model of work and professionalism that resonated with *Time and Tide*'s own idea of the 'modern woman'.

Time and Tide placed an advertisement in the *Woman Engineer* in September 1921, less than a year after it first drew attention to the WES in its own columns.²⁶ Advertising itself as 'The Cheapest Fourpennyworth Published' it explicitly targeted women, stating: 'All women who wish for a clean and impartial review of current affairs should subscribe to "Time and Tide"' (105). Occupying a full half-page beneath the *Woman Engineer*'s main feature (an article on women composers), the positioning of the advertisement is suggestive of a shared feminist discourse (the article is devoted to the 'difficulties' and 'possibilities' faced by industrial women). However, another item printed in the same issue deliberately removes the 'feminist' tag:

We would commend to our subscribers the bright and progressive Weekly Review *Time and Tide* [. . .]. While not a 'feminist' paper, *Time and Tide* does manage to keep to the fore the fact that this world is made up of men *and* women [. . .] and in our opinion fills a very great need in our public life. (96)

The *Woman Engineer* was not alone in promoting *Time and Tide* within women's print culture while at the same time distinguishing it from other 'feminist papers'. A 'misunderstanding' which arose the following year in the pages of *Opportunity* also points to the growing perception within professional women's networks that *Time and Tide* was different from other feminist magazines. According to an item printed in its issue of November 1922, a reader had objected to a paragraph in the previous number which implied (by omission) that *Time and Tide* did not devote itself to the championship of women's causes. The editor of *Opportunity* justified its representation of the *Woman's Leader* and the *Vote* as 'the two "feminist" weeklies', explaining that: 'We have never regarded *Time and Tide* as belonging

to that category. It does devote considerable space to women [. . .] but it is a publication on much wider lines, and on its literary and dramatic side should rank rather with general weeklies, *New Statesman* or *Saturday Review*' (126). Evidence that *Time and Tide* was already developing a reputation as a publication competitive with the leading 'general weeklies' of the day, these representations of *Time and Tide* in two professional women's magazines demonstrate how significant a role women's print media played in defining and differentiating between a variety of women's periodicals. The importance for *Time and Tide* of such promotional work within feminist print culture is further illustrated by two advertisements it placed in the *Woman Engineer* towards the end of 1925.

The first of these, printed on the inside back cover of the *Woman Engineer*'s September 1925 issue, boldly presents *Time and Tide* as 'The Modern Weekly for the Modern Woman' (Figure 1.1). Exploiting a media fascination with the 'modern woman' in the interwar

TIME AND TIDE
THE MODERN WEEKLY
FOR
THE MODERN WOMAN.

CONTENTS.

Review of Week's Events.
Book Reviews:
By Sylvia Lynd, Mary Agnes Hamilton, Algernon Blackwood, Edmund Candler, etc.

The Theatre:
By Christopher St. John and Anne Doubleday.

Music of the Week:
By Christopher St. John.

Fiction and Verse.
Literary Competition: Money and Book Prizes.
Finance and Investment.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months, 15s., 6 months, 8s., 3 months, 5s., (including postage at home and abroad).

To the CIRCULATION MANAGER,
"TIME AND TIDE," 88, Fleet Street, E.C.4.
Please send specimen copies to the undermentioned
free of charge.

.....W.E.

4d. EVERY FRIDAY. **4d**

Figure 1.1 Advertisement for *Time and Tide* in the *Woman Engineer* Sep 1925. Reproduced with the permission of the Women's Engineering Society and the Institution of Engineering and Technology Archives.

popular press (Bingham 2004), this striking strapline also echoes a new title in the popular women's magazine market, *Modern Woman*, which published its first issue in June the same year. Among the most prominent of the so-called 'service magazines' which sprang up in the 1920s in imitation of the pre-eminent publication of this kind, *Good Housekeeping*, *Modern Woman* (with its subtitle 'the journal with the new spirit of the age') was launched 'to appeal to the new interest in all things modern, and particularly, the latest developments in the home' (Hackney 2008: 117). The intertextual relationship between this new publication and the advertisement *Time and Tide* placed in the *Woman Engineer* is a reminder of *Time and Tide's* responsiveness to developments at the commercial as well as non-commercial end of women's periodical publishing. But it is the professional context of the *Woman Engineer's* periodical environment that provides the symbolic grounding for the advertisement, and which sets *Time and Tide* apart from its competitors in the women's magazine market. In contrast with the domestic focus of commercial magazines, the *Woman Engineer* addressed readers as economic workers eager to seize new professional opportunities.²⁷ Significantly, the issue in which this advertisement appeared was a special number devoted to 'The First International Conference of Women in SCIENCE, INDUSTRY and COMMERCE' (Sep 1925: front cover) which had taken place at the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley in July that year. Caroline Haslett was the chief organiser of the conference (Messenger 1967: 37–8) which, as she stated in the leading article of the *Woman's Engineer's* special issue, emphasised women's 'responsibility for service and citizenship in the world's work' (51–3). The issue also printed speeches given by a number of prominent women invited to speak at the conference, among them Lady Rhondda who used the platform to advocate commerce as a career for women.²⁸ In this context the 'modern woman' of *Time and Tide's* strapline is imbued with a feminist discourse shared by both magazines in relation to new fields of work for women, emphasising a range of occupational and professional opportunities which extended beyond women's more traditional employment in the teaching profession and the civil service. *Time and Tide* also drew attention in its columns to the 'Women's Week at Wembley' (25 July 1924: 723) and published several articles in the summer and autumn of this year on the subject of business and commerce as new fields for university-educated women.

The advertisement for *Time and Tide* as 'The Modern Weekly for the Modern Woman' appeared in the *Woman Engineer*, however, only once; on the inside back cover of its next issue Haslett's magazine

carried an advertisement with the more neutral strapline ‘Read *Time and Tide*, the Non-Party Weekly’ (Dec 1925). This removal of the woman-tag speaks, I suggest, to the continuing tension *Time and Tide* negotiated over its feminist designation and identification with the ‘women’s paper’ category, but apparently, too, to a conversation taking place within these periodical communities about feminist strategies as well as goals. In the lead-up to the ‘Women in Science, Industry and Commerce’ conference Rhondda and Haslett were also discussing a new feminist enterprise, a ‘Business and University Committee’ set up by Rhondda and Professor Caroline Spurgeon, President of the International Federation of University Women (IFUW), to promote opportunities for university-educated women to enter commerce and business, and to which Haslett became Honorary Secretary. Commenting, in November 1925, on the letterhead Haslett had drafted for the new committee’s notepaper, Rhondda questioned Haslett’s choice of nomenclature and remarked: ‘I do not see why we need to insert “Women,” it is such a comfort to get away from the word sometimes. What do you think?’²⁹ In her reply Haslett admitted to ‘an oversight on [her] part to continue to call it the Business and University Women’s Committee’ and agreed ‘that it will be quite a good thing to get away from the word “Women”’.³⁰ Whether or not Rhondda directly instructed *Time and Tide’s* advertising manager to remove the ‘modern woman’ tagline from the advertisement placed in the December 1925 issue of Haslett’s periodical, the promotion of her own magazine in more gender-neutral terms undoubtedly reflected her desire to ‘get away from’ the word women sometimes in order to realise her goal of a female-run but general-audience review. As we have seen, while the ‘modern woman’ was emblematic of the ‘new’ in popular post-war culture (Bingham 2004: 48), the ‘new’ thing that *Time and Tide* was doing was *not* being a ‘women’s paper’, for all its identification with a predominantly female contributor and readership base.

Evidence that *Time and Tide* was continuously monitoring and updating its image, these advertisements clearly demonstrate *Time and Tide’s* deliberate self-positioning in multiple sectors of the print media marketplace. But the *Woman Engineer’s* placement of the *Time and Tide* advertisement in its December 1925 issue, alongside advertisements for the *Woman’s Leader* and the *Vote* (see Figure 1.2), is also important in this respect. In contrast with *Time and Tide’s* gender-neutral strapline, the advertisements for these feminist periodicals specifically target women readers (‘A Non-Party, Political Paper, indispensable to Every Woman’; ‘The Progressive Non-Party Paper

READ

TIME AND TIDE

The Non-Party Weekly.

—

An impartial survey of Home Politics.
 Best Foreign News of any Weekly Review.
 Book Reviews - Dramatic Criticisms -
 Financial Article - Competition - etc., etc.

—

Write for Specimen Copy to

THE CIRCULATION MANAGER, TIME & TIDE,
88 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

W.E.

“The Woman’s Leader.”

1d. weekly, 6/6 per annum, post free.

A Non-Party, Political Paper, indispensable to Every Woman who wants to keep abreast of the woman’s movement.

Some recent Contributors :

Dame Millicent Fawcett, G.B.E., J.P., L.L.D., Professor Gilbert Murray, Stella Benson, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Maude Royden, Eleanor F. Rathbone, Mrs. Oliver Strachey, Sir Robert Newman, M.P., G. C. Ammon, M.P., Captain Reiss, Margery Fry, J.P.

Write for specimen copy to

THE COMMON CAUSE PUBLISHING COMPANY,
15 Dean’s Yard, Westminster, S.W.

The Progressive Non-Party Paper

that should be read by all women, both at Home and Abroad who believe in the POLITICAL, INDUSTRIAL, PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL Equality of Women with Men is:—

“THE VOTE.”

Latest News Every Friday. One Penny.

Annual Subscription 6/6 post free.

Send to-day to “THE VOTE” OFFICE, 144 HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.1. for a Specimen Copy.

Figure 1.2 Advertisement for *Time and Tide* in the *Woman Engineer* Dec 1925. Reproduced with the permission of the Women’s Engineering Society and the Institution of Engineering and Technology Archives.

that should be read by all women’), and through this juxtaposition Haslett’s magazine performed another important act of differentiation. Significantly, it is *Time and Tide* that dominates the advertising space, assisted by the bold border – characteristic of poster-advertising – designed to grab readers’ attention. But most striking of all are the typographical differences across the titles of these magazines. With their decorative flourishes, the serif typefaces of the former suffrage organs speak to an age that has been superseded by the modernist era. In contrast, the sans-serif type used in the instruction to ‘READ’ *Time and Tide* introduces this magazine as modern, as does the experimentation in the masthead itself where the extension of the crossbar on the letter ‘T’ accentuates the strong, modernistic lines of its design.³¹ In an era which saw a vogue for ‘self-expression via typography [. . .] and other material aspects of texts’ (Collier 2016: 13), *Time and Tide* emerges visually as the most ‘modern’ product alongside its immediate competitors in the feminist periodical market, without the ‘modern woman’ signifier. This careful framing of the magazine to avoid the women’s paper category was crucial to *Time and Tide*’s success beyond a feminist and female readership, as I discuss next.

Male readers and textual performances

Just two months before *Time and Tide*'s 'Modern Weekly for the Modern Woman' advertisement appeared in the *Woman Engineer*, a debate which began in its correspondence columns reveals the highly self-conscious ways in which this periodical was also constructing its relationship with male readers. The debate was started by a reader whose letter printed in *Time and Tide*'s issue of 12 June 1925 opened: 'Madam, – It would be interesting to know why (since readers of TIME AND TIDE must know its Editor to be a woman) they address their letters "Sir"' (576). In a note appended to the bottom of the letter, *Time and Tide* responded: 'Addressing an Editor as "Sir" is an editorial custom. We think the use of such words as Editress, Authoress, Sculptress is much to be deprecated' (576). This editorial note glosses over what was in fact a deliberate change of policy early in the periodical's life to adopt this 'editorial custom'. Following the convention used in other woman-run periodicals, including the *Woman's Leader* and the *Vote*, until mid-November of its first year all letters to the editor were printed with the female appellation 'Madam'; it was only from 26 November 1920 that *Time and Tide* began printing all letters with the male appellation 'Sir'. Crucially, *Time and Tide*'s adoption of the 'editorial Sir' took effect at the precise moment it launched its feminist programme, thus concealing its female editorial identity at the very moment it was making a more direct appeal to women. But if this use of the male appellation was part of a strategy to reassure male readers, it also propagates the problematic idea that professional women should adopt male standards. In the mid-1920s, deepening tensions between 'old' and 'new' feminists centred on whether they should assert women's 'difference' or 'sameness' in relation to men; as Law summarises, ('old') equalitarians perceived the welfare feminists' insistence on women's difference as 'playing into the opposition's hands', while the new feminists saw the equalitarians' position 'as that of aping male values' (1997: 166–7). As *Time and Tide* continued to compete for audiences both within and beyond feminist periodical communities, this was a debate that it would have to face in its own columns.

One week after the question of the 'editorial Sir' was raised in *Time and Tide*'s pages, *Time and Tide* printed another reader's letter which endorsed its editorial policy:

Sir, – I am pleased to note in the current issue of TIME AND TIDE that you are not anxious to be addressed as Madam. I am one of your male readers, and although I know your journal is conducted

by women, I have always admired the clever way in which you have avoided making it a women's periodical. I like it because it is readable and bears no sex label. (19 June 1925: 598)

Pointing to the journal's success in transcending the 'women's periodical' category, this letter also provides valuable evidence of *Time and Tide's* early male readers. However, the compromise involved in this successful elision of female editorial identity produced the following response from another correspondent:

Why should a woman editor be addressed as 'Sir'? 'Editress' and 'Authoress' are abominations, but surely 'Madam' is on a different plane? Might all women not as well insist on being described as men, and is the insistence on 'Sir' not a small insult to one's sex? Can one only become a reasonable being by taking over male appellations? (26 June 1925: 623)

This letter echoes the complaints of new feminists against old feminists' 'slavish acceptance of masculine standards' (Law 1997: 165) and reveals the risk *Time and Tide* ran in alienating some of its female readers. But *Time and Tide's* response was firm, effectively closing down the debate in a note appended to the letter which read: 'On [this] point we expressed our opinion on June 12 – *Editor*, TIME AND TIDE' (623). However, two weeks later *Time and Tide* published a feature which reignited the debate in the periodical's correspondence columns. At once an acknowledgement of the thorniness of the issue, this feature also worked to manage the debate, and to justify its editorial policy to its readers.

The feature, which appeared on 10 July 1925, comprised excerpts from a speech made by the well-known playwright and dramatic critic St. John Ervine at *Time and Tide's* recent annual staff dinner.³² Ervine began contributing regularly to *Time and Tide* in the mid-1920s and later gained 'the title of *provocateur*' in the periodical (13 Oct 1934: 1292). Taking up the question of the 'editorial Sir' that had been raised in *Time and Tide's* correspondence columns, Ervine mused:

I wonder what the editor of *The Times* would say if one of his readers addressed him as 'Madam'. [. . .] I think he would feel a little odd about it and I am not sure that I do not agree with the writer of the letter to TIME AND TIDE, and that this tradition [. . .] is not a tradition at all but merely an idle habit due chiefly in this case to the fact that most people do not know that TIME AND TIDE is edited by a woman. (10 July 1925: 669)

Ervine's use of double-negatives makes it very unclear whether he does agree with the writer of the letter to *Time and Tide*, or not. But by shifting attention from *Time and Tide*'s editorial policy to readers' assumptions 'that an editor must be a man' he cleverly refocuses the terms of the debate and goes on to assert (with another double-negative): 'I am not sure that it would not be rather a fine thing if everybody who wrote to the paper were compelled to address the editor as "Madam" [. . .] Why not in TIME AND TIDE alter the contributors' style of addressing the editor and make a convention of "Madam"' (669). In what might be read as a feminist argument for challenging sex-prejudice, Ervine's suggestion also reminds us that periodicals are gendered not by the sex of their editors but by textual performances. In the 1890s male editors commonly feminised the journalistic space of women's magazines by assuming female identities (Beetham 1996: 188); now *Time and Tide*'s female editor masculinises the periodical's journalistic space by adopting the male appellation in its Letters to the Editor. *Time and Tide*'s manoeuvres in this debate are canny. By printing Ervine's speech *Time and Tide* allows a dissenting voice to be heard in the paper while maintaining its editorial position. It also promotes the periodical's distinctiveness, for as the continuation of his speech makes clear, Ervine was in fact working *with* the paper's promoters in another important act of differentiation:

The thing I have noticed about TIME AND TIDE which I have never noticed about another paper is this. [. . .] I am still waiting for the burst of hysteria. Every newspaper is entitled to one burst of hysteria a year and many papers take more than their fair share of hysteria, but TIME AND TIDE has never yet indulged in any hysteria – and that is not right. (669)

Appreciation of the humour here – and the compliment (however patronising readers may have found it) – relies on familiarity with contemporary narratives about journalistic decline and a 'feminised' popular press: the absence of 'hysteria' in *Time and Tide* implies its (masculine) self-control and upholding of professional standards.³³

Sexual difference, as Bingham has shown, had become 'a central organising feature of the whole newspaper [. . .] operation' in the inter-war years (2004: 42), and *Time and Tide*'s unfeminine character is reinforced by Ervine in a series of further questions and provocations:

Where is the column giving advice to the young woman whose young man is wavering? Where is the column advising on the proper way in

which to keep your husband's affection, and all those things which are common features of newspapers for women edited by men. It is a violent breach of this tradition which makes adherents of the 'Sir' instead of 'Madam' look childish, and I suggest that if there is going to be any following of tradition, that the aged tradition of a newspaper for women dealing entirely in slop should be followed. (10 July 1925: 669)

Essentially, Ervine suggests, *Time and Tide's* use of "Sir" instead of "Madam" is of very little consequence compared with its departure from the conventions for women's newspapers, and he concludes with further accolades and endorsements: 'I do not know any other paper which succeeds in making me read so much of it as TIME AND TIDE does. [. . .] Perhaps the time will come, and that time will be Utopia, when there is only TIME AND TIDE to read' (669). Providing more evidence of *Time and Tide's* attractiveness to male as well as female readers, Ervine's speech also enacts another important construction of the new. It is precisely because it is modern that *Time and Tide* departs from 'the aged tradition of a newspaper for women dealing entirely in slop', a characterisation of women's newspapers which, however blunt, works rhetorically to distinguish *Time and Tide* from the popular women's magazine market.³⁴

Further correspondence published in *Time and Tide's* columns shows that its strategic adoption of the 'editorial Sir' did not win the support of all readers.³⁵ But a letter printed one week following the publication of Ervine's speech also suggests that *Time and Tide* may have had other tactical uses for the male appellation. This letter opens: 'Sir, – by so addressing you may I be allowed to express my complete agreement with your decision to remain editorially concealed as "Sir" rather than exhibited and labelled as "Madam"' (17 July 1925: 705). The sympathy expressed by this correspondent for *Time and Tide's* decision highlights a key context for this debate: the huge amount of attention focused on women in the interwar popular press. As Bingham has shown, women provided endless 'talking points' for newspaper editors looking to drum up interest, and the 'modern young woman' was 'one of the most prominent characteristic figures of post-war culture' (2004: 42; 48). In December 1920 *Time and Tide* commented in its 'In the Tideway' column:

Surely most people will agree most cordially with the writer in one of the Sunday papers that women are too much talked about. He complains of the absurd articles which are so numerous, headed, do women do this, that or the other well, and the persistent seeking for

and analysis of the woman's point of view. It would be much more comfortable all round if women were considered as human beings, and praised or condemned their merits as such. (17 Dec 1920: 668)

Time and Tide's impatience with the treatment of women as news in the popular press reflects its own desire to be read and evaluated as a periodical created by 'human beings' and not be 'exhibited and labelled' as a publication run by women. Arguably, for *Time and Tide's* female editor the 'editorial Sir' worked as a kind of bulwark against the kinds of assumptions and prejudices associated with the term 'Madam'. Indeed, as will be seen below, the disadvantages of visibility may have been felt even more keenly in the context of *Time and Tide's* early editorial problems, and, later, of its need to re-establish the periodical's identity unhindered by its new editor's public image.

It is not insignificant that *Time and Tide's* adoption of the 'editorial Sir' in November 1920 followed closely upon the departure of the periodical's first editor who was not – as is commonly documented – Helen Archdale, but Vera Laughton. In an early appraisal of Laughton Rhondda described her as 'young and keen', but only weeks later she reported that Laughton's performance on the paper was 'quite dreadful' and at the end of July 1920 Laughton was given two months' notice.³⁶ From this point the paper was effectively edited by Archdale who played a key role in establishing *Time and Tide* during its early years. However, by 1925 it appears that Rhondda and Archdale – who had been close companions since 1922 – no longer saw eye to eye on how the paper should be run. As revealed by Rhondda's recent biographer, Angela V. John, in June 1926 an action plan was drawn up stating that *Time and Tide* was to be 'tried for one year more from October 1926' with a number of measures aimed at reducing costs (2013: 302). Archdale had been resisting the changes proposed under these 'Terms of Arrangement' for a year and when in July they were 'proved, in practice, unworkable' Archdale was, in her words, 'blamed and sacked'.³⁷ This period represented a moment of crisis for *Time and Tide*, and when Rhondda took over from Archdale in the summer of 1926 the change of editorship passed unannounced in the periodical's columns. While sensitivity towards Archdale provides one explanation for this, it is likely that there were strategic reasons too.³⁸ A prominent businesswoman and public figure Rhondda was, as John notes, 'featured frequently in the Society columns of newspapers and magazines' (2013: 331), and any notice of her new editorial responsibility would undoubtedly have

attracted immediate attention. At this critical moment when *Time and Tide* was looking to secure its future, such challenges the periodical faced both internally and externally would need to be managed very carefully.

A series of articles published by *Time and Tide* in the autumn of 1926 on the subject of 'Women of the Leisured Classes' reveals just how sophisticated this periodical was in managing and controlling its image, and in using the media to extend its influence within existing and new readerships. Published under a pseudonym, 'Candida', the articles were in fact written by Rhondda, and her choice of signature (borrowed from the title of one of George Bernard Shaw's early plays) encodes a feminist agenda.³⁹ With conscious reference to Olive Schreiner's bible of the women's movement *Woman and Labour* (1911), the series condemned a large class of 'leisured' women and underlined the most central theme of *Time and Tide's* feminist discourse: that a woman's work was of the utmost importance for her and for society.⁴⁰ Economic independence through self-supporting professional work was a key value for middle-class feminists of the post-war period, building on the efforts of nineteenth-century feminism to free women from the private sphere. Rhondda's articles thus re-advertised *Time and Tide's* feminist identity, and reaffirmed the periodical's 'old' feminist position based on an equal rights tradition at a time of deepening divisions within the women's movement. Earlier the same year the NUSEC had moved family endowment and birth control to its immediate feminist programme, as well as the highly controversial issue of protective legislation, all 'new feminist' reforms which emphasised women's 'difference' from men, particularly in their traditional roles in the home.⁴¹ *Time and Tide* had responded rapidly in its columns to these developments, which were also reported and debated in the *Woman's Leader* (Alberti 1989: 166–80), but its widely advertised series was also designed to take its feminism into a wider public arena. Anticipating that the articles were 'likely to make something of a stir', in a letter to Robins Rhondda explained: 'We are most anxious to get up a correspondence and if possible a controversy about these articles and I should be so grateful [. . .] if you would enter into it.'⁴² The series generated a huge correspondence in *Time and Tide's* own columns and made headlines 'throughout the country'; towards the end of November *Time and Tide* reported in its 'Review of the Week' that the articles had been quoted in a variety of newspapers and journals including *The Daily Express*, *The Daily Chronicle*, the *Tatler*, the *Sphere*, *The Morning Post* and *Public Opinion* (19 Nov 1926: 1047).

Deliberately provocative, the series successfully exploited an obsession with ‘women as news’ in the popular press in order to circulate *Time and Tide*’s own name more widely; at the same time, the periodical made a clear intervention in public debates about the ‘modern woman’. Reflecting on the media interest the articles had generated, *Time and Tide* remarked:

Curiously enough the tendency in the general press has been to attempt to classify the articles as an attack on the ‘modern girl’ when they are in fact the very opposite of that. [. . .] they are not attacking anything modern for the leisured woman belongs to no new category. There have been leisured women since the time of Cnossos. It is one of the oldest professions of the world. (19 Nov 1926: 1047)

In this fascinating echo of the media attention ignited by Eliza Lynn Linton’s famous attack on the ‘Girl of the Period’ in the nineteenth-century press, *Time and Tide*’s exploitation of ‘woman’ as a hot media topic reveals the more commercial orientation of this periodical compared with the more organisationally based social movement papers such as the *Woman’s Leader* and the *Vote*.⁴³ Inverting the terms in which popular newspapers ‘contrasted “old” and “new” versions of femininity and emphasized the challenge that “modern young women” posed to convention’ (Bingham 2004: 49) *Time and Tide* represents the leisured young woman as positively archaic. Ostensibly *Time and Tide*’s critique is of the parasitic woman who is not involved in any form of labour, but the elevation of women’s contribution to society through work in the public sphere could also imply a devaluation or disregard of women’s domestic labour. In contrast with the ‘new’ feminists who, as DiCenzo and Motuz (2016) discuss, were engaged in politicising the home, *Time and Tide*’s emphasis was on liberating women from this sphere, as we have seen. As debates between ‘old’ and ‘new’ feminism continued to play out in the pages of *Time and Tide* and its chief rival the *Woman’s Leader*, Rhondda’s periodical chose this moment to reassert its claim to the ‘modern’ even as it eschewed the ‘new’ feminist label. Fuelled by the controversy ignited in its columns by the ‘leisured women’ series, *Time and Tide* went on to stage its own contest between ‘old’ and ‘new’ forms of femininity in which professional work and economic emancipation signalled the dawn of a new age.

This contest opened when, in December 1926, *Time and Tide* invited the popular journalist G. K. Chesterton to express his views in its columns. In his article Chesterton objected most particularly

to 'Candida's' claim that motherhood was no longer a full-time job (3 Dec 1926: 1098–9). In a reply to her critics, Rhondda (still writing as 'Candida') noted that the 'most deeply felt and widely held objection' to the articles was that they failed to appreciate 'the sacredness of motherhood' and she went on to challenge Chesterton 'to come and debate the whole question with me in public, when, where, and how he chooses' (10 Dec 1926: 1135). Chesterton responded just as Rhondda must have hoped. In a notice printed in *Time and Tide's* issue of 7 January 1927 (and which for the first time revealed 'Candida's' identity) readers were invited to attend a debate on 'The Menace of the Leisured Woman' between 'Mr. G. K. Chesterton and Lady Rhondda' which would be presided over by George Bernard Shaw on 27 January at the Kingsway Hall (9). Like the articles the debate attracted 'enormous interest' from the public (4 Feb 1927: 103). The Kingsway Hall was full, and while hundreds of people were unable to get seats, thousands more were able to listen in as it was broadcast live around Britain.⁴⁴ For nearly two months the subject of the 'leisured woman' again occupied *Time and Tide's* correspondence columns, and a large space was also devoted to it in the general press.⁴⁵ The success of *Time and Tide's* media stunt is hugely significant. According to Rhondda the debate resulted in a 50 per cent increase in sales of *Time and Tide*, and the radio broadcast, as well as coverage in provincial newspapers, took the periodical to new regional audiences.⁴⁶ One reader from King's Lynn wrote in to describe her experience of 'listening in' while a storm raged outside: 'Yes, TIME AND TIDE had actually found its way to a remote Norfolk Fen' (4 Feb 1927: 116).

The debate played an important role, therefore, in increasing *Time and Tide's* circulation and making the periodical better known. But it was also significant for the interventions it made in public discourse about the 'modern woman'. Known for his public anti-suffragism before the war, Chesterton spent much of his journalistic career railing against modernity and believed that women's primary place was in the home (Corrin 1989: 27; Sewell 1990: 18). More recently, in March 1925, he had founded *G. K.'s Weekly* which served as an organ for Distributism, a social and economic theory that favoured small-scale economic and manufacturing enterprises and looked back to the Middle Ages as a model for social life. The Distributist League had held its inaugural meeting at the Essex Hall, London, just one month before *Time and Tide* launched its series on 'Women of the Leisured Classes' (Corrin 1989: 107). While its philosophy was 'centrally committed to work as the main enjoyment

of life' Distributism opposed commercial and industrial progress and 'particularly [. . .] the concentration of power [. . .] brought about by the increasing role of international finance' (Shiach 2004: 224). Chesterton thus stood for everything that *Time and Tide* positioned itself against. As we have seen in *Time and Tide*'s association with the *Woman Engineer*, for members of these feminist periodical communities science, industry and commerce represented the future, and they were fields Rhondda and her colleagues wanted women to inhabit. By making Chesterton her chief antagonist Rhondda had set the stage for a contest between the forces of conservatism and the forces of progress, and, in the media coverage this debate generated, *Time and Tide* forged its own modern identity in Britain's feminist and interwar press.

By the end of 1926 *Time and Tide* had emerged as the leader in the feminist periodical market, both distinguishing itself from other feminist weeklies and making itself known to a much wider public. Participating in debates about work, professionalism and the 'modern woman' both within and beyond feminist communities, *Time and Tide* advertised its own brand of feminism in terms of a feminist 'duty' to work, and forged its own modern identity in contemporary journalism. However, the politics of work and leisure looked very different from the perspective of the labour movement, especially in 1926, the year of the General Strike. As *Time and Tide*'s discourse on professionalism makes clear, the periodical had come to represent the interests of middle-class women most strongly, and it is not insignificant that the only trade unionist representative on *Time and Tide*'s first board of directors, Christine Maguire, resigned before the end of its first year.⁴⁷ In the next chapter I examine the contributions to this periodical of a critically neglected socialist poet of the 1920s, Eleanor Farjeon, and explore the relationships *Time and Tide* was negotiating internally as well as externally during its early years, and also its interactions with periodicals and periodical networks associated with radical culture and the socialist press.

Notes

1. 'Press Comments on "Time and Tide"' were printed in the periodical in its issue of 11 June 1920.
2. Letter from Rhondda to Rebecca West, 1 June 1931. RW Tulsa.
3. For a discussion of the manifesto as a form, see Janet Lyon (1999).
4. MR to ER, 30 April 1920. ER Papers.

5. MR to ER, 4 May 1920. ER Papers.
6. *Time and Tide*'s remaining first directors were: Mrs Chalmers Watson and Dame Helen Gwynne-Vaughan, both leading figures during the war in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; Miss Christine Maguire, a trade unionist and Honorary Organiser of the Association of Women Clerks and Secretaries; and Mrs H. B. Irving (née Dorothea Baird), an actress and playwright well known for her interests in baby welfare and housing for the poor.
7. Founded in 1911 by the militant suffragette Dora Marsden, the *Freewoman* (later the *New Freewoman*, and then the *Egoist*) can also be considered part of the history of feminist periodical publishing *Time and Tide* was building upon. However, *Time and Tide*'s democratic and egalitarian commitment to the ordinary woman (see Chapter 4) contrasts with Marsden's 'elitist conception of the "freewoman"' only attainable by the few (Delap 2007: 116). Under Rhondda's editorship *Time and Tide* also remained committed to its feminism throughout the period discussed here, unlike Marsden's periodical which saw the 'progressive erasure of feminism in favour of individualism' through its successive titles (Rabaté 2009: 271). For more on the *Freewoman* see Joannou (2002) and essays on the Modernist Journals Project Website.
8. See Dale Spender (1984) for an overview and selection of *Time and Tide*'s overtly feminist content.
9. MR to ER, 6 May 1920. ER Papers.
10. The second issue carried an article by the leader of the Australian women's suffrage movement, Vida Goldstein, on 'Australian Women and Politics' (21 May 1920: 30). In the next issue, an article on colonisation in Palestine did not have a special focus on women.
11. In a letter to Robins dated 22 February 1920 Rhondda refers to the Board's decision to have 'a full discussion of the Prospectus before issuing it' even though this meant delaying the first issue by a week. ER Papers.
12. MR to ER, 13 August 1920. ER Papers.
13. In the absence of subscription lists and records it is impossible to firmly establish circulation figures for the periodical. In its first year *Time and Tide* calculated costs for producing 5,000 and 10,000 copies (ER Papers, *Time and Tide* Subject File). Shirley M. Eoff estimates that *Time and Tide* reached between twelve and fifteen thousand readers in the 1920s, and cites evidence suggesting that it increased its circulation to over 30,000 copies per week during the Second World War (1991: 121; 128). William Berry, Viscount Camrose, *British Newspapers and Their Controllers* (London: Cassell, 1948) places *Time and Tide*'s wartime circulation higher at around 40,000 (Eoff: 144 and n.99). These are respectable figures for an intellectual weekly review targeting a select public. In the early 1920s the *New Statesman*'s circulation averaged 6,000 to 8,000 a week, with net sales growing to around 14,500 following its merger with

the *Nation and Athenaeum* in 1931 and reaching a circulation of 29,000 by 1939 (Hyams 1963: 75; 122; 227).

14. MR to ER, 13 August 1920. ER Papers.
15. An item printed early the following year confirms that the programme outlined on 19 November ‘has now become the charter of the Six Point Group’ (25 Feb 1921: 176). The Six Points on which the Six Point Group campaigned for satisfactory legislation were: Child Assault, the Widowed Mother, the Unmarried Mother and her Child, Equal rights of Guardianship for Married Parents, Equal Pay for Teachers, and Equal opportunities for Men and Women in the Civil Service.
16. *Time and Tide* reported in December 1920 that it had received a ‘large number of letters’ showing ‘a very widespread demand among women for a clearly defined and practical programme’ (3 Dec: 604), and in a letter dated 4 April 1921 Rhondda told Robins that ‘The circulation continues to mount.’ ER Papers.
17. Rhondda communicated to Robins in a letter dated 13 January 1921 that the programme had been ‘reported on at some length in the *Telegraph*, the *Manchester Guardian*, and one or two other papers’. ER Papers.
18. MR to ER, 15 June 1921. ER Papers. The proposal was made during a lunch arranged by Strachey and J. C. Squire who was expanding his empire at the *London Mercury* offices. According to Rhondda, Strachey and Squire planned to make the *Woman’s Leader* into a 6d paper ‘very much on “Time and Tide” lines’ and the proposed amalgamation was based on the assumption that Strachey would be editor.
19. Tusan records the ‘falling circulations’ of both the *Woman’s Leader* and the *Vote* during the 1920s (2005: 216). The *Woman’s Leader* began, like *Time and Tide*, as a 24-page magazine, but by October 1924 it was only eight pages and had dropped its price from 2d to 1d. It published its last issue in 1932.
20. DiCenzo notes that ‘the demise of the *Englishwoman* occurred around the same time as the appearance of *Woman’s Leader* and *Time and Tide*’ (2011: 130).
21. The competition offered money and book prizes and remained a fixture in *Time and Tide*’s pages for years to come.
22. Miss Marion Jean Lyon is first listed among *Time and Tide*’s board of directors in its issue of 13 August 1926 (748).
23. The *Woman Engineer* was printed on a far higher quality of paper than any of the other trade magazines I have looked at, allowing for the high-quality reproduction of photographic and other visual material as well as clean, stylish print.
24. See Carroll Pursell (1993) for a discussion of the WES.
25. I am indebted to Alice Staveley for first alerting me to advertisements for *Time and Tide* carried by the *Woman Engineer*.

26. In its fifth issue *Time and Tide* drew attention to a resolution recently passed by the WES ‘call[ing] upon all leaders of industry and trade unions to act in the best interests of the nation by uniting with women in overcoming the artificial barriers to progress and development in productions’ (11 June 1920: 114).
27. Hackney notes that the version of modern womanhood envisioned by *Modern Woman* ‘was by no means restricted to domestic pursuits’ and like *Good Housekeeping* the magazine ‘envisioned a public agenda for its readers’ (2008: 118). Bridging political, cultural and domestic life, it addressed women primarily as housewives nonetheless.
28. This was a significant theme in Rhondda’s public engagements and her writing in this period which included a section on ‘Business and Commerce’ in a book on careers for girls (John 2013: 277).
29. MR to CH 17 November 1925. BFUW Papers.
30. CH to MR 25 November 1925. BFUW Papers.
31. Jeremy Aynsley observes that: ‘In the 1920s the sans-serif typeface in general was interpreted as a modern design solution’ and was advocated, particularly in Europe, ‘as international and fulfilling the Zeitgeist, or the spirit of the age’ (2007: 41).
32. The dinner was held on 3 July 1925.
33. Adrian Bingham identifies the ‘feminization’ of the press as ‘the most striking development in popular journalism between the wars’ (2004: 38). For an extended discussion of this perceived crisis in contemporary journalism, see Patrick Collier (2006), especially Introduction and Chapter 1.
34. One indignant female reader, who identified herself as the Controlling Editor of *Home Notes* and Leach’s Publications, challenged Ervine’s inference ‘that all Women’s papers are edited by men, or conducted on traditions laid down by them’ (24 July 1925: 728).
35. Helena Normanton, who identified herself as a former editor of a colonial magazine in India, wrote to express her ‘hearty support’ for Ervine’s suggestion ‘that women editors should be addresses *as women*’ (24 July 1925: 728).
36. MR to ER, 14 June and 27 July 1920. ER Papers.
37. Helen Archdale to Winifred Cullis, 27 July 1926. Material in private hands sourced via Angela V. John.
38. John notes that Winifred Holtby told Vera Brittain in April 1927 that Rhondda was keeping the change of editorship ‘as quiet as possible’ (2013: 340).
39. John notes that Rhondda ‘borrow[ed] the title of [George Bernard] Shaw’s early comedy with its eponymous heroine who challenged conventional representations of marriage and gender roles’ (2013: 410).
40. Schreiner’s famous cry ‘Give us labour and the training that fits us for labour!’ was printed at the start of the second article.

41. See DiCenzo and Motuz (2016) for a re-examination of this central debate in interwar feminism.
42. MR to ER, 5 April 1926. ER Papers.
43. I am indebted to Maria DiCenzo for this observation. For a discussion of Linton see Andrea L. Broomfield (2004).
44. A notice that the debate would be broadcast was printed in *Time and Tide's* issue of 21 January 1927.
45. Correspondence on the 'leisured woman' ran until 22 April 1927.
46. Letter from Rhondda to Doris Stevens, 27 March 1927. DS Papers.
47. Rhondda reported to Robins in a letter dated 24 November 1920 that Miss Maguire had resigned from the board. ER Papers.