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‘The lights of the electric octopus have been switched off’: visual and political culture in Edwardian London

Abstract

This article reconstructs the visual culture of politics in Edwardian London through a study of the 1907 London County Council election. It moves beyond the memorable account given in Graham Wallas’s *Human Nature in Politics* to examine the actors, especially associations and newspapers, that participated in the election. Drawing upon newspapers, election addresses, cartoon, leaflets and posters, the article argues that Edwardian London was a prime site in the application of new media for political communication. It shows, however, that new modes of communication could co-exist with, and intensify, established forms of public politics. It reveals a highly knowing visual culture of politics through which issues of authenticity and identity were contested, and recasts understanding of a controversial and critical election.
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In 1908 one of the defeated Progressive candidates for Hoxton in the last London County Council election published his second book. The realities of electioneering were central to Graham Wallas’s study of *Human Nature in Politics*.¹ His first readers recognised the element of life writing in his magnum opus: Sidney Webb observed that ‘everyone who writes or lectures on Politics ought to have been a candidate in a big town’.² Historians have acknowledged Wallas’s use of his political education to impart the ‘concreteness and the humour’ that William James found ‘characteristically English’, while noting that his book

² London School of Economics, Graham Wallas Papers, 1/38, Letter from Sidney Webb, 23 July 1908.
was the product of years of thinking about mass politics. Wallas certainly drew upon his lengthy involvement in and study of local politics, but the degree to which his work was specifically informed by the 1907 election has been underestimated. Central themes in the text - the power of repetition, the preoccupation with ‘branding’, the potency attributed to visual propaganda - are clarified when the circumstances of its composition are properly recalled. *Human Nature in Politics* was very much a London book. It offered a brilliantly suggestive vision of metropolitan picture politics that has proved lastingly influential. This vision was, though, partial, and coloured by the experience of electoral defeat. By revisiting the 1907 election, this article recasts our understanding of visual and political culture in Edwardian London, moving beyond Wallas’s seminal study.

The article argues that Edwardian London was a prime site in the application of new media for political communication. Historians have tended to see municipal elections as less innovative than their Westminster counterparts, but in 1907 campaigners drew upon the full range of visual media from film to posters and lantern slides. There was a striking coherence to the messaging of the political right especially that anticipated the supposed discoveries of later national election campaigns, and made a local election national news. This embrace of new media was, not, however, at the expense of established modes of electioneering. On the contrary, the insertion of cinema, phonographs and lantern slides into public meetings both in and out of doors was wholly compatible with, and could provoke, vivid expressions of the politics of disruption. Accusations of ‘Americanisation’ were freely dispensed by participants...

---


in the election with frequent reference to campaigning methods, especially the use of forceful pictorial publicity. Questions of probity and authenticity were central to much of the visual propaganda of 1907. Both sides accused the other of dishonesty, and of not being what they seemed. Cartoons and posters flattered the viewer as seeing through such trickery, enlisting the voter in a community of the knowing - a kind of political equivalent to the conspiracies of meaning detected by Peter Bailey in music hall - and presenting the imagery and its producers as agents of truth rather than partisan dissemblers. This approach to image-making, with its frequent depictions of pictures within pictures, both acknowledged and sought to transcend the growing reputation of visual publicity as untrustworthy, not least by casting the viewer as active and informed. It was a form of visual politics appropriate to the time and the place in which music hall attained its greatest popularity.

In their turn to the politics of place, modern British historians have paid less attention than one might expect to the municipal arena. The politics of the LCC operated on three interacting levels: London-wide, London-local, and national. Its remit as a body for London as a whole both reflected and fostered a conception of the capital as a unity, and the political project of Progressivism from 1889 was fundamentally concerned to create a sense, much invoked in 1907, of civic patriotism. The forces of the right in London were much less enamoured of this integrated, city-wide vision; but their very scepticism, like their championing in 1907 of borough councils, directed attention to the importance of the existing

---

8 Bailey, *Popular Culture and Performance*, 140.
machinery of London-wide governance. LCC elections were fought across 58 constituencies of widely varying character. As the electoral addresses of 1907 testify, candidates could appeal to voters on their credentials as local men of their districts. LCC elections also had a national dimension. In part, this exemplified broader trends, as urban and national politics increasingly overlapped, linked by demographic change, the rise of social issues, and problems of taxation and expenditure. However, the LCC received a level of attention in the media denied to other county councils. This reflected the sheer, and growing, scale of late Victorian and Edwardian London, but also the capacity of LCC elections to deliver newsworthy controversy and attract established political names. The Liberals’ General Election landslide of 1906 further elevated the LCC’s profile by bringing a number of councillors into the House of Commons so raising the possibility of a radical alliance between central and local government at a moment of intense party competition.

The 1907 LCC election was a focal moment in the development of political communication in Edwardian England. As Ken Young noted forty years ago, an

---

extraordinary volume of publicity was produced in 1907, not least 369,000 posters by the (Conservative) London Municipal Society alone.\textsuperscript{14} Recent legal decisions had expanded the electorate, and turnout, while lower than in Westminster elections, was unusually high by municipal standards.\textsuperscript{15} Importantly, the electorate included about 100,000 women, so 1907 provides a rare pre-war instance in which the full panoply of electioneering methods from leaflets to cinematographs was directed at a gender mixed audience. Prognostications, usually bereft of hard evidence, about the behaviour of female electors were a common feature of the post-match analysis, and were to have a lasting impact.

This article is organized in four parts. It starts with the existing historiography. As both a critical and a controversial election 1907 has not lacked for students. The literature has, however, tended to concentrate on the political organizations of either side rather than to examine the full range of actors. The role of newspapers especially in the election has been under-examined.\textsuperscript{16} Where historians have looked at the campaign more broadly, it has generally been as an instance of a ratepayers’ revolt or as an episode in the history of anti-socialism, rather than for what it can tell us about the character of visual and political culture in Edwardian London. The next part takes up this question. The use of large, pictorial posters, film and phonographs, along with repetitive newspaper coverage, was identified as both new and ‘American’. This section argues that this emphasis upon novelty and transatlantic imitation was overstated and misleading.\textsuperscript{17} Rather, the campaign was characterised by the co-


\textsuperscript{15} On the comparable intensity of LCC and parliamentary elections from a candidate’s perspective, James Stuart, \textit{Reminiscences} (London, 1911), 233.


\textsuperscript{17} James Thompson, ‘‘Pictorial Lies?’’: Posters and Politics in Britain, 1880-1914’, \textit{Past and Present}, 197
existence, and inter-relationship of ‘old’ and ‘new’ media, often combined in efforts to persuade electors, conceived as active participants in the construction of meaning and the creation of political communities. Contested relationships between word and image, proliferation of images across different media, and allusions to other images, were prominent features. Tracing the visual culture of the election reveals the development of key narratives, and the accretion of significance through a succession of inter-linked images. The role of particular cartoonists, notably Edward Huskinson and David Wilson, helped lend coherence to this messaging.

The third part examines the politics of naming that was central to the election. The efforts of the political right to rebrand themselves as ‘Municipal Reformers’ were fiercely resisted by the left whom the right in turn accused of masking its socialist profligacy under the false banner of the ‘Progressives’. This struggle over meaning was equally evident in the heated argument over London’s electricity supply in which both sides charged the other with hiding their intent of creating a Trust. The Trust dispute raised the spectre of ‘Tammany Hall’ big city bribery and corruption, and here too claims of Americanisation were freely made, not least with respect to electioneering techniques. Finally, the article reflects on how the election was, and should be, interpreted. It examines how contemporaries explained the outcome, the ‘lessons learnt’ for future campaigning, and returns to the significance of 1907 for our understanding of the relationship between visual and political culture in Edwardian London.

II.


The term ‘Tammany Hall’ referred directly to the Democratic Party machine that dominated New York city and state politics through its patronage networks, but was used more loosely in Britain to invoke big city political corruption through party organization.
As local elections go, the London County Council election of March 1907 borders upon the well known. On a record turnout of 55%, the broad left Progressive majority that had dominated London politic since 1889 was swept away, as the right of centre Municipal Reformers triumphed. A council composed of 83 Progressives, 34 Moderates and 1 Independent was replaced by one consisting of 79 Municipal Reformers, 38 Progressives and 1 Independent, inaugurating an era of Conservative rule that would last until the Labour victory of 1934.

Unsurprisingly, explaining the success of the Municipal Reformers has been a prime concern in the historiography. The dominant interpretation has emphasised voter unhappiness over high rates at a time when inflation was squeezing incomes. This view was influentially articulated in Avner Offer’s study of property and politics which argued that the weakness of the rental market from 1905 exacerbated the burden on ratepayers, while in an important essay on Progressives rule John Davis stressed the impact of rises in the cost of living, comparing 1907 to 1919-20 and the mid-1970s. This approach focuses on the travails of the middle-class ratepayer, whose sufferings were loudly proclaimed in the contemporary press.

In his ground-breaking study of London politics, Paul Thompson acknowledged the impact of divisions on the left leading to three-way contests and the alienation of nonconformists consequent upon the Council’s handling of the education issue. Strikingly, Thompson laid particular emphasis upon the success of Conservative publicity in fostering ‘mass revolt’


among ratepayers, and convincing previous non-voters, especially women, to vote.\textsuperscript{22} Offer too attributed some importance to the campaign waged against the Progressives.\textsuperscript{23} Yet we lack much by way of systematic, comparative analysis of the propaganda of 1907 within the literature of London history. In some respects, Ken Young’s 1975 account remains that most attentive to the diversity of Edwardian political communication.\textsuperscript{24}

The gulf in performance of the right between Westminster and LCC elections has long struck historians.\textsuperscript{25} Most commonly, it was proposed that municipal and parliamentary elections revolved around different questions, and that the first were not seen as ‘political’ (or not at least as ‘party political’) in the sense that the second were.\textsuperscript{26} More recently, Alex Windscheffel has importantly advanced our understanding of the dynamics of metropolitan politics. Windscheffel stresses the right’s failure to renovate its vision for London after the creation of the LCC bypassed the ‘tenification’ proposals of the 1880s.\textsuperscript{27} His demonstration of the creativity of London Conservatism in the parliamentary arena renders its municipal performance odder, and raises important questions as to why it was able to break through when it did. Like much of the literature, however, Windscheffel’s focus is upon one side of the party political divide. A fuller understanding of 1907, and of LCC electoral politics more broadly, requires a more comparative approach.


\textsuperscript{23} Offer, \textit{Property and Politics}, 304-5.

\textsuperscript{24} Young, \textit{London Politics}, 93-5.


\textsuperscript{27} ‘Tenification’ referred to schemes to create multiple municipal authorities within London; Windscheffel, \textit{Popular Conservatism}, 155.
Outside the work of London historians, the 1907 election has had a walk on part in writing on anti-socialism. This is unsurprising, given the intense efforts of the deeply anti-socialist London Municipal Society in 1907, and in the borough elections of November 1906. J. N. Peters provides one of the best descriptions of the 1907 campaign, noting its virulence and the preoccupation with the politics of naming. The networks of metropolitan anti-socialism were mobilised against progressivism in 1907, with the Property Owner’s Journal rivalling the Municipal Reform Gazette in its devotion to the cause. However, the anti-socialist message was scarcely new in LCC politics: The right-wing satirical journal Judy was already claiming in 1898 that the ‘Progressive programme means Socialism; it means the insertion of the thin edge of the wedge of Communism’. As in 1907, anti-socialism functioned in 1898 as a catch-all, purportedly unifying a medley of complaints, well encapsulated in Judy’s excited charge that Progressive success would render the LCC ‘a Tammany Hall, a stable of hobby-horses, a nest of faddists, theorists, agitators, strike-mongers, and adventurers’. Charting the ideology of anti-socialism reveals continuities in content that contrast with its chequered performance at the ballot box. We need, therefore, to


30 Judy, 13 February 1898.
consider the context of 1907, and especially how political messages were conveyed in that context. It is to the visual and political culture of Edwardian London that we now turn.\textsuperscript{31}

III.

Looking back at the 1907 election, Wallas observed that ‘there appeared on the London hoardings thousands of posters which were intended to create a belief that the Progressive members on the Council made their personal livelihood by defrauding ratepayers’. He remarked that ‘the person represented was, if judged by the shape of his hat, the fashion of his watch-chain, the neglected condition of his teeth, and the redness of his nose, obviously a professional sharper. He was, I believe, drawn by an American artist, and his face and clothes had a vaguely American appearance, which, in the region of sub-conscious association, further suggested to most onlookers the idea of Tammany Hall’.

Wallas was referring to Edward Huskinson’s poster ‘It’s Your Money We Want’, and suggested it had been ‘brilliantly successful’ [fig.1].\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{31} On the need for further work on ‘the methods employed by political parties’ in London, see Cragoe and Taylor, \textit{London Politics}, 240.

Described by the *Daily News* as ‘that hideous head that looked at them from every hoarding’, one election post-mortem claimed it was on ‘numberless hoardings’, while *The Tribune* designated it ‘the principal poster with which the Moderate party has been defacing the hoardings of London’. The image was revived in the 1910 LCC election, complete with the tagline ‘It’s Still Your Money We Want’. In 1912 T. Swinburne Sheldrake claimed that ‘we are all agreed that poster had a very marked effect on the polls’. The secondary literature on the election has long upheld its importance.

---

33 *The Tribune*, 4 March 1907.
34 *Printer’s Ink* (May 1912), 106-7; for subsequent borrowing, see the cartoon ‘No effects’, *Punch*, 26 March 1913; and the poster, G. R. Halkett, ‘John Bull’s Quack Doctors’.
The poster’s status on the left, exemplified by Wallas’s account, as a visual embodiment of the Americanisation of right-wing electioneering, was established by the end of the campaign.\textsuperscript{36} However, as Wallas himself recognised, the image did not go uncontested. Chairing a meeting of North Islington Progressives, the Reverend N. C. T. Parker drew laughter with his comments on ‘the picture that haunted one on the streets of London’. Suggesting ‘it was like putting Gladstone’s hat on the Duke of Norfolk’, he ‘criticised, amid great laughter, the big hat, and likened it to the Tories, who tried to imitate the Liberals’.\textsuperscript{37} The Tribune mordantly commented that ‘in our reproduction the misleading label has come off the hat’, before warning that ‘ratepayers will have no reason to question whom the poster really represents. He has got your votes’. Progressive use of Huskinson’s personification to attack ‘the Moderates’ during (and after) the campaign - apparent, for instance, in Arthur Moreland’s \textit{Morning Leader} cartoons - confirms its currency, and suggests the extent of its re-appropriation in the contested visual culture of Edwardian politics.

The poster’s association with Americanisation had several sources. The central figure - with its echoes of Thomas Nast’s anti-Tammany Hall cartoons of Boss Tweed in \textit{Harper’s Weekly} - was widely read as ‘American’, extrapolating from his disreputable appearance, and the ‘loud’ style of his clothes. This figure has been regarded - understandably - as stereotypically Jewish by historians.\textsuperscript{38} While it is entirely possible this interpretation was current at the time, there is little corroborating evidence, and the anti-Semitic cartooning that accompanied the agitation for the Aliens Act a few years earlier pictured a long-haired, ‘Fagin’, stereotype. The direct gaze out of the picture frame, and the pointing figure, are difficult for modern viewers to disentangle from Alfred Leete’s Kitchener recruitment

\textsuperscript{36} Manchester Guardian, 4 July 1907; The Nation, 9 March 1907.
\textsuperscript{37} Islington Daily Gazette, 19 February 1907.
poster. Perhaps tellingly, Leete later designed a poster incorporating a staring Bolshevik, and the slogan ‘It’s Your Money He Wants’ as part of the Conservatives’ 1924 election campaign. The ‘American’ qualities of Huskinson’s poster also rested in the idea that its brash appeal - even a sympathiser described it as ‘glaringly ugly’ - was borrowed from advertising, a notion not confined to progressive publicity.

Although Wallas’s account of the poster was thus rooted in contemporary reactions, its invocation as an emblem of an Americanised, commercially debased political culture is problematic. The history of the design itself is suggestive. As Gardiner noted, the poster itself reworked an illustration from a satire on the pro-tory Northcliffe press. Embedded in a web of imagery, it depended for its meaning upon easily alterable words, as The Tribune’s pastiche recognised. Born in Nottinghamshire, Huskinson was a rising star of Conservative cartooning, who became editor of Tatler in 1908. The majority of his posters in 1907 began life as newspaper cartoons, usually in the Municipal Reform Gazette. In many ways, ‘It’s Your Money’ was atypical of his work. Reflecting the heritage of the political cartoon, denser pictorial argument and a richer interplay between word and image characterised his output as a whole. At times, longstanding conventions of political cartooning were especially prominent, as in his almost-eighteenth century summary of the Municipal Reform case that high rates beggared all [fig. 2].

40 Beers, Your Britain, 60.
41 Gardiner, Benn, 356.
42 The Times, 19 November 1941.
His use of animals was also squarely in this tradition, as was the creation of linking pictorial devices - notably the shiny top hat - through which images referenced each other, accruing meaning. In discussing the lessons of advertising for elections, Jessel - often presented by
critics as the controlling mind behind the LMS campaign - stressed the political poster’s role in making arguments and telling stories, suggesting that ‘the political poster at election time is more likely to be studied than an ordinary commercial bill’.  

Commentators on the election often grouped gramophones with posters. A correspondent to the Islington local press complained of ‘these terrible cartoons and gramophones’.  

Coverage stressing the ‘modernity’ of the election pictured gramophones, alongside posters and motor cars. It is clear that Municipal Reformers made extensive use of gramophones to play both speeches and music. This practice was, however, usually integrated into established and valued modes of campaigning. A Municipal Reform rally at the Islington Cattle Market featured a ‘display of dissolving views’ outside with a gramophone concert in the hall. Gramophone concerts often preceded speeches at Municipal Reform meetings, supplying ‘popular songs and parodies’. The South London Press noted that ‘Municipal Reformers have enlisted the services of gramophones into the election campaign, and certainly the tabloid music is far more entertaining than some of the speeches which follow’, before concluding ‘it is magnificent, but it is not politics!’. Reporting a Municipal Reform meeting in Brixton, the paper observed that ‘there was more harmony in the gramophone than in the speechmaking proceedings’, insisting ‘that all present were not Moderates’ and that the customary resolution was not, contrary to the claims from the platform, actually carried.

As with the gramophone, lantern slides and cinematographs were incorporated into public meetings. Advertised through the press, illustrated lectures typically lasted about an hour, and could be followed by speeches from candidates. Will Crook’s biographer, George

---

44 Printer’s Ink (May 1912), 109.
45 Islington Daily Gazette, 28 February 1907.
46 Islington Daily Gazette, 15 February 1907; Islington Daily Gazette, 20 February 1907.
47 South London Press, 9 February 1907; South London Press, 16 February 1907.
Haw, scripted the *Daily News*’s contribution. The opening picture was of County Hall in Spring Gardens rapidly contrasted with grander municipal buildings in Britain, France and Belgium, followed by a *Daily News*’ artist’s mock-up of the County Council’s intended new home. Through images and words, the lecture emphasised London’s scale, and the necessity and grandeur of the Council’s work. In their fight to protect the weak from ‘wrong-doing’, London’s progressive leaders were favourably compared to the Knights of the Round Table. The battle was against ‘slumdom, fraudulent trading, disease, overcrowding, immorality, jobbery, sweating and that deadliest enemy of all - monopoly’. The horrors of trusts were conveyed through cartoon and song, driving home the message that ‘the only name that fittingly describes the Moderates is the Trust party’. Photographs of leading progressives served to personify the cause, and to associate progressive rule with the parks, gardens, trams, steamboats, training centres, and fire engines photographs of which were also displayed. By contrast, Municipal Reformers appeared solely through caricature. The initial images of buildings and politicians were succeeded by more familiar, but also evocative, subjects - coal and loaves - to illustrate ‘The LCC in the Home’. Seeking to domesticate progressivism with an awareness of women voters, a portrait of a progressive councillor was accompanied with the assurance that ‘the LCC sits down at table with them, and gathers with them round the family hearth’ not ‘intrusively, as the enemies of Progressive government would have you believe’ but ‘in a way that appeals to every housewife sympathetically’. The lecture’s focus on defending the Progressive’s record reflected the challenges of campaigning after 18 years in power, and in less than ideal economic circumstances. It finished with pictures of flames, and of fire engines setting out, providing a visual tie between County Hall and the home, between Progressivism and the people’s health.\(^ {48}\) Its invocation of the gains from

progressivism, and the potential material losses from Moderate rule, contained an implicit class-based defence of redistribution.

Delivering the *Daily News* lecture in Islington, H. W. Nettleship’s efforts were rewarded with ‘applause’ for pictures of newly-inspected coal sacks and properly-weighed bread followed by ‘a sigh of relief’ as images of ‘the horrors of slum life’ gave way to portraits of ‘commodious, healthy-looking County Council dwellings’. A query as to whether the Council’s work should be stopped elicited ‘a mighty shout of “No”’. In Dulwich a Progressive lantern lecture was greeted with ‘repeated cheers’. Like the cinematograph with which the Progressives opened their campaign, lantern lectures enlivened a vibrant culture of public meetings in which theatricality was not new. Interaction between politicians and audiences was frequent in campaign gatherings, and politically mixed audiences were common. The *Daily News* lantern lecture was designed to enable speakers to leave out sections that lacked local resonance. Local newspapers applauded lantern lectures tailored to the locality, incorporating photographs of candidates. For the most part, though, lantern lectures, and cinematographs, followed a common template, reinforcing the core messages each side sought to communicate. It would, however, be wrong to see this as a purely technological phenomenon. London-wide issues predominated, but this reflected a political context in which the meaning of ‘London’, the nature of party identities, and the role of its Council were all fiercely contested.

The tangled relationship between ‘old’ and ‘new’, and between different forms of political expression, is nicely illustrated by the events of ‘Reformer’s Day’, as the erstwhile Moderates sought to christen February 23rd. The *Municipal Reform Gazette* presented the

---

50 *South London Press*, 19 January 1907.
51 *South London Press*, 16 February 1907.
outdoor meetings held for the borough elections in 1906 as ‘quite a new departure’ for the
description, and as explicitly modelled on the methods of their opponents.52 Building on this
innovation, the highlight of Reformers’ Day was to be a procession wending its way from
Islington Cattle Market to Trafalgar Square, culminating in a multi-platform open air meeting
in one of the traditional focal points for radical demonstrations. Much covered by the
illustrated press for which it provided irresistible material, the procession embraced
wagonettes, sandwich men, bands, banners, posters mounted on vans, and cars carrying
visualisations of Progressive policies, including a Golem-like figure holding the ratepayer in
his massive hand, a dilapidated LCC-built house, and a steam boat without passengers
bearing the legend ‘One man, one boat’.53 [fig. 3]

![Procession image](http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tcbh)

52 Municipal Reform Gazette, 21 February 1907.
53 Illustrated London News (March 1907); The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times, 2 March 1907;
Special Collections, University of Bristol, LCC Election Addresses, 1907, by permission of the University of Bristol.
The progress of these three-dimensional cartoons was far from smooth; the banners were torn, the house toppled, and the steamboat had one side ripped off. In what the *Daily Mail* described as a ‘riot’, it was clear, in keeping with the pattern of public meetings as a whole, that the Progressives won the fight, if not the election. Despite their use of megaphones, the Municipal Reformers struggled to gain a hearing, and the mile-long procession splintered on arrival at the square. The *Mail’s* riot was the Liberal *Manchester Guardian*’s ‘lively scenes’, while the Northern newspaper reported that the resolution - ‘this mass meeting of London ratepayers indignantly protests against the increasing burden on the rates caused by the Progressive-Socialist party, and pledges itself to every effort to turn the ‘Wastrels’ out...’ - was inaudible in spite of claims that it was carried.\(^5\)

The story of Reformers’ Day encapsulates the inter-penetration of ‘old’ and ‘new’ media, and the significance of public space, and media coverage. It gave rise to some controversy - revealingly not primarily about the low-level violence - but rather over payments to join the procession. The Progressive press seized upon this as emblematic of the Municipal Reformers’ lack of conviction and authenticity. Their opponents admitted that the ‘burly’ hod-carrying men had been paid, but argued their ‘wages’ were more generous than those offered by a Progressive council. Some on the anti-socialist right, notably Lawler Wilson, thought the demonstration a ‘fiasco’, in which ‘the scum of London were paid to demonstrate’, arguing it was the demise, rather than the satirical pretensions, of the procession which inspired laughter in the Square. Predictably, Lawler Wilson emphasised the effectiveness of the anti-socialist press over the following week in rebuilding the Municipal Reform campaign.\(^5\) The *Mail* argued that the imagery of the procession did strike home,

\(^5\) *Daily Mail*, 25 February 1907, 5; *Manchester Guardian*, 25 February, 1907, 8.

while arguing that the ‘organised hooliganism’ of Progressives revealed their desperation.\footnote{Daily Mail, 25 February 1907, 5.}

The meaning of Reformers Day was as contested as its spectacle was reproduced.

IV.

On 8 January 1907, the \textit{Daily Mail} reported on the ‘Opening of Wastrel Campaign’.\footnote{Daily Mail, 8 January 1907, 4.} This headline was followed in the same month with, amongst others, ‘Wastrel Docks / How to Ruin the Port of London’, ‘Mr Burns defends the Wastrels’ and ‘The Wastrel’s Electric Trust’.\footnote{Daily Mail, 14 January 1907; Daily Mail, 25 January 1907; Daily Mail, 29 January 1907.} From January to February, the \textit{Mail} relentlessly referred to ‘Wastrels’ rather than ‘Progressives’, while designating their opponents with the name they had chosen for themselves. The paper had hit upon this happy device in the run up to the borough elections of the previous year. In October 1906, it distinguished three political groupings in London - ‘Progressives or Wastrels’, ‘Moderates or Municipal Reformers, whose cry is efficiency without extravagance’ and ‘Socialist-Labour’. By 9 November, pleased with how the term had caught on, the \textit{Mail} dedicated an article to its etymology.\footnote{The Mail claimed credit for the Wastrels tag in \textit{The Daily Mail and the Fight for London: A Handbook to the London County Council Election Giving Both Sides} (London, 1907), 5-6.}

In late February 1907 Beatrice Webb wrote that ‘the Harmsworth-Pearson gang are shovelling out money, using their daily and evening papers as great advertisement sheets...against the Progressives’.\footnote{Norman and Jeanne Mackenzie (eds) \textit{The Diary of Beatrice Webb: volume 3, 1905-24} (London, 1984), 65-66.} The contribution of Harmsworth and Pearson papers to the fiscal controversy had already given them, especially on the left, a reputation for political

\footnote{65-66. For similar sentiments in print see, ‘The Week’, \textit{The Speaker}, 19 January 1907, 460; ‘Current Events’, \textit{The Independent Review} (February 1907), 128.}
sloganeering.\textsuperscript{61} Webb was not, though, wrong to suggest that some newspapers ran an active and co-ordinated campaign against progressivism in 1907. The \textit{Mail} dedicated the far right-hand column of page 4 to LCC stories from January to March, lending a spatial coherence to its unfolding narrative of progressive failings.\textsuperscript{62} The Harmsworth’s \textit{Evening News} assiduously propagated the Wastrel moniker, and W. K. Haselden pictured Wastrel profligacy in the pages of the \textit{Daily Mirror}.\textsuperscript{63}

In the afterglow of victory, the \textit{Mail} quoted N. W. Hubbard, one of the defeated Progressives in Norwood, accepting that the wastrel tag had ‘caught on with the public’.\textsuperscript{64} It was certainly a recurring motif in the contest, and occupied a central place in interpretations of its outcome as far away as New York.\textsuperscript{65} The election address of Hubbard’s opponents repeatedly referred to ‘the Wastrels’, as did that of Municipal Reformers Jocelyn Brandon and Edward Collins in Hammersmith.\textsuperscript{66} By early January, the term had evidently achieved significant currency. It was used more commonly at public meetings than in election addresses. At the Islington branch of the recently founded Middle Class Defence League, Councillor Clarke complained of the ‘the wastrel LCC’ in connection to Progressive


\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Daily Mail}, 4 March 1907.


\textsuperscript{66} Special Collections, University of Bristol, LCC Election Addresses, C. U. Fisher & F. St John Morrow, 1907; Jocelyn Brandon and Edward Collins, 1907.
dominance of the Works Committee. Speaking at a Municipal Reform public meeting in Islington, Councillor J. H. T. Keeves commended the policy from the borough elections of fighting on the wastrel cry and the focus on the rates. In the LCC itself, Sir Brooke-Hitching defended the right’s commitment to the municipal tramways by arguing they ‘must be managed, not by the wastrels, but by sound, shrewd business men’. Progressives felt compelled to respond explicitly to the wastrel indictment. At a Progressive meeting in Kennington Baths, Sir John Benn demanded of his audience - ‘Who, then, were the Wastrels? (“The Moderates”). Seeking to defuse the charge, Benn later identified himself as a ‘veteran wastrel’. In general, Progressives aimed to downplay the scale of rate rises and the precariousness of LCC’s finances, while defending their expenditure.

The ‘wastrel’ charge drew upon a traditional emphasis upon efficiency and retrenchment. It was difficult to rebut in that few favoured waste. However, the term cast Progressives as not simply the source of waste, but also as worthless, as indeed a form of waste. Its use was not universal, but reflected differences of register within the press. It did not figure in the pages of The Times, other than in reporting Progressive attempts to rebut it. The Municipal Reform Gazette - one of the organs of the London Municipal Society - largely eschewed the term. Some local newspapers that adopted a strongly pro-Municipal Reform line in 1907 also avoided the tag. This does not mean that these publications did not argue that rates were too high, or that Progressive finance was wasteful. There were notable
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continuities in the messages conveyed by opponents of progressivism. It is, though, significant that the term ‘wastrel’ was chiefly propagated by the populist press of the right. The *Daily Mail*’s espousal of the term was a kind of ‘crusade’ that partook of its fondness for stunts, and for coining catchphrases. Pointed terminology was not new: *The Times* called Liberals ‘separatists’ in 1895. Like the paper as a whole, the more judgemental and vulgar ‘wastrels’ owed more, though, to the traditionally vituperative tone of the popular Sunday press, notably *Reynolds’s*. The origins of ‘wastrel’ in this segment of the newspaper market helps explain its limited appearance in papers that aspired to greater respectability, while much of the local press sought to sustain a putative ‘non-political’ status that depended upon the disavowal of strident partisanship, though this was a complex and not always successful operation.

The ‘positive’ counterpart to the Wastrel cry was the replacement of ‘Moderate’ with ‘Municipal Reformer’ as the preferred self-designation of the political right. This too was essayed in the borough elections of November 1906. The liberal press detected the shift in nomenclature in September 1906, prior to the launch of the *Municipal Reform Gazette* the following month. The new name was rapidly adopted in the press, though its unfamiliar and contested character is made apparent when a sympathetic local paper described the actor-manager George Alexander as ‘one of the Moderate, or Municipal Reform’ candidates. By late October 1906, Captain Jessel, chair of the London Municipal Society, was already
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rebutting criticism of the re-naming, claiming that Progressives were merely Radicals, and that ‘Moderate’ was not coined by the right. Jessel essentially acknowledged, however, the re-branding.\textsuperscript{79} Through posters, cartoons, speeches and electoral addresses, the right sought to seize the mantle of municipal reform, appropriating the language adopted by the champions of London-wide government in the 1880s, much to their chagrin. This was a concerted strategy, designed to present a more attractive and dynamic image to voters. Neither of the two main groupings mapped precisely onto the cleavages of Westminster politics, and both purported to put municipal patriotism above conventional party divisions. Whereas the right had altered its name previously, ‘Municipal Reformer’ would endure through and beyond their long tenure in County Hall. The victories of November 1906 and March 1907 consolidated its status as a winning formula.

Progressives vigorously disputed the right’s claim to the title of reformers. Most obviously, progressive politicians and publicists continued to refer to them as ‘Moderates’, denying that any transformation had occurred, and asserting that the right merely offered the usual reactionary policies and aristocratic leadership. Progressives detected only ‘so-called’ Municipal Reform, as in the electoral addresses of Alex Glegg and John Kipling in Clapham, Henry Jephson and Walter Pope in North Kensington, and Frank Briant in North Lambeth. ‘Labour’ and ‘Independent Labour Party’ candidates were similarly unimpressed.\textsuperscript{80} In the \textit{Review of Reviews}, W. T. Stead bemoaned ‘the set back to the cause of progress throughout the whole country’ that would be victory for the ‘so-called “Municipal Reformers”’.\textsuperscript{81} Noting that ‘the Tories of London believe in the value of a name’ \textit{The Speaker} compared them to

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Municipal Reform Gazette}, 23 October 1906, 5.
\textsuperscript{80} University of Bristol, LCC Election Addresses, Alex Glegg and John Kipling (Clapham), Henry Jephson and Walter Pope (North Kensington), Frank Briant (North Lambeth), W. T. Kelly (Peckham); London Metropolitan Archives, ACC/3606/1, Electoral Address of George Horne (Battersea).
\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Review of Reviews} (March 1907), 233-4.
'the simulated quick change artieste of the music halls'.\textsuperscript{82} Revealingly, it was the more pointed term ‘alias’ which Progressives most favoured. At a public meeting in Clerkenwell, the Marquis of Northampton observed that ‘our opponents are playing the old game under a new name - an alias - and of aliases I am always a little suspicious’.\textsuperscript{83} In an editorial the \textit{Daily Chronicle} referred to the ‘alias’ of Municipal Reform.\textsuperscript{84} A. J. Shepherd and W. B. Yates in Hackney deemed ‘the party hitherto known as the Moderates’ to now be ‘the party of many aliases’.\textsuperscript{85}

Visual media were ideally suited for making the case that Municipal Reformers were guilty of disguising their true identity. In cartoons, posters, lantern slides and cinematographs, Progressives presented their opponents hiding their true colours. Newspapers played the leading role in this process. \textit{Reynold's Newspaper} produced a poster, originally a cartoon, showing Municipal Reform as the hut behind which the hunter ‘Capital’ lurked armed with his net of ‘claptrap’ to catch innocent ratepayers.\textsuperscript{86} The preeminent liberal cartoonist, Carruthers Gould, tackled the theme in the \textit{Westminster Gazette} through a Municipal Reform bear that carries the ratepayer away, only to return, well fed, showing his true Moderate markings.\textsuperscript{87} ‘Artful Moderate Ruse Exposed’ encapsulated the argument [fig.4]. The courtroom scene has ‘Vested Interests’/‘Trusts’ before the bar of ‘London Public Opinion’ while his various jackets - ‘Municipal Reform’, ‘Moderate’, ‘Unionist’ - are exposed, and electors are urged not to be ‘led away by false names’. As with \textit{The Speaker’s} music hall
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comparison, this was very much a moral critique. The word ‘alias’, with its implications of dubiousness, even criminality, finds visual expression in the judicial backdrop, duly reinforced by the text.  

The closest equivalent amongst Municipal Reformers to the ‘alias’ accusation was the charge that ‘Progressives’ were actually ‘Socialists’. This was a constant refrain, adopted even by those who disdained the label ‘Wastrel’. It was Huskinson’s cartoons, heavily reproduced in newspapers, leaflets and posters, that constituted the most sustained attempt to fuse the terms ‘Progressive’ and ‘Socialist’, sometimes literally through hyphenation. In part, this reflected an established tendency amongst convinced anti-socialists to identify municipal activism as socialist, enflamed by anxieties about the implications for London of the Liberal landslide of 1906.

88 ‘Artful Moderate Ruse Exposed’, Coll. Misc. 0840-10, by permission of the London School of Economics.
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1906. Name-calling, and rows over nomenclature, were scarcely confined to 1907. However, the intensity of the conflict was both unusual and significant at this election.

The battle over names was driven by the need on both sides to forge viable coalitions of support from potentially divergent factions. Its ferocity owed much to the heightened ideological temperature of the Edwardian era, the emergence of a Labour party in parliament, and the aftermath of the controversies over electoral conduct in the recent general election. In its analogies with the music hall and its discourse of deception, the textual and visual language of denunciation recurred to questions of truth, appearances and identity. Such anxieties may reflect concerns about authenticity that historians have argued were widespread amidst the bustling anonymity of London life.90 The degree of anger articulated by some Progressives over their opponents’ self-descriptions seems to embody a sense that a hard-won political tradition and identity was being purloined.91

The contest over meaning in 1907 was not confined to party labels. In an image borrowing from the world of London theatre, one Progressive poster pictured identifiable Municipal Reformers riding on the shark of the Trusts. The Daily Chronicle cartoonist David Wilson repeatedly portrayed the ‘Moderates’ as the vehicle for the Trusts, as in the posters ‘The Moderate Trio’ and ‘Before and After’[fig.5]. 92


Progressives made the claim that Municipal Reform policy favoured private companies over the public good central to their campaign. William Davies argued in his Battersea electoral address that Municipal Reformers were ‘threatening to hand London over to the companies and trusts’. Edwin A. Cornwall and Edward Smith warned in Bethnal Green of the danger of a ‘huge Electric Monopoly’. H. J. Glanville, giving a limelight lecture in Highgate courtesy of the Daily News, asked ‘Were trusts to be allowed to come in next March?’, urging that a
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Moderate majority would lead to ‘great rejoicing in the camp of the electric trust’. Through oratory, leaflets, editorials, posters, lantern slides and cinematographs, the Progressives contended that a Municipal Reform victory would deliver key services, especially electricity, into the hands of private monopolies.

Unsurprisingly, their opponents denied the charge that they were the tools of vested interests. More interestingly, and more significantly, they argued that it was in fact the Progressives who aimed to create in the words of The Referee a ‘huge Municipal Trust’, or what the Property Owner’s Journal memorably termed ‘the electric octopus’. In their Bethnal Green electoral address Lionel H. Lemon and Richard A. Robinson accused the Progressives of seeking to create a ‘great Municipal Electricity Trust’. Communicated via a wide range of media from speeches to lantern slides, the core message was nicely encapsulated in a poster by Huskinson showing a ratepayer electrocuted by ‘The Progressive Socialist Electrical Trust’. The Daily Mail was to the fore in attacking ‘The Wastrel’s Electric Trust’. Anti-trust rhetoric was not limited to its reporting of the LCC, but was also apparent in coverage of the coal and rail industries, while the paper touted its earlier role in attacking the Soap Trust. This was in keeping with its efforts to articulate a consumer interest, but the extent and ferocity of its anti-trust rhetoric has been insufficiently acknowledged, as has the broader currency of such language. In its leaflets, the LMS likewise argued that the only trusts in the country ‘have been almost entirely the work of leading members of the Radical-Progressive Party’.
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Progressives aimed to put the trust question at the heart of the battle, not least in order to move the conversation away from rates and finances. The Municipal Reform strategy of turning the Progressives’ preferred issue against them reflects the sophistication and vigour of Edwardian electioneering. It remains, though, to explain why both sides regarded the trust label as so damaging. As Frank Trentmann has noted, free traders argued in 1906 that tariff reform would create and reward monopolies, damaging the interests of consumers, and debasing politics.\(^{100}\) The spectre of corruption was frequently invoked in, and after, the 1907 election. Trusts were closely associated with the United States, and with political graft. The trust allegation was also an accusation of Americanising city government, designed to conjure up images of Tammany Hall. The charge was frequently made explicit. In setting out the Municipal Reform case, Jessel claimed that ‘the Socialistic policy of the Progressives tends to create a second Tammany Hall, and to produce in London a state of sordid political corruption similar to that rampant in New York’.\(^{101}\) In contrast the *Daily Chronicle* held that the phenomenon of Tammany Hall flourished in the absence rather than the presence of municipal ownership.\(^{102}\) The Trust debate encapsulated the battle over civic patriotism, good governance, and political truth-telling.

V.

In *Human Nature in Politics*, Graham Wallas pondered the last half hour before the polls closed in the 1907 LCC election. He had spent the time at a polling station viewing proceedings and ‘thinking of this book’. Wallas recorded the ‘dazed’, and ‘bewildered’ state of these citizens, ‘snatched’ from work or the pub on a Saturday night. He observed that
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‘about half of them were women’. Wallas was far from unique in being struck by the role of women in 1907: assessments of their behaviour were central to the way in which the election came to be understood. The Nation proclaimed that ‘the outstanding feature of nearly every contest appears to have been that the women gave a heavy and an almost solid vote for the Moderate Reformers’. The Liberal MP J. W. Cleland attributed ‘the result at Lewisham to the fact that the Moderates were able to poll nearly the whole number of women voters, some 4,000 in number’. The Primrose Leaguer Lady Knightley Fawsley confided in her journal that ‘the Progressives think the women voters had a good deal to do with their defeat for the County Council’. The Municipal Reform Gazette claimed that whereas normally only 10% of female electors voted, more than half had done so, before remarking that ‘the Progressives even attribute their defeat to the women voters’.

Progressive analysts essayed a range of explanations for defeat beyond the alleged actions of female voters. The ‘immense increase in the polls’ was central to these, with the Manchester Guardian identifying ‘stay-at-home men’ as the source of anti-Progressive votes. The role played by divisions on the left, whether between liberals and socialists, or between non-conformists and progressives, was debated. It was, though, the ‘American’-style anti-progressive campaign waged by newspapers and political associations that was widely seen as crucial. While the political right unsurprisingly differed in its assessment of the morality of its efforts, and stressed the iniquities of progressive rule, it largely shared the view that itselectioneering had been highly effective. In an interview with the Globe headlined ‘Tammany’s Downfall’, the London Municipal Society Secretary W. G. Towler
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suggested of ‘It’s Your Money We Want’ in particular that its ‘effect...on much of the public has been great’. The Daily Mail suggested it was ‘the unanimity of the reasoning portion of the Press, backed by the admirable organisation which Captain Jessel and Mr Towler have so ably and brilliantly conducted’ that had delivered victory.\(^\text{109}\)

The evidential basis for these analyses was shaky, given uncertainties created by the rise in turnout. Many Progressive defeats were narrow, and, as some contemporary commentators, noted, the loss of candidates and energy to parliamentary duties resulting from the 1906 triumph was likely not to have helped. The campaign run by the right was stronger than its predecessors. The timing of the election was certainly propitious, and divisions on the left helped. The right was able to construct the election as a verdict on financial crisis and administrative competence, despite economic circumstances that were less clear cut than those of the early 1920s or the 1970s.

The emphasis upon novel ‘American’ methods, present in the immediate post-election coverage, received canonical expression in Wallas’s masterpiece, which can be seen as the most sophisticated expression of the progressive reaction to the 1907 defeat. Much as ‘It’s Your Money We Want’ was the key instance of the transferable power of pictorial imagery, so the Daily Mail’s use of ‘wastrel’ served to illustrate the potency of repetitive sloganeering. The focus on the rates, and the multi-media publicity onslaught, held by the right to have secured success, provided its model in future LCC contests and empowered those on the right keen to politicise further local government.\(^\text{110}\) Informed by a sense that the emphasis upon good budgetary housekeeping worked well with female electors, the right’s understanding of 1907 influenced its post-war thinking, when a changed tax environment, along with an
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altered electorate, made the lessons of London more generally applicable. The 1907 election demonstrated that new forms of political communication, and more coherent and organised messaging, could be pioneered in a municipal context, prior to the intense party conflict of 1908-1914.

Wallas offered a dazzling account of the process of transference and allusion whereby images gained meaning. Less apparent, though, was a full recognition of the range of media - from electoral addresses and newspaper cartoons, to posters, cinematographs and lantern lectures - that constituted the visual culture of London politics. Relying overly on Wallas’s participant account distracts from the inter-relationship between different media, much as his emphasis on the sub-conscious power of the iconic image neglects the active role of political audiences in creating and contesting meanings. New media before 1914 enriched rather than replaced existing forms of public politics. As David Wilson’s ‘Before And After’ portrays, visual media were incorporated into the battle over symbolic space; ‘new’ and ‘old’ media and campaigning techniques were inter-mingled, as in the Reformers’ Day march to Trafalgar Square. The referencing of images within images, and the frequent attention to questions of pictorial lying, reveal the self-conscious sophistication of pre-1914 political culture. The appeal to the viewer, or listener, was one firmly based upon interaction, in which the voter was enlisted into the construction of meaning as a knowing citizen, able to discern the duplicities of the other side. If not politics as art, this was politics as music hall. Most of
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all, what 1907 shows is that Edwardian political culture can only be fully understood through
critical engagement with both the word and the image.