

University of Alberta

Gendering Compassion: Women and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to
Animals

by

Erika Anne Elves

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
History

Department of History and Classics

© Erika Anne Elves
Spring 2013
Edmonton, Alberta

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Libraries to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only. Where the thesis is converted to, or otherwise made available in digital form, the University of Alberta will advise potential users of the thesis of these terms.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis and, except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatsoever without the author's prior written permission.

ABSTRACT

British women significantly impacted the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) during its formative period, 1824-1850. Through the adoption and imaginative use of the female gender norms of nineteenth century British society, philanthropic women influenced their society through compassionate volunteerism. The women who worked with the RSPCA used their personal influence within their families, their social circles, and society at large to promote animal welfare. They attended meetings. They participated in educational initiatives, such as the creation and distribution of tracts and pamphlets. These women both sought out and donated funds, adding significant sums to the Society's coffers. They witnessed and reported animal cruelty and then testified in court. Although they were initially not welcomed onto the formal Committee, they were the driving force behind the development of auxiliary societies in other areas of England and Ireland. Women were vital to the development of the RSPCA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
1. Historiography.....	2
2. Context	5
II. Female Identity	13
1. Class	14
2. Evangelicalism	15
3. Separate Spheres?.....	19
4. The Redefinition of Social Boundaries	25
5. Female Interaction with Animals.....	28
6. Summary	31
III. Multiple Roles in the RSPCA.....	33
1. Personal Influence	33
i. Influence within the Family	34
ii. Influence within the Social Circle.....	38
iii. Influence through Patronage	40
2. Attendance.....	44
3. Education.....	48
4. Financial Support	59
5. Reporting Cruelty	68
6. The Female Relationship to the Committee	76
7. Creation of Auxiliaries	80
IV. Conclusion	83
V. Bibliography	85

INTRODUCTION

British women were crucial to the foundation of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (hereafter RSPCA)¹ during its early period. Through the adoption and imaginative use of the female gender norms of nineteenth-century British society, philanthropic women took the opportunity to become involved in public activity through active volunteerism. The Evangelical worldview encouraged women to be pious and moral influences in their families and their social circles. Many women took this opportunity gladly. Not only were they testaments to the female's moral virtue, they also used the opening to push gently into areas of education, charitable finance, and even courts of law where they would not have been accepted otherwise. As long as they were protected by the banners of "female moral superiority" and philanthropy, these excursions were welcomed. These new openings for female involvement in societies such as the RSPCA created a favorable milieu for the adjustment and expansion of gender roles. For the purposes of this study, the years 1824-1850 will be examined. It is logical to begin in the year 1824, as this was when the Society was formed. As the RSPCA received its royal designation in 1840 and it is desirable to see what effect this had on the society, 1850 was chosen as a convenient stopping point. This choice enabled me to compare the activities and financial situation of the RSPCA before and after this major event.

Historiography

The involvement of women in the early RSPCA is a largely untouched topic, and the role of gender in the Society during this period has not been addressed at all. There

1 The Society went by "Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals" until it received its royal designation in 1840; however, the acronym RSPCA will be used throughout for convenience and clarity. In the footnotes, SPCA is retained where the date of publication was before 1840.

are only three books that explore the history of the RSPCA and all are woefully outdated; the most recent was published in 1974. The earliest of these is Edward G. Fairholme's and Wellesley Pain's 1924 work *A Century of Work for Animals: The History of the R.S.P.C.A., 1824-1924*. This book does an admirable job of covering the history of the RSPCA using topical chapters instead of strict chronology. Fairholme and Pain do a decent job of citing primary resources. They mention the individual efforts of women in passing. Like many advocates of that time, however, they make little attempt to be objective, wishing instead to convince the reader of the rightness of their cause. This is hardly surprising, considering that Fairholme was the Chief Secretary of the RSPCA and Pain was the Editor for the Society. Fairholme and Pain write a very one-sided story. The triumphal approach, which treats the success of the RSPCA as predetermined, mars an otherwise respectable attempt at the history of the Society.

Arthur W. Moss's *Valiant Crusade: The History of the R.S.P.C.A.*, published in 1961, is a fairly thorough history of the Society. Moss's topical chapter approach is fairly similar to Fairholme and Pain's; unfortunately, however, his citation is almost non-existent. His approach to women is also cursory. He mentions in passing how important their work was to the society, but does not go into depth. He does bring forward the work of Angela Burdett-Coutts and Mrs. Catherine Smithies in his chapter entitled "Some Early Notables".² Both women are praised for their characters, not their specific actions, an extension of earlier attitudes toward women. Neither was significantly active in the Society prior to 1850, so most of their work does not fall into the time period covered by this study.

The third history, Antony Brown's *Who Cares for Animals?* (1974) is written on

2 Arthur W. Moss, *Valiant Crusade: The History of the R.S.P.C.A.* (London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1961): 33-47.

behalf of the Society for a popular audience. As stated in his preface, Brown has not intended this book as a history, but as a living portrait of the work of the RSPCA brought to light.³ He focuses on charming vignettes, and especially upon Richard Martin, MP, who spearheaded the first successful animal welfare Act, which was passed in 1822. Women are almost entirely missing from Brown's narrative; the author limits himself to brief mentions of women who donated a significant amount of money to the Society or whose actions were very visible.⁴ Brown focuses on corporate over individual action, giving the RSPCA credit for initiatives, rather than naming the individuals who initiated these actions.

In addition to histories of the RSPCA, there are also a number of books that address the overall growth of the animal welfare movement in Britain. The most useful of these is E.S. Turner's 1964 work *All Heaven in a Rage*.⁵ Turner states that he “sets out to describe how the British nation was persuaded, shamed, shocked and coerced into showing mercy to the “brute creation”.”⁶ Turner's description of the historical context, including horse racing, bull- and bear-baiting, and cock fights, is helpful and enlightening. Turner does include a limited discussion of the importance of individual women writing for the benefit of children, alongside his discussion of works by Dr. Thomas Percival and Thomas Day. He is most interested in Sarah Trimmer's *Fabulous Histories designed for the Instruction of Children Respecting their Treatment of Animals*

3 Antony Brown, *Who Cares for Animals?* (London: Heinemann, 1974): ix.

4 These women are Mrs. Hall, author, Mrs. Radcliffe and Mrs. Foster, financial supporters, and Mrs. Catherine Smithies, who founded the children's group Band of Mercy. See Brown, *Who Cares for Animals?*, 12, 18, 22, 24.

5 See also Dix Harwood, *Love for Animals and How it Developed in Great Britain* (New York: Columbia University, 1928) and Kathryn Shevelow, *For the Love of Animals: The Rise of the Animal Protection Movement* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2008).

6 E.S. Turner, *All Heaven in a Rage* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964): 11.

(1786). Mrs. Trimmer uses the format of the children's story to promote kindness toward animals, but carefully teaches that people come first. Turner also briefly mentions Mary Wollstonecraft's *Original Stories* (1788) and Mrs. Barbauld's hymns, fables and verses, dedicating a paragraph to each.⁷ On the whole, Turner writes competently and from a more objective point of view.

Because there are very few secondary sources available that discuss the early RSPCA, and none at all that discuss the role of gender in the development of this institution, the existing primary sources are crucial. This thesis is based on documents housed at the headquarters of the RSPCA in Southwater, West Sussex, Great Britain. Unfortunately, only two types of documents remain in the Society's custody that tell the story of the RSPCA's earliest years. The first are the hand-written committee meeting minutes starting with the first meeting held 16 June 1824. The second are the published *Annual Reports*, beginning in 1836; each report includes a record of the annual meeting itself and the subscriber list for that year.

These documents present a number of challenges. First of all, both the meeting minutes and the *Annual Reports* were produced by men; as such, any discussion of women's involvement must be pieced together from records dominated by male concerns. There was undoubtedly more female involvement than was noted in either the committee meeting minutes or the annual reports. In addition, the nature of the documents themselves must be considered. Committee meeting minutes were not published; therefore, the committee members could be more free with their opinions. The minutes were, however, open to the scrutiny of other committee members. It is therefore unlikely that recorded comments represent completely unguarded opinions. Meeting minutes are also difficult in that they record only what the secretary believed was important at the

⁷ E.S. Turner, *All Heaven in a Rage*, 76-83.

time. This does not always coincide with what the historian wishes to know. For example, Moss includes a picture of a medal bestowed upon an important female supporter of the Society. It is engraved “Presented to M^{rs}. Elizth Gurney by the founder of the medal. Jan.^y 1833. Sam Gurney Esq.^r Treas.^r.”⁸ There is no mention of this award in the committee meeting minutes, and it appears that the Society did not publish annual reports before 1836.

The *Annual Reports* have their own set of limitations. Annual reports were intended to give subscribers and interested parties an overview of the work of the Society, presented in the best possible light. As these reports were public documents, they had to be very carefully managed so that only the official views of the institution were put forward. This bias in favour of solidarity must be noted when dealing with this sort of text.⁹

Context

When examining the treatment of animals in nineteenth-century Britain, it is important to remember that animal cruelty was not new. Hunting had been around for millennia, and games in which animals fought each other were nearly as old.¹⁰ Blood sport had been practiced for generations. Cock fighting rings were common, and it was not difficult to find a bull-, bear- or badger-bait to wager on. Dogs known as ratters would kill as many rats as possible in a certain time limit, while men looked on and

8 Moss, *Valiant Crusade*, frontispiece facing p. 164.

9 John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History* (London: Pearson Education Ltd., 2002): 65. See also Arthur Marwick, *The New Nature of History: Knowledge, Evidence, Language* (Chicago: Lyceum Books, Inc., 2001): 166.

10 Edward G. Fairholme and Wellesley Pain, *A Century of Work for Animals: The History of the R.S.P.C.A., 1824-1924* (London: John Murray, 1924): 3-5.

placed bets. Dog fights were omnipresent, and monkey fighting was not unheard of. More seemingly tame sport such as horse racing could be equally vicious.¹¹ Turner informs us that “if a horse was not whipped and spurred all the way the jockey was suspected of “pulling” it; occasionally a horse was spurred so savagely that its entrails were visible as it passed the winning post.”¹² Private time trials on the open road were no less dangerous; many horses were driven to death by exhaustion in this way.¹³

Many Britons did not only enjoy animal cruelty in the form of blood sport; they also enjoyed the flesh of animals that had been brutally treated. E.S. Turner examines the various slow-death methods ostensibly used to improve the taste and tenderness of various types of meat. Pigs were whipped to death with knotted ropes; such meat was considered a delicacy. Live turkeys were bled out slowly, hung upside down. Salmon were sliced into delicate morsels while still alive, and eels were skinned while still living. Live animals being prepared for market were not much better off. For example, geese being raised for *fois gras* often had their feet nailed to the floor to prevent them from exercising, and food was crammed down their throats, sometimes mixed with gin to make them sleepy and easier to handle.¹⁴

The social milieu that allowed these kinds of cruelty, however, was changing. As the population grew and opportunities became scarcer in the country, cities swelled with rural folk in search of work at the new factories. This urban growth led to increased congestion in the city streets; those of the urban middle-class and aristocracy were increasingly exposed, for example, to the animal abuse common among those who

11 Turner, *All Heaven in a Rage*, 4-5, 14-21.

12 Ibid., 58.

13 Ibid., 56-60, 107-8, 131, 151-6.

14 Ibid., 53-4.

worked in the transportation sector. Kean argues that “urban isolation from animal farming had nourished emotional attitudes which were hard to reconcile with the exploitation of animals by which most people lived.”¹⁵ Li points out that in addition to the rapid growth of cities, industry, and overall population, the scene was also set by “intense religious revival and national political tension that exerted substantial influence.”¹⁶ The combination of these factors lead to a rise in “organized moral indignation,” which in turn was addressed by the formation of animal welfare groups, such as the RSPCA.¹⁷

The introduction of a number of bills in Parliament against animal cruelty was a reflection of changing attitudes toward “brute creation.” At least as late as 1784 there was no British legislation against cruelty; animals were treated as property, and all laws regarded them as such.¹⁸ In 1800, William Pulteney introduced a bill against bull-baiting. It was narrowly defeated. In 1809, Lord Erskine presented a broader bill against cruelty to animals; he specifically listed horses, cows and sheep. This bill also foundered.¹⁹ Richard Martin's bill was more robust. In 1821, Martin introduced “A Bill to prevent the cruel and improper treatment of cattle.” This bill championed protection from cruelty for horses, donkeys, mules, sheep, and cattle.²⁰ Opponents argued that the bill was too broad,

15 Hilda Kean, *Animal Rights: Political and Social Change in Britain since 1800* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd., 1998): 30.

16 Chien-Hui Li, “Union of Christianity, Humanity, and Philanthropy: The Christian Tradition and the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Nineteenth-Century England,” *Society Animals: Journal of Human-Animal Studies* 8, no. 3 (2000): 266.

17 José Parry and Noel Parry, “The Equality of Bodies: Animal Exploitation and Human Welfare,” in *Social Policy and the Body: Transitions in Corporeal Discourse*, ed. Kathryn Ellis and Hartley Dean (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999): 160.

18 Moss, *Valiant Crusade*, 12-13.

19 *Ibid.*, 14-15.

20 *Ibid.*, 16.

and that it would be expanded to include other animals, such as dogs and cats, which did not warrant protection.²¹ The proponents, after producing amendments, won the day. The bill was passed and came into effect in July 1822.²² This created a precedent; animal cruelty was now a matter that could be legislated against.²³

The RSPCA was founded in 1824, two years after the first Bill against animal cruelty had been passed in Parliament.²⁴ The initial meeting of the RSPCA was held on 16 June 1824 at Old Slaughter's Coffee House, St. Martin's Lane, London. More than 20 men were present, including Rev. Arthur Broome who had initiated the event and T.F. Buxton in the chair. Richard Martin M.P., author and champion of the 1822 animal cruelty act, was also in attendance.²⁵ At this first meeting, two committees were established: one to pursue the publication of tracts, sermons, and other animal welfare literature, and the other to create a policy by which Inspectors could be hired and employed. The committee in charge of publication decided on 25 June that three tracts would be published, among them “a tract on cruelty to brutes by Mrs. Hall.”²⁶ This is the first mention of female involvement in the Society. Initially, the majority of Society finances were provided by Rev. Arthur Broome, Honorary Secretary. Moss describes him as “a clergyman of the Church of England [who] bears out the contention that religious

21 Hansard, *House of Commons Debates*, 01 June 1821, vol 5 cc1098-9. Accessed February 12, 2013. <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1821/jun/01/ill-treatment-of-horses-bill>

22 Moss, *Valiant Crusade*, 16.

23 Brian Harrison, “Animals and the State in Nineteenth-Century England,” *The English Historical Review* 88, no. 349 (Oct., 1973):788.

24 Hansard, *House of Commons Debates*, 07 June 1822, vol 7 cc873-4. Accessed January 24, 2013. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1822/jun/07/ill-treatment-of-cattle-bill#S2V0007P0_18220607_HOC_38

25 Kathryn Shevelov, *For the Love of Animals* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2008): 10.

26 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, “Meeting, Friday June 25, 1824,” *Minute Book [commencing] 1824*: 7.

belief of whatever kind must include the showing of mercy to those unable to defend themselves, most of all to animals.”²⁷ Broome was so insistent upon this point that he resigned his parish living in order to work for the RSPCA full-time. Two years after its foundation, the RSPCA faced financial difficulties and was required to suspend its operations between the summer of 1826 and the summer of 1828. Broome, as Secretary, was held responsible for the Society's debt of £300 and was thrown into prison in January 1826. Richard Martin and Lewis Gompertz were quick to raise the money required to pay the debt, and Broome was released.²⁸

The Society, however, continued to struggle with its finances. A windfall in the form of a £100 donation from William Radcliffe was of great assistance, but did not last for long.²⁹ By February 1828, Broome was required once again to find work to support himself. The title of Honorary Secretary was passed on to Louis Gompertz. With his assistance, the infant society was able to attract some patronage – including that of women.³⁰ In July 1828, a list of potential patrons to be approached was approved. Of the 23 names, 14 were female.³¹ A Ladies' Committee was formed, as was a committee responsible for finding clergymen to preach sermons against cruelty to animals.³² Subscription numbers improved. Society finances leveled out; although the money was not ample, it was adequate. Gompertz held the post of Secretary until 1832, when he

27 Moss, *Valiant Crusade*, 34.

28 Ibid., 25-26.

29 RSPCA, “Meeting, May 15, 1826,” *Minute Book 1824*: 38. This donation is later said to be from the estate of Mr. Radcliffe's wife, Ann Radcliffe, the novelist. I have not found any documentation supporting this claim.

30 RSPCA, “Meeting, Monday, June 30, 1828,” *Minute Book 1824*: 66.

31 RSPCA, “Public Meeting held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, the Strand (Thurs July 3, 1828),” *Minute Book 1824*: 68.

32 RSPCA, “Meeting July 20, 1829,” *Minute Book 1824*: 100; RSPCA, “Meeting January 7, 1830,” *Minute Book 1824*: 113.

resigned, ostensibly over the Society's insistence on Christian principles.³³ He went on to found the Animal's Friend Society.³⁴ The work of the RSPCA continued; inspectors were sent out to watch for cruelty in particularly suspect places, such as the huge Smithfield livestock market in London.

The work of the Society was greatly aided in 1835, when the scope of the 1822 bill was extended, preventing the use of animals for bloodsport.³⁵ Joseph Pease MP, Quaker and Society member, championed this legislation.³⁶ Concerns put forward by opponents included the cost of inspectors, the encouragement of mischievous informers, and the hardship placed upon the poor in removing their entertainment. Mr. Pease stated that “he would be the last man in the world to support the measure, if it tended to abridge the amusements of the poorer classes; but he was persuaded that it would have no such effect.”³⁷ The bill was put to a vote, and it was passed. The Society could now legally prosecute perpetrators of bloodsport.

The year 1835 was momentous for another reason as well. That year the RSPCA received an important boost in the eyes of society. In 1835, Princess Victoria and her mother, the Duchess of Kent, became patronesses.³⁸ This added both to the RSPCA's visibility and respectability. Five years later, the Society approached Queen Victoria to

33 Moss, *Valiant Crusade*, 26-28.

34 Lucien Wolf, ‘Gompertz, Lewis (1783/4–1861)’, rev. Ben Marsden, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed February 12, 2013. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10934>.

35 Harrison, “Animals and the State,” 789.

36 Fairholme and Pain, *A Century of Work for Animals*, 71-74. For more on legislation against animal cruelty, see Brian Harrison, “Animals and the State,” 786-820.

37 Hansard, *House of Commons Debates*, 14 July 1835, vol 29 cc537-8 . Accessed February 12, 2013. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1835/jul/14/cruelty-to-animals#S3V0029P0_18350714_HOC_3.

38 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, “Monthly General Meeting, July 6, 1835,” *R.S.P.C.A. Minute Book, No. 1 commencing March 1832*: 240.

request royal patronage. This was graciously approved, and the RSPCA obtained its royal designation.³⁹

There were three major issues with which the Society was concerned between 1824 and 1850. The first was the cruelty practiced at Smithfield Market, where cattle and sheep were sold. London, as the trade centre, saw many live animals driven there for sale. The city grew and modernized around the old structures, so that the Smithfield Market, once outside of London's walls, was now well within its boundaries.⁴⁰ Livestock being taken to market were driven through the busy streets of the metropole, often brutally beaten by the drovers. This treatment continued at the market, and could lead to human injury as well. For example, *The Morning Post* reported on 21 November 1828 that a man, a woman, and a girl had been tossed by a distressed cow let loose from Smithfield Market.⁴¹ The RSPCA was able to initiate some measures that were of great benefit to the livestock that passed through London and Smithfield Market. Sunday droving was prohibited, and early-morning transport was encouraged. Sticks used for driving cattle were regulated; cudgels and clubs were no longer acceptable. The market itself had lamps installed for better visibility and the City Police instructed to watch for cruelty.⁴²

Traditional bloodsports also came under the watchful eye of the Society. One of the major events they attempted to suppress was the annual bull-running at Stamford, Lincolnshire. Every November, a bull was brought into town. The streets were then

39 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Fourteenth Annual Report with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in Exeter hall, on Wednesday, the 6th day of May, 1840*. (London: [n.p.], 1840): 3.

40 Kean, *Animal Rights*, 29.

41 "Cruelty to Animals," *The Morning Post* (London, England), Friday, November 21, 1828. Issue 18077. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

42 Fairholme and Pain, *A Century of Work for Animals*, 88.

barricaded and the citizens of Stamford hunted the beast until it was exhausted. When the thrill of the chase was over, the dogs were set on the unfortunate animal.⁴³ Due to arguments about the wording of the 1822 Act and unhelpful magistrates who personally supported the practice, the RSPCA was initially unable to address this issue. After the 1835 Act protecting livestock was passed, the Society was able to initiate legal action. Charges were brought against the main organizers in 1836, and they were convicted. This did not stop the town of Stamford from arranging bull-runnings in 1837 and 1838, but both of these illegal attempts were suppressed.⁴⁴

The third major issue was the matter of dogs pulling carts as a method of transporting goods.

Not native to Britain, the idea of the dog cart had come from the Low Countries earlier in the nineteenth century. The carts became popular in England due to the lower cost of obtaining and feeding dogs. They were easier to obtain than horses, were more expendable, and were not subject to the same tolls.⁴⁵ The dogs used for such carts were often found to be in a sorry state, and rabies was rampant. Critics argued dog carts were unnatural, as dogs' feet were not made for the hard roads, and horses shied at the carts.⁴⁶ After the passing of the 1835 Act, the Society unsuccessfully attempted to abolish dog carts; their next attempt was to champion legislation that would limit their use. The carts were not successfully legislated against until 1854.⁴⁷

43 Fairholme and Pain, *A Century of Work for Animals*, 76.

44 *Ibid.*, 77- 79.

45 Turner, *All Heaven in a Rage*, 149-50.

46 Fairholme and Pain, *A Century of Work for Animals*, 109-117.

47 Turner, *All Heaven in a Rage*, 149-50; Hansard, *House of Lords Debates*, 10 July 1854, vol 134 cc1429-36. Accessed January 23, 2013.
<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1854/jul/10/cruelty-to-animals-bill>

FEMALE IDENTITY

The work of the Society would have suffered greatly if it had not been for concerned women who became involved in the animal protection movement. Female volunteers and subscribers flocked to the Society for the Prevention of Animals in the years following its formation in 1824. Newspapers featured stories of women who informed the Society of cruelties, women who funded anti-cruelty essay competitions, women who testified in court to right wrongs against animals. The RSPCA annual reports indicate that masses of women attended the annual meetings, sometimes in greater numbers than men. Women became patrons and gave the Society hundreds of pounds. Who were these ladies who were so energetically working on behalf of the Society? Where did they come from, and why did they so passionately support its goals?

The official views of the male committee members are the easiest to ascertain. The expressions of gratitude presented at the RSPCA annual meetings overflowed with praise for women as sensitive, religious, useful creatures. Such speeches express a belief in the “natural” moral superiority of women. At the 1832 Annual General Meeting, committee member Nathaniel Goldsmid, Esq. stated that “[he knew] of no instance in which the influence of that sex, to whom we owe all the milder virtues, is wanting in the cause of humanity; they on all occasions evince a readiness to come forward, to desert the privacy of their chamber, and sacrifice their feelings of retirement to promote feelings which do honor to human nature.”⁴⁸ It is plain, however, that not all women fit into this rather limited box. Women's individual identities were as disparate as men's. If, then, the dominant societal view of the respectable woman did not present anything close to the entire picture, what then explains women's philanthropic involvement? What aspects of

48 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *The Sixth Report and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, May 11th, 1832. To which is added an extract from the Evidence taken before the Committee of the House of Common.* (London: W. Molineux, 1832): 14-15.

their personally and culturally constructed identities drew them to this kind of work? In order to address these questions of identity, we must examine the impact of class affiliation, evangelical Christianity, and respectability on contemporary gender roles and expectations.

Class

For both men and women, class affiliation was an important identity marker. Fortunately, an analysis of RSPCA patronage and subscriber lists paints a clear picture of the social status of the bulk of those involved. Most of the men and women involved in the RSPCA were of or associated with the middle class. For example, in 1832, 59% of patrons and patronesses were either lesser gentry or upper middle class.⁴⁹ That same year, 76 % of donors belonged to that group, and they donated 85% of the yearly funds.⁵⁰ This extensive middle-class involvement in the work of the RSPCA was similar to that in other contemporary philanthropic societies. Beginning in the early nineteenth-century, middle-class men and women banded together in order to influence government and greater society in ways they could not undertake individually, as an influential member of the aristocracy might.⁵¹ Carson argues that “the middle classes were responsive to the idea of animal rights [in particular] because of their attachment to the reformed churches and because they were unaccustomed to the blood-stained episodes of the hunting field.”⁵² Although Carson conflates the contemporary concept of animal welfare with the

49 SPCA, *The Sixth Report and Proceedings*, 3.

50 *Ibid.*, 26-7. I judge donors to be middle class or minor gentry if they have contributed at least the annual subscription fee of £1.1.0 and were not listed with a title. Donors with the more generic Lord or Lady title, but no further designation, I hold to be minor gentry.

51 Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (London: Hutchinson, 1987): 73.

52 Gerald Carson, *Men, Beasts and Gods: A History of Cruelty and Kindness to Animals* (New

judicial principle of animal rights that developed during the twentieth century, he is essentially correct. I would add that, in addition, the urban middle-classes had been removed from traditional blood-sport as well, preferring more respectable entertainment.⁵³

The desire for moral change evidenced by such considerable middle-class involvement was based on an evangelical worldview that involved placing great value on an intentional, sober lifestyle and included a drive to share the good news of the New Testament gospel with the masses. Davidoff and Hall point out that “the zeal of the serious Christians played a vital part in establishing the cultural practices and institutions which were to become characteristic hallmarks of the middle classes.”⁵⁴ The RSPCA was a part of this greater change. In Bebbington's words, societies such as the RSPCA sought “to enforce the ethics of the gospel.”⁵⁵

Evangelicalism

An evangelical revival had begun within the Church of England in the early eighteenth century as a primarily working-class movement under the Methodist teaching of John Wesley. Wesley's focus on sharing the gospel with the masses in ways and places accessible to them has been criticized by Ford K. Brown, scholar of the history of evangelicalism, as an error in judgment. Brown argues that, in the task of reforming a

York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972): 50. For the responses of working-class men who were used to these things, see Brian Harrison, “Religion and Recreation in Nineteenth-Century England,” *Past and Present* no. 38 (Dec., 1967): 98-125. Accessed January 28, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/649750>

53 Gary Cross, *A Social History of Leisure Since 1600* (State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc., 1990): 95.

54 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 76.

55 David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989): 12.

nation, Wesley's approach was nearly useless.⁵⁶ He states that “Wesley's blunder was his conviction that one soul is as good as another. There is a spiritual way of looking at this matter and a practical way. Wesley chose the wrong one.”⁵⁷ Brown assumes that the primary goal of Evangelicalism was national reform in the manners of the English people. His incorrect approach causes him to place an undue emphasis on actions with temporal results, when, as David Bebbington argues, these were merely means to an end, that end being the conversion of the nation.⁵⁸

Bebbington has provided a carefully considered and encompassing definition of evangelicalism. He states that there are four markers of evangelical belief. The first is a belief in the prominence of Scripture. The second is the centrality of the crucifixion. The third, flowing from the first two, is the necessity for personal conversion; the fourth, the need for activism in the cause of the oppressed, in order to remove barriers that kept them from personal conversion and a sober godly lifestyle.⁵⁹ These markers were embraced by reformers in the Church of England who, inspired by Methodism's “religion of the heart”, sought to expand the impact of evangelicalism's serious religion to a larger segment of the population.⁶⁰ Although Methodism appealed primarily to the working classes, there were also aristocratic followers. Lady Huntingdon, for example, was crucial. She identified herself as an Anglican evangelical, and she used what means she had to introduce the upper classes to serious religion. She invited women from the nobility and gentry to talk about classical Christianity at her home; often introducing them to evangelists such as

56 Ford K. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians: The Age of Wilberforce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961): 4.

57 Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians*, 45-6.

58 Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*, 10.

59 *Ibid.*, 2-3.

60 Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians*, 4.

George Whitfield or Charles Wesley.⁶¹ She opened a college for clergymen in south Wales.⁶² She joined “her” preachers on evangelical trips. She installed evangelical clergymen trained at her college in as many churches as she could.⁶³ Through the efforts of Lady Huntingdon and others like her, evangelicalism began to reach different social classes. As evangelical concerns and attitudes took hold of the hearts and minds of banking, professional, industrial, and wealthy trade families, this group began to identify with the intentionality and sobriety of dress and behaviour that set this class apart from the conspicuously consumptive aristocracy and the rough and immoral working classes.⁶⁴

While Kean is partially right when she argues that individuals “supporting humane treatment for animals adhered to no one political or ideological set of beliefs,” she also misses the significance of the impact of evangelicalism on society as a whole.⁶⁵ Even those who would not consciously associate themselves with evangelicalism were affected by the intense involvement and vast scope of the evangelical minority.⁶⁶ This serious religion can be seen in the growth of a more serious mindset and a vision to improve society as a whole. As Ford K. Brown so eloquently states, “nearly everywhere, it seemed to sober and thoughtful men, there was a scandalous or dangerous antagonism, blindness or indifference to good manners, good morals, upright living and true religion, the most unmistakable evidence of a luxurious and profligate corruption of the upper

61 Tyson, John R. "Lady Huntingdon's Reformation." *Church History* 64 (December 1995): 587.. *OmniFile Full Text Select (H.W. Wilson)*, EBSCOhost (accessed February 12, 2013).

62 Ibid., 589.

63 Ibid., 591.

64 For more on class development theory, see E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1980).

65 Kean, *Animal Rights*, 24. See also Turner, *All Heaven in a Rage*, 65.

66 Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988): 26.

classes, a general debauchery and corruption of the lower.”⁶⁷ The belief in the superior morality presented by the evangelical worldview led a large percentage of these middle-class Christians to create, develop and support organizations aimed at the improvement of society – especially working-class society; this is rather ironic, given the working-class origins of evangelicalism. Indeed, “the conviction that “works”, inspired by Christian love, could regenerate English society was shared by evangelicals of all denominations and made possible the alliance of middle-class Anglicans and nonconformists in the bid to rescue those otherwise condemned to eternal damnation.”⁶⁸ The aim of this was not to reduce the social gap between working- and middle-class society, as suggested by Richard D. Ryder, but to create a class-specific expression of middle-class initiated respectability and morality among the rougher sort.⁶⁹ While the belief in the gospel story would cross class lines, the working out of that belief would be largely class-specific. The Christian poor would become the industrious slightly-better-off: not participating in the traditional bloodsport but instead involving themselves in the rational leisure of mechanics institutes, attending churches and sending their children to Sunday schools, and attending to their business. Respectable women of the working classes were still required to work outside the home, as were their social contemporaries, but their new industriousness would overflow into their homes as well. The intention of the middle-class mission to the labouring classes was intended to be of both spiritual and earthly good, but was not intended to make working-class recipients into middle-class citizens.

67 Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians*, 23.

68 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 95.

69 Richard D. Ryder, *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes towards Speciesism* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989): 81.

Separate Spheres?

Given the importance of evangelicals within and without the Church of England, as well as the large number of improvement societies they created, it becomes evident that the evangelicals themselves were exerting influence disproportionate to their numbers.⁷⁰ Their ideology became evident in the new importance placed upon, for example, the family. Davidoff and Hall point out that the evangelical belief in the necessity of a hierarchical family structure, buttressed by Scripture, became common among middle class Christians and their peers. The specific roles within the family were believed to be passed down by God and necessary for growth in faith and goodness.⁷¹ As evangelicals began to focus on the Scriptural injunction to be in the world, but not of it,⁷² and as the removal of the workplace from the home progressed,⁷³ women as the weaker sex were increasingly encouraged to spend their time in the home, so as to be protected from the evil implicit in public spaces.⁷⁴ Although this arrangement of gendered spaces and gender roles was not new, it became more important in religious belief and conversation at this time. Evangelicalism led to a turn toward domesticity, for men as well as women. Although “work was dignified, serious, and a properly masculine pursuit,”⁷⁵ to retreat to the home, rather than the pub, after the strains of the day was considered a respectable and fitting masculine practice. Davidoff and Hall note, however,

70 J.F.C. Harrison, *The Early Victorians 1832-1851* (New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1971): 133. For more information on evangelicalism and its influence, see John Wolffe, *The Expansion of Evangelicalism: The Age of Wilberforce, More, Chalmers and Finney* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2007).

71 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 108-9.

72 *Holy Bible*, John 17:6-19, 1 John 2: 15-17.

73 Lucy Delap, Ben Griffin, and Abigail Wills, eds, *The Politics of Domestic Authority in Britain since 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009): 5.

74 Delap, Griffin, and Wills, *The Politics of Domestic Authority*, 5.

75 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 112

that “men had to be careful that they did not become too attached to the home, for... too much affection for home would promote feebleness of character and dependence, characteristics that could never be associated with manliness.”⁷⁶ The view of the home as a female reserve created a certain masculine unease in that space, even if they were ostensibly the family head of this area as well.

It is important to note that only a minority of middle class women chose to devote their lives to philanthropic work, although many more were peripherally involved, and additional thousands subscribed to philanthropic societies.⁷⁷ There must, then, have been some deeply ingrained motivation for those women who chose to become heavily involved in societies like the RSPCA. Joan Wallach Scott has pointed out the necessity of considering the effects of gender on identity, in addition to class and social expectations. She points out the necessity to define key terms.⁷⁸ In considering the gendering of middle-class women, it is important to examine the masculine and feminine roles and spaces both sexes inhabited, which may or may not be directly related to their biological sex. For example, a man who spent too much time at home might be considered effeminate, while a strong-willed woman who publicly took culturally male roles would be considered masculine. I also want to draw attention to the selective use of the words "lady" and "female" in RSPCA speeches and narratives. Upon examination, it becomes evident that the designation "lady" is given to those women who adhere to the socially constructed view of femininity. This designation is deliberately avoided when speaking of a woman who acts in a culturally inappropriate manner. For example, at the 1835 Annual General Meeting, R. Batson, Esq., thanked the *ladies* for their “indefatigable”

⁷⁶ Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 113.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 436.

⁷⁸ Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History: Revised Edition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999): xii.

efforts on behalf of humanity. This language is not used during the trial of Mary Ireson and her nephew Charles for cruelty to a cat. In this case, Mrs. Ireson is referred to as the "female defendant". This is not only an acknowledgment of her sex, but also of society's judgment against her actions and her character.⁷⁹ It is important to take notice of such language during the examination of the written record.

Any discussion of gender and the middle classes during the nineteenth century must also deal with the historiographical concept of separate spheres. Historians' assessments of the use and practicality of this social dichotomy vary widely, from F.M.L. Thompson's insistence on the direct reality and "clear separation of male and female spheres" to Amanda Vickery, who points out the haziness of these boundaries and questions the usefulness of separate spheres as an organizing principle for middle-class culture.⁸⁰ The development of different approaches to the gendered organization of Victorian society can be traced through a review of the secondary literature. Davidoff and Hall's *Family Fortunes* supports the concept of separate spheres, while recognizing that the categories involved could not be rigidly held. They argue for the centrality and influence of evangelical religion as the central forming feature of the British middle-class and the defining nature of the public/private sphere divide.⁸¹ Ben Griffin challenges this view. He acknowledges the importance of the rise of evangelicalism, but he places more importance on the British reaction to the French Revolution, believing that it is more important to the formation of the middle-class gender split. He argues that as Britain

79 "Portsmouth, April 18, 1846," *Hampshire Advertiser & Salisbury Guardian* (Southampton, England), Issue 1184. Saturday, April 18, 1846: 5. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

80 F.M.L. Thompson, *The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain 1830-1900* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988): 253; Amanda Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History," *The Historical Journal* 36, no. 2 (Jun. 1993): 383-414.

81 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 108-9.

tried to build strength back into its society, the government focused on the creation of solid, even rigid, family structures, the success of which would stabilize the country as a whole.⁸² This is reiterated in Delap, Griffin and Wills, eds., *The Politics of Domestic Authority in Britain since 1800*, although stated slightly differently. Here, the widening of the gender barrier was a response to events happening abroad: the British house divided in the American Revolution and the French Revolution “prompted an effort to place categories of identity [ie. gender] ... on more stable foundations.”⁸³ Though nineteenth-century gender roles were not new, contemporary events called for a solidifying of both domestic ideology and gender roles.

Steven Mintz takes a much broader approach to the concept of gender difference and “separate spheres.” He argues that the unique situation in Victorian homes were a reflection of the far greater issue - “adapting the values of a differential, hierarchical patronage society to the values of an increasingly contractual, individualistic society.”⁸⁴ The rising complexity of domestic and gender relations was related to the growth of the individualistic evangelical worldview, where conversion was an individual response and evangelism directed to individual persons. The family unit, however, was expected to have a unified group dynamic, led by the male head of the house. At the same time, the complexity of kinship networks was reduced as rising life expectations and lower infant mortality made marriage longer-term and added to the prominence of the family.⁸⁵

None of these interpretations satisfied Amanda Vickery. In her well-known

82 Ben Griffin, *The Politics of Gender in Victorian Britain: Masculinity, Political Culture, and the Struggle for Women's Rights* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012): 47. ; Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 183.

83 Delap Griffin, and Wills, eds. *The Politics of Domestic Authority*, 8.

84 Steven Mintz, *A Prison of Expectations: The Family in Victorian Culture* (New York and London: New York University Press, 1983): 5.

85 Ibid., *A Prison of Expectations*, 19.

article “Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History,” Vickery argues that neither the middle class nor separate spheres were new developments; she points out earlier renditions of the same ideologies clothed in alternate cultural forms. She also challenges the concept of a rigid dividing line between classes, pointing out that “snobbery was not a powerful enough solvent to separate into distinct landed, professional and commercial fractions families who had so much else in common.”⁸⁶ Those who socialized together were most often those who had similar wealth and lifestyles; social status was of lesser value to those along the borders of class lines.

Eleanor Gordon and Gwyneth Nair built further on Vickery's argument. They point out that women were not in effect excluded from the public “sphere”, although their roles and contacts might be limited in these spaces. Both men and women shaped, and were shaped by, the nineteenth-century public arena.⁸⁷ Gordon and Nair argue that “separate spheres” are not useful, due to the diversity of experiences among individuals.⁸⁸ In fact, in some ways women actually moved between spheres with particular ease. Cultural associations of women with a moral and caring nature made them desirable in certain public settings; they cleared the way for the female presence in morally-connected public institutions such as hospitals, workhouses, and courtrooms.⁸⁹

This overview of the concept of “separate spheres” reinforces the need to step back and examine presumed cultural paradigms to see if they in fact reflect the experience of the individuals involved. Binary oppositions can create a mental trap which

86 Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres?,” 396.; see also Delap Griffin, and Wills, eds. *The Politics of Domestic Authority*, 8.

87 Eleanor Gordon and Gwyneth Nair, *Public Lives: Women, Family and Society in Victorian Britain* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003): 6.

88 *Ibid.*, 235.

89 Gordon and Nair, *Public Lives*, 224.

prevents the historian from seeing the extent to which the ideology or pattern presented varies from every-day life. As Vickery, Gordon, and Nair point out, male and female areas of activity were not nearly as fixed as it has been suggested. The “female sphere” and the “male sphere,” in fact, were not mutually independent. They overlapped to such an extent that any attempt to sketch their boundaries leads one into very uncertain territory. Indeed, the rather mathematical language of “spheres” may not be useful at all for discussions of middle-class places and gender roles. Instead, the language of gendered spaces may give the historian more insight. The middle-class domestic space, for example, could be a house, an estate, or a large apartment in a respectable part of town. While the day-to-day management of this domestic space fell under female purview, as did servants, children, and animals within that space, it was not an entirely feminized environment. A larger domestic space was sure to include a study, which was generally a masculine retreat. Masculine oversight of the home also gave it an alternate gendering. In the same way, courtrooms were emphatically non-feminine space, given over to argument and rational judgments – or were they? At the courts of assizes, while the judges, the witnesses, and the defendants were often men, respectable women could attend, offering their “morally superior” presence to an institution committed to correction of the wayward.⁹⁰

It is also useful to reconsider the concepts of “private” and “public” in relation to gendered spaces. Where does the line between public and private lie? The home, which has long been considered the epitome of private space, was often used for the public benefit. For example, women sold items created at home in the charity bazaar, bringing the domestic into public.⁹¹ Also, house-to-house visiting between members of the same

90 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 410.

91 Simon Morgan, *A Victorian Woman's Place: Public Culture in the Nineteenth Century* (London and New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007): 116.

social circles could be stated to be occurring simply in multiple feminine domestic spaces; the streets in between, however, were very public indeed. We must also examine whether masculine spaces, then, were always public. The local pub or coffee house, considered public space, could also be considered a private masculine arena; very few respectable women would darken the door of either institution. Indeed, most societies found that it was not until meetings were held in more gender-neutral meeting rooms and halls that large numbers of women began to attend.⁹² Morgan points out “the assumption that the public sphere was a masculine bastion, to which women had to fight for admission. It is more accurate to think of the public sphere as an organic entity that was continually growing, changing and reordering itself.”⁹³ Evangelicalism itself was part of this process, as “spiritual equality between the sexes had wrenched open a space for women in the extended activities of church and chapel but the extent of that space was constantly subject to discussion.”⁹⁴ The nineteenth-century debate surrounding whether voluntary societies constituted public or private space continued, as women stretched language of the private, domestic sphere to cover these forms of public activity.⁹⁵ The experiences of women involved with the RSPCA will illustrate this process well.

The Redefinition of Social Boundaries

The study of the women of the RSPCA emphasizes the way in which official societal boundaries were discussed, tried, and redefined. Mrs. F.M. Thompson was asked to be on a mixed-gender sub-committee that procured sermons and tracts for

92 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 433.

93 *Ibid.*, 4.

94 *Ibid.*, 430.

95 Delap, Griffin, and Wills, eds. *The Politics of Domestic Authority*, 7-8.

publication.⁹⁶ When the Committee was unable to find a member of the aristocracy to chair the 1840 Annual General Meeting, the Honourable Mrs. Singleton was asked to use her influence to get the Duke of Cambridge to preside; she was successful.⁹⁷ Women showed up to these annual public meetings in droves, prompting many approving comments from speakers.⁹⁸ Ladies of rank and/or influence were seated on the platform with the men.⁹⁹ Women became involved in the school system as educators on animal welfare.¹⁰⁰ In a society where very few women owned their own property, and then only under rigid rules, large female donations and legacies were celebrated.¹⁰¹ Women were taking the opportunity to stretch traditional boundaries and to be of use in a cause about which they were passionate.

In addition to tapping into her evangelical or evangelically-influenced religious identity and her middle-class cultural identity, a woman could also use her marital status and the interests of her spouse to enter public spaces and public action. Many married patrons and patronesses joined the RSPCA together. Lord and Lady Willoughby d'Eresby

96 RSPCA, "Meeting January 7, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*: 113.

97 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 6, 1840," *R.S.P.C.A. Minute Book: No. 3 commencing September 1838*: 245.

98 SPCA, *The Sixth Report and Proceedings*, 11; Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Eighth Annual Report, Together with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held on the 30th Day of April, 1834* (London: The Philanthropic Society, 1834): 15-6; Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Ninth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held on Wednesday, June 3, 1835* (London: The Philanthropic Society, 1835): 29.

99 "Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," *The Morning Post* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849; Issue 23535. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

100 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 3, 1845," *R.S.P.C.A. Minute Book: No. 5 commencing September 1842*: 333.

101 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Thirteenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, the 1st day of May, 1839. With the Act of Parliament*. (London: 1839): 34.

became patrons in 1832. Mrs. Elizabeth Gurney became a Society patroness in 1832, the same year as her husband Samuel Gurney, financier and MP, became its treasurer. The Earl and Countess of Beverly lent their support in 1842, and the Marquess and Marchioness of Westminster in 1845. There are also a number of cases where one spouse joined initially, then convinced the other of the necessity of the cause. These include the Duke of Sutherland, who became patron in 1834, and the Duchess-Countess who followed in 1837. The Marchioness of Bristol is listed in the first available published annual report (1832); her husband joins her in 1845. The Earl of Carnarvon, patron, committee member, and society president, added his patronage in 1833; his wife followed suit in 1838.¹⁰²

Patronage was not the only way in which women and their husbands participated together in the work of the RSPCA. Elizabeth Gurney, along with her husband Samuel, was heavily involved in fighting the cruelties apparent in the Smithfield live animal market; in fact, Mrs. Gurney was awarded an RSPCA medal for her work in January 1833.¹⁰³ The Honourable Mrs. Singleton and her husband become deeply involved in the affairs of the Society. Together, Mr. and Mrs. Singleton donated £10 to erect a water trough for cattle.¹⁰⁴ As Mrs. Singleton's energy in her work on behalf of the Society became increasingly appreciated, her extensive social networks also came into play. In April 1840, the Society sent a request to Mrs. Singleton through her husband. The Society was unable to get Lord Ashley or the Earl of Carnarvon to agree to chair that year's Annual General Meeting, as both were busy. "The Secretary also reported that

102 For full lists of patrons and patronesses, see the Royal Society for the Prevention of Animal's printed annual reports, beginning in 1832.

103 Moss, *Valiant Crusade*, 164, 202.

104 "Belfast Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," *The Belfast News-Letter* (Belfast, Ireland), Friday, May 3, 1844; Issue 11143. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

immediately after receiving the Earl of Carnarvon's letter, he waited upon Mr. Singleton and stated that he was directed by the Committee most respectfully to solicit the favor of the Hon. Mrs. Singleton using her influence to obtain the consent of His Royal Highness, The Duke of Cambridge to preside at the Annual Meeting. Mrs. Singleton kindly consented to do so.”¹⁰⁵ Mrs. Singleton spoke with the Duke, and he was convinced to chair the meeting, to the great relief of the committee. Women also acquired more direct input into Society affairs through their husbands. When a sub-committee was created to examine educational options and to press for sermons on animal welfare from sympathetic clergy, Mrs. Fenner and Mrs. L. Gompertz, both wives of committee members, were asked to take part.¹⁰⁶

Female Interaction with Animals

Motivation for female involvement in the Society could also be much more mundane; for example, a woman who loved her family pets would be more likely to want to be involved with RSPCA efforts. A review of the RSPCA primary sources reveals such a gendered relationship to animals. Despite the linguistic designation “domestic”, tamed animals were present in both “private” feminine and “public” masculine spaces, and thus associated themselves with feminine or masculine roles accordingly. The association of an animal with work or sport placed it firmly under masculine control; the association of an animal with the home generally made it “feminine”. The RSPCA was ostensibly under masculine control and active in mainly “masculine” areas of society - workplaces such as knackers' yards, the Smithfield market, and on the streets with transportation for hire. As such, the Society also dealt primarily with animals associated with the masculine

105 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 6, 1840,” *Minute Book 1838*: 245.

106 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting, July 20, 1829,” *Minute Book 1824*: 100.

life. Animals associated with working-class labour were the most prevalently targeted; most belonged to the transportation sector. Draft horses, cab horses, donkeys, and dogs as beasts of burden all came under RSPCA surveillance.

Animals kept in the home came under “feminine” purview; these were primarily small dogs and cats. Ostensibly these animals were kept to manage household vermin, but a female emotional bond becomes obvious. This does not preclude a male emotional bond to family pets or to companion, work-related, or sporting animals; however, the emotional language is more obvious in feminine cases. It is probable that the individual woman's love for a family pet was motivation for female involvement in the RSPCA. Ann Radcliffe, the novelist whose legacy was celebrated during a time of financial crisis, had herself cared for at least two rescued dogs. The first was Fanny, a female spaniel rescued from a working-class boy who had been ordered to kill her, as his family did not have the means to feed the dog.¹⁰⁷ The second was Dash, a male spaniel whose leg had been broken by a carriage; Radcliffe happened along shortly after.¹⁰⁸ Radcliffe's experiences also illustrate the Royal Family's fondness for dogs. When Radcliffe was staying at Windsor, away from London to improve her health, her dog Fanny played with the princesses' cocker spaniel, to the delight of all.¹⁰⁹ A woman with less exalted social connections, but with a similar emotional attachment to household pets, could be moved to involvement in animal protection societies like the RSPCA.¹¹⁰

In addition to female attachment to household pets, there was also a negative response to pet abuse that likely turned women, as well as men, toward involvement with

107 Victor Norton, *Mistress of Udolpho: The Life of Ann Radcliffe* (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1999): 226.

108 *Ibid.*, 234.

109 *Ibid.*, 227.

110 For more information on pet keeping, see Shevelov, *For the Love of Animals*, 59.

the RSPCA. The vast majority of prosecuted cases involved male perpetrators; most prosecution was aimed at the abuse of animals in public. Animals under female purview were much less likely to be noticed, as they were less visible. The belief in a woman's natural "humanity" toward those animals under her purview made those rare cases involving women and their pets more shocking. The first case, reported in the *Hampshire Adviser and Salisbury Guardian*, related a charge against Ann Slugg, a stranger in the area. She had given a dog to a woman in the district, then left; later, she came back to demand payment for it. When the new owner of the dog refused to pay, Miss Slugg took the dog and killed it by bashing its head against the ground. The prosecutor, in addition to showing revulsion for the act, also addressed the way in which he felt this "female" had transgressed what was believed to be natural moral behaviour among the fair sex. The newspaper reports that "Major Travers, addressing the defendant, said he believed that this was the most atrocious case which was ever brought before that or any other Bench. It was an interesting feature in the character of woman that she usually possesses a strong sense of humanity. In her case, however, she had cruelly ill-used an animal that had done her no injury, and then caused its death. He was glad to find that she was a stranger in the borough; had she been an inhabitant, she would be a disgrace to the place."¹¹¹

A second case related the results of a female grudge, which was seen as a natural, if unfortunate, aspect of a woman's illogical nature. Women were more likely to face tensions within their immediate neighborhood, as they were much more closely tied into local society. Due to gender pressures, they generally left their neighborhoods much less frequently than their male contemporaries; this often caused them to rub shoulders with

111 "Portsmouth, April 18, 1846," *Hampshire Advertiser & Salisbury Guardian* (Southampton, England), Saturday, April 18, 1846. Issue 1184: 5. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

those they would rather avoid. The incident in question occurred in London, and was a direct result of a broken relationship between two neighbors. Mary Ireson's nephew Charles caught a neighbor's cat, accused of being a local thief. The cat was made a prisoner of the “female defendant's” basement, and was left there overnight. The next day the nephew, keen to have both sport and revenge, set his dog on it. When the cat latched on to his dog, Charles beat it with a rolling pin. His aunt actively urged him on in this. Upon facing prosecution, both Charles and Mrs. Ireson were charged with cruelty to the cat; this charge resulted in a conviction of the nephew only. The aunt, as she did not actually physically participate in the beating, was released.¹¹²

A final incident during this period resulted from a disagreement between those who lived in close proximity to each other, the result of a dispute between a lodger and her landlady. Mrs. Elizabeth Hunt, after “having words” with landlady Mrs. Scott, picked up the latter's dog and hurled it down the stairs. The dog broke a leg, and Mrs. Hunt was charged. Given the private nature and location of the violence in this case, perhaps it is not surprising that the witness called forward was female: Miss Mary Skelly, the charwoman. The response to unnatural female cruelty toward animals in both public and private spaces caused a great deal of dismay, resulting in publicity. It likely drew a greater number of supporters to the RSPCA.

Summary

The discussion of gendered spaces leads to an examination of the gendered roles that developed around and within “public” and “private” spaces. As Vickery points out, the association of women with home and children and men with the workplace is not new. The debate about appropriate behaviour within and around these places was ongoing.

¹¹² “Law and Police,” *The Era* (London, England), Sunday, November 18, 1849; Issue 582. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*.

Gender roles, then, seen by some historians as fixed during this period, were actually quite elastic. Women who adopted the expected roles could also stretch them to cover additional roles.¹¹³ The belief in the role of women's influence, as opposed to rational argument, gave women opportunities to participate in philanthropic societies in socially acceptable ways. Women who became involved with the cause of animals primarily became active one or more of the following seven areas: educational, financial, information, patronage, direct action, committee participation, and creating related animal protection societies. Each of these areas played on cultural understandings of natural female characteristics or gender roles. Educational roles, such as the creation of essay competitions or providing reading materials to schools, could fall under the mothering and spiritual guide roles. Financial donations, both subscriptions and legacies, also related to mothering and moral protection. Women who informed the Society of cruelty perpetrated against animals were acting within their assumed role of public and moral guardianship. Women who became patronesses of the Society were begged, as the Honorable Mrs. Singleton was, to use the benefit of their larger social circles in the benefit of this cause. In a few cases, women took on more "masculine" roles – taking direct action by initiating judicial proceedings or joining mixed-sex sub-committees. As we will see in the next section, there seems to be a certain amount of discomfort surrounding these actions.

113 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 436.

MULTIPLE ROLES IN THE RSPCA

As we have seen, women used contemporary gender roles to expand their public influence; we will now explore the details of that influence, and the responses to it, in their work for the RSPCA. Committee members of the RSPCA appealed to women to use their moral authority in service to their cause.¹¹⁴ The eloquent Nathaniel Goldsmid, at the Annual General Meeting in 1833, called for greater female involvement, stressing the importance of their moral sway: “It is you, ladies, whose influence, next to that of religion, is the greatest purifier of the hearts of men.”¹¹⁵ Women were not only considered the spiritual heart of society. Davidoff and Hall point out that in Britain generally at this time, women also “acted as gatekeepers for admissible behaviour.”¹¹⁶ The vital power of influence and approval wielded by women found its outlet in a myriad of ways; some were more socially acceptable than others. This section will illustrate the practical ways women impacted public space and society through female volunteerism in the RSPCA, beginning with those areas of action that were found the most acceptable and fit most readily with contemporary concepts of gender and propriety, moving toward those that were more questionable.

Personal Influence

Personal leverage was primarily exerted by women in three ways – on their families, on those within their social networks, and upon society at large. The vast majority of the ways in which women were involved with public activities was based on their moral and social influence. First, influence could be exercised on husband, servants,

¹¹⁴ RSPCA, *Fourteenth Annual Report*, 37.

¹¹⁵ Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Seventh Annual Report, Together with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, Held on the 27th day of June, 1833* (London: The Philanthropic Society, 1833): 20.

¹¹⁶ Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 399.

and children. As previously noted, husbands, like the Marquess of Bristol, could be convinced by their wives to become patrons.¹¹⁷ They could also be convinced to donate to causes on behalf of the household. Davidoff and Hall point out that men's donations were often a reflection of their roles as heads of families, so some women's donations were likely hidden by record-keeping practices.¹¹⁸ Servants, as part of the household if not part of the family, were influenced as well. For example, Jane Shaw, servant to subscriber Mrs. Smart, donated eight shillings to the Society.¹¹⁹ Those believed to be most susceptible to female persuasion, however, were a woman's children.

Influence within the Family

The identity and task of mother was one of the primary female roles acknowledged by male society members. They pointed out the necessity of raising children who understood the need for humanity towards the “dumb brutes”. They begged female adherents to raise their children with a respect for animals. Nathaniel Goldsmid, Esq., entreated mothers to inculcate humanity in their children, and attributed the development of feeling and compassion to them.¹²⁰ C.B. Sherridan gave women a near-divine power when speaking of compassion and humanity. He stated that “it is the part of woman, not only to cultivate, but almost to create those qualities.”¹²¹ Rev. Dr. Fletcher pointed out the importance of motherhood at even the highest ranks of society, noting that

117 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Nineteenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in the Hanover-Square Rooms, on Tuesday, June 10, 1845* (London: [n.p.], 1845): 3.

118 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 432.

119 SPCA, *Seventh Annual Report*, 53.

120 *Ibid.*, 20. See also SPCA, *Seventh Annual Report*, 36; SPCA, *Ninth Annual Report*, 17-18.

121 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Sixteenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover-Square Rooms, on Wednesday, June 8, 1842* (London: William Tyler, 1842): 14.

Queen Victoria herself benefited from “the unparalleled maternal tuition extended to her by her mother.”¹²² The queen's mother Victoire, Duchess of Kent, did indeed supervise her daughter's education; it was Sir John Conroy, however, who conceived of the strict educational system and implemented it.¹²³ Victoire was known to have some philanthropic interests; she became patroness of the RSPCA in 1835, at the same time as her daughter. Perhaps, however, Victoria's interest in philanthropy was influenced more greatly by her aunt, Queen Adelaide, whose penchant for charity was well-known. During her youth in the small duchy of Saxe-Meiningen, Adelaide had superintended both poverty relief measures and schools for the poor. Seen in the German states as a royal duty, this charitable attitude continued throughout her life.¹²⁴ Victoria's warm correspondence with her aunt likely encouraged her own philanthropic interests.¹²⁵

The influence of a philanthropic mother or sister is also evidenced in the annual reports. The Honourable Mrs. Singleton was accompanied by her sister Sophia, The Honourable Miss Upton, who begins attending in 1839.¹²⁶ Her daughter joined them beginning in 1847.¹²⁷ There is also a Mrs. Upton and a Lady Anne Hervey who may have been related to Mrs. Singleton as well. Lady and Miss Wombwell were fixtures

122 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *The Annual Report of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals; with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Tuesday, May 7th, 1850* (London: [n.p.], 1850): 51.

123 Gillian Gill, *We Two. Victoria and Albert: Rulers, Partners, Rivals* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2009): 59-63.

124 A.W. Purdue, “Queen Adelaide: Malign Influence or Consort Maligned?” In *Queenship in Britain: 1660-1837*, edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002): 269-70.

125 *Ibid.*, 280.

126 RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, February 4, 1839,” *Minute Book 1838*: 107.

127 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Twenty-First Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Wednesday, May 26th, 1847* (London: [n.p.], 1847): 59.

beginning at the 1842 meeting.¹²⁸ The Countess of Carnarvon was known to bring her family with her.¹²⁹ Lady Croft and the Misses Croft were mentioned in the 1842 Annual Report.¹³⁰ This communal tendency illustrates the importance of family to female identity, as well as the parental concern with humanity and philanthropy, especially where daughters were concerned.

The most conservative view of the status of women in the Society was put forward by the Earl of Carnarvon. Often the chair of the annual general meetings during the early years of the RSPCA, he had the most freedom to express his opinions, and express them he did. At the 1837 Annual General Meeting, perhaps in an unconscious expression, he stated that “the more weak and defenseless the object, the greater the mercy which we ought to show,” referring to animals. This statement would also appear to apply to his understanding of women. He called on them to teach their children early lessons in compassion, as it was these early learning experiences which shape a person's life.¹³¹ On a different occasion he stated that he “believe[d] all man's best impressions are instilled into his mind by the female sex,” referring to the superior morality present at the centre of the female heart.¹³² Most revealing, however, was his speech of 1843: “it is

128 RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, June 8, 1842,” *R.S.P.C.A. Minute Book: No. 4 commencing 1840*: 296. See also RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, May 18, 1843,” *Minute Book 1842*: 95.; Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Seventeenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in the Hanover-Square Rooms, on Thursday, May 18, 1843* (London: Tyler and Reed, 1843): 52. ; Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Eighteenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in the Hanover-Square Rooms, on Thursday, May 16, 1844* (London: [n.p.], 1844): 51.

129 RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, May 18, 1843,” *Minute Book 1842*: 95.

130 RSPCA, *Sixteenth Annual Report*, 43.

131 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Eleventh Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting at the Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen Street, on Saturday the 29th day of April, 1837. With Acts of Parliament, and other Papers circulated by the Society* (London(?): ?, 1837): 21-22.

132 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Twelfth Annual Report, with the*

your province to make it the rule of action within the *limits* of your blessed household homes” [emphasis mine].¹³³ Despite the number of volunteer roles filled by women, the Earl still placed them firmly within the confines of the home. He also intimated that mothers inculcate virtues more gently than their male spouses, and that later instruction would be stricter, as if mothers had no need of sternness in their parenting styles.¹³⁴

Not every male committee member or speaker took the Earl of Carnarvon's conservative stance. C.B. Sherridan acknowledged the role of “every father and every tutor” in the early education of children, in addition to the mother's role.¹³⁵ Dr. Carpenter, FRS, indicated his understanding that, although the mother took the larger share of parenting responsibilities at this time, fathers were not exempt from the duty to teach their children humanity towards animals.¹³⁶ The willingness even to admit to male influence in a child's early life, however, is rare. Prince Albert's insistence on being present and actively involved at his children's births was almost unheard of. He also delighted in being a father to his young offspring at a time when the idea of fatherly influence was mainly reserved for older children.¹³⁷ John Tosh points out that middle-class fathers, once active in the nursery, became primarily protectors and providers during the nineteenth century, more often at work than at home.¹³⁸ This shift led to mothers

Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday the 23rd day of May, 1838. With Abstracts of Acts of Parliament, and other Papers circulated by the Society (London: [n.p.], 1838): 22-23.

133 RSPCA, *Seventeenth Annual Report*, 21-22.

134 *Ibid.*, 21-22.

135 SPCA, *Thirteenth Annual Report*, 56.

136 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Twenty-Second Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Saturday, May 20th, 1848* (London: [n.p.], 1848): 33.

137 Gill, *We Two*, 166-7.

138 John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*

being seen as guardian angels and the sole influence in a small child's life. This paints a distorted picture of parental influence. Although the feminine influence was considerable, a father's presence or absence was also very important. The limitation of women to early education was also wishful thinking, given the expansive nature of their influence, as explored next.

Influence Within the Social Circle

The second major area of socially acceptable influence involved the use of one's social circle to convert others to the cause. Women, especially those in urban centres, could have a vast network of friends; these social networks made a perfect highway for the exchange of information and for discussions aimed at changing a friend's point of view. In particular, the connections of influential gentry and aristocrats were highly prized. As such, the Honourable Mrs. Singleton, with her energy and conviction, was a great boon to the Society. Born Lady Caroline Upton, fourth child of Clotworthy Templetown, created Viscount Upton, she had friends in high places. Her marriage to James Singleton, a member of the upper middle class who would become a Member for Parliament, would have given her additional contacts in that segment of society.¹³⁹ The well-connected Mrs. Singleton convinced many patrons to join the society and raised much money for its operations. Many of her primary contacts were within her own family. Her husband James was Secretary to the Society for many years. Her sister,

(London: Yale University Press, 1999): 83-89.

139 John Burke, *A General and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and the British Empire. Fourth Edition Corrected To M DCCC XXXIII. In Two Volumes. Vol II.* (London: Published For Henry Colburn By Richard Bentley, 1833); John Burke, "Templeton, Viscount." *A General and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire, Vol II.* (London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, M.DCCC.XXXII (1832)): 531.; Bernard Burke, *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry of Great Britain and Ireland.* (London: Harrison, 1871): 1266.

Elizabeth Hervey, was actually the first of the Upton family to be involved in the RSPCA; she was a patroness at least as early as 1832.¹⁴⁰ Elizabeth's husband, the Marquess of Bristol, became a patron in 1845.¹⁴¹ Mrs. Singleton's youngest sister Sophia, the Hon. Miss Upton, began subscribing to the society in 1834 and is noted at the annual general meeting in 1839.¹⁴² Her brother James, the Lord Viscount Templetown, made a donation to the Society in 1848.¹⁴³ Mrs. Singleton's web of connections began with her own noble family and extended out into the aristocracy.

In addition to networks based on social status, religious networks also proved useful. Mr. MacKinnon, MP, acknowledged the women “of the Society of Friends, whose high station in society, kindness to their fellow creatures, and great influence in their circles are looked up to with deference by society.” Mrs. Elizabeth Gurney was the premiere example, and these comments were given on the announcement of her patronage of the Society.¹⁴⁴ Mrs. Gurney, as a part of the evangelical wing of the Society of Friends, was part of a subculture that placed great value on philanthropy and gave women leadership opportunities that were denied to their non-Quaker contemporaries.¹⁴⁵ She had the benefit of an extensive network of Friends, due in part to the large sizes of Quaker families and the resulting large number of marriage connections.¹⁴⁶ Her marriage into the well-known Gurney family, evangelically-

140 RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, May 11, 1835, Exeter Hall,” *Minute Book 1832*: 182-3.

141 RSPCA, *Nineteenth Annual Report*, 3.

142 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Eighth Annual Report*, 57.; RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, February 4, 1839,” *Minute Book 1838*, 107.

143 RSPCA, *Twenty-Second Annual Report*, 86.

144 SPCA, *The Sixth Report and Proceedings*, 15.

145 F.K. Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980): 10-11.

146 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Ties*, 87.

mindful and very active Friends, gave her additional social and philanthropic resources.

Influence through Patronage

Women who were prominent in the middle and upper strata of society could use their very visibility to the benefit of the Society. This was no secret to the committee members of the RSPCA. Lord Viscount Mahon, chairman of the 1832 Annual General Meeting, acknowledged and requested the aid of female influence on society at large. “I call upon the fair sex, not merely to aid us by observing all the duties of humanity, which they will do without any such call, but to endeavor to impart their sentiments of benevolence to others, and thus to give the tone to public feeling.”¹⁴⁷ This public influence was largely directed through the convention of patronage.

Women could choose to let their names stand as patronesses in order to encourage others to support their society or societies of choice. For the most part, patrons and patronesses were of upper middle-class or higher status. The visibility of their status or rank made them recognizable to others, who were encouraged to imitate them. The first mention of patrons in the RSPCA record is in the published Address of 1827, where 9 men and 14 women of the aristocracy or gentry let their names stand.¹⁴⁸ Willing patrons and patronesses, however, were few. On July 3, 1828, the committee, in desperate financial straits, put forward a list of possible patrons and patronesses to be approached on behalf of the society. Nine men and fourteen women are listed, the women ranging from the aristocracy, personified in the Marchioness of Bristol (Mrs. Singleton's sister Elizabeth Hervey) and others, to untitled but influential women of the upper middle

¹⁴⁷ SPCA, *Eighth Annual Report*, 15-16.

¹⁴⁸ Lewis Gompertz, *Address of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals: Established June, 1824, at Old Slaughter's Coffee House, St. Martin's Lane, London* (London: Printed by Richard Taylor, 1827): 2.

classes. 149 When reviewing the list of patrons and patronesses attached to the 1832 Annual Report, it becomes evident that 10 of these ladies heeded the call.150

The Committee publicly acknowledged the importance of the “the Ladies’ Patronesses, and those other Ladies who have by their liberality and influence materially promoted the interest of this Society.”151 At the 1837 Annual General Meeting, new patrons and patronesses were acknowledged individually.152 Committee members also encouraged their wives to become patronesses.153 These women were held up as examples to be emulated and individuals whose approval was desired. “A list of the Royals and distinguished Patronesses and Patrons and leading members” was included in a letter to the Secretary of State, Home Department, expressing concern regarding the practices of bull running and baiting in the country.154 Perhaps due to the fact that the highest ranking patrons were women, the women are mentioned first,. It is an indication of the strong feminine element present in the Society, and foreshadows the increase in female volunteerism and financial support that would attend the RSPCA's growth.

Not only did these women exemplify humanity toward animals, some also actively recruited further noble interest in the Society. Mrs. Singleton of the extensive social network was one of these ladies. It does not come as a surprise that she convinced the Duke of Beccleuch to become a patron and to donate the handsome sum of £20 as

149 RSPCA, “Public Meeting held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, the Strand (Thurs July 3, 1828),” *Minute Book 1824*, 68.

150 SPCA, *The Sixth Report and Proceedings*,3; RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, May 11, 1835, Exeter Hall,” *Minute Book 1832*, 182-3.

151 RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, April 30, 1834,” *Minute Book 1832*, 140-1. See also RSPCA, “Public Meeting June 23, 1830,” *Minute Book 1824*, 121.

152 SPCA, *Eleventh Annual Report*, 24.

153 RSPCA, “General Monthly, Mon, March 2, 1835,” *Minute Book 1832*, 207.

154 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 5, 1836,” R.S.P.C.A. *Minute Book: No. 2 commencing 1835*: 98.

well.¹⁵⁵ The RSPCA committee was highly grateful for Mrs. Singleton's patronage upon her success in convincing the Duke of Cambridge to preside at the 1845 Annual General Meeting. The Secretary was “instructed to present to that Lady the special thanks of the Committee for the additional and welcome proof she has thereby afforded of her active and effective Patronage of this Society.”¹⁵⁶

Although there were those who, like Mrs. Singleton and Mrs. Gurney, made the most of their extended social networks, the most influential in the broadest sense were those of the very highest status, the women of the royal family. At the Annual General Meeting of 1832, Mr. MacKinnon paid tribute to the example set by pious Queen Adelaide, Princess Victoria's aunt, the “example of virtue and all which can adorn or dignify the female sex.”¹⁵⁷ If the committee members were pleased to point out the influence of Queen Adelaide's personal piety, they were overjoyed to acknowledge Victoire, Duchess of Kent and her daughter, the heiress presumptive, Princess Victoria, as the royal patronesses of the Society. Not only was their patronage gratifying, it was also expected to result in further aristocratic patronage and a spread of the influence of the Society.¹⁵⁸

It was, in fact, women who had suggested that the Society invite royal female patronage. The meeting minutes of July 6, 1835, indicate that unspecified ladies had suggested that the Princess Victoria and the Duchess of Kent be approached. Upon

155 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 1, 1840,” *Minute Book 1838*, 284.

156 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, May 5, 1845,” *R.S.P.C.A. Minute Book: No. 6 commencing March 1945*: 29. For Mrs. Singleton's response, see RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 2, 1845,” *Minute Book 1845*, 38.

157 SPCA, *The Sixth Report and Proceedings*, 16.

158 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Tenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting at the Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen Street. On Friday the 29th Day of April, 1836* (London: The Philanthropic Society, 1836): 7.

considering their proposition, Mr. Batson, committee member, was instructed to prepare the suggested report and letter of request.¹⁵⁹ Their success was celebrated in Resolution No. 4 of the Monthly Meeting of the Committee held on December 5, 1836, which expressed the Society's gratitude for Royal condescension.¹⁶⁰ Four years later, Mr. Batson was called upon again to propose that Victoria, now Queen, extend royal patronage to the RSPCA; she graciously agreed.¹⁶¹ Earl Grosvenor noted in the *Sixteenth Annual Report* that “she has been noble enough to declare through us to the world that she possesses feelings which dignify her as a woman, while they exalt her as a monarch.”¹⁶² The Society, having obtained so great a patroness, was careful to keep her informed as to its activities: the Committee presented a beautifully bound copy of the Annual Report to their monarch the following year.¹⁶³

With the Queen as their head patron, the continuance of the RSPCA was assured. In addition to attracting a greater numbers of patrons and larger donations, royal patronage also forwarded the aims of the Society through its association with specific initiatives. For example, the Queen gave her permission to present an award for a Prize Essay written on the theme of humanity toward animals. This type of interaction associated Queen Victoria's name more closely with the Society.¹⁶⁴

159 RSPCA, "Monthly General Meeting, July 6, 1835," *Minute Book 1832*, 240.

160 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 5, 1836," *Minute Book 1835*, 98.

161 RSPCA, "Monthly General Meeting of the Committee, December 4, 1837," *Minute Book 1835*, 213.

162 RSPCA, *Sixteenth Annual Report*, 16.

163 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, November 5, 1838," *Minute Book 1838*, 29.

164 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 4, 1839," *Minute Book 1838*, 77.

Attendance

Women of any rank, regardless of their social influence, could exercise the power of their approbation through the action of attendance at committee meetings or annual general meetings. The location of the meetings in question is important to consider. As previously noted, annual general meetings were more heavily attended by women once they were held in a more respectable setting than a tavern or coffee house. Only the most stalwart women attended monthly or annual general meetings while they were in specifically masculine spaces. From 1824 to at least 1830, the traditionally male domains of the tavern or the coffee house were the locations of choice for meetings. The Society was founded at Old Slaughter's Coffee House in 1824, and subsequent meetings were held at locations such as Willis's Coffee House, the Crown and Anchor Tavern, and Green's Hotel and S--- Coffee House.¹⁶⁵ It is not until the 13 January 1832 General Meeting that the eminently respectable and evangelically-connected Exeter Hall was used.¹⁶⁶

The stalwart women willing to transgress gender boundaries were few but enthusiastic. Some, like Mrs. Gompertz and Mrs. Fenner, attended meetings of the society with their husbands. Others had no such connection and were likely trusting the respectability of the men of the committee to make their presence in male-dominated spaces acceptable. When women attended those early meetings, their presence was noted. Sometimes they were recorded as "in attendance", sometimes they were recorded as "visitors"; the notation is inconsistent. Only six women attended monthly meetings; Mrs. Frances Maria Thompson was most persistent, attending five times.¹⁶⁷ After March

165 RSPCA, "Thursday, August 28, 1826," *Minute Book 1824*, 76; RSPCA, "Meeting, October 6, 1828," *Minute Book 1824*, 79.

166 RSPCA, "General Meeting, Exeter Hall, 13 Jan 1832," *Minute Book 1824*, 143.

167 For records of female attendance, see RSPCA, "Meeting July 20, 1829," *Minute Book 1824*,

7, 1831, women's attendance ceases to appear in the committee meeting minutes. It is unclear whether this is because they ceased to attend, or if the Secretary of the Committee simply refrained from recording their presence. Perhaps this was because women's attendance was no longer remarkable.

Although their attendance at committee meetings ceased to be recorded, the mute attendance of women is noted in annual general meeting reports. Their presence was a particularly powerful example of the importance of sheer numbers. From the earliest published Annual Reports, it becomes obvious that women were attending the annual general meetings in masses.¹⁶⁸ Committee members were continually remarking on the vast female presence before them, and often addressed themselves directly to the women in the audience.¹⁶⁹ The sheer numbers of women in attendance demanded attention. Although no specific numbers are recorded, we know that at least on one occasion women accounted for more than half of those in attendance.¹⁷⁰ The constant awareness of the female factor itself points to a reordering of the discussion surrounding philanthropy and gender roles. Women's presence demanded acknowledgment from a traditionally male hierarchy, even if they were seated in the crowd and not on the platform.

100; RSPCA, "Quarterly Meeting, September 23, 1829," *Minute Book 1824*, 108; RSPCA, "Meeting January 7, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*, 113; RSPCA, "Meeting March 15, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*, 116; RSPCA, "Meeting April 5, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*, 119; RSPCA, "Meeting October 14, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*, 128; RSPCA, "Meeting, November 18, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*, 130; RSPCA, "Meeting March 7, 1831," *Minute Book 1824*, 135.

168 SPCA, *The Sixth Report*, 11.

169 For examples of such speeches, see SPCA, *Seventh Annual Report*, 40. ; SPCA, *Tenth Annual Report*, 12. ; RSPCA, *Fourteenth Annual Report*, 43. ; Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Twenty-Third Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Friday, May 11th, 1849* (London: [n.p.], 1849): 29.

170 "All Aboard," *The Morning Post* (London, England), Monday, May 01, 1837; pg. 5; Issue 20714. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*.

The gentlemen of the Committee dealt with this vast female presence in a number of ways. The most common response was to express their gratification at their interest and attendance.¹⁷¹ These remarks were often greeted by great applause, likely due to the number of women in the audience. The Earl of Carnarvon was always pleased to compliment the ladies. In expressing his delight that the women “have left [their] peaceful homes to give this meeting [their] welcome presence,” he illustrated the general association of femininity and private home life, and the male expectation that it was a sacrifice for a woman to leave her house.¹⁷² Lord Mahon gave attention to female moral superiority and attributed progress in the area of humanity to female suasion.¹⁷³ J.G. Meymott, Esq., paid homage to feminine fragility; he chose not to include details of cases of cruelty during his speech, “so many of the tender sex, who are so sensitively alive to the sufferings of the brute creation, being present.”¹⁷⁴ C.B. Sherridan, Esq., credited the state of accord within the meeting to a strong female presence.¹⁷⁵ While each of these individual men upheld the contemporary gender expectations, they also adjusted them to deal with this experience of mass female attendance at a traditionally masculine event, even if held in a more neutrally gendered space.

The printed *Annual Reports* also acquiesce to female presence. In addition to listing the Patronesses of the Society, the most socially important women in attendance are also noted. This notation was likely included to add status to the Society and its

171 RSPCA, *Twenty-Second Annual Report*, 47-8

172 SPCA, *Eleventh Annual Report*, 21-22.

173 SPCA, *Ninth Annual Report*, 29.

174 SPCA, *Eleventh Annual Report*, 30.

175 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Fifteenth Annual Report with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, the 12th day of May, 1841* (London: [n.p.], 1841): 75-76.

Annual Report. Prior to 1845, the notable gentlemen are mentioned before the ladies in a separate paragraph. In 1844, the notable women are listed with the notable men. This practice presents at least one interesting statement about gender and rank: women who outrank their husbands could be listed before them in a place of authority, as was the case with the Singletons. In the 1844 *Annual Report*, The Honourable Mrs. Singleton is listed well before her husband, as she was of higher rank.¹⁷⁶ This practice of mixing genders within the same attendance paragraph is implemented at times in following years, but inconsistently. Some later reports still list women and men separately.

The presence of women at the RSPCA annual meetings was not only noted by those speaking at such meetings; newspaper reports also remarked on the number of ladies.¹⁷⁷ On May 1, 1837, the *Morning Post* reported that the majority of those in attendance at the recent annual meeting had been ladies.¹⁷⁸ Similarly, *The Standard* reported in 1839 that “the centre benches were crowded with ladies.”¹⁷⁹ This state of affairs was acknowledged to be common among philanthropic causes. Beginning in 1847, newspapers began to report which individual women were present. Mrs. Singleton and her extended family were often centerpieces.¹⁸⁰ It is also from the newspapers that we

176 RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, May 16, 1844,” *Minute Book 1842*, 243. See also RSPCA, “Annual General Meeting, June 10, 1845,” *Minute Book 1845*, 45.

177 “Multiple News Items,” *The Standard* (London, England), Wednesday, June 11, 1845; pg. 5; Issue 6511. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

178 “All Aboard,” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Monday, May 01, 1837; pg. 5; Issue 20714. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

179 “Court Circular,” *The Standard* (London, England), Thursday, May 02, 1839; Issue 4638. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

180 “Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Morning Chronicle* (London, England), Thursday, May 27, 1847; Issue 24208. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. See also “Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Monday, May 22, 1848; pg. 3; Issue 23231. *19th Century British Library Newspapers* Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012; “Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Morning Post* (London, England),

learn that women were seated on the platform with the men in 1849: Lady Catherine Buckley, Hon Mrs. Singleton and Miss Singleton were among those so honoured.¹⁸¹ Women were beginning to be publicly acknowledged for their involvement in the RSPCA, an involvement that had by this time gone on for 25 years.

Education

As previously noted, women used their unofficial authority to influence members of their families, their social circles, and British citizenry as a whole. They also stretched these areas of influence beyond their normal roles. Women were especially active in the area of childhood education, but their initiatives stretched far beyond the traditional role of the unmarried grammar school Mistress. Dr. Carpenter was preaching to the choir when he quoted the Superintendent of Police in Glasgow: “It is useless to talk of *no* education; for if you do not educate these poor children, the devil educates them.”¹⁸² Women such as Sarah Trimmer and Hannah Moore had been championing the cause of working-class education since the 1780s.¹⁸³

One of the primary ways women became involved in formal education was to create written works about animal welfare for use in schools. Their efforts were noted. Mr. Warre MP, praised a children's book he had recently come across. He described it as

Saturday, May 12, 1849; Issue 23535. 19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II; “Multiple Commerce Items,” *The Standard* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849; Issue 7721. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.; “Anniversary Meetings,” *The Bury and Norwich Post, and East Anglian* (Bury Saint Edmunds, England), Wednesday, May 23, 1849; pg. [1]; Issue 3491. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

181 “Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849; Issue 23535. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

182 RSPCA, *Twenty-Second Annual Report*, 33.

183 Frank Prochaska, *Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain, The Disinherited Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006): 33-34.

“a little work written by Mrs. Esther Hewlett on natural history, with scriptural illustrations, which is admirably calculated to effect good, and I think that every father of a family should put this book into his children's hands.”¹⁸⁴ Another female author was acknowledged in the *Annual Report* of 1835.¹⁸⁵ The Committee Minutes also reveal a number of female authors attempting to have their animal welfare works published. A Mrs. Gaskell, for example, requested publication of her paper in the form of an abstract, stating that she would buy a number of copies if it is so published.¹⁸⁶ Her request was forwarded to the School Committee. That body indicated that the paper was accepted and would be printed and circulated with other Society publications.¹⁸⁷ These successes were built upon by later writers, both inside of and outside of the RSPCA. Frances Power Cobbe, for example, was a notable anti-vivisectionist; her writings were an attempt to open the study of physiology to the amateur scientist and the reading public. She insisted that individuals investigate matters of vivisection for themselves so that anti-vivisection would be a logical response to the practice of animal experimentation.¹⁸⁸

Not every publication was accepted, however. Miss Morgan, for example, drew the attention of the Committee to the request of the Infant School Society for cooperation in teaching children about compassion toward animals. She feared that this resolution had been overlooked by the RSPCA. The members of the Committee were glad to

184 SPCA, *The Sixth Report and Proceedings*, 18.

185 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. “To the Subscribers,” *Ninth Annual Report*, 2.

186 It is possible that this was Mrs. Elizabeth Gaskell, novelist and humanitarian.

187 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 5, 1838,” *Minute Book 1835*, 271; RSPCA, “Meeting of the Committee, March 19, 1838,” *Minute Book 1835*, 278. No such publication remains in the RSPCA archives.

188 Susan Hamilton, “Reading and the Popular Critique of Science in the Victorian Anti-Vivisection Press: Frances Power Cobbe's Writing for the Victoria Street Society,” *Victorian Review* 36, no. 2 (Fall 2010): 71-73. *Historical Abstracts with Full Text*, EBSCOhost. Accessed February 14, 2013.

participate, and they offered to publish and contribute toward the expense of a small booklet for use in schools. When Miss Morgan forwarded her manuscript, however, it was decided that it was not fit for printing, and the Committee returned it to its author.¹⁸⁹ Other women did, on occasion, get turned down for publication by the Society, but then decided to publish their manuscripts themselves. Miss Patrick was one such lady.

Miss Patrick's interest in the RSPCA began with her decision to become a subscriber in 1838.¹⁹⁰ As many other women were, she became inspired to submit some form of written instruction for the use of children. The Committee Meeting Minutes of April 6, 1846, indicate that she wrote to the Committee. In her letter, Miss Patrick offered to put together a catechism for use in public schools in to aid in the teaching of humanity. The Committee was not indifferent to her proposal; it was interested enough to ask her to send a draft.¹⁹¹ Miss Patrick duly submitted her manuscript,¹⁹² which was turned down for publication by the Society, possibly due to lack of funds.¹⁹³ The Committee intimated that did feel able, however, to buy 100 copies should she decide to publish it herself.¹⁹⁴ Miss Patrick had her tract for schools printed and forwarded 100 copies to the Society for purchase at 3p. each.¹⁹⁵

189 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 7, 1845," *Minute Book 1845*, 24-5; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, October 6, 1845," *Minute Book 1845*, 71; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 1, 1845," *Minute Book 1845*, 96-7.

190 SPCA, *Twelfth Annual Report*, 131.

191 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 6, 1846," *Minute Book 1845*, 133.

192 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, May 4, 1846," *Minute Book 1845*, 136-7.

193 In 1830, the RSPCA reduced their printing budget due to financial restrictions. As the Society often had funding challenges in these early years, I surmise that that this was what happened in this case. See Fairholme and Pain, *A Century of Work for Animals*, 67.

194 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 1, 1846," *Minute Book 1845*, 140.

195 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 8, 1847," *Minute Book 1845*, 219-20.

Miss Patrick's positive interaction with the RSPCA Committee seems to have encouraged her to explore further her ability to effect educational change. In 1847, she wrote again to the Committee to request permission to bring a boys' class from Notting Hill to the Annual Meeting. She also suggested that a speaker be requested to address the boys directly for their edification. The Secretary was directed to respond that the boys were welcome, but they would not be spoken to from the platform. Despite this declaration, the class was acknowledged by the Bishop of St. David's, who praised Miss Patrick for her efforts made to instruct the boys in humanity.¹⁹⁶

Given the success of her efforts, it is not surprising to find that Miss Patrick continued to bring the class of boys to Annual Meetings. She attempted, again, to have the scholars introduced from the platform, but without success. In 1849, Miss Patrick intended to expand her efforts if given permission from the Committee. She requested leave to bring schoolboys from the National School at Notting Hill, and children from the Ragged School as well. The Society gave her permission to bring 25 National School boys.¹⁹⁷ It is likely that the Committee believed that the Ragged School boys would be rambunctious and out of place; if they required discipline, it would detract from the message of humanity that the Society was trying to portray. There was, however, an eventual victory for Miss Patrick. In the 1849 Annual Report, it becomes evident that the Committee had acquiesced to her repeated requests for acknowledgment for her boys. After praising her efforts, the Committee stated that Miss Patrick was most worthy of emulation. The report states that “your Committee hope that many other ladies may be induced to follow so laudable an example, and make similar exertions for inculcating in

196 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 12, 1847,” *Minute Book 1845*, 232.; RSPCA, *Twenty-First Annual Report*, 35-6.

197 RSPCA, “Special Meeting of the Committee, May 2, 1848,” *Minute Book 1845*, 315; RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 16, 1849,” *R.S.P.C.A. Minute Book: No. 7 commencing July 1848*: 54.

the minds of youth the principles of kindness towards the inferior creation.”¹⁹⁸ In addition to their inclusion in the report, one of the speakers also acknowledged the group from the platform. George Samuel Evans, Esq., refers to the lady offering classes in humanity in one of the national schools.¹⁹⁹ *The Morning Post* also acknowledged Miss Patrick's effort.²⁰⁰ Her perseverance had produced fruit. Not only had she obtained the formal recognition of the RSPCA, her activities were also brought to the attention of *The Morning Post's* London readers.

Miss Patrick was not the only lady to gain such notice; Miss Sutton also made a successful bid to gain access to masculine educational institutions, and this initiative garnered attention. Miss Sutton is described as "an old subscriber of the Society". She offered a prize for the best essay on humanity to animals to the students of Charter House School, with a prize of £5 for the best and £2 for the second best essay. The RSPCA Committee would award the prizes at the annual general meeting. The master of the school received 13 essays; the boys who had written the best two received their rewards from the Earl of Carnarvon at the 1838 annual general meeting. Flattering things were said about the benefactor, but Miss Sutton's name was not announced. She had requested to simply be referred to as "a Lady".²⁰¹ For four years the prize was offered to the scholars at Charter House School, and each year, the recipients would attend the annual general meeting to receive their prizes. Miss Sutton's name was never mentioned, but

198 RSPCA, *Twenty-Third Annual Report*, 13-4.

199 Ibid., 22.

200 "Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," *The Morning Post* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849; Issue 23535. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

201 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 2, 1838," *Minute Book 1835*, 289-90; SPCA, *Twelfth Annual Report*, 13-14, 40.

both her enlightened liberality and her wisdom were praised.²⁰²

In June 1841, the Society received a letter from Rev. Mr. Saunders, which they forwarded to Miss Sutton. Rev. Mr. Saunders suggested that Miss Sutton offer her prizes to other schools in addition to the Charter House School.²⁰³ Miss Sutton considered it and agreed to offer the prize to a different school. She requested that the Committee choose from Westminster, St Paul's, or Christ Hospital.²⁰⁴ Christ's Hospital was chosen, and for the next six years, the scholars of that school were the beneficiaries of Miss Sutton's prize.²⁰⁵ It is possible that fewer essays were received from Christ's Hospital scholars in these years; in 1843, only six essays were received for adjudication. When the prize returned to Christ's Hospital in 1849 after a brief departure, only four essays were received.²⁰⁶

Although there may have been fewer essays received during the years the prizes were offered to Christ's Hospital, there was no shortage of gratitude from the winners. Mr. Thompson, winner of the £5 prize in 1847, expressed his gratitude to the women present at the meeting, in lieu of the specific benefactor whom he did not know. He

202 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 4, 1839," *Minute Book 1838*, 86; RSPCA, "Special Meeting of the Committee, April 22, 1839," *Minute Book 1838*, 105; SPCA, *Thirteenth Annual Report*, 14, 43, 45; RSPCA, *Fourteenth Annual Report*, 21; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 22, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 95; RSPCA, *Fifteenth Annual Report*, 63.

203 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 7, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 137.

204 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 5 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 154-5.

205 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 7, 1842," *Minute Book 1840*, 232; RSPCA, *Seventeenth Annual Report*, 12, 45.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 1, 1844," *Minute Book 1842*, 214; RSPCA, *Eighteenth Annual Report*, 15; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 3, 1845," *Minute Book 1845*, 10-11; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 12, 1847," *Minute Book 1845*, 231; "Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," *The Standard* (London, England), Friday, May 17, 1844; Issue 6187. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

206 RSPCA, *Seventeenth Annual Report*, 12.

begged to assure the audience that, although the prize money would not last forever, “the recollection of the honor I have received, and the gratitude I feel to my unknown friend, will be as firmly impressed upon me, long after that has departed, as they are at the present moment.” Mr. Thompson's declaration brought loud cheers from a primarily female audience.²⁰⁷

During the last three years covered by this study, Miss Sutton's prize moved between schools, being offered to Battersea College in 1848, Christ's Hospital in 1849, and Merchant Taylor's School in 1850.²⁰⁸ During the presentations of her awards, Miss Sutton continued to be lavishly praised, as in 1849 when Mr. Meymott presented a longer than usual monologue on her virtues.²⁰⁹ Miss Sutton had encouraged students to take a stand against cruelty. Due to the liberality of her gift and the subsequent interest of the newspapers, the RSPCA had received additional publicity. Miss Sutton also exhibited her feminine modesty in choosing to have her name withheld from public knowledge. What Mr. Meymott did not mention was the impact that Miss Sutton had on the auxiliary anti-cruelty societies: in 1843, the Auxiliary Society at Plymouth followed Miss Sutton's example and institute essay prizes in the amounts of 5 guineas and 2 guineas respectively.²¹⁰ In addition, *the Belfast News-Letter* indicates that the Belfast auxiliary had also noted her example and had given two prizes for notable anti-cruelty essays. The first was awarded to James Marshall, who received a medal for his efforts. The second

207 RSPCA, *Twenty-First Annual Report.*, 47-8.

208 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 15, 1848,” *Minute Book 1845*, 308; RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 12, 1849” *Minute Book 1848*, 43; “Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849; Issue 23535. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*; RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 8, 1850,” *Minute Book 1848*, 135; RSPCA, *The Annual Report...1850*, 64-7; RSPCA, *Twenty-Third Annual Report*, 11-2.

209 RSPCA, *Twenty-Third Annual Report*, 36-38.

210 RSPCA, *Seventeenth Annual Report*, 11.

was awarded to Miss Eliza Moncrieff. She was not given the more masculine medal as a prize; she was given *The Women of England*, by Mrs. Ellis.²¹¹

Women's educational roles were not limited to handing out awards to students and writing books for children. They also were involved in the adult educational world as well, using the some of the same methods they employed when working with schools. Tracts were written by women and books published. In the burgeoning reading culture of nineteenth-century Britain, this was one of the chief ways they could be of use to the cause. They had this role from the very start of the RSPCA. At the first meeting held at Old Slaughter's Coffeehouse, one of the three tracts put forward for publication was written by a Mrs. Hall.²¹² This literate task was embraced by committed women at the middle and upper levels of society; it does not appear that working class women were involved in the production or selection of these materials. Middle-class women such as Miss Rainforth and members of the aristocracy such as the Baroness de Milauges present tract manuscripts to the Society for approval and publication.²¹³ The Society was somewhat selective about what it published; it had to be, as it was operating on a limited amount of money. Mrs. Blackfords, for example, found her verses turned down for publication. Mrs. Evans, when presenting a translated manuscript for publication, complete with illustrations, was told that the project was too expensive for the RSPCA to be able to complete within their current budget. Mrs. Evans was also turned down for the publication of a tract that she had written; it was good enough, however, for the

211 "Belfast Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," *The Belfast News-Letter* (Belfast, Ireland), Friday, May 3, 1844; Issue 11143. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*.

212 RSPCA, "Meeting, Friday June 25, 1824," *Minute Book 1824*, 7.

213 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 4 1842," *Minute Book 1840*, 311; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 5, 1842," *Minute Book 1842*, 36.

committee to suggest that she submit it to an essay competition.²¹⁴

Women who did not feel they had the gift for writing had the opportunity to secure printed materials for Society use from a number of sources. Mrs. Brown, in cooperation with Dr. Rudge, donated 50 copies of a tract on animal abuse and an unspecified number of copies of a related sermon.²¹⁵ A woman referred to in the committee minutes rather familiarly as “Charlotte Elizabeth” had one of her tracts published by the Religious Tract Society; the committee determined to buy 25 copies.²¹⁶ Similarly, £10 was paid to Mrs. Youatt and family for 100 copies of her late husband's book, *The Obligation and Extent of Humanity to Brutes*.²¹⁷ In addition to donating written materials or locating appropriate tracts for purchase, the women most closely involved in the workings of the RSPCA kept an eye on the number of tracts needed at any given time. In September 1842, the Hon. Mrs. Singleton requests the reprint of early tracts.²¹⁸ She follows up in July 1843, when the Secretary reports that “the Hon. Mrs. Singleton, Mrs. Gurney and other subscribers were much displeased that the tracts were not reprinted as required.” Their displeasure has the desired effect; the dearth was ordered to be remedied.²¹⁹

The spread of the printed tracts, both in London and in rural areas, was another area for female involvement. Mrs. Alexander of Ipswich requested, and was given,

214 RSPCA, “General Monthly Meeting, August 3, 1835,” *Minute Book 1835*, 2; RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 10, 1850,” *Minute Book 1848*, 155; RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, August 5, 1850,” *Minute Book 1848*, 164-5.

215 RSPCA, Meeting Monday, June 2, 1828,” *Minute Book 1824*, 63.

216 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 2, 1844,” *Minute Book 1842*, 311

217 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 12, 1847,” *Minute Book 1845*, 232-3.

218 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 5, 1842,” *Minute Book 1842*, 7-8.

219 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 3, 1843,” *Minute Book 1842*, 127.

permission to reprint Society tracts in her native county.²²⁰ Women also were involved with the physical dispersal of written materials. For example, Miss Cayley assisted her father, Sir George Cayley, in distributing tracts and other Society publications in their area.²²¹ Such female assistance was highly useful. In fact, at the 1837 annual meeting, Sir George Chetwynd pointed out that women had been of great assistance in handing out tracts. He went on to connect this effort with the creation of public awareness; both the female members and their tracts had caused the public to think about their relation to the animal world.²²²

At the same meeting, Sir George Chetwynd went on to request that ladies apply themselves to having sermons preached in churches concerning humanity to animals.²²³ A number of the female members of the RSPCA were pleased to oblige; in fact, they had been active in this area since at least 1830. In January of that year, female usefulness in obtaining tracts and arranging to have sermons preached was confirmed by the Committee. They took the unusual step of inviting several women to sit on a mixed-gender sub-committee, convened “to obtain sermons from clergymen of various denominations to diffuse moral and religious impressions toward brute creation.” This group was to meet over a period of three months only, and had a budget of £15 for printing and advertising for their use.²²⁴ The active and energetic Mrs. Frances Maria Thompson was asked to be involved, a tribute to her persistent efforts on behalf of

220 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 14, 1846,” *Minute Book 1845*, 204.

221 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, November 1, 1841,” *Minute Book 1840*, 201.

222 SPCA, *Eleventh Annual Report*, 54.

223 RSPCA, *Fourteenth Annual Report*, 36.

224 RSPCA, “Meeting January 7, 1830,” *Minute Book 1824*, 113.

animals. Mrs. P. Fenner also participated.²²⁵ Upon completion of their task, the Committee forwarded their best thanks for the ladies' kind attendance and services.²²⁶ There were also other instances of female interest in such sermons. The *Salisbury Guardian* reported that Mrs. St John had left in her will an annual sum of four guineas for the preaching of three sermons in Southampton.²²⁷ Mrs. Cowell offered the same amount for the preaching of four sermons.²²⁸ Although neither of these amounts was adequate for the task in question, female willingness to give money for the preaching of sermons illustrates the interest of women to invite church participation in the anti-cruelty cause.

The monetary incentive was used to greater purpose in the establishment of prize essays open to adult entries. For example, the Committee showed interest in Lady Westmoreland's offer of an anonymous essay prize of £10.10.0.²²⁹ It accepted her offer, and determined that the essay should be written on "the value and importance of this Institution and its objects."²³⁰ Upon completion of the competition, twelve copies of the winning essay would be presented to the Dowager Countess of Westmoreland for her use.²³¹ It is interesting to note that, when Lady Westmoreland requested that her name not be attached to the prize, the gentlemen of the committee chose to advertise as if the prize had been put up by a male "Friend to the Society." Not only was her name concealed, her sex was also. Lady Westmoreland had evidently increased her donation,

225 RSPCA, "Meeting February 23, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*, 115.

226 RSPCA, "Meeting April 5, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*, 119.

227 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, November 1, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 201.

228 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 7, 1842," *Minute Book 1840*, 235.

229 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 12, 1848," *Minute Book 1845*, 330-1.

230 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 10, 1848," *Minute Book 1848*, 1-2.

231 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 11, 1848," *Minute Book 1848*, 25.

for by the time of advertisement, the prize had been increased from £10.10.00 to £21 for first place and £10.10.00 for second.²³² Once the essays had been received and adjudicated, the winners were announced in the London papers. Mrs. Eumia Le Faun of Cork won the first prize of £21 for her essay on the ameliorating influence of the RSPCA, and her essay was then published.²³³ The prominence of a female participant in such a contest points to the growing acceptability of female involvement in causes of this kind.

Financial Support

Women were very active in supporting the RSPCA financially. They participated in a number of ways: subscriptions, donations, legacies, annuities, and fund raising. Davidoff and Hall point out that men's donations were often a reflection of their roles as heads of families, and women's donations were likely hidden by record-keeping practices. This does not appear to be the case with the Society.²³⁴ There are many women on the subscriber and donations lists; in some cases, such as that of Mr. John Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy, married couples could and did subscribe individually.²³⁵ If there were additional women donating under the names of their husbands alone, the female financial support of the Society was vast indeed.

Given that the majority of married women did not have personal property, and were not permitted to do so, where did the female financial supporters obtain the money? Some women donated out of money given to them for their use by husband or family.

232 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 12, 1849," *Minute Book 1848*, 96-7.

233 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 10, 1850," *Minute Book 1848*, 152; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, August 5, 1850," *Minute Book 1848*, 160.

234 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 432.

235 RSPCA, "General Monthly Meeting, October 7, 1833," *Minute Book 1832*, 103-4.

Others donated with permission from husbands or fathers.²³⁶ In marriages where men who left the majority of the household finances to the discretion of their wives, women might have greater latitude in their spending. Women such as Eumia Le Faun might also have prize money at their disposal. No matter where the money originated, the committee of the RSPCA were grateful for it. Thanks were forwarded publicly to female supporters at the various annual meetings, again indicating the blurring of gender boundaries.²³⁷

The most common way for women to support the RSPCA was to become subscribers. The suggested annual subscription seems to have been £1.1.0, or one guinea, although a subscriber could contribute as little as £0.5.0 annually, and some contributed as much as £10.²³⁸ The ability to pay £1.1.0 on a yearly bases points to the economic status of the majority of those who contributed. This is not to say that less comfortable households did not contribute. For example, Mrs. Simpson of Herne Hill Camberwell complained that her subscription was collected early. The Society sent the collector in question to apologize and offer to return the amount – likely in part because it understood that some of its subscribers were from the less wealthy ranks of society and had less financial flexibility as a result.²³⁹

Donations caused greater comment than individual subscriptions, so there are more detailed records about them. Most donations were made in cash during the benefactor's lifetime, and were in a wide array of amounts. Donations as low as £1.10.00

236 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*, 432.

237 For example, see SPCA, *Ninth Annual Report*, 31.

238 The vast majority of subscribers, according to the subscriber lists included with the annual reports (1832-1850) contributed £1.1.0. The lowest subscription amount of £0.5.0 becomes more common after 1840.

239 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 13, 1837," *Minute Book 1835*, 130-1.

were noted in the meetings minutes, and donations of up to £100 were recorded, although these were rare.²⁴⁰ In fact, one donation of £100 merited not only a note in the committee minutes, but also praise at the 1839 general meeting. In January 1839, Mrs. Blackenbury of Lincoln had donated this sum to the Society and requested that the Stamford bull-running continue to be suppressed. At the annual meeting, Mrs. Blackenbury's donation was described as given by an anonymous "benevolent donor [who] congratulated the Society upon the great moral victory it had been able, under the blessing of God, to achieve,"²⁴¹ once again referring to the cessation of the Stamford bull-running. Nor were all of these donations from residents of London, or even the Home counties. Donations came from places as disparate as Cornwall, Edinburgh, Bristol, Oxfordshire, and Durham.²⁴² One particularly generous contributor was Mrs. Catherine C. Manning from Moorwinstow, Cornwall. The committee minutes indicate that she donated a total of £185 in 8 installments between 1837 and 1847.²⁴³ She is also mentioned at the 1837 Annual General Meeting as being the largest donor of the year at £20, beating out the

240 For the lower end of this range, see RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, October 3, 1836," *Minute Book 1835*, 83. For the higher end, see RSPCA, "General Monthly Meeting, February 5, 1838," *Minute Book 1835*, 251; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, January 7, 1839," *Minute Book 1838*, 60-1; SPCA, *Thirteenth Annual Report*: 10-11.

241 SPCA, *Thirteenth Annual Report*, 11.

242 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, August 1, 1836," *Minute Book 1835*, 73; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 2, 1839," *Minute Book 1838*, 166; SPCA, *Eleventh Annual Report*, 25-26.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 5, 1844," *Minute Book 1842*, 193.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 5, 1842," *Minute Book 1842*, 2.

243 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 13, 1837," *Minute Book 1835*, 131; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 2, 1840," *Minute Book 1838*, 238.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 22, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 97.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 4, 1844," *Minute Book 1842*, 214; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, January 6, 1845," *Minute Book 1842*, 322-3.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 6, 1843," *Minute Book 1842*, 76; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 7, 1845," *Minute Book 1845*, 25.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, May 4, 1846," *Minute Book 1845*, 137; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, May 10, 1847," *Minute Book 1845*, 242.

Earl of Carnarvon who donated only £15.²⁴⁴

Although many female contributors donated to the efforts of the RSPCA in the most general sense, many women also donated to specific initiatives or to support personal concerns. Women left money to have anti-cruelty sermons preached in local churches.²⁴⁵ Miss Augerstein donated £5 and Mrs. Singleton £3 towards a fund meant to buy worn-out horses on London streets. Others joined them in this effort.²⁴⁶ Several women, including Mrs. Frances Maria Thompson and Mrs. Singleton, contributed to an effort to start an auxiliary society in Dublin.²⁴⁷ The Honourable Mrs. Singleton, active in almost every area, also offered an additional £10, to be added to the Society's offer of £20, as a reward for apprehending those responsible for a case of animal cruelty against some lambs on Plumstead Marsh.²⁴⁸ These financial responses to specifically identifiable needs were common among sympathetic women.

Women also used their financial abilities to create awards for various types of skilled or good behaviour. As previously mentioned, several essay competitions with monetary awards were instituted by women. Prizes for compassion to animals, like the five pound prize instituted by "a benevolent lady" for donkey drovers at Hampstead Heath, were also donated by women.²⁴⁹ One of the more major, if ultimately

244 SPCA, *Eleventh Annual Report*, 25-26.

245 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, August 1, 1836," *Minute Book 1835*, 73; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, October 3, 1836," *Minute Book 1835*, 78; RSPCA, "General Monthly Meeting, February 5, 1838," *Minute Book 1835*, 251.

246 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, August 1, 1836," *Minute Book 1835*, 74; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, October 3, 1836," *Minute Book 1835*, 83.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 2, 1840," *Minute Book 1838*, 233..

247 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 7, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 143-4; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 5, 1842," *Minute Book 1842*, 9.

248 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 5, 1842," *Minute Book 1842*, 4.

249 "Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," *The Morning Post* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849; Issue 23535. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*:

unsuccessful, female initiatives was for a Humane Drivers' Fund, which would award those driving cattle or sheep to Smithfield Market who acted in a compassionate way toward their charges. At the 1835 Annual General Meeting, a prospectus for this Fund was presented; ladies had initiated this move.²⁵⁰ R. Batson, Esq. thanked the ladies for their "indefatigable" efforts on behalf of humanity, and suggested that women become involved in the proposed Humane Drivers' Fund.²⁵¹ In addition to the prospectus, it was suggested that the writings of Mrs. Trollope be copied for all Humane Drivers' Fund subscribers, likely for dispersal to the working class populace. Mrs. Trollope's work was believed to present a beneficial example to those who worked in driving cattle to market; it described a scene in Germany of healthy business practices and healthy animals.²⁵² This fund lasted for only two years. At the 1837 annual general meeting, supporters of the Humane Drivers' Fund were encouraged to transfer funds to the Fund for the Purchase of Worn Out Horses, &c., as there were so few drivers eligible for awards.²⁵³

Although the majority of donations were in cash, some women found more creative ways to contribute to the work of the Society. For example, in November 1842, Mrs. Blackford wrote to inquire whether the Society would like some animal pictures to hang in their offices. The response is "that the Committee have no objection...if she thinks the cause of humanity to animals will be thereby promoted."²⁵⁴ In this case, female attention to the built environment surpasses that of the men; the creation of a

Part II. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

250 SPCA, *Ninth Annual Report*, 69.

251 *Ibid.*, 19-20.

252 *Ibid.*, 71.

253 SPCA, *Eleventh Annual Report*, 123.

254 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, November 7, 1842," *Minute Book 1842*, 26.

comfortable space seemed to be an appropriate feminine concern. Other donations were received for the use of the Society as well. For example, Miss Chambers, a woman of limited financial means, sent six concert tickets to the Committee; she expressed the hope that they would be able to sell them and the profits be put toward Society objectives. Three of the six were sold, netting a total of £1.11.6.²⁵⁵

In addition to subscriptions and donations of various sorts, women also contributed to the financial goals of the Society by leaving money for its use in their wills. Mrs. Elizabeth Knight set up an annuity of £10, with the help of RSPCA committee members W.A. MacKinnon, Robert Batson, and J.G. Meymott. This sum would be transferred to the RSPCA yearly upon her death.²⁵⁶ Mrs. Wilks of Finsbury Square left ten guineas annually.²⁵⁷ Many more women left legacies to the RSPCA. Between 1826 and 1850, 22 legacies were received from the estates of deceased women. The records of amounts donated no longer exist for two of these – their names are simply mentioned in the primary sources. The remaining 20 donated a total of £4169.19.00. The average legacy was £208.10.00, with the most common amount being £100. Five women left amounts under £100; 7 gave amounts over £100. It is also evident that women left legacies more often, and in greater sums, than men did, at least in these early years. Eight women left legacies prior to 1840; the total amount donated was £1940. Only 5 men's legacies were recorded as received within this time, for a total of £485.10.0.²⁵⁸ Most

255 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, May 3, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 124; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 7, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 139.

256 RSPCA, "General Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 7, 1834," *Minute Book 1832*, 157-8; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, January 6, 1840," *Minute Book 1838*, 204.

257 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 14, 1846," *Minute Book 1845*, 175-6.

258 For more information, see the "Lists of Legacies and Donations" appended to the 1833-1839 Annual Reports. For comments in the Committee Minutes, please see RSPCA, "Special

legacies were received promptly without much difficulty. Occasionally, however, special arrangements needed to be made. In the time period under study, two revisionary legacies were received. In these cases, the deceased left money to the RSPCA, but to be paid after the death of a dependent. Such was the case with the Hon. Juliana Curzon's legacy, which was to be paid after the death of her sister. The Society was informed of this legacy in 1835; they received the money in 1842.²⁵⁹ The second revisionary legacy was received in 1850. T.D. Lewis had left a legacy of £100 to be paid after the death of Miss Lewis; however, Miss Lewis insisted that the money be forwarded to the Society immediately.²⁶⁰

Some bequests created financial complications for the Society on legal grounds; others presented a factual difficulty for the historian due to conflicting sources. The first legacy provided for the use of the Society is the best known; it is also the most problematic. A sum of £100, ostensibly from the will of novelist Mrs. Ann Radcliffe, rescued the RSPCA from its 1826 monetary troubles. The money was provided by her husband William. The difficulty in this matter was twofold. First, the committee notes made no mention of Mrs. Radcliffe in its initial reference to the donation; only her husband was referred to.²⁶¹ This may be a reflection of the role of the husband as the head of the house, or it may simply be that William Radcliffe donated to an animal welfare

Meeting, May 2, 1832," *Minute Book 1832*, 26; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 7, 1842," *Minute Book 1840*, 232.; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 13, 1837," *Minute Book 1835*, 129; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 7, 1840," *Minute Book 1840*, 61-62; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 2, 1844," *Minute Book 1842*, 290; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 4, 1849," *Minute Book 1848*, 70.

259 SPCA, *Ninth Annual Report*, 9; RSPCA, *Sixteenth Annual Report*, 14; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 7, 1842," *Minute Book 1840*, 232.

260 RSPCA, *The Annual Report...1850*, 20.

261 RSPCA, "Meeting, May 15, 1826," *Minute Book 1824*, 38.

society because he knew that it was something about which his late wife would have been passionate. Second, there is the issue of the timing of Mrs. Radcliffe's death. She passed away on February 7, 1823, four months before the first meeting of the RSPCA. William Radcliffe made the donation in May 1826. It seems unlikely that Mrs. Radcliffe left her legacy to the Society directly. In any case, it is evident that the Society chose to record this donation in Mrs. Radcliffe's name. In the 1833 Annual Report, Mrs. Radcliffe and "her" donation of £100 is printed under the title "LEGACY prior to 1832" in the section listing subscriptions and donations.²⁶² By 1842 it was believed that Ann Radcliffe herself had saved the Society from collapse. At the 1842 annual general meeting, and again in 1850, W.A. MacKinnon mentioned the importance of Mrs. Radcliffe having left a legacy to the Society.²⁶³ In 1846, when telling the early story of the RSPCA, he was more specific. He says: "We determined to make one more appeal to the community. That appeal was made, and made successfully, and the late well-known and celebrated Mrs. Radcliffe the author of so many interesting and instructive works, left us a legacy of 100 guineas."²⁶⁴ Although this statement is inaccurate, it does express the popular belief that Mrs. Radcliffe herself left such a legacy. Whether this belief was purposefully created to make use of Mrs. Radcliffe's fame, or is simply a part of the Society's internal mythology, is unclear. It does, however, illustrate the connection between financial support and the superiority, and likelihood, of female morality; Ann Radcliffe is given the credit for the donation, not her husband.

In addition to donating to the Society itself, many active women were directly

262 SPCA, *Seventh Annual Report*, 44.

263 RSPCA, *Sixteenth Annual Report*, 41; RSPCA, *The Annual Report...1850*, 34.

264 Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, *Twentieth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Wednesday, June 10, 1846* (London: [n.p.], 1846): 40.

involved in soliciting funds. For example, A.G. wrote to the Committee to offer to collect funds on its behalf in her area.²⁶⁵ At least 45 different women were involved in collecting subscriptions and donations between 1832 and 1850.²⁶⁶ Some were more active than others. The woman who was most energetically involved was the Honourable Mrs. Singleton, whose fingers were in every Society pie. Between 1836 and 1850, she brought in a total of £266.17.4, averaging £19 collected from 9.6 individuals per year.²⁶⁷ Mrs. Singleton was a woman to be reckoned with, but she was not the only one. Mrs. Banks comes to our attention in 1840, the only year that Mrs. Singleton seems to be absent from collection activities, and she collected from 17 different people. She was working among a completely different section of society: the subscriptions she collected were most often in the amount of £0.5.0, so she never collected nearly as much as Mrs. Singleton. She did, however, easily surpass the number of individual donations and subscriptions of that formidable lady. Mrs. Banks continued to be very active until 1850; she was joined by Mrs. Simpson in 1849 and 1850.²⁶⁸

There is no clear evidence that such collecting was done door-to-door; the society employed formal male collectors for this purpose. Women, such as Mrs. Banks and Mrs. Simpson, may have collected in this way in working-class neighbourhoods. Upper-class women, such as the Hon. Mrs. Singleton, collected within their social circles.²⁶⁹ If any

265 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, January 4, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 70.

266 See the subscriber lists appended to each annual report.

267 See the subscriber lists appended to each annual report. See also: RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 2, 1840," *Minute Book 1838*, 233; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 1, 1840," *Minute Book 1838*, 284; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 6, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 171; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, November 6, 1843," *Minute Book 1842*, 153; RSPCA, *Twentieth Annual Report*, 16; RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 2, 1840," *Minute Book 1838*, 233.; RSPCA, "Annual General Meeting, May 18, 1843," *Minute Book 1842*, 98.

268 See Lists of Subscribers and Donations appended to each annual report.

269 For example, Mrs. Singleton collected from Lord William Bentinck, Lady Francis Egerton,

women collected by going from house to house at this time, it would have signified an extension of female gender roles from the home to the street. Even if this were not the case, the financial involvement of women in the RSPCA reveals a blurring of the gender boundaries in regard to personal property and the handling of money.

Reporting Cruelty

As interest in the RSPCA spread, informers began to step forward in all corners of the country to report animal abuse. Many of these informers were men, but by no means all of them. Women were vitally involved as informers in directing cases of cruelty to the authorities. Some were cautious about their involvement, as was the “Lady at Millbank” who sent an anonymous letter.²⁷⁰ Some were unsuccessful in their attempts, as was subscriber Mrs. Bellis, who wrote to request an officer of the Society come to Tolness to prevent cruelty to animals. She was turned down due to lack of funds.²⁷¹ In most recorded cases, however, the information provided by women was useful and the actions taken by the Society at least moderately effective.

Two women stand out as particularly vocal informers on the need for Society constables in their areas. In December 1840, Mrs. Webb wrote to complain of cruelties in Bristol and requested that a constable be sent.²⁷² The committee was able to respond affirmatively, and a constable was sent for a three month engagement. In May 1841 Mrs. Webb wrote to express her satisfaction with Constable Smith's work, and to suggest that

Admiral Sir George Martin, and the Marquess of Tichfield in 1836. It is unlikely that she obtained these donations by going door-to-door. See SPCA, *Tenth Annual Report*, 98, 101, 106, 111.

270 RSPCA, “General Monthly Meeting, January 7, 1833,” *Minute Book 1832*, 64.

271 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 4, 1843,” *Minute Book 1842*, 169.

272 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 7, 1840,” *Minute Book 1840*, 63.

an auxiliary society be begun in Bristol.²⁷³ The Society suggested sending the Constable back to Bristol for a period of three months, and in November 1841 Mrs. Webb wrote to confirm. She was having little success forming an auxiliary society in Bristol, but was anxious for the RSPCA to receive the funds that she had collected. She also requested tracts to hand out at Bristol.²⁷⁴

Miss Morgan had a similar passion for encouraging compassion to animals at Brighton. In this she was joined by a wealthy woman, Miss Davis of Montpelier Road, a subscriber. Miss Morgan visited the Society's office to request that a constable be sent to Brighton, and indicated that she believed enough money could be raised to keep the constable there for an undisclosed period of time. She reported that "there is a strong disposition among the respectable inhabitants in that town to repress the cruelty to animals which is very general." The Society agreed to send Constable Ditton to Brighton to address the situation there.²⁷⁵ Brighton being a popular destination, the Secretary himself had opportunity to visit. While at Brighton, he had called on Miss Davis of Montpelier Road "who said she was exceedingly pleased with the proceedings taken by the Society, and that it was her determination to be an annual subscriber to the society, as also towards defraying the expenses of a Constable at Brighton."²⁷⁶ It is unlikely that Constable Ditton was permanently stationed at Brighton; in 1845 Miss Morgan wrote again to request that the Society establish a branch office in that town, and she mentioned the significant interest of the Society of Friends in this project. The Society offered their assistance, but declined to open a branch office. The committee does seem, however, to

273 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, May 3, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 121.

274 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 6, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 214-15.

275 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, October 4, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 189-90.

276 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 6, 1841," *Minute Book 1840*, 216.

be very open to most suggestions that might be put forward, whether by men or by women.²⁷⁷

One of the most obvious practices of cruelty was evident to both male and female Londoners, and it was the beating of animals driven through the streets to Smithfield Market. Miss Rist is praised for her actions taken against a drover for brutal treatment of a sow; she had initiated court proceedings and had been successful in obtaining a conviction. The committee forwarded “an expression of their admiration of her benevolent and active zeal and that cause of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals which the Society is formed to promote.”²⁷⁸ Thanks were also given to Mrs. Rolls of Maria Lane for her efforts in preventing the beating of a lamb, and when that failed, for witnessing against the drover at Guild Hall.²⁷⁹ In a rare case, one woman extended her concern to the shipping of cattle. Mrs. Elizabeth Bunsen of Carleton House Terrace went so far as to inform the Committee of a case of international cruelty. The cattle on ships from Rotterdam and other ports were in very poor shape, due to their lack of space, food and water. The Committee decided to consult Mr. Sewell, the Honorary Veterinary Surgeon to the Society.²⁸⁰ The surgeon declined to comment, due to his lack of knowledge of the subject, so the Society wrote to the British Consul at Rotterdam to have him step in.²⁸¹

Animals intended for slaughter were not the only creatures who experienced brutality. The sight of the abuse of donkeys and horses used for transport within the city

277 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 7, 1845,” *Minute Book 1845*, 65.

278 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 7, 1845,” *Minute Book 1845*, 52.

279 RSPCA, “Meeting, October 6, 1828,” *Minute Book 1824*, 80.

280 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, October 8, 1849,” *Minute Book 1848*, 87-8.

281 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 12, 1849,” *Minute Book 1848*, 94.

was also common. The daughter of Gen Sir Samuel Hawker and niece of Joseph Hawker MP reported the horrible abuse of donkeys in Southend. Miss Hawker spoke to her father and uncle about this, and her uncle wrote to the Committee, who sent a constable to Southend.²⁸² This “horrible usage” might have consisted of the driver overloading his donkey, as did James Fruin, who was reported by Mrs. Sankey of St. Martin's Lane. He was discharged with an admonition from the magistrate.²⁸³ Abuse might also consist of overwork. Lady Cave wrote in February 1842 to complain of the cruelty committed against both donkeys and horses who worked drawing coal in the Coventry area. These animals were overworked and forced to keep going in all circumstances. Lady Cave reported that “during the severe weather they are worked until they die in [the harnesses of] the carts.”²⁸⁴ As a result of this letter, Constable Ditton was sent over from Brighton to observe.²⁸⁵

The abuse of horses, as in the above case, was far from rare. Most instances of cruelty reported were committed against horses. Mrs. Cowell of Great Cumberland reported abuse of horses by drivers of the Defiance Coaches at Bridgewater and Taunton. The Society sent Constable Smith, who is stationed at Brighton, to observe the abuse.²⁸⁶ Two respectable ladies informed the RSPCA of a case where a horse was dying without food. The Society initiated an investigation.²⁸⁷ A woman might also witness against an

282 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, August 6, 1838,” *Minute Book 1835*, 340-1.

283 RSPCA, “General Monty Meeting, October 7, 1833,” *Minute Book 1832*, 105.

284 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 7, 1842,” *Minute Book 1840*, 239-40.

285 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 5, 1844,” *Minute Book 1842*, 194.

286 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, January 3, 1842,” *Minute Book 1840*, 227.

287 “Hull Police Court,” *The Hull Packet and East Riding Times* (Hull, England), Friday, June 1, 1849; Issue 3362. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

perpetrator of cruelty in court, due to her so-called “superior morality”. Miss Hubbuck of Wellclose Square was praised for witnessing against omnibus driver Pallmgall, who flogged his horse brutally. Due to her cooperation, the Society was able to prosecute the driver to conviction.²⁸⁸ Subscriber Miss Rist also obtained a conviction in an anti-cruelty case, and was acknowledged by the committee for her efforts.²⁸⁹ Mrs. Bushell, also a subscriber, initiated legal proceedings against the man who harnessed his saddle horse to a heavy cart and drove it around a plowed field until it died.²⁹⁰ Mrs. Hodges, described as a respectable married woman, witnessed against a man whipping his horse to get it to draw a cart out of the mire at the end of the street. It had been obvious that the horse was wholly unable to do it.²⁹¹

Not all women were particularly useful as informers, as shown by a deeply ironic case reported in *The Morning Post* of London. Two ladies observed a man beating his horse from their drawing room window. Their response was to send their servant out to stop the beating, but he was not able to. Fortunately, a police officer was able to apprehend the culprit based on the ladies' testimony. Unfortunately, the women did not proceed with haste to the police station. The newspaper reports:

as ladies proverbially take a long time in dressing, and as the two whose sympathies had been enlisted upon the present occasion were not exceptions, by the time they made their appearance to charge the defendant, which was something like an hour and a half after the occurrence, the officer on duty had liberated the accused for want of complainants or witnesses, and left the ladies to their remedy by summons.²⁹²

288 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 7, 1845,” *Minute Book 1845*, 23.

289 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, October 6, 1845,” *Minute Book 1845*, 70.

290 “Odiham – Case of Alleged Cruelty,” *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle etc* (Portsmouth, England), Saturday, September 8, 1849; Issue 2605. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

291 “Law and Police,” *The Era* (London, England), Sunday, May 26, 1850; Issue 609. *9th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

292 “Police Intelligence,” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Friday, November 02, 1849;

In this case, it is important to consider the women's quandary; there are two opposing expressions of virtue at stake. A virtuous woman expressed her character by the modesty and appropriateness of her dress. These women also wished to express virtue in assisting in the capture of a man guilty of animal cruelty. Either way they were compromised. Their choice to dress appropriately over haste in reporting the crime is not particularly surprising; they were attempting to preserve virtue on both fronts.

Dogs were also being used for transport at this time, especially in the villages and the country. This caused some concern, as there were outbreaks of what we would now call rabies among cart dogs, and they were known to bite humans and spread the disease. Contemporary wisdom separated the concepts of madness and hydrophobia, which is a symptom of rabies. Dogs were believed to become mad when they were beaten excessively. Hydrophobia was believed to be linked to overworking a dog; his driver made him so thirsty that he was unable to drink, and therefore died.²⁹³ In July 1834, Mrs. Gurney wrote to request the Society take steps against the use of dogs as beasts of burden; in response, the committee initiated warnings and printed notices aimed at owners of dog carts.²⁹⁴ The practice seems to have continued after this point; Mrs. Simpson of Southampton expressed her continued concern in February 1842.²⁹⁵

Concern was also expressed about animals used in the ancient bloodsports of

Issue 23683. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

293 "Miscellaneous," *Berrow's Worcester Journal* (Worcester, England), Thursday, May 25, 1837; Issue 7017. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*; "London, May 23," *Jackson's Oxford Journal* (Oxford, England), Saturday, May 27, 1837; Issue 4387. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

294 RSPCA, "General Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 7, 1834," *Minute Book 1832*, 159.

295 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 7, 1842," *Minute Book 1840*, 237.

Britain: bull- and bear-baiting, dog fights, cock fights, and bull running. Many of these sports were not within a respectable woman's purview; she would have avoided the locations at which these things occurred. As such, many more sporting-related cases were reported by men. There are a few cases in which women were helpful in putting down bloodsport, however. Miss Sarah Wedgewood insisted on having a bull-baiting at Birmingham witnessed. The Society replied to her letter stating that she should find a man in Birmingham to take care of this, and the Society would pay the expense so that a conviction might be procured.²⁹⁶ Misses Yewen and Denny were involved in indicting the Westminster Pit, and received four guineas from the Society for their troubles.²⁹⁷ Captain Serle and his daughter witnessed an intentional dogfight and stood up in court against the two owners.²⁹⁸ Sometimes bloodsport was hard to avoid, even if one wished to. A letter was written by an anonymous author to a female Member of the RSPCA. The letter reported the complaint of a female friend in Staffordshire, whose home was so close to the location of bull-baitings that she was forced to listen to them.²⁹⁹ Not only was bloodsport on the public streets, the noise was also infiltrating domestic spaces.

Smaller animals were also the victims of cruelty; this was especially true of cats. The poorest of the labouring classes might sell cat skins to vendors looking for a cheap source of fur. The cats were generally skinned alive, as this was believed to make the fur more desirable. At the 1839 Annual General Meeting, Sir George Chetwynd tells the meeting of a mother and her two daughters who skinned female cats alive for their fur, to

296 RSPCA, "Meeting, August 20, 1829," *Minute Book 1824*, 102.

297 RSPCA, "Meeting Monday, August 2, 1830," *Minute Book 1824*, 126.

298 "Portsmouth Police," *Hampshire Advertiser & Salisbury Guardian* (Southampton, England), Saturday, August 15, 1846; Issue 1201: 8. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*

299 "Bull-Baiting," *The Morning Post* (London, England), Saturday, November 01, 1828; Issue 18060. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

sell for making cheap caps.³⁰⁰ Dead cats were found in their abode. The Society was indignant, but the record does not suggest that the woman in question was prosecuted.³⁰¹ Similarly, the author of an article in *The Ladies' Newspaper* was shocked to learn that six cats had been divested of their skins and left in a basket. She called for RSPCA to investigate.³⁰² This article is written in such a way as to play on women's feelings and presumed sensitivity. Also included in this newspaper is a report of a cat “terribly mangled about the belly and jaws by the teeth of the dog – a large and fierce one of the bull-terrier breed,” which two men had set on it. This horrific act was reported in an article which did not include any follow-up actions taken in the case; it seems to be calculated only to shock. It is included with written pieces entitled “Child Flogging” and “The Barbarity of a Father”.³⁰³ Not all women, however, were contented to be continually shocked by such depravity; some sought to do something about it. Elizabeth Wilkinson witnessed in court in the case of a pregnant cat worried to death by a dog under orders in a slaughter-yard.³⁰⁴ Mrs. Blackford, who wished to encourage good behaviour, wished the committee to award William Tolley, who fed a trapped cat for a month. The committee requested that Mr. Tolley attend its next meeting.³⁰⁵

300 SPCA, *Thirteenth Annual Report*, 40.

301 SPCA, *Thirteenth Annual Report*, 40.

302 “Table Talk,” *The Lady's Newspaper* (London, England), Saturday, April 28, 1849; Issue 122: 227. *New Readerships*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

303 “Law and Intelligence – Cruelty and Demoralization,” *The Lady's Newspaper* (London, England), Saturday, February 23, 1850; Issue 165.: 112 *New Readerships*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

304 “Police Intelligence,” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Friday, May 12, 1843; Issue 22563: 7. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

305 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 13, 1837,” *Minute Book 1835*, 129-30.

The Female Relationship to the Committee

While women were welcome to participate in nearly any philanthropic initiative of their choosing, it was incredibly difficult for women to become involved in the institutional organization of the RSPCA itself. The Committee was entirely composed of men, and while a ladies' auxiliary was formed in 1839, it was a separate and subordinate group.³⁰⁶ The male committee members were more than happy to let the ladies have their auxiliary, and said so. At the monthly meeting in April 1830, they expressed their appreciation of “the services they have rendered to the Society in their capacity of a corresponding and subordinate committee.”³⁰⁷ The women involved, however, did not limit their activities to this female-specific group. They interacted with and influenced the official committee in a number of ways.

As previously discussed, Mrs. F.M. Thompson and Mrs. P. Fenner participated in a sub-committee in 1830. This group was dedicated to securing anti-cruelty sermons from a wide variety of denominational groups, and was commissioned for a period of three months.³⁰⁸ This sub-committee had some success. The meeting minutes show that “Mr. Fenner on the part of the Sub Committee reported that they had prevailed on Rev T.J. Greenwood to preach a Sermon in aid of this Society, at St. Mary's Somerset Upper Thames Street.” The sermon was to be advertised in the *Morning Advertiser* and the *Morning Herald*.³⁰⁹

Direct female participation within a sub-committee happened only this once. Most women who wished to be involved in the governance of the Society had to do so in

306 RSPCA, “Meeting July 20, 1829,” *Minute Book 1824*, 100.

307 RSPCA, “Meeting April 5, 1830,” *Minute Book 1824*, 119.

308 RSPCA, “Meeting January 7, 1830,” *Minute Book 1824*, 113.

309 RSPCA, “Meeting May 3, 1830,” *Minute Book 1824*, 119.

more tangential ways. One of these was to support certain men for involvement with or employment by the Committee. For example, Mr. Henry Thomas was appointed to be pro tem secretary upon Mrs. Sankey's recommendation.³¹⁰ Miss Isabella Groves acted as surety of Mr. Belson, Society clerk.³¹¹ Mr. Middleton, clerk and collector, found himself without sufficient surety after the death of his patron Mrs. Legh.³¹² Female backing seems to have created a firm basis for a man's reputation and financial security. On occasion, women also would attend and speak at a Committee meeting. A woman might speak on behalf of an absent husband, as did Mrs. Harvey when she explained to Mr. Meymott why Mr. Harvey had removed his support for Mr. Belson.³¹³ Miss Morgan attended to request cooperation on behalf of the Infant School Society, with a positive response.³¹⁴ Miss Sutton both attended the November 4, 1839, meeting and placed an item on the agenda. The Committee listened politely as Miss Sutton expounded on her views on Society actions, or lack thereof. Her concern was with the lack of action taken using the Fund for Worn Out Horses. Only three horses had been purchased and put down in the last year, and Miss Sutton viewed this as unacceptable. She expressed her frustration:

When I inquired why therefore [the funds] raised were not more extensively appropriated to that benevolent purpose, he replied "that would be offering a premium for these animals". Now Sir when I contemplate the many miserable starved skeletons of horses daily and hourly in the street I must say that on becoming a subscriber to that fund I did it with the view of offering a premium for those wretched ill-used animals in order to terminate their miserable existence and not that the

310 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting, May 4, 1835," *Minute Book 1832*, 220.

311 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, January 6, 1840," *Minute Book 1838*, 198.

312 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, February 12, 1849," *Minute Book 1838*, 37.

313 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, November 4, 1839," *Minute Book 1838*, 176.

314 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, April 7, 1845," *Minute Book 1845*, 24-5.

funds should lie dormant and the wishes of the subscribers frustrated.³¹⁵

Miss Sutton goes on to suggest an alternative solution, that the Society purchase a knacker's yard to put the animals down themselves, under the supervision of a veterinary surgeon. The Committee promised to discuss her proposal at their earliest possible convenience; they were able to put off the discussion until the next month's meeting, when they determined that they would not pursue this plan. The Committee did forward their thanks to Miss Sutton for "the zeal, benevolence and liberality which her suggestion and offers display."³¹⁶

Female interactions with the Committee met with mixed results. Mrs. Gurney, along with Mr. Ernest Bunsen and Mr. Samuel Gurney, wrote in vain to ask the Society to put £1000 towards agitation for an Act of Parliament against animal abuse in Smithfield Market. They were disappointed, but not defeated. They prepared a Petition to be presented in Parliament instead.³¹⁷ Miss Gordon wrote to request the installation of watering troughs in Notting Hill Road for use during the upcoming Exhibition. The Society responded that water would likely be taken care of in other ways, and that they did not think it was wise to go to this expense unnecessarily.³¹⁸ Miss Gordon had more positive results, however, when she suggested the creation of a reward for donkey keepers and drovers who treated their animals well. The Society responded that if she would contribute £5.5.0 per year, the Society would match it for this prize.³¹⁹ The first round of awards included one won by Mary Collins, age 14, who had been driving a donkey for 2

315 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, November 4, 1839," *Minute Book 1838*, 182.

316 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 2, 1839," *Minute Book 1838*, 192.

317 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, March 8, 1847," *Minute Book 1845*, 224.

318 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, November 11, 1850," *Minute Book 1848*, 171-2.

319 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, August 14, 1848," *Minute Book 1848*, 7.

years. She was awarded six shillings, the first recorded RSPCA monetary award to a female.³²⁰ Occasionally a woman's communication would cause discomfort at a committee meeting. Mrs. F.M. Thompson wrote a letter to the Committee to warn them of the activities of Mr. Charles Wheeler, who had been a collector for the society at one time. She had donated money to Wheeler for humanitarian work, who had promised a refund if the work was not completed. Wheeler reneged on his promise; neither work nor money was forthcoming. If her letter to the Animals' Friend Society on the same topic is any indication, her recitation of Mr. Wheeler's wrongs was impassioned, if irrelevant to Committee proceedings, and her tone was aghast.³²¹ The Committee simply notes the receipt of her letter and "resolved that the thanks of the Committee be presented to Mrs. Thompson for her communication and for her good wishes toward this society."³²² The matter is thus dismissed, with no further discussion or action.

Female attempts to interact with the official Committee of the RSPCA were partially successful; however, the official administration of the Society remained beyond their reach at this time. Contemporary gender roles could only be stretched so far, and slowly. Women could use their roles as wives to represent their husbands in their absence if necessary. They could play on their role as moral guardians to approach the committee, as Miss Sutton did concerning the Fund for Worn Out Horses. They could not, however, become permanent members of the Committee or speak at an annual general meeting. This type of involvement was not acceptable during our period.

320 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, December 12, 1849," *Minute Book 1848*, 105.

321 *The Animals' Friend, or, The Progress of Humanity*, No. III. Published Periodically for the Animals' Friend Society, By N.H. Cotes, Bookseller, 139, Cheapside (London: E. Colven, 1835): 19. Accessed September 24, 2012. <http://books.google.ca>.

322 RSPCA, "Monthly Meeting of the Committee, July 6, 1840," *Minute Book 1838*, 284.

Creation of Auxiliaries

If the women of the RSPCA could not be directly involved in the activities of Committee, they could be directly involved in the creation of auxiliary societies in other parts of Great Britain and Ireland. An article, enclosed in a letter from Baroness de Milauges, mentioned her intention to begin an Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Exeter.³²³ Auxiliary societies were also created in Plymouth, Bath, Bristol, Norwich, Leeds, Bury St. Edmunds, and Gloucester. A corresponding Society was created at Belfast.³²⁴ Women encouraged this expansion and played an important part in setting up these groups.

There seems to have been a fair amount of interest in creating a corresponding Society in Dublin. Mrs. F.M. Thompson attended the committee meeting of May 7, 1838, to present a report of the beneficial results of RSPCA action in that city. Letters from several influential people in Ireland were presented, and a salary of £50 suggested to employ a constable there.³²⁵ The Committee began a search for the appropriate person.³²⁶ Funds were collected for the Dublin Auxiliary Society. Contributors included the RSPCA, the Hon. Mrs. Singleton, the Hon. Mrs. Upton, Mrs. Thompson, and Lady Mary C. Beutuick.³²⁷ Mrs. Thompson also presented additional donations “to encourage Mayor Moore with his useful exertions to repress cruelty to Animals in Dublin.”³²⁸ After a fair amount of perseverance, the Dublin Society was established. At the 1838 annual general

323 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, August 1, 1842,” *Minute Book 1840*, 325.

324 RSPCA, *Twentieth Annual Report*, 6.

325 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, May 7, 1838,” *Minute Book 1835*, 313-14.

326 *Ibid.*, 313-14.

327 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, September 6, 1841,” *Minute Book 1840*, 171.

328 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 7, 1841,” *Minute Book 1840*, 143-4.

meeting, Sir John de Beauvoir acknowledged Mrs. F.M. Thompson, “a most enthusiastic creature,” and her support of a Society in Dublin. It was reported that “a Society has been formed in Dublin, and it is indebted to the exertions of Mrs. Frances Maria Thompson, who has spared neither time, trouble, or expense, in introducing it, and obtaining the liberal patronage of the Lord Lieutenant.”³²⁹

Dublin was not the only city in which women were involved in creating cooperating societies. News of an incipient Liverpool society reached the Committee in London with the November 2, 1833, letter of Mr. William Fry. Mrs. Jane Roscoe had led a number of ladies in anti-cruelty actions at the local markets. Mr. Fry asked that RSPCA publications might be forwarded to them and that the London Society would offer them some support.³³⁰ This is what appears to have happened. A number of years later, the *Liverpool Mercury* reported that a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals had been founded in Liverpool, in cooperation with the London RSPCA. The author acknowledged the local auxiliary to be “mostly under the auspices of ladies.”³³¹

Although women were only tangentially active in the official work of the Committee itself, there was some recognition of their potential for political or politically-related action in the last two years of this study. In 1849, women were asked by the Society to speak with any Members of Parliament known to them regarding the proposed “Bill for the More Effectual Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.”³³² At the 1850 annual meeting, Rev. W.T. Wild went further, suggesting that if ladies made up Parliament, then

329 SPCA, *Twelfth Annual Report*, 37.

330 RSPCA, “General Monthly Meeting, Nov 5, 1833,” *Minute Book 1832*, 109-111.

331 “Liverpool Auxiliary Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *Liverpool Mercury etc* (Liverpool, England), Friday, April 2, 1841; Issue 1560. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012.

332 RSPCA, “Monthly Meeting of the Committee, June 4, 1849,” *Minute Book 1848*, 69.

the cause of animals would be assured. He declared that if the House of Ladies passed such a bill, the Lords would be sure to carry it, “for lords are so jealous of their own honor, that if they find the ladies are likely to be so distinguished, you will see that the next time it is presented for their approbation, they will say, “let us pass it, lest the ladies should do it to our discredit.” And I trust you will have to congratulate the House of Lords on the favour they will thus confer, and on the great service they will render the cause of humanity.”³³³

Although full female suffrage would not be achieved in Britain until 1928, these events foreshadow a major change in the gender biases of the political arena, a change made up of many smaller victories. Millicent Garrett Fawcett paid tribute to these incremental changes: “Women’s suffrage will not come, when it does come, as an isolated phenomenon, it will come as a necessary corollary of the other changes which have been gradually and steadily modifying during this century the social history of our country. It will be a political change...based upon social, educational, and economic changes which have already taken place.”³³⁴ The women of the RSPCA contributed to such societal and political changes through the adoption and imaginative use of the female gender norms of nineteenth-century British society.

333 RSPCA, *The Annual Report...1850*, 40-1.

334 Quoted in Susan Kingsley Kent, *Sex and Suffrage in Britain 1860-1914* (Taylor & Francis, 2012): 195. <<http://lib.myilibrary.com?ID=13861>> (12 February 2013)

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, women were actively involved in the activities of the RSPCA during its formative years, 1824-1850. They used their influence in their families, their social circles and British society as a whole. They lent their patronage, their time, and their money. Enthusiastic women, such as Mrs. Singleton and Mrs. Thompson, were able to bring about large amounts of good on behalf of the Society through the wise application of their influence and ideas. Women witnessed cruelty on the streets and against it in court. They educated children and encouraged awareness among adults. They encouraged good behaviour. Individually or in groups, women created change in their world and enlarged the span of their indirect influence and direct action.

The women of the RSPCA, primarily middle-class and educated, were influenced by the evangelical world view. Looking for the ability to encourage gospel ethics towards the brute creation, women became involved in the animal protection movement in droves. They taught their children to be kind to animals. They encouraged their husbands and those within their social circles to become involved in the movement. Women wrote children's books supporting animal welfare. They wrote tracts intended to convince adults of the need for increased humanity. Mrs. Sutton and others initiated essay competitions. With difficulty, women even managed peripheral involvement with the governing Committee itself. In seeking justice for animals women's involvement was vital during the formative years of the RSPCA, and the Society gave them socially respectable scope for their energy and talents.

All of these activities demonstrate how the women of the RSPCA took the new opportunities offered them by feminized philanthropy to become active in public spaces. Despite the growing importance of the home as a moral respite from the world, women took what action they could to expand their horizons beyond the hazy boundaries of the

domestic realm. This study adds to Turner's minimal treatment of female involvement, expanding from the importance of authorship alone to list the myriad of ways in which women were involved. It articulates Moss's acknowledgment of the importance of female character, describing ways in which women used their alleged moral superiority to be of use to the RSPCA and the animal protection movement. It also provides examples of cases in which gender boundaries were blurred and stretched. Through the adoption and imaginative use of the female gender norms of nineteenth-century British society, philanthropic women took the opportunity to impact public space and society through female volunteerism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources – Books and Pamphlets

- The Animals' Friend, or, The Progress of Humanity*, No. III. Published Periodically for the Animals' Friend Society, By N.H. Cotes, Bookseller, 139, Cheapside. London: E. Colven, 1835. Accessed September 24, 2012. <http://books.google.com>.
- Burke, Bernard. *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry of Great Britain and Ireland*. London: Harrison, 1871.
- Burke, John. *A General and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and the British Empire. Fourth Edition Corrected To M DCCC XXXIII. In Two Volumes. Vol II*. London: Published For Henry Colburn By Richard Bentley, 1833.
- . "Templeton, Viscount." *A General and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire, Vol II*. London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, M.DCCC.XXXII (1832).
- Gompertz, Lewis. *Address of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals: Established in June, 1824, at Old Slaughter's Coffee House, St. Martin's Lane, London*. London: Richard Taylor, 1827.
- . *Moral Inquiries on the Situation of Man and of Brutes. On the Crime of Committing Cruelty on Brutes, and of Sacrificing Them to the Purposes of Man; with Further Reflections*. London: Printed for the Author, and sold by Westley and Parrish, Opposite St. Clement's Church, Strand, 1824.
- Hansard. *House of Commons Debates*, 07 June 1822, vol 7 cc873-4. Accessed January 24, 2013. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1822/jun/07/ill-treatment-of-cattle-bill#S2V0007P0_18220607_HOC_38
- . *House of Commons Debates*, 14 July 1835, vol 29 cc537-8. Accessed February 12, 2013. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1835/jul/14/cruelty-to-animals#S3V0029P0_18350714_HOC_3.
- *House of Commons Debates*, 22 March 1843, vol 67 cols 1286-8. Accessed November 6, 2010. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1843/mar/22/dogs-employed-in-drawing#S3V0067P0_18430322_HOC_11.
- . *House of Lords Debates*, 03 April 1843, vol 68 cols 318-23. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1843/apr/03/dogs-employed-in-drawing#S3V0068P0_18430403_HOL_30. Accessed November 6, 2010.
- . *House of Lords Debates*, 10 July 1854, vol 134 cc1429-36. Accessed January 23, 2013. <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1854/jul/10/cruelty-to-animals-bill>

Oswald, John. *The Cry of Nature; or, An Appeal to Mercy and to Justice, on behalf of the Persecuted Animals*. London: Printed for J. Johnson, 1791.

Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *The Annual Report of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals; with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Tuesday, May 7th, 1850*. London: [n.p.], 1850.

---. *Eighteenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in the Hanover-Square Rooms, on Thursday, May 16, 1844*. London: [n.p.], 1844.

---. *Fifteenth Annual Report with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, the 12th day of May, 1841*. London: [n.p.], 1841.

---. *Fourteenth Annual Report with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in Exeter hall, on Wednesday, the 6th day of May, 1840*. London: [n.p.], 1840.

---. *Minute Book, [commencing] 1824*.

---. *Nineteenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in the Hanover-Square Rooms, on Tuesday, June 10, 1845*. London: [n.p.], 1845.

---. *R.S.P.C.A. Minute Books, No. 1-7. March 1832 to July 1848*.

---. *Seventeenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in the Hanover-Square Rooms, on Thursday, May 18, 1843*. London: Tyler and Reed, 1843.

---. *Sixteenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover-Square Rooms, on Wednesday, June 8, 1842*. London: William Tyler, 1842.

---. *Twentieth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Wednesday, June 10, 1846*. London: [n.p.], 1846.

---. *Twenty-First Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Wednesday, May 26th, 1847*. London: [n.p.], 1847.

---. *Twenty-Second Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Saturday, May 20th, 1848*. London: [n.p.], 1848.

---. *Twenty-Third Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held in the Hanover Square Rooms, on Friday, May 11th, 1849*. London: [n.p.], 1849.

- Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. *Eighth Annual Report, Together with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held on the 30th Day of April, 1834*. London: The Philanthropic Society, 1834.
- . *Eleventh Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting at the Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen Street, on Saturday the 29th day of April, 1837. With Acts of Parliament, and other Papers circulated by the Society*. London: [n.p.], 1837.
- . *Ninth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, held on Wednesday, June 3, 1835*. London: The Philanthropic Society, 1835.
- . *Seventh Annual Report, Together with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting, Held on the 27th day of June, 1833*. London: The Philanthropic Society, 1833.
- . *The Sixth Report and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, May 11th, 1832. To which is added an extract from the Evidence taken before the Committee of the House of Common*. London: W. Molineux, 1832.
- . *Tenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting at the Freemasons' Hall, Great Queen Street. On Friday the 29th Day of April, 1836*. London: The Philanthropic Society, 1836.
- . *Thirteenth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, the 1st day of May, 1839. With the Act of Parliament*. London: [n.p.], 1839.
- . *Twelfth Annual Report, with the Proceedings of the Annual General Meeting held in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday the 23rd day of May, 1838. With Abstracts of Acts of Parliament, and other Papers circulated by the Society*. London: [n.p.], 1838.

Primary – Newspapers and Periodicals

“All Aboard.” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Monday, May 01, 1837. Issue 20714: 5. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3209947592&contentSet=LTO&source=gale .

- “Anniversary Meetings.” *The Bury and Norwich Post, and East Anglian* (Bury Saint Edmunds, England), Wednesday, May 23, 1849. Issue 3491: 1. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3213431327&contentSet=LTO&source=gale .
- “Belfast Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *The Belfast News-Letter* (Belfast, Ireland), Friday, May 3, 1844. Issue 11143. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=page&docId=Y3202341219&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Bull-Baiting.” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Saturday, November 01, 1828. Issue 18060. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3211630179&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Court Circular.” *The Standard* (London, England), Thursday, May 02, 1839. Issue 4638. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3211806836&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Cruelty to Animals.” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Friday, November 21, 1828. Issue 18077. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3209801902&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Exeter Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *Trewman's Exeter Flying Post or Plymouth and Cornish Advertiser* (Exeter, England), Thursday, October 20, 1842. Issue 4011. *19th Century British Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=Y3200673398&contentSet=LTO&source=gale .

“Female Humane Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *The Satirist; or, the Censor of the Times* (London, England), Sunday, February 07, 1841. Issue 460: 42. *New Readerships*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. <http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/dvnw/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=DVNW&userGroupName=edmo69826&tabID=T003&docPage=article&docId=DX1900396095&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>.

“Female Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *The Satirist, and the Censor of the Time* (London, England), Sunday, April 20, 1834: 125. *New Readerships*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. <http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/dvnw/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=DVNW&userGroupName=edmo69826&tabID=T003&docPage=article&docId=DX1900414122&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>

“Hull Police Court.” *The Hull Packet and East Riding Times* (Hull, England), Friday, June 1, 1849. Issue 3362. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BB3205938185&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Law and Intelligence – Cruelty and Demoralization.” *The Lady's Newspaper* (London, England), Saturday, February 23, 1850. Issue 165: 112. *New Readerships*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. <http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/dvnw/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=DVNW&userGroupName=edmo69826&tabID=T003&docPage=article&docId=DX1900454007&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>.

“Law and Police.” *The Era* (London, England), Sunday, November 18, 1849. Issue 582. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BA3207629092&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Law and Police.” *The Era* (London, England), Sunday, May 26, 1850. Issue 609. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BA3207630328&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Liverpool Auxiliary Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *Liverpool Mercury etc* (Liverpool, England), Friday, April 2, 1841. Issue 1560. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BC3203955220&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“London, May 23.” *Jackson's Oxford Journal* (Oxford, England), Saturday, May 27, 1837. Issue 4387. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=Y3202668342&contentSet=LTO&source=gale

“Magnificent Donations and Bequests.” *The Nottinghamshire Guardian and Midland Advertiser* (London, England), Thursday, December 27, 1849. Issue 193: 1. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3209363718&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“The May Meetings.” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Tuesday, May 02, 1848. Issue 23214: 3. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3210409418&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Miscellaneous.” *Berrow's Worcester Journal* (Worcester, England), Thursday, May 25, 1837: Issue 7017. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3214878193&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Multiple Commerce Items.” *The Standard* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849. Issue 7721. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3212528890&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

- “Multiple News Items.” *The Standard* (London, England), Wednesday, June 11, 1845. Issue 6511: 5. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=page&docId=R3212497902&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Odiham – Case of Alleged Cruelty.” *Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle etc* (Portsmouth, England), Saturday, September 8, 1849. Issue 2605. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BB3206046330&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Police Intelligence.” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Friday, May 12, 1843. Issue 22563: 7. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3209994581&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Police Intelligence.” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Friday, November 02, 1849. Issue 23683. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3210417353&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Portsmouth, April 18, 1846.” *Hampshire Advertiser & Salisbury Guardian* (Southampton, England), Saturday, April 18, 1846. Issue 1184: 5. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3208546666&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Portsmouth Police.” *Hampshire Advertiser & Salisbury Guardian* (Southampton, England), Saturday, August 15, 1846. Issue 1201: 8. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3210788211&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Religious Anniversaries.” *The Leeds Mercury* (Leeds, England), Saturday, May 4, 1839. Issue 5495. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BB3201505185&contentSet=LTO&source=gale

“Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *Daily News* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849. Issue 924. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BA3202841047&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *The Morning Chronicle* (London, England), Thursday, May 27, 1847. Issue 24208. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BC3207326673&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Monday, May 22, 1848. Issue 23231: 3. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3213235976&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Saturday, May 12, 1849. Issue 23535. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3213235976&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

- “Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.” *The Standard* (London, England), Friday, May 17, 1844. Issue 6187. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3212188230&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Belfast News-Letter* (Belfast, Ireland), Friday, April 27, 1849. Issue 11552. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=Y3202352506&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *Daily News* (London, England), Thursday, June 11, 1846. Issue 10. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BA3202825689&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Morning Chronicle* (London, England), Thursday, June 17, 1824. Issue 17212. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BC3207300804&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.
- “Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Morning Chronicle* (London, England), Thursday, March 15, 1832. Issue 19517. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=BA3207150989&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *The Morning Post* (London, England), Thursday, April 30, 1836. Issue 20404. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3213518599&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

“Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,” *Scottish Missionary and Philanthropic Register* (Edinburgh, Scotland), [Sunday], [August 01, 1824]. Issue VIII: 347. *Empire*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. <http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/dvnw/infomark.do?source=gale&prodId=DVNW&userGroupName=edmo69826&tabID=T003&docPage=article&docId=CC1903653657&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>.

“Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals – The Case of Cruelty to a Horse, Near Worcester,” *Berrow's Worcester Journal* (Worcester, England), Thursday, December 28, 1843. Issue 7361. *19th Century British Library Newspapers: Part II*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=R3212256543&contentSet=LTO&source=gale

“Table Talk,” *The Lady's Newspaper* (London, England), Saturday, April 28, 1849. Issue 122: 227. *New Readerships*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. <http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/dvnw/infomark.do?source=gale&prodId=DVNW&userGroupName=edmo69826&tabID=T003&docPage=article&docId=DX1900456917&type=multipage&contentSet=LTO&version=1.0>.

Wilson, Josias. “Correspondence,” *The Belfast News-Letter* (Belfast, Ireland), Friday, July 7, 1843. Issue 11058. *19th Century British Library Newspapers*. Gale. Accessed September 27, 2012. http://find.galegroup.com/login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/bncn/infomark.do?docType=LTO&docLevel=FASCIMILE&prodId=BNCN&tabID=T012&type=multipage&version=1.0&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&userGroupName=ualberta&docPage=article&docId=Y3202339608&contentSet=LTO&source=gale.

Secondary

Holy Bible: New International Version. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2011.

Abbott, Mary. *Family Ties: English Families 1580-1920*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Adams, Carol J and Josephine Donovan. “Introduction.” In *Animals and Women*:

Feminist Theoretical Explorations, edited by Carol J Adams and Josephine Donovan. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995.

Ascione, Frank R. *Children and Animals: Exploring the Roots of Kindness and Cruelty*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2004.

Bebbington, David W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Bradley, Ian. *The Call to Seriousness: the Evangelical Impact on the Victorians*. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1976.

Brown, Antony. *Who Cares for Animals?* London: Heinemann, 1974.

Brown, Ford K. *Fathers of the Victorians: The Age of Wilberforce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Butler, J. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Carson, Gerald. *Men, Beasts, and Gods: A history of cruelty and kindness to animals*. New York: Scribner, 1972.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

Cross, Gary. *A Social History of Leisure since 1600*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing Inc., 1990.

Davidhoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. London: Hutchinson, 1987.

Delap, Lucy, Ben Griffin, and Abigail Wills, eds. *The Politics of Domestic Authority in Britain since 1800*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Dunayer, J. "Sexist Words, Speciesist Roots." In *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*, edited by Carol J Adams and Josephine Donovan. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995.

Etherington, Norman, ed. *Missions and Empire*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Fairholme, Edward G. and Wellesley Pain. *A Century of Work for Animals: The History of the RSPCA, 1824-1924*, 1st ed. London and New York: John Murray, 1924.

Ferguson, Moira. *Animal Advocacy and Englishwomen, 1780 - 1900: Patriots, Nation, and Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Gill, Gillian. *We Two. Victoria and Albert: Rulers, Partners, Rivals*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2009.

- Gordon, Eleanor, and Gwyneth Nair. *Public Lives: Women, Family and Society in Victorian Britain*. London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Griffin, Ben. *The Politics of Gender in Victorian Britain: Masculinity, Political Culture, and the Struggle for Women's Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Guither, Harold D. *Animal Rights: History and Scope of a Radical Social Movement*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1998.
- Hamilton, Susan. "Reading and the Popular Critique of Science in the Victorian Anti-Vivisection Press: Frances Power Cobbe's Writing for the Victoria Street Society." *Victorian Review* 36, no. 2 (Fall 2010): 66-79. *Historical Abstracts with Full Text, EBSCOhost* (accessed February 14, 2013).
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=30h&AN=60870125&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Harrison, Brian. "Animals and the State in Nineteenth-Century England." *The English Historical Review* 88, no. 349 (Oct., 1973): 786-820.
- . "Philanthropy and the Victorians." *Victorian Studies* 9, no. 4 (Jun., 1966): 353-374.
- . "Religion and Recreation in Nineteenth-Century England." *Past & Present*, no. 38 (Dec., 1967): 98-125.
- Harrison, J.F.C. *The Early Victorians 1832-1851*. New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- Harwood, Dix. *Love for Animals and How It Developed in Great Britain*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1928.
- Heasman, Kathleen. *Evangelicals in Action: An Appraisal of their Social Work in the Victorian Era*. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1962.
- Hilton, Boyd. *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Ittmann, Karl. *Work, Gender and the Family in Victorian England*. New York: New York University Press, 1995.
- Kean, Hilda. *Animal Rights: Political and Social Change in Britain since 1800*. London: Reaktion, 2000.
- Kent, Susan Kingsley. *Sex and Suffrage in Britain 1860-1914*. Taylor & Francis, 2012. Accessed February 12, 2013. <http://lib.myilibrary.com?ID=13861>.
- Kitson Clark, G. *The Making of Victorian England*. New York: Atheneum, 1982.

- Li, Chien-Hui. "A Union of Christianity, Humanity, and Philanthropy: The Christian Tradition and the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Nineteenth-Century England." *Society Animals: Journal of Human-Animal Studies* 8, no. 3 (2000): 265-285.
- Malcomson, Robert W. *Popular Recreations in English Society, 1700-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Marwick, Arthur. *The New Nature of History: Knowledge, Evidence, Language*. Chicago: Lyceum Books, Inc., 2001.
- Mintz, Steven. *A Prison of Expectations: The Family in Victorian Culture*. New York and London: New York University Press, 1983.
- Morgan, Simon. *A Victorian Woman's Place: Public Culture in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007.
- Norton, Victor. *Mistress of Udolpho: The Life of Ann Radcliffe*. London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1999.
- Moss, Arthur W. *Valiant Crusade: The History of the R.S.P.C.A*. London: Cassell, 1961.
- Owen, David. *English Philanthropy, 1660 - 1960*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Parry, José and Noel Parry. "The Equality of Bodies: Animal Exploitation and Human Welfare." In *Social Policy and the Body: Transitions in Corporeal Discourse*, edited by Kathryn Ellis and Hartley Dean: 160-179. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.
- Prochaska, F.K. *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- . "Philanthropy," *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- . *Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain, The Disinherited Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Purdue, A.W. "Queen Adelaide: Malign Influence or Consort Maligned?" In *Queenship in Britain: 1660-1837*, edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and other Creatures the Victorian Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Ryder, Richard D. *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes towards Speciesism*. Oxford and New York: B. Blackwell, 1989.
- Shevelov, Katheryn. *For the Love of Animals: The Rise of the Animal Protection Movement*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2008.

- Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing attitudes in England 1500 – 1800*. London: Penguin, 1984.
- Thompson, E.P. *The making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1966.
- Thompson, F.M.L. *The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social history of Victorian Britain 1830-1900*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Tosh, John. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. London: Yale University Press, 1999.
- . "The Old Adam and the New Man: Emerging Themes in the History of English masculinities, 1750-1850." *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*: 61-82. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2005.
- . *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History*. London: Pearson Education Ltd., 2002.
- Tyson, John R. "Lady Huntingdon's Reformation." *Church History* 64 (Dec., 1995): 580-593. *OmniFile Full Text Select (H.W. Wilson)*, EBSCOhost (accessed February 12, 2013).
<http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjac&AN=edsjac.10.2307.3168839&site=eds-live&scope=site>.
- Turner, E.S. *All Heaven in a Rage*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965.
- Turner, James. *Reckoning with the Beast: Animals, Pain, and Humanity in the Victorian Mind*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1980. T
- Vickery, Amanda. "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History." *The Historical Journal* 36, no. 2 (Jun. 1993): 383-414. Accessed October 21, 2010.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2639654>.
- Wallach Scott, Joan. *Gender and the Politics of History: Revised Edition*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Walton, John K. "Mad Dogs and Englishmen: The Conflict over Rabies in Late Victorian England." *Journal of Social History* 13, no. 3 (1979): 219-39.
- Weeks, Jeffrey. *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800*. Hong Kong: Longman Group (FE) Limited, 1989.
- Wolf, Lucien. 'Gompertz, Lewis (1783/4–1861)', rev. Ben Marsden. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed February 12, 2013.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10934>.

Wolffe, John, ed. *Evangelical Faith and Public Zeal: Evangelicals and Society in Britain 1780-1980*. London: SPCK, 1995.