

‘Whirl’d through the World’:

The Role of Travel in the Making of Dora Montefiore, 1851–1933

Abstract: New technologies of mobility which emerged in the wake of industrialisation helped to create a radical diaspora which in the first decades of the twentieth century began to create new transnationalist politics. This diaspora of socialists, feminists and anarchists consisted both of migrants (whose politics spurred migration or whose migration prompted political engagement) and travellers. Amongst the latter was Dora Montefiore, an English suffragist, socialist and later communist, who sought to make an internationalist politics in the last years of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth. During her personal political journey through the changing landscape of progressive politics, travel was to be an important ingredient in her developing political practice.

This essay explores the ways in which travel affected how Montefiore ‘did’ her politics. It considers why travel was such an important feature of her life as well as the different kinds of political travel she engaged in and its function in her politics. Political tourism, networking and propagandist tours are all explored. For Montefiore, travel could enable unforeseen conversations, serendipitous encounters, new experiences and even friendships which could be put to work by her as a political activist. These experiences often had a lasting effect on her politics. Travel could also be transformative when it was about leisure, pleasure and recuperation. Many of Montefiore’s journeys contained all of these elements. However, increasingly the constraints on such travel, particularly the growth of police surveillance, changed the nature of how travel was experienced by political activists and thus what they could do with it within their politics. This essay is therefore about the possibilities of travel for a political activist, but also its limitations. How a radical activist ‘whirl’d through the world’ was always contingent, but the process of this kind of political travel necessarily affected the traveller herself as well as those she encountered along the way.

Key Words: political travel, political tourism, radical diaspora, transnationalism, socialism, suffrage

‘Whirl’d through the World’ was the title of a column in the *Maoriland Worker* newspaper which reported news of progressive movements across the world to readers in New Zealand. Most early twentieth century radical newspapers had spaces like this which in the name of internationalism reported not only the activities of their comrades in other countries but also those activists who were whirling around the world. The new technologies of mobility which emerged in the wake of industrialisation helped to create a radical diaspora which in the first decades of the twentieth century was creating a new transnationalist politics. This diaspora consisted both of migrants (whose politics spurred migration or whose migration prompted political engagement) and travellers. Amongst the latter was Dora Montefiore, an English suffragist, socialist and later communist, who sought to make an internationalist politics in the last years of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth. Her organisational affiliations reflected her attempt to construct a woman-focused socialism in a range of different political spaces. Her suffragism which began in Australia in the early 1890s was in England channelled through various women’s suffrage pressure groups, through early membership of the *Women’s Social and Political Union* (WSPU) – including becoming a suffragette prisoner in 1906 – and then from 1907 through the *Adult Suffrage Society*. At the same time she developed her commitment to socialism as a leading member of the marxist *Social Democratic Federation* (SDF)/ *British Socialist Party* from about 1900 to 1912, rejoining in 1916. Finally, she was a foundation member of the *Communist Party of Great Britain* (CPGB) in 1920, elected as the only woman member of its first executive. In both strands of her politics, which she refused to see as separate, she was an energetic although often dissident activist in both national and international organisations. During her personal political journey through the changing landscape of progressive politics, travel was to be an important ingredient in her developing political practice. She travelled within Europe, to Australia, the United States, South Africa and Russia.

This essay explores Montefiore’s travelling and how it affected her political practice. It considers how significant travel was for her politics by identifying the kinds of travel she engaged in, the uses she made of experiences derived from travel and the function that travel had within her evolving politics. Through observation and participation, Montefiore made connections with the domestic politics of other countries and found ways to translate these experiences into the politics of different countries, particularly those of Britain. Travel could enable unforeseen conversations, serendipitous encounters, new experiences and even friendships which could be put to work by a political activist and which could have a lasting effect on their politics. Travel could be equally transformative when it was about leisure, pleasure and recuperation. Many of Montefiore’s journeys contained all of these ele-

ments. I want to explore how she made use of travel to 'do' her politics. However, increasingly the constraints on such travel, particularly the growth of police surveillance, changed the nature of how travel was experienced by political activists and thus what they could do with it within their politics. This essay is therefore about the possibilities of travel for a political activist, but also its limitations. How a radical activist 'whirl'd through the world' was always contingent, but the process of this kind of political travel necessarily affected the traveller herself as well as those she encountered along the way.

A radical diaspora

I want to begin with an image from 1911. The starting point is the coincidental arrival in Sydney, Australia of two socialists. He was Archie Crawford (1883–1924) and she was Dora Montefiore (1851–1933).¹ Both were socialists, but in every other respect seemed very different. They were of different generations (he was 28, she was 59), they were of different social classes (he was working-class and she was middle-class), from different places (he from South Africa and she from England), and with different emphases in their politics (his politics had grown out of trade unionism whilst hers had originated with suffragism). Yet Crawford did not see these differences when he first met Dora Montefiore. He recalled his first impressions of her:

“She has met and talked to every Socialist worth meeting and talking to. She has attended several International Socialist Congresses. She isn't a politician; has no 'axe to grind' and no reason or desire to live except to help the revolutionary cause. To her I unfolded my idea and asked her opinion. To my joy I found she had been for years tending in the same direction.”²

Dora in turn introduced herself to the readers of Crawford's newspaper, the *Voice of Labour*:

“I don't know what Comrade Crawford may have written you about me, but I will take it for granted he has been writing nice comradely things; for we have done our little bit of propoganda together in Sydney, have together wandered through its slums and unlovely spots besides enjoying (in the delightful companionship of Charles Edward Russell, the American writer and Socialist, and of Miss Mander, the Socialist correspondent of the *New Zealand Commonwealth*) the natural beauties and seductive loveliness of Sydney's world-famed harbour.”³

So this is the image: an international group of socialists (an Englishwoman, a New Zealander, an American and a South African) talking and wandering about Sydney together. They might have been taken for tourists: they were certainly travellers a long way from home. Yet they were all activists whose travel had a purpose. For Crawford and Montefiore, this meeting was not planned and yet the personal connections it represented were to affect their individual politics as well as the space in which their 'whirling round the world' had momentarily come to a halt. While in Australia they contributed to local socialist propaganda, spoke at meetings and wrote for the press.⁴ Dora's stay was considerably longer than Archie's, partly because she stepped in to edit the Sydney-based *International Socialist* when its editor fell ill. As a consequence of her meeting with Crawford, Dora changed her travel plans so that when she finally left Sydney at the end of January 1912, her next port of call was South Africa where she engaged in political travels for six months.⁵

Crawford and Montefiore were part of a new phenomenon. The opportunities for global travel and for migration had exploded from the second half of the nineteenth century. As a consequence, this mobility created significant possibilities for the transfer of all aspects of culture between peoples across the world. In particular, mobility accelerated the transmission of political ideas, aspirations and strategies. The new social movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century – socialists, anarchists and feminists – seized the opportunities presented by increased global mobility. They were motivated largely by their shared internationalist aspirations. What exactly they meant by internationalism may have varied, but they all sought in some way to connect the struggles of the oppressed across the world.⁶ Travel was one of the ways in which such connections were made and sustained by what can be termed a radical diaspora.⁷

Travel was experienced in different ways by the increasingly mobile populations of the world in the later nineteenth century, from those spurred to migrate by economic deprivation or by ethnic or political persecution to those who took advantage of the new technologies of mobility to acquire fresh experiences in their modern pursuit of leisure.⁸ Political activists also travelled for many reasons and in many conditions. This is apparent when one contrasts the travels of those two socialists whose paths crossed in Sydney in 1911. One had travelled from London (Montefiore) and the other from Johannesburg (Crawford). She had travelled at her leisure in some comfort while he often worked his passage as a stoker, and travelled in the cheapest manner possible. For some, travel created the conditions out of which their activism grew, while for others it was their activism that prompted the travel. However, whatever the reason for travel, it was an activity which contained transformative possibilities.

For political activists, it now became possible to engage in a transnationalist political practice – making connections across national boundaries but also between and above nations.⁹ Dora Montefiore was one activist who seized this opportunity, spending key periods of her life travelling, networking and making her politics outside Britain. Over a political life that began when she was forty, she built a transnational practice spurred by her desire to develop an internationalism that challenged class, gender and even racial divisions.¹⁰ Her kind of transnational practice was premised on a particular kind of political travel which I want to explore here. It is my contention that travel becomes *political travel* when the travellers make connections between disparate experiences located in political spaces which are foreign to them. Such a practice is as much about how these foreign experiences were deployed as about the experiences themselves. In order to explore the role of travel in the making of Montefiore as a political woman, I will first consider how travelling came to be such an important feature of her life. I will then turn to the political journeys themselves and disentangle some of the different functions that this sort of travel had within Montefiore's evolving politics. Political tourism, networking and propagandist tours will all be explored before considering the increasing constraints on this kind of political travel and how this affected Montefiore.

Travel

For Dora Montefiore, it was her Victorian middle-class childhood that gave her some of the means to make use of opportunities to travel as an adult. She developed a facility with languages which she put to good use in her later political work – translating for the movement, publishing in foreign-language journals and making herself understood by a wide range of audiences abroad. Her background also gave her the class confidence and the financial wherewithal to travel. For although the economic position of her father Francis Fuller was not always secure, he did enable his large family to lead a middle-class life. She in turn married within her class, if not her nationality, when in 1881 she wed the Australian merchant George Barrow Montefiore. His sudden death at sea eight years later left her in a position where she did not need to work. Although as a widowed mother of two young children she was always worried about money, it was the anxiety of someone who was never in danger of sinking into poverty.

In her memoirs Dora recalled travel of various sorts in her early years. She remembered summer holidays with her father travelling in continental Europe in order to research his papers to Social Science Congresses on topics such as scientific farming. She acted as his translator. These travels were, she said, “some of the

happiest and most valuable in my life.”¹¹ Already travel was not simply about leisure. Her longest journeys in the years before she became politicised were those she took to and from Australia. She travelled out on the long sea voyage to New South Wales, accompanied by a cousin, so that she could undertake the duties of an unmarried daughter helping her eldest brother’s delicate wife to manage the housekeeping and the care of the children.¹² It was in Australia that she began to take the first steps on a political journey that would occupy the rest of her life. Australia was to play an important role in her evolving politics both as the location of key political experiences – politicisation as a suffragist (1889–92); as a socialist activist encountering the immigration control regime known as ‘White Australia’ (1911); and as a communist (1923) – but also as a source to which she instinctively turned for compelling examples to use in her work as a political propagandist.¹³ Thus although Britain (mainly England) was where she centred her political activism after 1892, it was an important feature of her politics that another country had shaped her first political steps and continued to have personal as well as political significance for her.

Travel continued to be an important feature of her life. She lived in continental Europe (Paris, Brussels) at various points after her return from Australia and often chose Europe, particularly Italy, as a place to recuperate or to holiday (with her children and later on her own or with friends). She also began to travel for political reasons: to attend conferences (both international congresses and the national congresses of other socialist or suffragist organisations); to make speaking tours; to conduct investigations; and to accept invitations that resulted from networking at international events. There were also more extensive trips to America, Australia and South Africa where she often moved from observer to participant in the political life of the country. This was through her journalism and by editing newspapers, by participating in political congresses (rather than just witnessing them) and by taking on short-term political tasks.¹⁴

The destinations of her travels could therefore provide new experiences and encounters which Montefiore reported back to British and to other audiences but which also stimulated reflections, revisions and even reconfigurations of her own politics and the priorities within them. For example, in 1913 she reflected to *Daily Herald* readers:

“The more I have travelled, the more I have compared programmes and parties the world over, the more I incline to the opinion (though I have fought myself on the subject now for some time) that no real revolution can come about through the agency of a political party.”¹⁵

This statement shows that she acknowledged that for her, travel was a means to acquire new knowledges which would enrich and refine her politics. Indeed, the

implication is that without such travel her politics might have stagnated. The purpose of political travel, as she practised it, was as much about the reflections upon the encounters and observations of the traveller as the actual experiences themselves. However, this political travel could take different forms. Distinguishing between the various kinds of political travel engaged in by Dora Montefiore across her life allows for some interrogation of the function of this travel within her political practice as well as to distinguish political travel from any other kind of travel.

Political tourism

Journeys could have different purposes for the political activist. In 1905 Montefiore made her first trip to Scandinavia. In many ways this was a form of 'political tourism' as distinct from her later political travels within the British Empire.¹⁶ Joan Sangster has helpfully defined political tourism as "a practice that involved visiting another country in order to explore, enjoy, and tour the foreign land, though the trip was simultaneously made to observe a place's distinct political, cultural and social organisation". Critical to this is the fact that political tourists in one way or another "share observations about their trip with a wide readership or community on their return".¹⁷ Montefiore seems to have been conscious of the idea of political tourism as a distinct form of travel. This is apparent in her description at this time of travellers who "arm themselves with mackintoshes and circular notes of credit, and with these weapons force an entry into the remotest regions".¹⁸ Even at this stage she does not seem to be describing herself. Indeed, later she was to talk disparagingly of what she called "political globe-trotters" and clearly did not see herself as one.¹⁹ For her the identity of the passive political tourist was never very far from that of the active political propagandist. In this case she not only described her Danish trip through her column in the radical weekly *New Age* but she also drew out key political issues for her readers.

Nevertheless this was a different kind of journey to her later ones as it was an organised trip with quite a diverse group of travellers. Montefiore joined a party visiting Denmark to learn about its ancient and modern institutions. The trip was set up as a form of political tourism as each of the group had paid a guinea to the woman who organised the party who then "provided lectures, arranged excursions to co-operative dairies, Poor Law and Municipal institutions, educational centres, etc – sides of life which it is usually very difficult for the ordinary tourist to see during a short visit to a foreign country".²⁰ The group included travellers from Holland, Bohemia, Sweden, Germany and England. It was accompanied by a Danish woman whom Dora already knew, having met her at the *International Council of*

Women (ICW) congress in London in 1899. Nellie Hansen was a women's trade union organiser and a socialist who was married to the editor of one of Denmark's socialist daily newspapers.²¹ The politics and interests of the travellers were quite diverse. Amongst the English was Mary Higgs from Oldham, a social investigator who had gone on the tramp to expose the lives of destitute women, as well as the head of a London settlement, a lecturer from the labour movement institution Ruskin College and a lady farmer from Shropshire.

The effect of the trip on Montefiore was apparent in a number of different ways. In a fortnight's trip Dora not only learnt about matters of interest to her in Denmark, for example meeting the founder of the domestic servants' union, but she also soaked up the experiences of many of her travelling companions. Her conversations with Mary Higgs were soon translated into a feature in her *New Age* women's column.²² She also wrote about the land question in Denmark as well as the country's high school system.²³ The choice of topics not only reflected her curiosity but was also political as was the way in which she chose to represent her experiences to a wider audience. The political tourist melted into the activist who had to do something with what she had seen. For Dora such experiences immediately informed her work as a propagandist whether in her journalism or through public speaking, as in her lecture to the socialist *Kelmscott Club* on 'Socialism in Denmark'.²⁴

This journey was relatively short in duration and had a broad agenda, observing different aspects of Denmark's history and culture. The itinerary was set by the guide rather than Montefiore and had to meet the interests of the group as a whole. Montefiore then reported on her observations on her return to England. In these respects, this is an example of political tourism. Although her subsequent journeys might have elements of political tourism within them, they were to be more focused. They were not principally about an activist taking a holiday, although there were moments of leisure and tourism, but their purpose was much more determinedly to make a politics wherever she found herself (in transit and at destinations) through networking, making propaganda and participating in political action.

Fact-finding tours

Montefiore's next trip to Scandinavia in 1906 was a little different. The main purpose of her journey was to go to Finland to discover how exactly it had become the first European country to enfranchise women. However, as with many of her journeys she bolted together travelling of various sorts and purposes into one trip. There were leisure pursuits such as holidaying with family, meeting old friends and making new ones, and tourism. This was interspersed with political work of vari-

ous sorts: participating in an international congress, networking in and beyond the congress and addressing public meetings as well as making various enquiries into how other countries dealt with key political issues of the day.

Montefiore left London with her son, an eighteen-year-old student at London University. They spent a few days in Cologne and then travelled on to Copenhagen via Hamburg and Kiel.²⁵ She had come to Copenhagen to take part in the *International Woman Suffrage Alliance* (IWSA) congress as a representative of the WSPU.²⁶ She was already an experienced participant in such events, having attended her first international conference in 1897. Each congress provided a new experience, sustaining and widening networks which were both political and personal. Aside from attending the congress, Dora and her son were, she recalled, “most hospitably entertained by groups of students, suffrage friends from many parts of the world, and Danish families.”²⁷ They also spent a few days holidaying by the seaside before Dora saw her son off on his journey back to London. Her kind of political travelling always seemed to give some space both to leisure and pleasure, as well as informal interactions with local contacts. Dora continued on to Stockholm where she was due to speak at the Folkeshus on ‘Women’s Suffrage’. Through this lecture she met local activists who then became her guides as she sought to gain a picture of Swedish workers’ lives. Dora was not only taken to interesting galleries and museums – for she did not eschew the interests of the conventional tourist – but also to the kind of places which were well off the tourist trail. One example which captivated her was newly constructed working-class housing. This particularly impressed her because it was extremely well-thought-out from the working woman’s point of view in terms of labour-saving devices.²⁸ After her brief visit to Stockholm, Dora travelled on by sea to Finland.

Once in Finland, as she later recalled, “the real object of my journey began – to find out how the Finnish women had gained their political emancipation.”²⁹ This involved a close study of Finnish, Swedish, and Russian history as well as participation in the fast-moving events around her. She attended the final meeting of the Chamber of Nobles before they were dissolved as part of the new democratic constitution. When she got to know Minna Sillanpää and some of the other working women’s leaders, they helped her to understand more fully the meaning of the scene she had witnessed and the reasons for the success of the Finnish women. In particular, Dora was struck by the crucial role of the mobilisation of domestic servants, of whom Sillanpää was the organizer, and who, at the eleventh hour, joined in the general strike. This gave the signal to include women in the franchise which was then won “by a stroke of the pen of an autocrat.”³⁰ While in Finland Dora also benefited from the help of feminists such as Annie Furuhjelm, who had attended the IWSA congress in Copenhagen the month before.³¹ These women not only faci-

litated her research in the university library, they also, as she later recalled “put me in the way of visiting many schools, institutions and art collections, and at their houses I met most cultured and delightful circles of friends, all of whom helped to make my visit to Finland a very happy spot in my memory.”³² Dora also found time to make a quick visit to St. Petersburg, where she spent a day with literary friends. The city was under martial law and her friends’ flat had been raided by the police the previous night. Even when a visit like this one had no explicit political purpose, Dora was acquiring experiences which would inform her judgements and practices as a political woman. Soon after the trip to Russia, Dora’s visit to Finland was over. On her return, she began to put these experiences to work in her political activism.

By 1906 Dora Montefiore had been a suffragist for over fifteen years. She had already been part of a number of British women’s suffrage pressure groups and was now a member of the WSPU and the *Hammersmith Suffrage Society*.³³ It is therefore perhaps not surprising that as soon as women were enfranchised in Finland, she wanted to know how they had won the vote. What makes her much more unusual was her belief that she needed to *see* for herself how the Finns had made this breakthrough. Indeed, it is clear that without meeting key actors and exploring for herself the nature of Finnish politics, she would not have been able to make the case that she did on her return.³⁴ This was important as she was not the only person who brought the Finnish suffrage story to a British audience. Some Finnish women also managed to give an account of their victory. Baroness Gripenberg, novelist and long-time women’s rights advocate, published her account of ‘The Great Victory in Finland’ in *The Englishwoman’s Review*. Gripenberg, whom Dora had met in Finland, stressed how important the strategy of demanding universal suffrage had been to the women’s success, both in terms of getting male support and of ensuring that women were included in any reform. However she placed relatively little stress on the role of the labour movement in women’s victory.³⁵

In contrast, Montefiore narrated the achievement of women’s suffrage in Finland to audiences in Britain and beyond in a particular way. Her argument drew directly on what she had discovered when in Finland. The fact that the full democratic demand had been won without the kind of compromises which featured in the mainstream demand for women’s enfranchisement in Britain, was important to her representation of the Finnish victory.³⁶ But so too was the crucial role of a labour movement in which even women servants were organised (not an area of work which many in the British labour movement saw as fruitful). Yet she later recalled that what had seemed such a persuasive and hopeful achievement to her as a socialist woman who supported adult suffrage was not always heard in this way by her audiences. She felt that when she laid the “facts” she had discovered before English suffragists and at public meetings, “I found unfortunately, that they were as bewil-

dered by them as were Continental and American audiences.³⁷ This was because few understood the differences between those who argued for limited women's suffrage and those who insisted on full adult suffrage – the vote for every adult man and woman without property qualification. The issue in British suffrage was that the existing franchise was based on a property qualification as well as a sex disqualification. The significance of the former was a matter of enormous contention in Britain, but was a detail of the British experience of which many European and American audiences were unaware.

Montefiore deployed her Finnish experiences in a number of different ways, depending on the needs of the situation. This was apparent in 1910, when she told a New York audience how much she had learned from meeting Minna Sillanpää in Finland. Sillanpää was clearly very different to the middle-class Montefiore. She had started working as a domestic servant when she was ten years old, was self-educated and had become an organiser of other servants. She eventually became one of the first Social Democrat women to be elected to the Finnish Diet. Meeting Sillanpää gave Montefiore a personal connection with the successful Finnish suffragists and allowed her to show that suffragism did not have to have a middle-class face and could particularly benefit working-class women. Dora used her reading of Finnish enfranchisement to emphasise the need for class-conscious men and women to work together in politics and in the trade union movement as they had done, and were doing, in Finland.³⁸

Most importantly for Montefiore, travel and the resulting experience gave authority to the political arguments she wished to make. This was particularly the case when the position she took was outside the mainstream or challenged dominant thinking. In the case of Finland, travel reinforced her particular suffragist position which was the demand for full adult suffrage. In the tempestuous debates on the franchise in Britain which centred on determining the most effective strategy to achieve women's enfranchisement, the demand for adult suffrage was often regarded as hopelessly utopian.³⁹ The Finnish experience, as presented by Montefiore, seemed to show that it was an achievable demand. Her continuing mobilisation of the Finnish story in her international travelling had a power for each new audience precisely because it was based on her experiences. It was only by going to Finland, the only British suffragist to do so at the time, and by persistently reinforcing the relationships established there with Finnish women like Sillanpää, that Montefiore was able to make her distinct contribution to suffrage politics in Britain and beyond.⁴⁰ Travel helped to shape Montefiore's evolving suffrage politics and the relative significance suffrage had amongst her political priorities. She increasingly became an unapologetic proponent of immediate adult suffrage, leaving the WSPU at the end of 1906 for the *Adult Suffrage Society*. However as her travels

became more extensive and her politics increasingly radical, suffrage itself became less of a priority as she became increasingly critical of the political process, particularly once she had observed the consequences of a Labour government in power in Australia. Montefiore's kind of political travel was therefore about learning lessons from abroad, deploying those lessons domestically and in subsequent travels to give the authority of experience to a set of arguments which some in her audiences would have found challenging. Not all suffrage audiences wanted to hear a message which emphasised class so emphatically by challenging a property-based franchise and lauding the power of the organised working class to achieve full adult suffrage. Similarly the labour movement was not always keen to be reminded that organised women workers, including servants, could have a decisive role in achieving political goals. An argument based on her own experiences could make Montefiore's message more palatable and gain her audiences.

Only connect: political travel as networking

Political travel brought much with it: greetings, messages, as well as advice and warnings from across the globe. It could also confirm solidarity and cement a sense of being part of a world-wide movement. Such travel could produce dividends for the traveller and for those encountered on the journey – it certainly broadened the possibilities for communication between individuals and about experiences which were unlikely to connect otherwise. One example recounted by Archie Crawford concerned a visit that he made with Dora Montefiore to an Agricultural High School in Ballarat, Victoria in 1911. He reported to his South African readers, “Our world travelled woman comrade possesses an enviable extent of knowledge on education matters and I believe I learned more from her than from the Principals of the Schools we visited”.⁴¹ Experiences were therefore exchanged between individuals and knowledge acquired. Through the socialist press these experiences could then reverberate over considerable distances.

Travel enabled encounters between people and places but also between people and people. Much of Montefiore's travelling reinforced her existing networks and expanded them. This took the form of formal and informal networking. The formal networking took place in the international conferences of the women's movement and the socialist movement and by attending the conferences of other countries' socialist and communist parties. Dora was a busy networker in these settings, attending conferences of the ICW and the IWSA as well as the congresses (full and women's) of the Second International. In between conferences contact was sustained through formal channels as when Montefiore became the first Repor-

ter for the *Socialist Women's Bureau* (British) communicating on behalf of the British movement with the headquarters of the new *International Bureau for Socialist Women* located in Germany.⁴² Contact was also maintained more informally by providing hospitality for other international socialist women such as the German Clara Zetkin and the Russian Alexandra Kollontai who both stayed at Dora's home in Hammersmith in 1909.⁴³ Throughout her travels one can see Montefiore picking up these threads of contacts made at international events and weaving them together into friendship networks.

Socialists across the world put in place structures or created spaces which enabled travellers, whether migrants or itinerant propagandists, to make contact with one another and with local activists. By tracing Montefiore's travels some of these become apparent. One example was Sydney's *International Socialist Club* which was set up in 1898 on the initiative of immigrant socialists, who opposed Australian labour's support for immigration controls ('White Australia').⁴⁴ They created a point of contact, of welcome and a way into the networks and politics of a new country. When Dora arrived in Sydney in 1911, the Club was still a focal point, advertising itself in the local socialist newspaper, *International Socialist*. It had a reading room which kept inter-state and international socialist and labour papers which could be used by "comrades arriving from other countries".⁴⁵ The office of *International Socialist* also provided a focus for visitors and for those who were travelling within Australia. Dora remembered that when she temporarily took over the editing of the *International Socialist* in 1911, she "had the opportunity of meeting day by day many of the most revolutionary comrades from all over Australia, who would drop in for a chat and an exchange of views, and who enlarged my knowledge of industrial conditions in the various parts of the country".⁴⁶ So clubs and newspaper offices tagged as 'internationalist' could act as hubs for travelling socialists to meet up and to enable them to access local networks and knowledges.

The experience of the itinerant socialist propagandist and the political traveller was affected by the fact that their progress was often reported upon in newspaper columns like 'Whirl'd Through the World'. The travels of the South African Archie Crawford on his round-the-world trip in 1911 can be traced through the Australasian socialist press as well as through his home newspaper, the *Voice of Labour*.⁴⁷ Amongst those Australian socialists who had not met Crawford, a 'virtual comradeship' was reinforced through the coverage of his journey and the dissemination of his political reflections on his travels. Similarly, his own newspaper *Voice of Labour* created anticipation for Dora Montefiore's arrival in South Africa in 1912. Her travels can also be traced through socialist newspapers which followed her progress or received reports from her. Nor were Crawford and Montefiore alone: the traf-

fic, particularly around the White Dominions of the British Empire, could be quite heavy. As Dora argued at a public meeting in Pretoria in 1912:

“Capitalism called large masses of workers from all over the world. These men mixed, travelled, compared notes and returned home and spread the propaganda they had learned [...] That was why there was a band of socialistic agitators travelling all over the world, stirring up the people.”⁴⁸

Even a cursory reading of the global English-language socialist press makes clear that this was not just a British diaspora. Socialists from other countries were also on the move.⁴⁹ For example, on a trip to Pretoria Dora met “a young and enthusiastic comrade” from the United States who had been jailed at Spokane with the well-known ‘Wobbly’ Elizabeth Gurley Flynn during a fight for free speech. The two travellers discovered that they both intended to attend the Socialist Conference to be held shortly in Johannesburg.⁵⁰

Shared origins also often made connections possible for the traveller, so when Dora met the editor of what she called a Dutch (Afrikaner) newspaper early in her first visit to South Africa, the fact that he knew her work on the *New Age* during the Boer War meant, she said, that opportunely “he will dispose the Dutch population favourably towards my mission here”.⁵¹ Mutual recognition through earlier shared experiences could also facilitate the traveller’s progress. Thus when Dora landed at Durban in 1912 she found that amongst the comrades who welcomed her was one who had belonged to the *Bristol Socialist Society* and had often heard her speak.⁵² When the British Labour couple Philip and Ethel Snowden set off in 1914 on a trip to carry out “a long-cherished desire to see the world”, their journey was punctuated by meetings with expatriate British socialists.⁵³ In Winnipeg, Canada, Philip Snowden remembered “the feeling of homeliness grew upon us as our experiences accumulated. In a short walk along the street we were accosted frequently by people who had known us in the old country”.⁵⁴ Dora might not have been quite such a political celebrity as Snowden, who was an MP and leading member of the *Independent Labour Party*, but she too encountered many who were familiar with her and her writing.

Such encounters and re-encounters forged the links in the chain of international solidarity which was central to the socialist vision of the future. This solidarity was enacted in person across the world by political travellers and virtually through the interconnected Second International socialist presses. As Dora observed when in South Africa:

“She had been used to travel but as an International Socialist she was never homeless. Wherever she had gone she had met with the same kind welcome and found home and fatherland wherever there was work to be done for Socialism.”⁵⁵

As a 'socialistic agitator' her own networks gave her access to further networks and to new audiences. She used travel to nurture and expand these networks in pursuit of her vision of International Socialism.

Journeying by steamship: opportunities for the political traveller

Connections were made and networks sustained in the countries to which the traveller journeyed but the journeys between countries could also be significant. The intercontinental steamship not only conveyed migrants and travellers but also peripatetic socialist activists. It was a space which contained many possibilities for the traveller. Jonathan Hyslop has explored what he calls the Steamship Empire and the political connections created by it, from the point of view of the Asian, African and British sailors whose labour enabled this new form of mobility.⁵⁶ However, we know little about the sea voyages of the passengers who were also political travellers. Travelling British activists tended to concentrate in their writings on the colourful destinations, foreign encounters and even hazardous travel in the hinterland, rather than their experiences on intercontinental steamers.⁵⁷ Dora Montefiore seems to have appreciated the comforts of the modern steamship.⁵⁸ However, she also recognised that it provided particular opportunities to the political traveller: to network, to reach different audiences and to engage in brief meetings organised on the shore.

This was apparent in her journey out to Australia at the end of 1910. On board the *Orvieto*, she took the opportunity to address the third class passengers on socialism at their request. However, she was then forbidden by the captain to repeat this transgression.⁵⁹ This was not appropriate behaviour for a saloon passenger. Later on in her stay in Australia she was approached by one of her steerage audience on the *Orvieto*, who had recognised her voice. He thanked her, saying "I often wondered on board the ship how a lady so far removed from poverty and necessity could trouble herself about and among the workers' classes [...] instead of enjoying yourself like so many others in your station in life"⁶⁰ He likened her to Florence Nightingale, only with a mission to come to the aid of the struggling on the *industrial* battlefield. Moreover this was not just one way traffic – some kind of radical philanthropy. Montefiore said of this exchange, and the many others like it: "It is these passing contacts, these refreshing inspirations, coming from the very heart's blood of the workers, that have helped me again and again, when the progress their cause was making seemed so slow"⁶¹

The serendipity of travel was also seized upon when the steamships made land-fall. When Dora arrived in Melbourne in 1910, she had an overnight stop before the ship sailed on to her destination of Sydney. She and the local socialists seized

this opportunity. In the afternoon she was the guest of the *Women's Political Association*. At 6 pm she was given a welcome dinner by the executive of the *Victorian Socialist Party* where the toast was 'The Social Revolution and Mrs Montefiore'. At 8 pm she addressed a packed meeting at the Socialist Party Hall. In her wide-ranging speech, she told of her travels and said she had come to Australia to study their socialist organisations, their women's work, and what the Labour Party could and could not do.⁶² This was to be an exchange not only of experiences but also of knowledges. In a later return journey from Sydney to England, Dora again made use of a stop. This time at Perth:

"I was entertained by an enthusiastic group of Communists, who remembered well my work when I was editing the *International Socialist*. The leading women's organisation at Perth also entertained me, and the Labour Party held a Social for me at their headquarters. It was again pleasant meeting old comrades and friends in Australia, and feeling that the work one had been privileged to put in the past was now bearing fruit in a better understanding of the international solidarity of Labour."⁶³

Political travel of this sort was about making connections in order to build and sustain networks. For socialists like Dora Montefiore, this was the way in which they believed international solidarity could be made a reality. These personal connections could then be amplified through the socialist press. For example when Montefiore left England for her visit to the United States in 1910, she explained to the readers of her column 'Our Women's Circle' in the SDF's newspaper *Justice*:

"[a]s I know from correspondents who write me from time to time, I have 'Circle' friends and comrades in many parts, and I hope not to break the link formed by this column in 'Justice', but perhaps to strengthen it, whilst on my travels, for I hope to learn much about the American movement [...] The joy of Socialism is that we find friends and comrades and fellow-workers in every land. So I only leave for a time to find others: I only turn my back on Socialist work of one sort to plunge into Socialist work of another sort."⁶⁴

One of the ways in which Dora plunged into "Socialist work of another sort" was to take an active part in the politics of the country she was visiting. In these trips she made propaganda as she travelled as well as storing up experiences which she would later deploy on subsequent journeys and in her domestic political practice.

Propaganda and agitation tours

From 1910 to 1914 Dora Montefiore made a series of extra-European trips. She travelled to the United States in 1910, round the world (Australia, South Africa) in

1910–12, and then returned to South Africa in 1914. In undertaking these lengthy trips, she was not only part of a significant movement of population around the world, she was also engaging in the kind of political travels that a number of her contemporaries in the British socialist movement had also made. Amongst their number were Keir Hardie, the MacDonalds, the Snowdens and the Webbs who all took round-the-world trips in this period.⁶⁵

The purpose of these trips varied, although most were a mixture of fact-finding and agitation. Some made extensive stays along the way, such as Tom Mann in Australia from 1902–10. For others the initial motive was to improve their health. So Keir Hardie took a recuperative world cruise from July 1907 to April 1908, funded by well-wishers.⁶⁶ Fairly quickly this became a political world trip as he travelled through India, Australasia and southern Africa, being greeted in the latter by riotous outbursts by settler colonists in Natal and Transvaal. Montefiore's travels could also be prompted by her health. She returned to South Africa in 1914 at the suggestion of her doctor, only to arrive at Cape Town on the day of the deportations to Britain of nine labour leaders, including her friend Archie Crawford.⁶⁷ Like Hardie's trip, Montefiore's became more than had originally been planned. She took her rest cure in the mountains. However, a month later she returned to Cape Town to chair the welcome meeting for Tom Mann, who had been sent out to South Africa by the British Left to hold a series of protest and solidarity meetings on the issue of the deportations.⁶⁸ Although this was a lower key visit than her first, it was nevertheless headlined in the *Daily Herald* as 'Woman Socialist in Africa. Preaching the Gospel of Revolution.'⁶⁹ As this suggests, many of these trips became at least partly the opportunity for political missionary work. These propagandists were some of those who were 'whirling through the world'.

In her year-long stay in Australia, Montefiore was active in socialist politics: speaking, writing and editing for the cause. One issue was to have particular significance for her at the time and subsequently. This was the campaign against compulsory military training for boys. She took part in the Australian socialist campaign in 1911 which prefigured later wartime anti-conscription campaigns in Australia.⁷⁰ The manifesto 'Conscript Boys of Australia' printed in the *International Socialist* was drafted by Montefiore. It called for a campaign of passive resistance and was widely seen as seditious.⁷¹ This experience played a key role in developing her anti-militarist politics, which she then took with her and put into play in South Africa, warning against the effect of similar plans there.⁷² Later that year when she attended the meeting of the Socialist International in Basle, marching in a demonstration beside Clara Zetkin and Rosa Luxemburg, she told them about her recent travels in Australia and South Africa:

“On hearing about the compulsory military training of all Australian and New Zealand boys over 12 years of age, Clara Zetkin arranged an evening meeting in one of the large halls in Basle in order that I might put before an international audience these facts of military preparation on the part of the British Empire, which, though known to European and other Governments, were not generally known among the people. The meeting was packed to the doors.”⁷³

On her return to Britain she prioritised anti-militarism in her activism.⁷⁴ The fact that she had taken part in the Australian campaign, had centred much of her propaganda in South Africa on the same theme and continued to deploy these experiences in her politics on her return to Europe, underlined how significant this kind of political travel was to her evolving politics.

Montefiore’s round-the-world trip not only produced specific experiences that she could employ in later propaganda work, it also illustrated for her the possibilities for a new level of international solidarity. This idea was prompted by the serendipitous possibilities of travel. It is clear that if Crawford and Montefiore had not met in Sydney, she would not have spent six months in South Africa in 1912 and that experience would not have shaped her politics. Moreover, when the two of them met in Sydney, they discovered that through their different experiences and because of the impact of their socialist travels, they both envisaged a much more dynamic form of international network of revolutionary socialists than currently existed. What was needed now they felt was a Red International (Dora’s phrase).⁷⁵ It would be a network of revolutionary socialists linked together through the editors of socialist newspapers. The mechanisms of communication, themselves based on the new technologies of mobility, which had allowed for such a transnationalist practice as theirs to develop could now enable a more radical, truly international politics, they argued. Dora employed a powerful metaphor, as she explained this idea to readers of Crawford’s newspaper. She said that she wrote: “so as to link up another strand of the web of the Red International which is spreading round the world, and weaving the warp and woof of the new brotherhood of man.”⁷⁶ She felt this Red International was now possible because the world was shrinking. She spoke of:

“The growing ease of conquering distance, which has today succeeded in making the earth seem a comparatively small place, and has rendered the task of taking an interest and a part in the International Socialist Movement, not only possible, but comparatively easy.”⁷⁷

New technologies of communication and of mobility had helped to facilitate this, such as continually improving transport, a particularly effective mail system and the cablegram. It was up to revolutionary socialists to exploit these creations of capitalism for their own ends. The kind of political travel that Montefiore and Crawford

engaged in enabled them to envisage the creation of something more lasting and with a much greater reach than their own travelling encounters.

Growing obstacles

Yet, despite the optimism threaded through these internationalist aspirations and the attempts to enact this transnationally, none of this was to be. One of the reasons was that the technologies of communication and of mobility used by travelling socialist activists could also be used by the 'other side'. The deportation of the South African labour leaders was just the beginning of much greater surveillance and of further deportations (of enforced travel). For example, in 1917 twelve foreign-born Wobblies were deported from Australia, while at the same time the American authorities shipped some of their convicted Wobblies to Australia.⁷⁸ The introduction of passports in Britain during the war meant that post-war travel for socialists and communists became much more difficult, with both Montefiore and Tom Mann being refused passports to travel to Australia.⁷⁹ The lively socialist press of the pre-war period was no more – both the *International Socialist* and the *Voice of Labour* could not be sustained and had failed before the war. In a post-1917 world the politics of the Left became increasingly polarised. With bolshevisation came a much more disciplined and disciplining internationalism which abhorred the plurality of the earlier transnational rebel networks. Even though Dora still dreamed of a Red International, its moment had evaporated.

Montefiore's ability to travel and what she had done with those experiences had continually shaped her sense of herself as a political woman. She was to find that travelling as a communist woman was to be a different experience to travelling as a socialist woman. One example was an attempt to meet Clara Zetkin in 1919. After staying with her friend Professor Herron in Geneva, Montefiore travelled to Zurich only to find that Zetkin had been arrested by the Swiss police, rigorously searched – the hems and lining of her clothes had been ripped open and the skin on her back was examined through a magnifying glass to see if messages were written on it – and forced to return to Germany. The next day Montefiore received a letter from Herron warning her that he had a visit on her behalf from the police and advising against a return to Geneva.⁸⁰ Montefiore was herself forced to go into hiding as a member of the CPGB executive in 1921. Disguised in a nurse's uniform and using her mother's maiden name she went to stay with comrades in the mining community of Abertillery.⁸¹

Montefiore's last trip to Australia was in 1923. After questions were asked in the House of Commons and Dora agreed not to engage in political propaganda, a passport was finally granted.⁸² Despite Special Branch surveillance, she smuggled mes-

sages from the CPGB to the nascent Australian party and quietly sought out new comrades.⁸³ Her experience of Australia was very different now that she was a communist. Her travels still involved a mix of observation and networking (she later reported to the Comintern on the progress of communism in Australia); of personal visits to her family and looking up old friends (such as the former WSPU activist Adela Pankhurst who had emigrated to Australia); as well as writing profiles for the Australian labour press on leading socialists she had known such as Rosa Luxemburg and the Irish trade-unionist Jim Larkin.⁸⁴

The last lengthy journey Montefiore took was to Moscow in 1924. This was neither comfortable nor easy. Travel may have become considerably more difficult for this elderly communist woman with failing health, but she had no regrets. Even in Moscow she seized opportunities to be both a tourist and a political traveller: visiting the Winter Palace, having tea with Clara Zetkin in the Kremlin as well as attending the Comintern Congress.⁸⁵ She said that “If I had been a younger woman and in better health I could have desired nothing better than to spend two or three years studying conditions in Soviet Russia.”⁸⁶

Conclusion

The appeal of travel as a way to make politics never seems to have diminished for Dora Montefiore. She had travelled before she became politicised and she seized opportunities once her political journey began. From the earliest days of becoming a political woman, travel shaped a politics for Montefiore which was premised on making connections. She used her communication skills – as a speaker, journalist, pamphleteer and poet – to bring her experiences to the attention of other progressives. She published in the radical, socialist, suffragist, communist as well as the mainstream presses. Her kind of propaganda, which she saw as education, rested on her own curiosity which does not seem to have dimmed. She remained politically engaged in old age even though her blindness limited her activism. Her political travels were an integral part of her political practice. She made observations and gained experiences which she used to underpin her arguments and to give authority to what were often challenging views. She fostered connections between others and enhanced international networks between progressives to the point where she tried to make a reality of a new Red International. Whether in transit or at temporary destinations, she sought ways to make propaganda, seizing the opportunities that travel brought. Travel was such a crucial element in her making as a political woman that it is hard to imagine her in stasis, indifferent to her immediate environment and unengaged in the politics around her. For her, travel was part of her identity: when she was

introduced in 1909 to readers of the American journal, *Progressive Woman*, it was as a woman who began her work in Sydney, had spoken for socialism and suffrage in France, Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Hungary and had visited Russia where she had many friends.⁸⁷ Throughout her political life she recognised that travel “knitted up the bonds of comradeship” and made her feel “how vital and vibrating was the force of international Socialism”.⁸⁸ Dora Montefiore was not the only radical activist whirling around the world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century but for her the experiences she had, and what she then did with them, were integral to how she built a political life which remained optimistically internationalist to the end.

Notes

- 1 For a brief profile of Crawford, see his entry in Eric Rosenthal, *South African Dictionary of National Biography*, London 1966, 79. For Montefiore, see her entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, www.oxforddnb.com (19.10.2010). For contemporary pen portraits of both of them, see *International Socialist*, 24 June 1911.
- 2 *International Socialist*, 6 May 1911.
- 3 *Voice of Labour*, 5 May 1911. For Mary Mander (pen name Manda Lloyd), see *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, www.dnzb.govt.nz (18.10.2010); for Charles Edward Russell, see Robert Miraldi, *The Pen is Mightier: The Muckraking Life of Charles Edward Russell*, London 2003.
- 4 For example, *Socialist*, 14 March 1911.
- 5 See Karen Hunt, *Towards a Gendered and Raced Socialist Internationalism: Dora Montefiore Encounters South Africa (1912-14)*, in: *African Studies* 66/2-3 (2007), 321–341.
- 6 See Karen Hunt, ‘The Immense Meaning of It All: The challenges of internationalism for British socialist women before the First World War’, in: *Socialist History* 17 (2000), 22–42.
- 7 For broader discussion of the term, see Stéphane Dufoix, *Diasporas*, Berkeley 2008.
- 8 For example, Gary B. Magee and Andrew S. Thompson, *Empire and Globalisation. Networks of People, Goods and Capital in the British World, c.1850–1914*, Cambridge 2010; Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton, eds., *Moving Subjects. Gender, Mobility, and Intimacy in an Age of Global Empire*, Urbana and Chicago 2009.
- 9 See Special Issue: *Transnational Labour in the Age of Globalization*, *Labour History Review* 75/1 (2010).
- 10 See Hunt, *Towards a Gendered*.
- 11 Dora B. Montefiore, *From a Victorian to a Modern*, London 1927, 27.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 30.
- 13 For the significance of Australia to Montefiore, see Karen Hunt, *Learning from One Another? Gender and Labour History as an Anglo-Australian Comparative Project*, paper to the Anglo-Australian Labour History Conference, Manchester, July 2003. For the power of the Australian example in labour politics, see Neville Kirk, *Comrades and Cousins. Globalization, workers and labour movements in Britain, the USA and Australia from the 1880s to 1914*, London 2003, 59–148.
- 14 For example, Montefiore was a scrutineer at the count of the first United Socialist Party candidate to contest a South African parliamentary seat: *Justice*, 3 August 1912.
- 15 *Daily Herald*, 25 August 1913.
- 16 Alison Blunt makes a distinction between travellers, explorers and tourists when discussing women travelling alone in the late nineteenth century: Alison Blunt, *Travel, Gender and Imperialism. Mary Kingsley and West Africa*, New York and London 1994, 20.
- 17 Joan Sangster, *Political Tourism, Writing and Communication: Transnational Connections of Women on the Left, 1920s–1940s*, in: Pernilla Jonsson et al., eds., *Crossing Boundaries: Women’s Organizing in Europe and the Americas, 1880s–1940s*, Uppsala 2007, 103.

- 18 New Age, 24 August 1905.
- 19 Daily Herald, 25 August 1913.
- 20 New Age, 24 August 1905.
- 21 New Age, 24 August and 31 August 1905.
- 22 New Age, 14 September 1905.
- 23 New Age, 7 September 1905.
- 24 Justice, 10 March 1906.
- 25 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 84.
- 26 For Montefiore and the Copenhagen congress, see Karen Hunt, *Transnationalism in Practice: The Effect of Dora Montefiore's International Travel on Women's Politics in Britain before World War 1*, in Jonsson et al., eds., *Crossing Boundaries*, 81–82.
- 27 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 85.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 86–7.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 87.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 89.
- 31 Annie Furuhjelm became a Vice President of the IWSA in 1909 and was a Member of Parliament in Finland from 1913–29: see Mineke Bosch and A. Kloosterman, eds., *Politics and Friendship: Letters from the International Suffrage Alliance, 1902–42*, Columbus, Ohio 1990, 16, 85.
- 32 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 90.
- 33 For Montefiore's suffragism, see Karen Hunt, *Journeying Through Suffrage: The Politics of Dora Montefiore*, in: Claire Eustance et al., eds., *A Suffrage Reader: Charting Directions in British Suffrage History*, London 2000, 162–176.
- 34 For a detailed exploration of how Montefiore put her Finnish experiences into play in her suffrage politics, see Hunt, *Transnationalism in Practice*, esp. 85–94.
- 35 Alexandra Gripenberg cited in Susan G. Bell and Karen M. Offen, eds., *Women, the Family and Freedom. The Debate in Documents*, vol. 2, 1880–1950, Stanford 1983, 229–230.
- 36 Both constitutional and militant suffragists in Britain demanded what was called limited women's suffrage, that is the vote on the same terms as men. This meant satisfying a property qualification in order to be able to vote.
- 37 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 89.
- 38 New York Call, 21 May 1910.
- 39 For the context for the British adult suffrage campaign, see Karen Hunt, *Equivocal Feminists. The Social Democratic Federation and the Woman Question, 1884–1911*, Cambridge 1996, chapter 6; June Hannam and Karen Hunt, *Socialist Women. Britain 1880s to 1920s*, London 2002, chapter 5; Sandra Stanley Holton, *Feminism and Democracy: Women's Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain, 1900–18*, Cambridge 1986, chapter 3.
- 40 For a more recent analysis of the Finnish example, see Irma Sulkunen, *Suffrage, Nation and Political Mobilisation – the Finnish case in an international context*, in: Irma Sulkunen et al., eds., *Suffrage, Gender and Citizenship: International Perspectives on Parliamentary Reforms*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2009, 83–105. For Montefiore's evolving suffrage politics, see Hunt, *Journeying through Suffrage*.
- 41 *Voice of Labour*, 26 May 1911.
- 42 *Justice*, 9 November 1907.
- 43 See Cathy Porter, *Alexandra Kollontai*, London 1980, 164–168.
- 44 Frank Farrell, *International Socialism and Australian Labour. The Left in Australia 1919–1939*, Sydney 1981, 15.
- 45 *International Socialist*, 7 May 1910.
- 46 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 136.
- 47 For example, *Voice of Labour*, 26 May 1911; *International Socialist*, 17 June 1911.
- 48 *Pretoria News*, 13 June 1912.
- 49 See, for example the two voyages to the Congo of the Belgian socialist Vandervelde: Janet Polasky, *The Democratic Socialism of Emile Vandervelde. Between Reform and Revolution*, Oxford 1995, chapter 3.
- 50 *Voice of Labour*, 5 April 1912. Wobbly was the familiar term for members of the *International Workers of the World*.
- 51 *Justice*, 13 April 1912.

- 52 Justice, 6 April 1912.
- 53 Philip Snowden, *An Autobiography*, vol. 1, 1864–1919, London 1934, 320.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 325.
- 55 *Voice of Labour*, 8 March 1912.
- 56 Jonathan Hyslop, *Steamship Empire: Asian, African and British Sailors in the Merchant Marine c.1880–1945*, in: *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 44/1 (2009), 49–67.
- 57 See, for example, Snowden, *Autobiography*, vol.1, chapter 23; J. Ramsay MacDonald, *Wanderings and Excursions*, London 1925.
- 58 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 182.
- 59 *Ibid.*, 139.
- 60 *Ibid.*, 141.
- 61 *Ibid.*, 144.
- 62 *Socialist*, 9 December 1910.
- 63 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 211.
- 64 *Justice*, 30 April 1910.
- 65 For example the MacDonalDs were in Australia in 1906 while the Webbs had travelled round the world in 1898: see David Marquand, *Ramsay MacDonald*, London 1997, 100; Norman and Jean MacKenzie, eds., *The Diary of Beatrice Webb*, vol. 2 1892–1905, London 1983, 135–49.
- 66 Caroline Benn, *Keir Hardie*, London, 1992, 230. For the trip see *ibid.*, 230–32 and Jonathan Hyslop, *The world voyage of James Keir Hardie: Indian nationalism, Zulu insurgency and the British labour diaspora 1907–1908*, in: *Journal of Global History* 1/3 (2006), 343–362.
- 67 For the context of the deportation of the labour leaders, see the biography of one of them: Jonathan Hyslop, *The Notorious Syndicalist. J.T. Bain: A Scottish Rebel in Colonial South Africa*, Johannesburg, 2004, chapter 19.
- 68 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 179.
- 69 *Daily Herald*, 25 May 1914.
- 70 Joy Damousi, *Socialist Women and Gendered Space: the anti-conscription and anti-war campaigns of 1914–1918*, in: *Labour History* 60 (May 1991), 1–15.
- 71 *International Socialist*, 29 July 1911; Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 136.
- 72 *Voice of Labour*, 24 May 1912. See also Karen Hunt, *The lessons of political travel: constructing anti-militarism in a colonial context*, paper to Colloquium on Political Travel in the Colonial World, University of Witwatersrand, August 2010.
- 73 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 153–154.
- 74 See Dora B. Montefiore, *Anti-Militarism from the Workers' Point of View*, London 1913.
- 75 *Voice of Labour*, 5 January 1912.
- 76 *Voice of Labour*, 5 May 1911.
- 77 *Socialist*, 24 March 1911.
- 78 Verity Burgmann, *Revolutionary Industrial Unionism. The Industrial Workers of the World in Australia*. Melbourne 1995, 218.
- 79 Nicholas Hiley, *Counter-espionage and security in Great Britain during the First World War*, in: *English Historical Review* 101 (1986), 635–670; Karen Hunt, *Dora Montefiore: A Different Communist*, in John McIlroy et al., eds., *Party People, Communist Lives. Explorations in Biography*, London 2001, 43–44; Joseph White, *Tom Mann*, Manchester 1991, 194.
- 80 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 203–204.
- 81 *Ibid.*, 208–209.
- 82 *Ibid.*, 210.
- 83 For an example of surveillance see Investigation Branch to All Representatives Melbourne, 12 January 1923, B741/3 V/408, Australian Archives, Victoria.
- 84 *Comintern Archives*, ML MSS 5575 FM4/10416/495/94/26, Mitchell Library, Sydney; Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 210–211; *Workers' Weekly*, 22 June and 6 July 1923.
- 85 Montefiore, *From a Victorian*, 213–219.
- 86 *Ibid.*, 219.
- 87 *Progressive Woman*, August 1909.
- 88 *Justice*, 11 June and 28 May 1910.