RRR
Romance, Revolution & Reform

# ‘Body And Soul’ – Emotional Labour in Margaret Harkness’ Fin-De-Siècle Fiction and Journalism

ROSEMARY ARCHER

Abstract: This article seeks to uncover a political reading of Margaret Harkness’ writing by applying late-twentieth-century sociological theories of emotional labour, especially those of Arnie Russell Hochschild, to Harkness’ fin-de-siècle fiction and journalism. I consider the novellas *Connie* (1893-94) and *Roses and Crucifix* (1891-92) as well as a series of investigative articles for the *British Weekly* (later published as a collection, *Toilers in London*), reading them through the critical lens of emotional labour. Using this approach, I argue that Harkness’ protagonists can be seen as belonging to the ‘emotional proletariat’.[1] I examine the various ways in which these texts present the requirement for working-class women to undertake emotional labour which, in turn, subjects them to the intersectional disadvantage of class and gender. I ultimately argue that it is Harkness’ recognition and discussion of this that positions her writing as political activism, giving her a distinctive voice in both contemporary slum fiction and socialist writing.

Keywords: Margaret Harkness, Emotional Labour, Working-Class Women’s Labour, Emotional Proletariat, Intersectional Disadvantage, Socialist Fiction

‘LADIES SEEM TO think that they buy servants body and soul for so much a year’.[2] This servant’s complaint is made during an interview carried out by Margaret Harkness for her *British Weekly* ‘ Tempted London’ articles, a series intended as an investigation into

[1] Cameron Lynne Macdonald and Carmen Sirianni, eds., *Working in the Service Society*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), p. 3. The term ‘emotional proletariat’ is coined as a knowing reference to the Marxist concept of the proletariat.

[2] Margaret Harkness, *Toilers In London* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889), p. 121.

the difficulties facing young working-class women employed in London.[3] Whilst the expression 'body and soul' may be a clichéd attempt by the servant to convey emotional intensity, nevertheless she has intuited a deeper truth, one which Harkness would observe and record throughout her journalism and fiction, and one that late-twentieth century sociologists would later theorise: namely, that for some nineteenth-century working-class women the most oppressive aspect of their employment was the requirement for them to undertake emotional labour, a form of paid labour requiring not just outward emotional conformity but the manipulation and commercialisation of their psyche, or soul.

Harkness' representations of working-class women's labour are already ripe ground for fresh scholarly attention, yet I extend this by focusing specifically on Harkness' representation of these women's emotional labour: within this, I use the term 'emotional labour' to refer to the process by which working-class women in the service sectors are expected to manage, display and even experience emotion in the manner required by their employer. Crucially, in this paradigm, the employee's pay depends upon their ability to suppress or evoke the requisite emotion. Coined by Arlie Russell Hochschild in 1983, 'emotional labour' is a late-twentieth century term that is significant in that it describes a type of labour that was previously invisible and unseen and therefore not valued. Reading Harkness' work through the lens of Hochschild's theory enables a form of nineteenth-century intersectional oppression to emerge from the pages of Harkness' texts, furnishing us with a critical vocabulary, unavailable to Harkness, to articulate that oppression. Reading *Toilers in London* and the novellas *Roses and Crucifix* and *Connie* through this lens of emotional labour, I argue that Harkness positions her working-class women as an emotional proletariat, subject to the intersectional disadvantage(s) of class and gender. This interrogation uncovers much about the ideological struggle in which Harkness was engaged during the fin de siècle and positions her writing as both socialist and feminist political activism. At the end of the nineteenth century there was little, if any, understanding of emotional labour as a named concept, much less using this terminology: nevertheless, this methodology positions 'emotional labour' as a useful critical lens in exploring working-class women's

[3] As a result of the lively debate that ensued after Harkness' previous article on servants was published in the British Weekly 13 July 1888, Harkness tells her readers that she was invited to meet about twenty servants and to have tea with them to gather first-hand accounts of their experiences.

felt, if unnamed, experience. My methodology seeks not to apply twentieth-century sensibilities to the fin de siècle, therefore, but rather to provide a novel critical framework for understanding working-class women's experiences of labour during this period.

In her major work *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling* (1983), Hochschild argued that emotional labour had the same commercial value as physical or intellectual labour.[4] She defined emotional labour as 'the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display; emotional labor is sold for a wage and therefore has *exchange value.*'[5] Although the emphasis in her definition is on the external display of this labour, much of her work explores the necessity for employees to internally experience (as well as externally exhibit) these emotions; an authentic display of emotion is vital if it is to have exchange value. In this way, Hochschild finds equivalence between the psychic harm that results from emotional labour and the physical harms experienced by those in, for example, unregulated factory work.

Hochschild goes on to argue that the growth of late twentieth century service industries, which have employed a predominantly female workforce, has meant that emotional labour is more often required from women than it is from men, and that therefore women are disproportionately impacted by its harms. Although service industries are often considered to be a twentieth-century development, significant numbers of working-class women were employed in this sector at the fin de siècle, literally 'in service', in bars, in the theatre, or in the newly emerging department stores. Roles requiring emotional labour from the employee tended to be low status with few opportunities for collectivism which, in turn, left those undertaking emotional labour more vulnerable to workplace exploitation and job insecurity, as Harkness' writing amply illustrates. Cameron Lynne Macdonald and Carmen Sirianni developed these sociological ideas further in their edited collection of essays, *Working in the Service Society* (1996): here, they define emotional labour as 'the conscious manipulation of the workers' self-presentation either to display feeling states and/or to create feeling states

[4] Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012).

[5] Ibid., p. 7.

in others', building on Hochschild's ideas to coin the term 'emotional proletariat'.[6] Drawing upon Marxist terminology, they finessed this to describe those in the lowest socio-economic classes who, lacking the means of production, must sell their emotional labour instead. Emotional autonomy is removed from the employee, their continued employment being contingent upon their ability to successfully sell their emotional labour. The loss of autonomy is emphasised through explicit instructions, known as feeling rules, that dictate how the employee should speak or act. Adherence to these feeling rules, and the sincerity with which the required emotional labour is carried out, is policed by both manager and customer. Although these theoretical stances were developed almost a hundred years after Harkness was writing, their relevance to the circumstances that she delineated is both striking and compelling. As sociologist and socialist, the one informing the other, Harkness' observation of women undertaking emotional labour, and its accompanying disadvantage, reaches across the century and resolves itself in the theoretical frameworks developed by Hochschild, Macdonald and Sirriani. What Harkness observed, they would later theorise.[7]

Throughout 1888, Harkness wrote intensively: her realist novel *Out Of Work* was published under her pseudonym John Law and, at the same time, a subsequent novel *Capt. Lobe* was being serialised in the *British Weekly* alongside her sociological study of working-class women's labour, *Tempted London*.[8] Each of these texts was characterised by a socialist interrogation of working-class life and employment, with a particular focus on women's experience. This year would mark something of a turning point in Harkness' writing career; not only was more of her work being published, after several years of sporadic journalism, but she was now deploying her fiction and journalism as a form of political activism. By the end of 1888, the name 'John Law' was becoming widely known in both England and Europe, and was associated with a form

[6] Cameron Lynne Macdonald and Carmen Sirianni, eds., *Working In the Service Society*, p. 3.

[7] These early theories have inspired a great deal of subsequent sociological research which has tended to resolve into two strands; firstly, emotional labour as a way of understanding the social relations of service roles and secondly, the way in which individual employees express and regulate emotion. Latterly, there has been some concept creep with a focus on emotional labour carried out in the home as opposed to the workplace.

[8] These articles appeared over a period of nine months and were later published by Hodder & Stoughton as a collection, *Toilers in London or Inquiries Concerning Female Labour In The Metropolis,* in 1889.

of realist novel underpinned by socialist ideology. Harkness' novelistic and journalistic output encompassed a broad sweep of topics: East End unemployment and unrest, the pernicious effects of poverty, the social action of the Salvation Army but, above all, working-class women's experience of work. These themes were not exclusive to Harkness, and several other writers at this time, such as George Gissing, Walter Besant and Arthur Morrison, were engaged in the developing genre of realist slum fiction. However, most of these slum novels were written by men who privileged an androcentric depiction of poverty: the lives of *women* living in poverty were doubly marginalised, rendered subordinate to narratives focusing on men's experiences of poverty, whilst also being mediated through the gaze of a middle-class male writer. It is perhaps this that Harkness had in mind when, in an interview for *The Evening News and Post*, she opposed these masculine accounts with the self-declared truthfulness of her own writing. She comments: 'Walter Besant had brought out his first book on the East-end and I was so disgusted with its untruthfulness that I conceived the idea of writing a story which should picture the lives of the East-enders in their true colours.'[9] The 'true colours' that Harkness speaks of here entailed the foregrounding of women's experience of poverty within a politicised framework with a particular focus on the requirement for working-class women to undertake emotional labour.

That working-class women were obliged to engage in hard physical labour was already a concern, whether this was pit brow lasses, shop girls standing for seventeen hours a day or the 'slavey' who was the single maid-of-all-work in a modest household.[10] What went unobserved, by legislators and inspectors alike, was the necessity for working-class women in certain employment roles to undertake demanding emotional labour with its requirement to not only present by facial and physical display the appropriate emotions, but to actually internalise and experience these emotions. Employees were effectively 'selling' emotions such as gratitude, loyalty, care and affection, to maximise profit for an employer by flattering the customer.

[9] Harkness, 'A Slum-Story Writer', *The Evening News and Post*, 17 April 1890. The book Harkness refers to here is her first novel, *A City Girl*. Besant's book, which she disparages, is *All Sorts and Conditions of Men* (1882).

[10] Various factory acts had sought to impose limitations on women's working hours whilst Lakeman, the Senior Metropolitan Inspector for HM Factory Inspectorate, had produced an 1887 report into the social conditions of women working in the factories and workshops of London. However, less interest was shown in legislating for women in service industries.

Harkness, in a way that was unusual for the period, observed the intersectional disadvantage of class and gender that arose from this requirement to undertake emotional labour. At the time, these struggles were generally seen as separate rather than intersectional. However, as Patricia E. Johnson argues, 'Class and gender are composed dynamically and dialogically', and this dynamic and simultaneous testing of class and gender boundaries by her protagonists becomes a recurring plot device in Harkness' novels, albeit one that often results in wistful defeat.[11] Johnson goes on to argue that there was a 'masculine bias in the construct of the Victorian working class' and a separate, yet linked, disadvantage in that there was 'middle-class bias in [the] construct of femininity.'[12] Harkness is therefore already unusual in turning her attention to working-class women's labour, yet she goes further by focusing her analysis on their intersectional disadvantage. In particular, she demonstrated that this coalesced in a very specific form of exploitation, one that was unique to their class and gender – the exploitation of their emotional labour.[13]

This concern first emerges in her fortnightly articles that appeared from April to December 1888, 'Tempted London: Young Women', in the *British Weekly,* a periodical that combined non-conformist religious views with a liberal political agenda. Harkness explained, in a later 1890 interview with *The Evening News and Post*, that:

> the editor of the *British Weekly* wrote and asked me if I would write a series of papers they were contemplating on young men. He, of course, thought 'John Law' was a man. I called upon him, and we had a great laugh. But I undertook to write the papers on young women.[14]

There was a campaigning mode to these sociological studies and subsequent papers; the style was quasi-fictional, as Harkness frequently quoted her subjects verbatim and at times had recourse to elements of melodrama in order to impart the full horror of the women's employment. In writing these articles, later reprinted in a single volume

[11] Patricia E. Johnson, *Hidden Hands* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2001), p. 8.

[12] Johnson, *Hidden Hands*, p. 8.

[13] This concern with emotional labour is integral to her fiction written between 1887-1894. In addition to the texts discussed in this article, it is required from Polly Elwin in *Out of Work* and Ruth Weldon in *Capt. Lobe*.

[14] *The Evening News and Post*, 17 April 1890. 'John Law' was Harkness' pseudonym under which she published all her fiction and some of her journalism.

by Hodder and Stoughton as *Toilers in London*, Harkness was adding to a larger corpus of women's social investigation into the experience of working women.[15] Yet Harkness differs from her contemporaries in privileging a discussion of emotional labour which becomes as important to her ideological purpose as the accompanying details about long working hours and poor pay.

One of these articles, 'Barmaids', an inquiry into women's pay and working conditions in the bars of London's theatres, hotels and railway stations, often illustrated by anecdotal evidence, is particularly pertinent to women's experience of emotional labour. MacDonald and Sirianni would later argue that, for women working in service industries, work involves not the production of a product but the creation and maintenance of a relationship through emotional labour whilst, for the emotional proletariat, emotional labour is supervised or policed by both manager and customer. This theoretical stance is evident in Harkness' article: for example, she presents the case of a barmaid who refused to undertake such labour and instead 'ventured to remonstrate with a customer'.[16] Accordingly, the customer complained that 'they had not been treated with sufficient courtesy' and Harkness tells us that 'The following day all of the girls were discharged at a moment's notice'.[17] There is a synergy here between Harkness' nineteenth-century observations and Macdonald and Sirianni's twentieth-century sociological theories of emotional labour, which note that 'at the lower end of the spectrum of service jobs, workers are peripheral and expendable'.[18] Hochschild would go on to argue that emotional labour requires the worker 'to either display feeling states and/or to create feeling states in others': mirroring this, Harkness observes that the barmaids must 'wink at many things and try to keep their customers in good humour'.[19] We are told that the women must 'make themselves agreeable, or they are dismissed' and that managers 'will only have girls that flirt' in order to please their customers.[20] Women's emotional labour becomes the product that is being sold; if business falls off then the girls 'try to look smart; they laugh and chaff' in order to

[15] Notable amongst these women were Clementina Black, Beatrice Webb (née Potter) and, later, Maud Pember Reeves.

[16] Harkness, *Toilers In London*, p. 210.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Macdonald and Sirianni, *Working in the Service Society*, p. 13.

[19] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*,, p. 3; Harkness, *Toilers In London*, p. 210.

[20] Harkness, *Toilers In London*, p. 210.

increase custom.[21] But Harkness goes further; she not only observes this in her *British Weekly* articles but seeks to politicise it, too, when she writes that 'employers do not seem to have any conscience about barmaids. The public ignore them altogether'.[22] Harkness seems to be making an accusation of neglect by both sides of the political spectrum; government inquiries were concerned only with working-class women's sweated or factory labour whilst socialist organisations such as the Social Democratic Foundation (SDF) excluded women's labour, in all its forms, from their policies and strategies.

Between June and September 1888, Harkness' articles for the *British Weekly* investigated the experiences of women in domestic service through a series of interviews with both servants and mistresses. These, in turn, attracted a lively correspondence, and a selection of the letters was subsequently published in the September 7th edition of the *British Weekly*. Harkness stated that she could 'vouch for the truth of the statements' that the letters contained, again reiterating her written commitment to *truthful* representation of these women's experiences.[23] She prefaced them with the statement 'Readers will find that each of these letters embodies at least one grievance', and indeed the 'one grievance' that implicitly emerges is that of being obliged to undertake emotional labour.[24] The hours, the conditions and the pay may all be poor, but it is this specific form of labour that the servants find most oppressive because of the demands it makes on their psyche. In their later theorising, MacDonald and Sirianni established that the emotional proletariat were obliged to go beyond exhibiting merely superficial performances of emotion: instead, employers' control extended to the workers' inner lives.[25] Applying these theoretical ideas to Harkness' ironically-titled article "A Perfect Servant" reveals the way in which an employer seeks to control the servant's aesthetic choices as part of this tendency by employers to 'oversee and control […] workers' personal and psychic lives too'.[26] Harkness tells us, in

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid., p. 212.

[23] Ibid., p. 151.

[24] Ibid. Although the explicit complaints are of poor conditions or hard labour, underlying these complaints is a resistance to the emotional labour demanded by their service roles.

[25] In naming her monograph *The Managed Heart,* Hochschild recognises that for emotional labour to succeed it cannot be merely performative but must be sincerely felt too.

[26] Macdonald and Sirianni, *Working in the Service Society*, p. 4.

a sardonic tone, how this servant had her aesthetic tastes managed by her mistress: 'She is stated to have had a mania for china ornaments […] But she conquered this with the help of her mistress.'[27] The complacency of the mistress in exercising this control is contrasted with the 'bitter complaints' from servants who are subject to it.[28] In particular, complaints have reached Harkness about the 'want of liberty in choosing their "place of worship"' from servants whose mistresses would seek to dictate their religious belief and its expression.[29] A later letter from A West End Housemaid complains, amongst other things, that 'What is worse than the work is the whims of my mistress. I am a Dissenter, but am supposed to go to the Established Church as they do.'[30] This objection is telling: for her, the requirement to carry out emotional labour, to allow her inner life to be controlled or managed by her employer, is 'worse than the work'. Another servant expresses this more concisely in the chapter *Servants versus Mistresses,* noting that 'Ladies seem to think that they buy servants body *and soul* for so much a year', a phrase freighted with more meaning than the servant could perhaps have realised.[31]

Conversely, in an almost covert manner, Harkness establishes her ideological argument by also drawing upon accounts from the mistresses of these servants. These accounts enable her to demonstrate that it is the servant's perceived ability to manipulate her own presentation, to display appropriate feeling-states *and* thereby to generate a positive feeling-state in her employer, that is at the heart of what one mistress deems 'perfection'. The mistress, who is the wife of a City gentleman and mother of two small children, goes on to say that her servant apparently 'expresses herself to be "perfectly happy"' and, to the mistress, she 'gives satisfaction', fulfilling her mistress' emotional needs and expectations by generating positive feelings in her employer .[32] The qualities that the mistress goes on to list – that is, the servant is 'good-

[27] Harkness, *Toilers In London*, p. 106.

[28] The 'bitter complaints' are expressed to Harkness, not the mistress. As part of her qualitative research, Harkness invited servants to correspond with her, perhaps surmising that she would obtain more authentic accounts than from interviews alone. A selection of these letters was published pseudonymously by the *British Weekly* on 7 September 1888.

[29] Harkness, *Toilers In London*, p. 111.

[30] Ibid., p. 156.

[31] Ibid., p. 121. My italics.

[32] Ibid., p. 102.

tempered, honest, sober, cheerful, affectionate, hard-working' – are qualities that are displayed by the servant but that are designed to bring emotional satisfaction to the employer. It is notable that in this asyndetic listing, the mistress prioritises the emotional labour required by the role over its task-based elements: physical hard work is at the end, not the beginning, of the list.[33] It is as if the mistress has paid close attention to the servant's behaviour and disposition, the outward signifiers of inwardly-felt emotion, whilst her physical labour has remained largely invisible. The mistress claims that 'servants always behave well to me' and 'I have never heard her say a rough word to the children, or anyone else. *She is perfect*'.[34] The servant's perceived perfection, here, is a product of her emotional, more than her physical, labour.

These articles in the *British Weekly* clearly touched a nerve in their readers. Uncollectivised domestic servants saw in Harkness someone who could champion their cause, and a series of letters were delivered to Harkness on condition that she 'would keep the names of the writers secret'.[35] Employers subsequently demanded a right of reply to justify their actions, yet in so doing, some unwittingly reinforced their exploitative expectations of emotional labour from their female servants. Lady Florence, 'a constant reader of THE BRITISH WEEKLY' had, as a result of reading Harkness' papers, 'invited a Commissioner [Harkness] to meet half-a-dozen mistresses at her house [...] to hear what ladies have to say about servants'.[36] There, a mistress asserts that in return for all the material benefits that servants receive from their employers, 'we have a right to expect from them gratitude'.[37] The implication is clear: the expectation of gratitude implies a further expectation of indebtedness, and therefore loyalty. Hochschild would later theorise the importance of this specific form of emotional labour by arguing that 'Gratitude lays the foundation for loyalty'.[38] Applying this theoretical lens to Harkness' article, it becomes apparent that the emphasis in the mistress' assertion on 'the right to expect' underscores the exchange value of emotional labour. Servants exchange gratitude, plus other feelings that are demanded by their employer, for benefits in kind

[33] Ibid., p. 103.

[34] Ibid., p. 104. Harkness' italics.

[35] Ibid., p. 152.

[36] Ibid., p. 122.

[37] Ibid., p. 127.

[38] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, p. 101.

such as 'comfortable homes, good food'.[39] Hochschild noted that not only was personal interaction a primary component of service roles such as these (and it is telling that in Harkness' accounts both employer and employee return repeatedly to the relational aspects of their roles) but that in such roles the primary product that was being sold was the creation and maintenance of a relationship: 'Impersonal relations are to be seen *as if* they were personal'.[40] The servant whose anguished complaint prefaces this article, has therefore intuited correctly that her 'soul', her emotional labour emanating from her 'managed heart', has become a commodity that can be bought along with her physical labour.

Harkness' sociological methodology was broadly observational, and her interpretation of these observations was political rather than theoretical. It is especially significant that emotional labour undertaken in someone else's home, domestic service, becomes the locus for this political analysis.[41] In her 2007 essay on working women's homes, Karen Hunt argues that 'the home as a physical space provided a catalyst to women's political action'.[42] Although Hunt is discussing the homes of working women, as opposed to the homes in which women worked, this nevertheless captures the experience of the women whose lives Harkness records in her *British Weekly* articles. Their experience of emotional labour in the home of an employer was becoming a spur to political action precisely because domestic employment as a servant was relational, with emotional labour prized over physical labour. When a mistress frets about the over-education of servants, what lies beneath is a fear that once servants hear 'what is going on in politics' they will become collectivised. This, in turn, will make them less

[39] Harkness, *Toilers In London*, p. 127.

[40] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, p. 106. Hochschild's italics.

[41] Throughout *Toilers In London*, Harkness reverts to the structural and political changes required to address the problems that she has observed. Although she frequently recommends societies such as the YWCA who can offer practical help, she also concedes that the YWCA 'cannot attack the evils from which these girls are suffering – namely, long hours, bad accommodation, low wages…' not least because 'They are evangelists not economists' (*Toilers In London*, p. 213). Hochschild distinguishes between emotional labour, which has exchange value, and emotional management – or work – which has use (but not exchange) value only. It is the former that Harkness is discussing here.

[42] Karen Hunt, 'Gendering the Politics of the Working Woman's Home' in *Women and the Making of Built Space in England 1870 -1950*, ed. by Elizabeth Darling and Lesley Whitworth (Burlington: Ashgate Press, 2007), p. 107.

willing to undertake the emotional labour required for their roles.[43] Yet it is not the political sphere exterior to the home that the mistress needs to fear, but the political catalyst of the domestic space. The home, with its insistence on servants' emotional labour, reveals intersectional disadvantage to those who work there. Hunt observes that fin-de-siècle Socialism had little to offer women of any class, as 'domestic matters had a marginal place within socialist strategy': at the same time, however, there was an anxiety amongst socialists that feminists sought 'to substitute sex war for class war'.[44] In politicising her observations of women and emotional labour, Harkness is recognising that the twin struggles of class and gender are not mutually exclusive but, for working-class women, compounded into a form of insidious oppression.

Harkness' 1891 novella, *Roses and Crucifix*, with its narrative of Lilian's dismissal as a governess and her subsequent descent into the bars of the East End, revisits this analysis. As the novella is not widely known, I offer a brief summary. The orphaned Lilian, having been brought up in a convent, initially works as a governess but is dismissed for 'flirting' with her employer's son, Mr. Grey, although Lilian is so naïve that she is unclear of what she stands accused. Without a reference, the only work she can obtain is that of a barmaid. Subsequently, they meet again in a chance encounter and Lilian saves Grey from a robbery. Their relationship is resumed and when she later becomes seriously ill from overwork in the bar, she returns to the convent where Grey visits frequently. When Lilian dies, it is with Grey's name on her lips, not that of a saint. Although the novella draws upon the melodramatic mode throughout, much of the text is concerned with a depiction of the oppressive conditions in which Lilian works. Originally published in the *Women's Herald*, Sidney Webb was quick to categorise this work when he wrote to Beatrice Webb in 1892: ''John Law' has a sensational *'Tendenz-Roman'* running in the *Women's Herald* about Barmaids'.[45] The context in which it was published might have suggested this even before a first reading as the *Women's Herald* began life as the *Women's Penny Paper* in 1888, a periodical with an avowedly suffragist

[43] Harkness, *Toilers In London*, p. 124.

[44] Hunt, 'Gendering the Politics of the Working Woman's Home' in *Women and the Built Space in England, 1870 -1950*, p. 108.

[45] Norman Mackenzie, ed., *Letters of Sidney and Beatrice Webb Vol. 1*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 380. Webb's use of the word *tendenzroman*, indicating a novel with a clear political orientation and propagandist intent, is indicative of Harkness' notoriety in socialist circles at this time.

and feminist purpose, declaring in its opening editorial of October 27th 1888 that 'Our policy is progressive' and its pages 'will be open to […] to the working woman as freely as to the educated lady'.[46] It would be a newspaper that would 'reflect the thoughts of the best women upon all the subjects that occupy their minds'.[47] This context is significant, as the socialist tendencies of this novella – with its descriptions of long hours, poor pay and exploitative conditions – are evident, but its feminist politics, the interrogation of the oppressive nature of the requirement for emotional labour from female employees, present with more subtlety.

The novella begins *in medias res*, opening upon a rare night-time moment of leisure when the barmaids, Lilian and Mary, are not under the near-constant surveillance of the management, and are therefore at liberty to discuss the appalling conditions in which they work. However, the dialogue is concerned primarily with the emotional demands, rather than the physical hardships, of the job. Mary captures the centrality of this to a barmaid's role: 'She must attract customers and do good business, and if she doesn't, she's sent away.'[48] Lilian's success in 'doing good business' has explicit exchange value; Mary tells her that she saw the Manager 'look at you last time he was here, and nod his head. He'll raise your wages'.[49] Harkness deconstructs exactly how Mary carries out this emotional labour. Just as Hochschild observed that flight attendants in the 1980s must deploy 'two traditionally "feminine" qualities […] the supportive mother and the sexually desirable mate', so Mary uses a slightly different familial simile – 'I treat the men as if I was their sister' – whilst the customers see her as sexually available as they 'stand at the bar […] leering'.[50] As Hochschild theorises, it is

[46] *Women's Penny Paper,* 27 October 1888. The name was changed to *The Woman's Herald* in 1891 to better reflect the campaigning aims of the newspaper.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter 1 'An Underground Bedroom', *Women's Herald*, 5 December 1891, pp. 11 -12 https://theharkives.wordpress.com/2016/06/04/harkives-summer-serial-roses-and-crucifix-instalment-i/ accessed 6 March 2024. References to *Roses and Crucifix* and to *Connie* refer to electronic texts, accessed online, which are only available in unpaginated versions. Therefore, chapters are referenced in place of page numbers.

[49] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter 1 'An Underground Bedroom'.

[50] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, pp. 181 -182; Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter 1 'An Underground Bedroom'. Although there were many live debates during the fin de siècle about the nature of women's work, these debates focused on professional (or professional-adjacent) women's work and not on barmaids and slaveys.

Mary and Lilian's apparent success in replicating relational roles for the customers in the bar, offering an emotionally authentic expression of their inner psyche, that results in 'good business' for both employer and employee.

When Lilian first attends for an interview for her role as barmaid, the manager hands her a paper headed "Rules for Barmaids". Hochschild recognises the role of informal feeling rules in dictating appropriate feelings as part of social norms, but she also theorises that where emotion management is sold as part of labour then 'feeling rules' are decreed 'by company manuals' and become part of the employee's contractual obligation.[51] The "Rules for Barmaids", through this conceptual lens, constitute a form of nineteenth-century company manual. The first rule, the need to 'do good business', is glossed for her by the manager: 'It isn't every girl can attract men, and keep them at arm's length, but you must learn the trick'.[52] The rules will require Lilian to 'look smart' and 'have a pleasant manner with customers' in order to 'do good business, and bring customers about the place'.[53] Hochschild would later use the term 'transmutation of an emotional system' to describe the way in which feelings or emotions, usually thought of as private or even unconscious, must be manipulated and engineered to serve 'the profit motive'.[54] In this way, the insistence on the barmaids doing 'good business' becomes a laconic reference to the emotional labour that the barmaids must undertake as part of their employment, as members of the emotional proletariat.

The private and the personal, feelings and emotions, become corporate possessions once they have exchange value. There is some dawning recognition of this in Lilian's declamatory insight: 'I belong to the bar'.[55] As a result, Lilian begins to experience emotional dissonance, Hochschild's transmutation of an emotional system. In reality, Lilian 'hated bar customers and loathed their inane compliments' but

[51] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, p. 19.

[52] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter lll 'Why She Became A Barmaid'. https://theharkives.wordpress.com/2016/06/18/harkives-summer-serial-roses-and-crucifix-instalment-iii/ accessed 6 March 2024.

[53] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter lll 'Why She Became A Barmaid'.

[54] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, p. 19.

[55] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter Vll 'Thieves Language'. https://theharkives.wordpress.com/2016/07/16/harkives-summer-serial-roses-and-crucifix-instalment-vii/ accessed 6 March 2024.

nevertheless she 'listened patiently while customers payed [sic] her compliments…' in order to do 'good business'.[56] As Hochschild observes, 'Maintaining a difference between feeling and feigning […] leads to strain', and it is not long before Lilian begins to exhibit the signs of illness, both physical and psychological, 'a wave of disgust sweeping across her consciousness'.[57] This culminates in her death; she has been compelled to transmute her emotional system in her role as a barmaid, and this is implicated in her demise.

Harkness' novella continually returns to the expendable nature of women, for whom emotional labour is their primary task: one of the 'Rules For Barmaids', for example, is that they can be dismissed with a day's notice if they 'don't suit' and 'We never give our reasons for sending girls away'.[58] Lilian has already been dismissed from her previous relational role as a governess for 'flirting with the Squire', and thereby transgressing what Hochschild terms the unspoken Feelings Rules.[59] Macdonald and Sirianni later observed this double disadvantage, noting that roles requiring emotional labour were not only predominantly undertaken by women but also tended to be at the lower end of the pay spectrum where employees were seen as expendable.[60] At the same time, opportunities for collectivisation were limited for women in service roles. This becomes apparent in Chapter IV of *Roses and Crucifix*, titled 'The Waiter's [sic] Union Meeting'; an unlikely topic for a novel but entirely in keeping with the *tendenz-roman* purpose of both this text and the periodical in which it appeared. Harkness satirises the failed attempt to include barmaids in the Union, as both the Conservative MP who attends – and the male waiters who predominate – agree that such a move would be to 'go too fast'.[61] The single dissenting voice is one of the men attending the meeting, with his cry that 'Capital killed my sister' resulting in his ejection from the

[56] Ibid.

[57] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, p. 90; Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter Vll 'Thieves Language'.

[58] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter lll 'Why She Became A Barmaid'.

[59] Ibid. Lilian is unclear what flirting is, having only recently left a convent; the young man of the house, Mr. Grey, has flirted with her yet she is blamed and dismissed.

[60] Macdonald and Sirianni, *Working in the Service Society*, p. 11.

[61] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter lV 'The Waiter's [sic] Union Meeting'.

meeting.[62] Prior to the meeting, Mary has recognised the futility of pursuing collectivism for the emotional proletariat, saying: 'If we girls struck, the manager would get hundreds to fill our places.'[63] Those undertaking emotional labour are exploited by their employers whilst being denied the protection of a union. This speaks to socialism's fear, highlighted previously, that feminism would substitute 'sex war' for 'class war'. Barbara Taylor describes the way in which feminism was viewed by socialists 'not as an essential component of the socialist struggle, but as a disunifying, diversionary force, with no inherent connection to the socialist tradition.'[64] This explains the resistance shown in this union meeting, a fear that extending their collectivism to women will allow a dangerous feminism to somehow dilute or distract from the Waiters' Union's central purpose: class war. The fictional waiters fail to recognise that working-class women are fighting on two fronts: class and sex.

This consideration of emotional labour as a uniquely female form of workplace exploitation is distilled in Harkness' later unfinished novella *Connie,* serialised in the *Labour Elector* between June 1893 and January 1894. The socialist context of this periodical frames the novella as primarily ideological in purpose: the *Labour Elector* had initially flourished under Henry Hyde Champion's editorship in 1888, but with his departure for Australia in 1890, publication ceased and was not resumed until January 1893.[65] Although Harkness had been involved with the periodical previously, John Barnes claims that by 1893 it was likely that 'she supported the *Labour Elector* financially'.[66] What precise form this took is unclear, but it seems that she was not

[62] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter IV 'The Waiter's Union Meeting'. https://theharkives.wordpress.com/2016/06/25/harkives-summer-serial-roses-and-crucifix-instalment-iv/ accessed 6 March 2024.

[63] Margaret Harkness, *Roses and Crucifix*, Chapter IV 'The Waiter's Union Meeting'.

[64] Barbara Taylor, *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*, (London: Virago Press, 1983), p. xvi.

[65] Henry Hyde Champion was at the forefront of emerging Socialist movements in England, such as the Socialist Democratic Federation and the Independent Labour Party. He was also a prominent leader of the 1889 London Dock Strike.

[66] John Barnes, *Socialist Champion – Portrait of the Gentleman as Crusader* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2006), p. 115. In September 1889, Harkness wrote an article on 'The Loafer: What Shall we do With Him' and in 1890 her article on 'The Future of the Labour Party', which was first published in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, was then reprinted in *The Labour Elector*. Both were published under her pseudonym John Law.

remunerated for the serial *Connie*: rather, a serial by 'John Law' was intended to boost the periodical's circulation alongside the novella's ideological aim of promulgating its socialist values. Commercially, this failed as the periodical folded in 1894 with the novel unfinished.[67]

As *Connie* is so little known, I offer a brief outline of the plot. Connie Ufindel ekes out a precarious living as an actress. A chance meeting and subsequent relationship with Humphrey Munro, the son of a country squire, offers escape, especially from her alcoholic father whom she supports. However, this escape turns into a relationship of dependence upon Munro as she loses her job due to the jealousy of The Boss, her employer, and Munro moves her into a house near Kew. Melodramatic plot twists including Connie's pregnancy, meddling by Munro's sister, and misunderstandings and letters that remain undelivered, result in Connie finding herself homeless in London and reliant on the kindness of two strangers, prostitutes Bess and Flora, who take Connie in. There is no real resolution, and characters and plot lines remain frozen as in a tableau, leaving only the tentative hope of the last line in which the Squire tells Munro: 'Your wife must be my daughter.'[68] There is ideological ambivalence, too. The novella's mode is one of highly-politicised melodrama yet, as Deborah Mutch observes, if Harkness had conformed to socialist ideology, then 'both Humphrey Munro and his father would be positioned as the aristocratic threat'.[69] Instead, in the final pages, the Squire agrees that if Munro can once again find Connie, then he must persuade her to marry him. In this way, Harkness confounds readers' expectations of a conventional socialist melodrama by aligning the aristocracy and working class rather than polarising them.

---

[67] As Harkness never finished the novella, the Squire's declaration in the last sentence 'Your wife must be my daughter' has the feel of a placeholder ending.

[68] Margaret Harkness, *Connie*, Chapter XVI 'Your Wife Must Be My Daughter'. https://theharkives.wordpress.com/2017/07/22/harkives-summer-serial-connie-instalment-viii/ accessed 6 March 2024. Despite the squire's use of the word 'wife' here, Munro and Connie are not yet married. Peter Brooks notes melodrama's use of tableaux at the end of scenes or acts to 'give, like an illustrative painting, a visual summary of the emotional situation' (*The Melodramatic Imagination*, p. 48).

[69] 'Deborah Mutch, ''Connie': melodrama and Tory socialism', in *Margaret Harkness: Writing Social Engagement 1880-1921*, eds. Flore Janssen and Lisa Robertson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019), p. 155.

Harkness adopts this unconventional approach, I argue, because her ideological purpose lies in the intersectionality of class and gender, interrogated through a consideration of emotional labour. In this novella, Connie's performative emotional labour as an actress becomes emblematic of the women, both real and imagined, in Harkness' previous works for whom such labour was *im*plicit. The *ex*plicit emotional labour required by Connie's stage role is apparently uncontroversial for both actor and audience. The audience in the theatre is aware that the emotion displayed on the stage is salaried artifice, but mostly chooses to suspend disbelief. And Connie knows that, as an actress, she 'must prepare for the theatre, and there must smile and dance to amuse the audience' and thereby satisfy her employer.[70] There are echoes here of Mary and Lilian's dawning understanding in *Roses and Crucifix* – that their role is primarily productive through affective performance. There is similarity, too, in that Connie's success depends on the extent to which she can manipulate her own feelings and emotions (and thereby those of the audience) in order to serve not merely artistic but commercial ends. The audience, as customer, indirectly dictates and polices the actors' emotions whilst employers, such as the servant's mistress or the bar manager that Harkness has referenced previously, do so directly.

For an actor such as Connie, there is always some degree of Hochschild's 'transmutation of an emotional system'.[71] When employees are required to undertake emotional labour, a superficial display of fake emotion is insufficient. Instead, what is required is 'deep acting'; the employee must change their felt emotion to match the emotion that they are required to display. Although Hochschild uses the term in a quasi-metaphorical manner – after all, she is discussing flight attendants, not professional actors – this is nevertheless what is expected of Connie. Amy Wharton observes that such deep acting can result in depersonalisation, an idea that Hochschild builds upon by exploring the way in which this can lead to a 'fusion of the 'real' and 'acted' self'.[72] Elsewhere, Hochschild considers the equivalence between the kind of

[70] Margaret Harkness, *Connie*, Chapter IV 'I Thought You Were Offended'. https://theharkives.wordpress.com/2017/06/10/harkives-summer-serial-connie-instalment-ii/ accessed 6 March 2024.

[71] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, p. 19.

[72] Amy Wharton, 'Service With A Smile: Understanding the Consequences of Emotional Labor', *Working in the Service Society*, p. 94; Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, p. 133.

deep acting required from those who undertake emotional labour, and the method acting taught by Stanislavski, in which actors are required to not merely exhibit but personally experience emotions required by the role. What Hochschild seeks to demonstrate, therefore, is that where employees are required to undertake emotional labour, mere display is insufficient; it is their inner psyche that is being manipulated and commercialised. So, although Harkness observes that sometimes Connie 'took pleasure' in acting, feeling the emotions she was required to exhibit, on other nights her acting is merely performance. The superficiality of this is emphasised: 'At last the performance was over and she could wash the rouge from her cheeks and take off her gauze petticoats.'[73] However, any failure to engage in deep acting or emotional labour is noted: '"You're not well this evening," remarked the dresser.'[74] The impact of the emotional depersonalisation that Connie is experiencing, as her psyche is hijacked by 'the world of profit-and-loss statements' presents negatively to others.[75]

Connie must, therefore, not simply exhibit the required emotions but, in the interests of Capital, she must experience them too. In this way, Connie is recruited into the ranks of the emotional proletariat, alongside the slaveys and barmaids depicted in *Toilers In London.* However, Connie's emotional labour is not confined to the explicit artifice of the stage. Connie must navigate the demands of The Boss, a Jewish diamond merchant who finances the theatre and who is, by extension, her employer: 'How he leered at her when he stood at the wings with "Master" written on his ugly face.'[76] The realignment of her melodrama enables Harkness to position The Boss as the villain (rather than, as might be expected, Munro or his father the squire), deploying a range of contemporary antisemitic tropes to establish his villainy. Not least of these is his expectation that Connie's emotional labour will serve him both on, and off, the stage. Mutch reads this novella 'through the dual lenses of melodramatic form and Tory socialism' with the former presenting 'the working-class woman's powerless and precarious existence under late nineteenth-century British capitalism.'[77] I would extend

[73] Margaret Harkness, *Connie*, Chapter lV, 'I Thought You Were Offended'.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Hochschild, *The Managed Heart*, p. 133.

[76] Margaret Harkness, *Connie*, Chapter Vlll, 'The Boss Revenges Himself' https://theharkives.wordpress.com/2017/06/24/harkives-summer-serial-connie-instalment-iv/ accessed 6 March 2024.

[77] Deborah Mutch, ''Connie': melodrama and Tory socialism', p. 147.

this analysis by arguing that Mutch's powerless precarity is heightened when women like Connie are obliged by an employer to undertake emotional labour, but choose instead to resist. Harkness frequently conflates Capitalists and Jews and her use of antisemitic tropes here is intended to intensify Connie's exploitation whilst seeking to extend her readers' existing antipathy towards Jews, to Capitalism as well.

As previously noted, MacDonald and Sirianni observed that a defining feature of the economic proletariat is that they are denied both the protection of collectivism and emotional autonomy. Whilst it might be expected that Connie would lack emotional autonomy in her public role as an actress, Harkness also demonstrates how this lack of autonomy extends to the private sphere. The Boss is not only her *de facto* employer, but he also believes that his role as patron of the theatre, and therefore of Connie, extends his reach of power beyond her affective work undertaken in the theatre itself. Like the servant's mistress in *Toilers in London*, he believes that she belongs to him 'body and soul'. The diamonds that 'glistened on his fingers when he ran them through his greasy hair' are metonymic of his economic power over Connie and its reach beyond her place of employment.[78] Connie is all too aware of this; she is fearful, when at supper with Humphrey Munro, that The Boss will see her failing to follow his unwritten 'Feelings Rules' and that, like the barmaids in *Toilers In London,* she will be dismissed as a result. '"The Boss. He'll never forgive me," she said. "I shall loose [sic] my engagement."'[79] Consequently, when Connie refuses to go out to supper with The Boss the following evening, implicitly refusing to undertake emotional labour that has exchange value, she loses her job.

It is Connie's assertion of emotional autonomy which leads to her dismissal; she knows that The Boss 'was master in the theatre with power to have her salary raised or get her dismissed'.[80] As MacDonald and Sirianni observe, when an employee's primary role is to carry out emotional labour, managers then expect 'to control workers' personal and psychic lives too'.[81] The Boss seeks to extend his mastery, and thereby his economic 'ownership' of Connie, to her inner life beyond the theatre, reaching into her domestic or private sphere. This translates what is required from Connie in these

[78] Margaret Harkness, *Connie*, Chapter Vlll 'The Boss Revenges Himself'.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Macdonald and Sirianni, *Working In a Service Society*, p. 4.

spheres from emotional use, or emotional management into emotional labour because it has exchange value. Connie's refusal to participate in this exchange signals her innocence in the moral universe of this melodrama, as befits a melodramatic heroine, but simultaneously precipitates her into a precarious existence in London.

Homeless, unemployed, and pregnant, Connie, the actress, is taken in by prostitutes Bess and Flora.[82] Harkness recognises the contingency of these roles; for many Victorians, there was a blurred line of immorality between acting and prostitution. Although Harkness has already established Connie as a moral heroine, she nevertheless positions the morality of this melodrama as more nuanced and less binary than one might expect. Harkness contrasts the kindness of Bess and Flora with the exploitation of the capitalist Boss, a name that signals a generic representation of management and the ownership of capital. Connie's pregnancy protects her from the taint of stage roles, or even sex work, but Bess' comment that 'You won't get any sort of work, depend on that' is ambiguous.[83] It is not solely Connie's physical condition that precludes employment; rather, her advanced pregnancy is a constant reminder to customer and employer alike that any emotional labour she might seek to undertake is perforce flawed and insincere. If emotional labour is to have exchange value it must first be authentically felt by the employee and then perceived by the employer, or customer, as authentic. By interpolating itself into the exchange, Connie's visible pregnancy would be a constant reminder to all the inauthenticity of any emotion she might seek to display, whether as actress or prostitute.

The labour of working-class women, such as those in Harkness' sociological studies who were the real-life counterparts of Mary, Lilian and Connie, has, in the broadest sense, long been marginalised and ignored, elbowed out of fiction and subsequent critical attention by the disruptive novelty of the middle-class New Woman's foray into professional life.[84] Yet, for her part, motivated by ideological and

[82] The baby is Munro's and he has promised marriage, but due to melodramatic machinations by his sister Dinah, to protect the family wealth, Connie appears lost to him.

[83] Margaret Harkness, *Connie,* Chapter XlV 'Bess and Flora', https://theharkives.wordpress.com/2017/07/15/harkives-summer-serial-connie-instalment-vii/ accessed 6 March 2024.

[84] Whilst these three fictional characters are not taken directly from Harkness' sociological studies, there are nevertheless striking similarities between the experiences of the unnamed barmaids in Harkness' *Toilers in London* and the experiences of Mary and Lilian in *Roses and Crucifix*.

political conviction, Harkness was determined to bring working-class women and their labour to the forefront. More than this, I argue that what emerges from this reading of Harkness' work is a specific, unifying thread: the problematic nature of emotional labour for working-class women. Harkness demonstrates that the intersectional oppression of this requirement is layered over the already hostile environments of workplace and marketplace. E. Ann Kaplan observes that nineteenth-century fiction 'manages to articulate woman's oppressive positioning in such a way that their positioning is exposed, even though the text does not usually consciously critique it.'[85] This summarises Harkness' work: she is writing long before emotional labour was theorised and is therefore precluded from offering an explicit critique informed by this theoretical framework but, nevertheless, her writing works to expose this particular expression of class and gender disadvantage. Harkness may not have had the same terminology to critique it, but in her sociological studies and her fictional representations of working-class women, her writing articulates a specific oppression, that of emotional labour, that would elude theoretical and ideological notice for another hundred years.

❖ ❖ ❖

BIOGRAPHY: Rosemary Archer is a third-year PhD researcher at Loughborough University. Her doctorate, provisionally titled 'Writing Women's Work', considers how various facets of working-class female labour at the fin de siècle are represented in Margaret Harkness' fiction and journalism. Rosemary holds a BA (Hons) from Reading University and an MA in Victorian Studies from the University of Leicester where her dissertation on infanticide in the Victorian novel won the Waddington MA Prize for English. She presented a paper on working-class women's emotional labour at the Romance, Revolution and Reform conference in 2024.

CONTACT: r.j.archer@lboro.ac.uk

[85] E. Ann Kaplan, *Motherhood and Representation: The Mother in Popular Culture and Melodrama*, (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 126.