



A University of Sussex PhD thesis

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

**SYMBOLIC JEWELS:
THE MILITARY SWEETHEART BROOCH
IN WARTIME BRITAIN**

Penelope Streeter

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD, Art History
at the University of Sussex

March 2018

VOLUME 1

I hereby declare that this thesis has not been and will not be, submitted in whole or in part to another University for the award of any other degree.

Signature

Acknowledgements

Firstly I would like to thank Dr. Meaghan Clarke for agreeing to supervise this thesis and for her invaluable feedback, constructive guidance and support throughout.

In addition my thanks go to Professor Liz James, whose serendipitous discovery of a long out-of-print copy of Mabell Airlie's memoirs, with its account of the first sweetheart brooch, provided me with a starting point from which to structure the study. Dr. Flora Dennis, Dr. Anne Stutchbury and Dr. Emma Doubt read draft copies and their helpful comments were all much appreciated. My research could not have been undertaken without the assistance of the many archivists, librarians and curators who were so generous with their time and knowledgeable about their collections, providing photographs, documents and information. Too numerous to list here, they are credited throughout and at the end of the thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Steve Wharton, who encouraged me to pursue the subject and Dr. Alistair Grant, who was enthusiastic about metalwork in his home city of Birmingham and provided useful background information.

This study deals with sensitive objects connected to emotional experiences and wartime bereavement, so I particularly appreciate the help of all those individuals who were kind enough to allow me to write about the very personal stories of their relatives, lent me their brooches, sent family photographs and diaries and shared their memories.

Finally, I would like to thank all my family for their encouragement and support including my parents, who would have loved to know about this, and George and Jack, who keep everything in perspective.

University of Sussex
PENELOPE STREETER
PhD, Art History

**SYMBOLIC JEWELS:
THE MILITARY SWEETHEART BROOCH
IN WARTIME BRITAIN**

Abstract

This thesis examines the role of military badge brooches, miniature replicas of regimental insignia worn by women from the 1880s to the present day. Often given to mark personal relationships, they became known generically as ‘sweetheart brooches’ but in fact communicated much more than this, articulating societal solidarity, status, concepts of patriotism and frequently commemoration. Their tangible presence in the quotidian lives of women across all strata of society maintained links between personnel on the front line and those on the home front but no academic investigation has been conducted into them and they are conspicuously absent from studies of jewellery, dress or material culture.

Starting with the brooches themselves and synthesising case studies, archival material and primary documentation, the thesis aims to address this gap in scholarship. Five chapters consider their significance to wartime society. They denoted military history, became a vital part of the jewellery trade and were promoted as propaganda. For the women who wore them they might be fashion items, wedding jewellery, talismanic charms, status symbols or memory objects. The brooches are considered in conjunction with images as commemorations of events and people and situated within the history of the earlier sentimental jewels from which they evolved.

Regimental sweetheart brooches were ubiquitous across all walks of society, forming part of the pervasive visual wartime background. The study shifts the emphasis of conflict-related art from male uniforms and artefacts towards the concerns of women on the home front by considering these evocative but hitherto unexplored jewels through the approaches of material culture, commercial interests, museums and the oral and written testimonies of those who gave and wore them, demonstrating that they should be integrated into the historiography of jewellery and conflict artworks.

Volume I

Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
List of Illustrations	8
Introduction	30
Defining a Sweetheart Brooch	35
Focus of the Thesis	36
Excluded objects	36
Timeframe of the thesis	37
Geographical Scope	39
Literature and Scholarship Review	40
Methodology and Sources	45
Thesis Structure	50
 Chapter 1: Military Insignia to Personal Adornment:	
The Origins of the Sweetheart Brooch	
1.1 Introduction	54
1.2 The Gunners' Badge	56
1.3 Banners and Badges 'to Avoide Confusion'	59
1.4 Badges, Devices and Brooches	62
1.5 'An Atmosphere of Patriotic Fervour': Tin Badges, Paintings and Music-Hall Songs	70
1.6 Sentimental Jewellery: Puzzles, Flowers and Meaningful Stones	75
1.7 A New Fashion in Jewellery: The Airlie Brooch	79
1.8 Conclusion	87
 Chapter 2: Sweetheart Brooches and the Jewellers:	
Making and Selling	
2.1 Introduction	89
2.2 'Unknown except to the Merchants': Manufacturing In London and Birmingham	89
2.3 'A Sheet of Metal to a Bright Gold Ornament'	99

2.4 'His House as a Workshop'	105
2.5. 'The Best Patriotic Emblem': Luxury in Wartime	109
2.6 Uniforms to Brooches	119
2.7 Conclusion	121

Chapter 3: Wartime Governments, Gendered Propaganda and the Sweetheart Brooch

3.1 Introduction	123
3.2 'That all-important recruiting-agency, his sister or sweetheart': Women, jewellery and Gendered propaganda in the Great War	124
3.3 Images of gendered propaganda	129
3.4 'Choose the proper sort': Women as reward	133
3.5 'Shaming these laggards': Symbols, Badges and Jewellery in WWI	136
3.6 Viewing the war from the Front and the Home Front	143
3.7 'Every mother's son'	147
3.8 'Wear the brooch of his regiment': Women, Jewellery and Propaganda in WWII	151
3.9 Symbols, Badges and Jewellery in WWII	154
3.10 Creating the Hero: Guy Gibson's Gold Wings Brooch	164
3.11 Conclusion	

Chapter 4: 'Every Female Seemed to Wear One': Wearing Sweetheart Brooches in Wartime Britain

4.1 Introduction	166
4.2 'A Nice Jumper and Skirt, with lots of Jewellery': Sweetheart Brooches as Fashion	167
4.3 'Wartime is Wedding Time'	173
4.4 Self-fashioning: Sweetheart Brooches as Identity in Wartime	182
4.5 Rings and Wings: Sweetheart Brooches and Status	184
4.6 Medals and Brooches	186
4.7 Lady Congreve's Brooch	190
4.8 'Hope it will bring you luck': Sweetheart Brooches as Amulets and Talismans	190

4.9 Sweetheart Brooches as Mourning and Memory Objects	200
4.10 Brooches and Public Memorials	208
4.11 Conclusion	218
Chapter 5: Brooches with Images, Images of Brooches	
5.1 Introduction	220
5.2 Portrait Miniatures to Military Brooches	221
5.3 Images of a Marriage: Two Portraits of Anna Maria Crouch	224
5.4 Public Image, Hidden Message: Major Fleming Hartley's gift	230
5.5 Sweetheart Brooch with Photograph of an Unknown Boy	236
5.6 Woman with Navy Sweetheart Brooch	237
5.7 'A Link to Bind': Uniform Buttons and Hidden Images	238
5.8 Photography and the Sweetheart Brooch: A First World War Soldier and his Bride	239
5.9 The Paratrooper's Brooch	244
5.10 Conclusion	245
Conclusion	247
Bibliography	258
Appendix 1: Methods of Research	283
Appendix 2: Museums and Archives	288
Table 1: Military Museums	290
Table 2: Museums of Design and Social History	301
Table 3: Jewellers and Archives	304
Volume 2	
Illustrations	1- 120

List of Illustrations

Figure 1

Royal Irish Rifles Sweetheart Brooch. Undated. Diamond harp, diamond and enamel Imperial (King's) crown, motto 'QUIS SEPARABIT' (Translated as 'Who will separate/divide [us]') above a diamond bugle. Sold at auction by Christie's, South Kensington, 2.9.2003. Image: URL: <http://www.christies.com/lotfinder/Lot/a-diamond-and-enamel-regimental-sweetheart-brooch-4142457-details.aspx> [accessed 3.9.2016].

Figure 2

Sweetheart brooch of the Royal Scots Fusiliers. c.1914. 15ct yellow gold, silver setting, 39 Old European cut and Dutch-cut diamonds (2.13 carats total), raised enamels. H.4.5cm. Image: © ACSilver, URL: <http://www.acsilver.co.uk/shop/pc/-2-13ct-Diamond-15ct-Yellow-Gold-Royal-Scots-Fusiliers-Regimental-Brooch-Antique-Circa-1914-35p7010.htm> [accessed 17.12.2015].

Figure 3

Bickerton, Birmingham. *Sweetheart brooch of the 17th/21st Lancers.* 2016. 9ct gold, diamonds, rubies, enamels. Image: © Bickerton, URL: http://www.bickertonjewellery.com/17th_21st_lancers [accessed 2.4.2016].

Figure 4

Royal Artillery Cap Badge (the Gunners). c.1903. Metal. Image: National Army Museum, URL: <https://www.nam.ac.uk/explore/royal-artillery> [accessed 14.2.2015].

Figure 5

'Screened from Hostile Airmen: British Gunners in Action at the Front' (right), *Illustrated War News*, 23.12.1914, p.38.

Figure 6

Goldsmiths & Silversmiths Company 'Military Badge Jewellery' Advertisement. *Illustrated War News*, 'Great War Deeds' Special Edition, 23.5.1916, page unknown, depicting Royal Artillery brooch at lower right.

Figure 7

Unknown woman wearing a Royal Artillery sweetheart brooch. c.1914-1918. Image: <https://www.facebook.com/Sweetheart-Brooches-of-the-Great-War-1388245738129729> [accessed 25.4.2014].

Figure 8

Royal Artillery Sweetheart Brooch. c.1930s. 18ct white gold & platinum, round brilliant cut diamonds and square sapphires and rubies. Image: © Hatton Jewels, URL: https://www.hattonjewels.com/royal_artillery_sweetheart_brooch.html [accessed 3.6.2014].

Figure 9

Sweetheart Brooch of the Royal Artillery mounted on brass (?) wishbone, on original card. 1939-40s? Brass(?), enamel. 3.2 x 1.9cm. Image: eBay, URL: <http://www.ebay.ie/itm/C1930S-VINTAGE-ROYAL-ARTILLERY-WISHBONE-SHAPE-SWEETHEARTS-PIN-BROOCH-ON-ITS-CARD-/141918354527?hash=item210afe3c5f:g:zbgAAOSwFNZWzZA9>[accessed 1.4.2016].

Figure 10

Lance-Bombadier Ron Goldstein, Royal Artillery, showing the RA cap badge. c.1942. Black and white photo on paper. Image: courtesy of Ron Goldstein.

Figure 11

Royal Artillery Sweetheart Brooch belonging to Nita Goldstein, c.1940s, metal, red and blue enamels. Image: courtesy of Ron Goldstein.

Figure 12

The Master of the Harley Froissart, collaborating with the Master of the Vienna *Chroniques d'Angleterre*, 'Tents and Mounted Knights(detail)', *The 'Harley Froissart'*, Vol.IV, Part I, f.23.v., c1470-1472. Netherlands (Bruges). Froissart, Jean (Author), *Chronicles* [14C]. Parchment codex, penwork, gold. Collection of British Library, London. Image:British Library, URL: <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=7233>[accessed 25.4.2016].

Figure 13

The Wilton Diptych. Richard II presented to the Virgin and Child by his Patron Saint John the Baptist and Saints Edward and Edmund. c.1395-1399. English or French. Egg tempera and gold on oak. 53 x 37 cm. Image: National Gallery, URL: <https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/english-or-french-the-wilton-diptych>[accessed 2.4.2016].

Figure 14

The Wilton Diptych (detail), showing the white hart, peascod and rosemary sprigs woven into Richard II's robe, the bejewelled peascod collar sent to him by Charles VI and the brooch bearing his own white hart emblem with pearls on the antlers. The original of the brooch may have been made of gold with opaque white enamel.

Figure 15

Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (attributed to). *The 'Rainbow' Portrait.* c.1600-1603. Oil on canvas. 127x99.1cm. In the collection of the Marquess of Salisbury. On display at Hatfield Hatfield House. Image: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Portraiture_of_Elizabeth_I_of_England[accessed 2.3.2014].

Figure 16

Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (attributed to). *The 'Rainbow' Portrait.* (detail showing the gauntlet brooch).

Figure 17

Nicholas Hilliard, *George Clifford, 3rd Earl of Cumberland*. c.1590. Watercolour and body colour, gold and silver leaf, on vellum laid on fruitwood panel. 258x176mm. Caird Collection, National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, London. Image: NMM, URL: <http://collections.rmg.co.uk/collections/objects/42140.html>[accessed 2.5.2015].

Figure 18

Military Trophy Brooch. c.1750. Made Western Europe. Silver, rose-cut diamonds. V&A Museum, London. Image: V&A URL: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O152479/brooch-unknown/>[accessed 27.5.2015].

Figure 19

R & S Garrard & Co. Thought to have been designed by Prince Albert. *The Nightingale Jewel*. 1855. Brooch presented to Florence Nightingale by Queen Victoria. National Army Museum. Image: NAM website, URL: <http://www.nam.ac.uk/online-collection/detail.php?acc=1963-10-280-1>[accessed 3.6.2014].

Figure 20

R & S Garrard & Co. Co. Thought to have been designed by Prince Albert. *The Nightingale Jewel (reverse)*. 1855. Brooch presented to Florence Nightingale by Queen Victoria. National Army Museum. Image: NAM, URL: <http://www.nam.ac.uk/online-collection/detail.php?acc=1963-10-280-1>[accessed 3.6.2014].

Figure 21

Florence Nightingale and the 'Nightingale Jewel'. *Illustrated Times*, London, Saturday, February 2, 1856, front page. © The British Library Board. Image: British Newspaper Archive, URL: <https://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/viewer/BL/0000357/18560202/001/0001>[accessed 30.9.2014].

Figure 22

Whitehead & Hoag, Newark N.J., *Lapel badge with printed image of Sir Hector Archibald MacDonald KCB, DSO*. C.1900. Paper, tin with pin fastening, c.1900. Sold on eBay 2016. Image: eBay, URL: <https://www.ebay.co.uk/itm/Vintage-1900-Gen.Hector.Macdonald-Pin-Made-By-Whitehead-Hoag-Co/142521612864?hash=item212ef33a40:g:ZxYAAOSwyrIZzUmx>[accessed 27.11.2015].

Figure 23

J. Francis & Co., Advertisement for 'Kharki' brooch. Publication unknown. c.1899-1900. Bought on eBay 2016. Author's collection.

Figure 24

Edmund Blair Leighton. *Stitching the Standard*. 1911. Oil on canvas. 98x44cm. Private collection.

Image: © Sotheby's, URL:

<http://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/2011/victorian-edwardian-art/lot.51.html>[accessed 13.4.2016].

Figure 25

Eastman Johnson. *The Girl I Left Behind Me*. c.1872. Oil on Canvas.

106.7x88.7cm. Smithsonian American Art Museum. Image:©

<http://americanart.si.edu/collections/search/artwork/?id=11492>[accessed:28.12.2016].

Figure 26

Botley & Lewis, '*The Girl he left behind him*', Advertisement, *The Lion and the Rose*, Journal of the King's Own Royal Lancaster Regiment, c.1915-1918. Image: courtesy of Peter Donnelly, Curator, Museum of the King's Own Royal Regiment, Lancaster.

Figure 27

'*She Won't Forget You*', Advertisement. *Newcastle Journal and North Mail*.

10.10.1941, p.2.

Figure 28

Bee Stick Pin. 1860-1870. British Museum, Hull Grundy Collection. Gold, enamel.

Image: British Museum,

URL:http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=627390001&objectId=77429&partId=1#more-views[accessed 17.3.2015].

Figure 29

George Dunlop Leslie. *The Language of Flowers*. 1885. Oil on Canvas.

112.3x145cm. Manchester Art Gallery Accession No.1900.9. Image: © Manchester Art Gallery.

Figure 30

Brooch. c. 1850. English. Gold, turquoise, diamonds. Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Image: V&A: URL:<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O144689/brooch-unknown/>[accessed 12.12.2014].

Figure 31

Dove Brooch, c.1890. 14ct yellow gold set with turquoise and diamonds. Image: Art and Antiques, URL:<http://www.onlinegalleries.com/art-and-antiques/detail/antique-victorian-turquoise-and-015-ct-diamond-14-ct-yellow-gold-dove-brooch/183746>[accessed 4.4.2015].

Figure 32

W. Bolus & Co. Ltd. Order to Smith & Pepper, 4 November 1911. Smith & Pepper Order Book, p.47, O/N.W9198.W10.Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham. Photo: Author.

Figure 33

W. Bolus & Co. Ltd. Order to Smith & Pepper, 4 November 1911 (detail) showing designs of birds to be used on brooches. Smith & Pepper Order Book, p.47, O/N.W9198.W10. Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham. Photo: Author.

Figure 34

'The Marriage of Lord Airlie: The Wedding Presents', *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, 21.1.1886, p.7.

Figure 35

The Airlie Brooch. 1885-1886. Insignia of the 10th Royal (Prince of Wales' Own) Hussars. 18ct white gold, 200 rose-cut diamonds, blue enamel. H 4.5x W 3cm. Collection of the King's Royal Hussars, Tidworth, Wiltshire, known as 'the Commanding Officer's Brooch'. Photo: Author, by kind permission of the King's Royal Hussars.

Figure 36

The Airlie Brooch (reverse). Photo: Author, by kind permission of the King's Royal Hussars.

Figure 37

Alexander Bassano. *David William Stanley Ogilvy, 6th Earl of Airlie.* 1883. Half-plate glass negative. Image: © National Portrait Gallery, London. Ref.NPG127643.

Figure 38

Mabell, Countess of Airlie. 3rd December 1901. [Photographs. English Portraits Volume 58. 1893.] RCIN 2911913. Image: © H M Queen Elizabeth II. Royal Collection:
URL: <https://www.royalcollection.org.uk>[accessed 3.9.2015].

Figure 39

Alexander Bassano. *Mabell Frances Elizabeth, Countess of Airlie,* 5 June 1939. Half-plate film negative. NPG156375. Image: National Portrait Gallery, URL: <http://www.npg.org.uk>[accessed 3.9.1915].

Figure 40

John James Basire the Elder. *The Procession of King Edward VI from the Tower of London to Westminster, Feb.XIX, MDXLVII, previous to his coronation.* Published 1788. Engraving on paper from drawings by S. H. Grimm of a contemporary painting, now lost, at Cowdray Park. Oxburgh Hall, Norfolk. Image:© National Trust.

Figure 41

John James Basire the Elder. *The Procession of King Edward VI from the Tower of London to Westminster, Feb.XIX, MDXLVII, previous to his coronation (detail).*

Figure 42

Button. 1795. Birmingham. Cut steel, the outer rim of beads individually riveted in place on a cast plate. Diameter: 2.8 cm. V&A, London, M.30-1997. Image: V&A, URL: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O78537> [accessed 1.12.2014].

Figure 43

Dante Gabriel Rossetti. *Jane Morris as 'Beatrice'*. 1879. Oil on canvas. 36.5x30cm. Auctioned by Christie's, London, 15 June 2015, Sale 11148. Image: © Christie's, URL: christies.com.

Figure 44

Map of the Birmingham Jewellery Quarter (2011). Image: Jewellery Quarter Development Trust, URL: <http://www.jqdt.org/the-area/> [accessed 17.3.2016].

Figure 45

Smith & Pepper Order Book, p.73. J.S. Greenberg & Co. Ltd., 15 September 1919 with instruction 'Goods to be stamped with our punch sent h/w' and Deakin & Francis Ltd., 22 September 1919 instruction 'Would like these goods marked with our initials'. Collections No. 2071/234, 1918-23, Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham. Photo: Author.

Figure 46

Kent Artillery Volunteers Sweetheart Brooch, c.1910. White horse of Kent rendered in white gold set with diamonds, garter in yellow gold over blue *basse taille* enamel with regimental motto 'Quo Fas Et Gloria Ducunt' surmounted by the Royal crest of a lion statant guardant in white gold set over the Imperial State Crown in yellow and white gold set with rubies and diamonds. 39mmx20mm. Image: <http://www.armoury.co.uk/regimental-brooches> [accessed 1.3.2015].

Figure 47

Large drop-stamp machine, or 'monkey-press' and lapping machine. Image: Edwin W. Streeter, *Hints to purchasers of jewellery on the relative value of the different qualities of gold* (8th Edition Part II), (London: 1867), p.37.

Figure 48

Small drop-stamp machine. Smith & Pepper Factory, Museum of the Jewellery Quarter. Photo: Author.

Figure 49

Dies for drop-stamping machine, for use with brooches. Smith & Pepper Factory, Museum of the Jewellery Quarter. Photo: Author.

Figure 50

Embossed shape for a brooch, and metal shapes cut from a sheet of metal, Smith & Pepper Factory, Museum of the Jewellery Quarter. Photo: Author.

Figure 51

T. & J. Bragg, *Machine made gold brooch and component parts with steel dies*. 1872. V&A, London. Accession No.915:1, 2, A to M-1875. Image: V&A Museum, URL: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O76533/brooch-and-component-t-j-bragg/> [accessed 15.7.2014].

Figure 52

Bradley & Cohn Order to Smith & Pepper, 3 February 1913. Smith & Pepper Order Book, p.223 (detail), O/N.10019.626. Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham. Photo: Author.

Figure 53

Elkington & Co. *Liverpool 'Pals' Sweetheart Brooch*. WWI. Birmingham. Silver-gilt. H 2.9cm. Image: <http://www.regimentalbrooches.com/shop.php?c=470> [accessed 15.11.2014].

Figure 54

Unknown woman wearing Liverpool Pals sweetheart brooch. WWI. Image: bought on eBay 28.6.2015. Author's collection.

Figure 55

Elkington & Co. Ltd., Trade Catalogue. c.1920. Birmingham. Image: courtesy of Dr. Alistair Grant.

Figure 56

R. J. Wakefield, Jeweller, 48 Tenby Street, Hockley, Birmingham,. 1868. Image: Newman University, Birmingham, URL: <http://www.newmanlocalhistory.org.uk/?p=649> [accessed 31.4.2014].

Figure 57

15 Hatton Garden, workshop (first floor rear). 1971. London Metropolitan Archives, Collage Collection. © City of London.

Figure 58

Demonstration at a jeweller's bench, Smith & Pepper Factory, Museum of the Jewellery Quarter. June 2014. Photo: Author.

Figure 59

North Staffordshire Sweetheart Brooch. WWI. Brass (?), enamel. Private Collection. Image: courtesy of Giles Guthrie.

Figure 60

Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers sweetheart brooch, 1939-45. Brass (?), enamel. Private Collection. Image: courtesy of Giles Guthrie.

Figure 61

Mr. and Mrs Bishop of Brentford W. London. Bishop wears cap badge of Royal Fusiliers, 16th Battalion, City of London Regiment. Mrs Bishop wears associated sweetheart brooch. c1940. Black and white photo. Image: Robin Dickers, ARTY-BOYS: The History & War Diary of the 10th Medium Regiment (Royal Fusiliers) (Lonsdale, 2010).

Figure 62

Advertisement for J. R. Gaunt & Son, Peck's Circular, 1896-7, p.32.

Figure 63

National War Savings Committee Poster. 1916. Letterpress on paper, 763mmx507mm. Printers Roberts & Leete Ltd., London. Image: Imperial War Museum London, Catalogue No. IWM PST 10122.

Figure 64

Goldsmiths & Silversmiths' 'Military Badge Jewellery', advertisement, in Colour magazine, February 1917. Image: Mary Evans Picture Library, Ref. 10731515.

Figure 65

Illustrated London News, Special 'Great War Deeds Supplement Cover, 1915.

Figure 66

Goldsmiths and Silversmiths Advertisement for Regimental Brooches, Illustrated London News, Inside front cover, above left. 1915.

Figure 67

Canteen, No.3 Rest Camp, Folkestone. WWI. Photo postcard. Purchased through eBay, from C & R Spurgin. Author's collection.

Figure 68

Canteen, No.3 Rest Camp, Folkestone (detail, showing display of sweetheart brooches).

Figure 69

Advertisement, W.A.P. Watson, British Jeweller, Vol.8, No.6, February 1941, pages unnumbered.

Figure 70

Advertisement, Thomas L. Mott Ltd., British Jeweller, Vol.8, No.6, February 1941, pages unnumbered.

Figure 71

Advertisement, Bravingtons Ltd., Badges and Emblems of the Services (London: N.A.G. Press: London, 1940), outside back cover.

Figure 72

Sweetheart Brooch, King's Own Royal Regiment (Lancaster), one of three possibly (?) made by Sergeant Richard Hamblett c.1939. Reverse marked 'Bethlehem'. Mother-of-pearl. Accession Number KO2467/02. Museum of the King's Own Royal Regiment (Lancaster). Image: kind permission of Peter Donnelly, Curator, Museum of the King's Own Royal Regiment (Lancaster).

Figure 73

Major C R G Barrington, *Sweetheart brooch, Royal West African Frontier Force*. 1942-1943. Gold. Collection of Imperial War Museum, London. No. INS773. Image: IWM: URL: <http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/30070700>[accessed 23.5.2014].

Figure 74

Army Service Corps Sweetheart Brooch. 1900, made in Birmingham. Silver (?). Image:Regimentalbrooches.com. URL: <http://www.regimentalbrooches.com/viewphoto.php?shop=13245&phqu=2>[accessed 30.3.2015].

Figure 75

Photograph, front row, left to right, Mary, Charlotte and Ellen McCarroll, with their grandmother, Mary Walker. WWI. Personal collection. Photograph by kind permission of Christine Begg.

Figure 76

Sweetheart brooch of the 9th Battalion (Princess Victoria's) Royal Irish Fusiliers (one of the brooches worn in the photograph in Figure 75). WWI. Silver, enamel, on mother-of-pearl background. Photograph by kind permission of Christine Begg.

Figure 77

Savile Lumley. *Daddy, What did YOU do in the Great War?* Printed by Johnson, Riddle & Co., Published by the Parliamentary Recruiting Committee. Colour lithograph, ink on paper. Imperial War Museum, London. Image:IWM: URL: <http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/17053>[accessed 17.6.2014].

Figure 78

Poster of Recruiting Poem: 'Fall In', by Harold Begbie, by Begbie, Harold. November 1914. © The Great War Archive, University of Oxford / Primary Contributor via *First World War Poetry Digital Archive*, URL:<http://www1lit.nsms.ox.ac.uk/www1lit/gwa/item/5204>. [accessed 2.9.2017].

Figure 79

Unknown Artist. *'To the Young Women of London' Poster*. c.1915. Produced by the Voluntary Recruiting Committee, Great Britain. Letterpress on paper. H.759xw.508mm. Image: Imperial War Museum, London: URL: <http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/28305>[accessed: 23.9.2015].

Figure 80

H. Brandon & Co. *Advertisement for Regimental Sweetheart Brooches*. *The Daily Mirror*, 26.6.1915, p.10.

Figure 81

Wilson, David, W.F.B., (Artist), *Red Cross or Iron Cross? Poster*. Dangerfield Printing Company (Printer). Lithograph on paper. N.D. H.759x509mm. Image:© IWM, London (Art.IWM PST 13544).

URL:<https://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/38215>[accessed 4.6.2015].

Figure 82

Women of Britain Say 'Go'. Parliamentary Recruiting Committee. Poster. 1915. Paper, lithograph. H.759x505mm. Image: ©Imperial War Museum, London (Art.IWM PST 2763). URL:

<http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/14592>[accessed 4.6.2015].

Figure 83

Postcard to E. A. Brookes. IWM, URL:

<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/podcasts/voices-of-the-first-world-war/podcast-3-joining-up#&gid=1&pid=2>Document 5020 [accessed 4.9.2015].

Figure 84

Vesta Tilley as a 'Tommy'. *The Tatler*, 17 January 1917, front cover.

Figure 85

C. B. Stanley. *Unknown medical orderly of the Royal Army Medical Corps with his family.* 1914-1918. Leicester. Black and white photograph. Image © TACA, The Army Children's Archive.

Figure 86

Women of England's Active Service League form, included with Orczy's appeal. *Daily Mail*, 5 August 1914.

Figure 87

Fred Spurgin. *'This Little Thing', The Derby Scheme.* 1915. Postcard, full colour. Image: Picture Postcards from the Great War 1914-1918 website,

URL:<https://www.worldwar1postcards.com/comic-cards.php>[accessed 27.4.2016].

Figure 88

Roll of Individuals entitled to the 'WAR BADGE' with Harry Harrop's name (4th row) and his badge.. 18th August 1917, Warwick. War Office Certificate, Infantry Records. Badge: author's collection. Image: author.

Figure 89

Unknown young man wearing Silver War Badge on right lapel (and regimental tie pin?).

WWI. Black and white photograph., purchased from Andrew Read, through eBay. Author's collection.

Figure 90

'On War Service' Badge 1915, issued to Alfred Armitage. Brass. Donated by Sue Armitage, Alfred's great-niece. Image: Europaeana Collections, Alfred Armitage, URL:https://www.europeana.eu/portal/en/record/2020601/contributions_17174.html#&gid=1&pid=7[accessed 21.1.1918].

Figure 91

Unknown young woman wearing her 'On War Service' badge. c.1915. Photograph.
Image: photodetective URL:<http://www.photodetective.co.uk/OWS1916-A.html>[accessed 3.9.2015].

Figure 92

A young munitions worker wearing her 'On War Service', identifying badge issued to munitions workers (see below). c.1916. Black and white photograph. Image: Photodetective:
URL: <http://www.photodetective.co.uk/OWS1916-A.html>[accessed 3.9.2015].

Figure 93

'On War Work' badge on original card with verse 'From a Munition Worker'. 1914-1918. Metal, card. Image: Archiveshub. URL: <https://archiveshub.jisc.ac.uk/features/imperialwarmuseum/munitionworkersbadge.html>[accessed 3.9.2015].

Figure 94

Lewis & McIntyre advertisement for Old Mancunians colours, Khaki shirts and Regimental brooches. Ulula, Magazine of Manchester Grammar School, February 1916.

Figure 95

Mr and Mrs Gordon Richardson. 1917. Black and white postcard. Image from the Elstob family album. Private collection. Image by kind permission of Roger Vaughan, Roger Vaughan Photograph Collection.

Figure 96

Soldier of the Loyal North Lancashire Regiment with his family. WWI. Black and white photograph. Possibly taken in Blackpool. Image: © The Loyal North Lancashire Regiment 1914-1918 URL: <https://www.loyalregiment.com/photo-lnl-soldier-and-family/>[accessed 2.1.2018].

Figure 97

Thomas Cantrell Dugdale (artist). *'They can't get on without us'. ATS Forces Recruitment Poster. WWII. Pastel and gouache on paper.* Collection of the National Archives. Catalogue Number: INF 3/117. Image: National Archives: URL: http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/theartofwar/prop/home_front/INF3_0117.htm[accessed 20.2.2016].

Figure 98

'Loose lips sink ships' brooch. Metal. WWII. Image: Pinterest: URL: <https://www.pinterest.co.uk/pin/188869778095730687/?lp=true>[accessed 20.9.2017].

Figure 99

'Victory V' sweetheart brooch. 1941-1945. Enamel, pearl, silver. Sold on eBay. Image: eBay, URL: <https://www.ebay.ie/itm/V-For-Victory-Vintage-WWII-/263741360412?hash=item3d6835c91c>[accessed 21.3.2010].

Figure 100

Victory 'V' Sweetheart Brooch with Morse Code sign. WWII. 2 x 1 ½ “. Brass, enamels. Sold on Etsy, 2015. Image:Etsy,URL:
<http://www.etsy.com/shop/thevelvetgarage>.

Figure 101

RAF Wings and Crown Sweetheart Brooch, gift of Wing Commander Gibson to Joyce Meade. 9 carat gold, red and blue enamels. 1944. The brooch is shown on the letter he sent her on 18 September 1944 (detail, showing Gibson's signature). Image courtesy of © Burstow & Hewett, Auctioneers, Battle, East Sussex.

Figure 102

Wing Commander Guy Penrose Gibson, VC, DSO and Bar, 1943-1944. Royal Canadian Air Force Collection, taken at the Royal Canadian Air Force Station at Rockliffe, Ontario, Canada. Imperial War Museum, London. Catalogue No.MH6673. Image retrieved from website of Imperial War Museum, URL:
<http://www.iwm.or.uk/collections/item/object/205125230>[accessed 7.7.2015].

Figure 103

Guy Gibson's letter to Joyce Meade dated 18 September 1944 (first page) and the brooch. Image courtesy of © Burstow & Hewett.

Figure 104

Unknown woman wearing Royal Artillery sweetheart brooch on white enamel background. WWI. Image: <https://www.facebook.com/Sweetheart-Brooches-of-the-Great-War-1388245738129729/>[accessed 6.6.2015].

Figure 105

Unknown woman wearing Prince of Wales Own, Regiment of Yorkshire sweetheart brooch. WWI. Image <https://www.facebook.com/Sweetheart-Brooches-of-the-Great-War-1388245738129729/>[accessed 6.6.2015].

Figure 106

Unknown couple, man in Royal Flying Corps uniform, woman wearing RFC sweetheart brooch. 1916-1918.

Image from the Elstob family album. Photograph. Private collection. Image: by kind permission of Roger Vaughan, Roger Vaughan Photograph Collection.

Figure 107

Uniformed women postal workers wearing sweetheart brooches, from left, Royal Artillery, Canadian badge and Queen's Royal (West Surrey). WWI. Image: <https://www.facebook.com/Sweetheart-Brooches-of-the-Great-War-1388245738129729/>[accessed 6.6.2015].

Figure 108

'Hats go Military', *Derbyshire Times*, 17.11.1939, p.2.

Figure 109

Signature (?) 'PF'. *'Fashion Notes' taken at 'a London dress show'.* Sept.? 1939. Sketch of a black velvet beret based on London Irish Rifles' traditional corbeen [sic] with brooch in form of the regimental harp badge and feather hackle, showing the influence of the military on women's fashions. Survey of Ladies' Hat Fashions 1.8.1941. SxMOA1/2/18/5/E.

Figure 110

Unknown woman wearing Yorkshire regiment sweetheart brooch. Monochrome photograph. c.1939-1945. Image: photograph purchased on eBay 2010. Author's collection.

Figure 111

'Reports of racing at Newbury': Mrs. Goode, wearing a jewelled sweetheart brooch on her turban. *The Standard*, 22.2.1940, p.9.

Figure 112

Court Circular. 'Wedding Present Reception', *The Times (London)*, 22 July 1908, p.15.

Figure 113

R. Denison Binns (Photographer), Mersea Rd, Colchester. *Wedding Portrait of Rose and Frederick Fahie.* 11 May 1918. Printed as postcard. 13.7x8.7cm. Purchased on eBay from Andrew Read, London, 13.5.2017. Author's collection.

Figure 114

R. Denison Binns (Photographer), Mersea Rd, Colchester. *Wedding Portrait of Rose and Frederick Fahie (reverse).* 'May 11th 1918'. Printed as postcard, with handwritten message. 13.7x8.7cm. Purchased on eBay from Andrew Read, London, 13.5.2017. Author's collection.

Figure 115

Wedding Photograph of Flying Officer H.F.G. Southey and Miss Joan Davies. St. Paul's Knightsbridge, London 9 November 1920. Photograph purchased from: <https://www.mediastorehouse.com/dmcs-media-workshop.html?cid=10305708>. Author's collection.

Figure 116

Wedding Photograph of Flying Officer H.F.G. Southey and Miss Joan Davies (detail). St. Paul's Knightsbridge, London 9 November 1920. Photograph purchased from: <https://www.mediastorehouse.com/dmcs-media-workshop.html?cid=10305708> Author's collection.

Figure 117

Wedding Photograph of Barbara Wyers, showing her regimental badge brooch with her watch attached by an RAF ribbon. *Daily Herald*, 26 January 1940, p.5.

Figure 118

The marriage of Lady Anne Walpole to Major Eric Palmer, taken at the reception, Walterton Park, 'Weddings and Engagements', *The Sketch*, 17.1.1940, p.73.

Figure 119

Garrards, London. *Top: Queen's Surrey sweetheart brooch (1967), bottom: Queen's Surrey sweetheart brooch (1978)*. Private collection Photo: Courtesy of David Dickens, Managing Trustee, Surrey Infantry Museum.

Figure 120

The 'Cook Crew' (75(NZ) Squadron RAF. Taken Nottingham, November 1944. Black and white photograph of crew of a Lancaster of RAF Bomber Command. Image © Owen Cook, by kind permission of Simon Somerville.

Figure 121

RAF Pilot's Sweetheart brooch. Double-winged brevet. c.1939-1945. 14ct. white gold. 'RAF' set 10 rose-cut diamonds. Green and red enamels. L.50mm. Image: <http://www.ebay.co.uk/itm/Superb-Antique-Regimental-14ct-Gold-Diamond-Enamel-RAF-Wings-Sweetheart-Brooch-/291736184153?hash=item43ecd4e559>[accessed 4.1.2016].

Figure 122

Navigator's Half-Wing Sweetheart Brooch. Silver and Marcasite. c.1939-1945. Image: Denhams: URL:<https://denhams.com/antique-auction/august-2006/silver-jewellery>[accessed 3.4.2015].

Figure 123

RAF Air Gunner's Sweetheart Brooch. C.1939-1945. Silver, enamels. Author's own. Photo: Author.

Figure 124

Victoria Cross Sweetheart brooch belonging to Clara Woodroffe, mother of Second Lieutenant Sidney Clayton Woodroffe, 8th (Service) Battalion, Rifle Brigade (The Prince Consort's Own). C.1915. Gold, diamonds, enamels. H.3x2.2cm. Donated by Mrs. N. E. N. Woodroffe, February 1977. Image: © Royal Green Jackets Museum, Winchester.

Figure 125

Victoria Cross Sweetheart brooch belonging to Clara Woodroffe, (Reverse). Showing Woodroffe's initials, 'S.C.W.', and the date of his death, 30 July 1915. Photo: Author.

Figure 126

Hancocks, Bruton Street, London, *Victoria Cross awarded to Augustus Willington Shelton Agar*. Engraved, reverse: 17 June 1919, engraved reverse suspender bar: LIEUT. A.W.S.AGAR, ROYAL NAVY. Imperial War Museum, London. Image:IWM, URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/30008577>[accessed 12.2.2015].

Figure 127

Sweetheart brooch in the shape of the Victoria Cross, commissioned by Augustus Willington Shelton Agar for his wife Ina. C.1954-1955. Diamonds, white gold. 32 mm x 40 mm x 48 mm. © National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, London.

Figure 128

H. Brandon & Co., *advertisement for Touchwood charm and regimental sweetheart brooches*. *Daily Mirror*, 8 May 1915, p.12.

Figure 129

J.C. Vickery, *Advertisement for Good Luck Charms*. *The Graphic*. 17 May 1915, p.12.

Figure 130

Sweetheart Brooch of Imperial Yeomanry. 1900. Hollow silver. 'MB'. ©National Army Museum, London. Image: NAM.URL: <http://www.nam.ac.uk/online-collection/detail.php?acc=1997-08-64-1>[accessed 2.6.2013].

Figure 131

Woman with Royal Artillery (?) horseshoe brooch. c.1914-1918. Image: <https://www.facebook.com/1388245738129729/photos/pcb.1422851524669150/1422851161335853/?type=3&theater>[accessed 19.2.2014].

Figure 132

Royal Army Service Corps 'Good Luck' Horseshoe sweetheart brooch. c.1939-1945. Brass, enamels. Image: Badges and Medals. URL:<https://www.badgesandmedals.co.uk/index.php/product/george-vi-ww2-rasc-royal-army-service-corps-horse-shoe-design-sweetheart-brooch/>[accessed 11.9.2017].

Figure 133

Mizpah Brooch with ivy decoration and Royal Engineers' sweetheart brooch attached. 1939-1952. Brass, enamel. Pin back. Image: Badges and Medals. URL:<https://www.badgesandmedals.co.uk/index.php/product/ww2-king-george-vi-royal-engineers-mizpah-sweetheart-brooch/>[accessed 7.8.2016].

Figure 134

Soldier in uniform with woman wearing a double Mizpah brooch similar to the one in Fig. 136. 1914-1918. Black and white photograph, purchased from market stall, Cambridge, November 2017. Author's collection.

Figure 135

Sydenham Brothers. *Mizpah brooch, heart within a shield with floral decoration*. 1889. Silver. Birmingham. H.4.2x3cm. Offered for sale on eBay, 2015.

Figure 136

Sweetheart Brooch of the King's Own Royal Lancaster Regiment. Brass lucky wishbone, enamel. N.D. Accession No.KO2426. Image: kind permission of Peter Donnelly, Curator, Museum of the King's Own Royal Regiment (Lancaster).

Figure 137

Letter from Eric Smith to Doris Smith, 9.9.1918. Smith & Pepper Archives, Museum of the Jewellery Quarter, Birmingham.

Figure 138

'Bird and Crown' Sweetheart Brooch of the Royal Flying Corps. 9ct gold, enamel. C.1914-1918.

Image: <https://www.the-saleroom.com/en-gb/auction-catalogues/moss-green-auctions/catalogue-id-srmos10015/lot-a4ac8ada-e8b9-416a-95e1-a43500bfe424>[accessed:9.4.2016].

Figure 139

Bandsman George E. Martin, 2nd Battalion Princess Louise's Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders. Photo: courtesy of Rod Mackenzie, Deputy Curator, Argyll and Sutherland Regimental Museum. ©Argyll and Sutherland Regimental Museum.

Figure 140

Argyll and Sutherland's sweetheart sporran brooch, given by Bandsman George E. Martin to 'Gertie'. WWI. Brass (?), fabric. Photo: courtesy of Rod Mackenzie, Deputy Curator, Argyll and Sutherland Regimental Museum. ©Argyll and Sutherland Regimental Museum.

Figure 141

Bandsman George E. Martin to 'Gertie'. Card, pierced and threaded with coloured ribbons, first page of 5.

Photo: courtesy of Rod Mackenzie, Deputy Curator, Argyll and Sutherland Regimental Museum. ©Argyll and Sutherland Regimental Museum.

Figure 142

Bandsman George E. Martin to 'Gertie'. Card, pierced and threaded with coloured ribbons, page 5 of 5, with Gertie's handwritten postscript to George dated 5th August 1973. Photo: courtesy Rod Mackenzie, ©Argyll and Sutherland Regimental Museum.

Figure 143

Charles William and Nellie May Pashler. c.1914. Photo: by kind permission of Bill Fulton.

Figure 144

Some of Pashler's belongings discovered in the suitcase, including his bloodstained diary, his watch and the sweetheart brooch. Photo: by kind permission of Bill Fulton.

Figure 145

Pashler's diary, showing the shrapnel damage and bloodstains. Photo: by kind permission of Bill Fulton.

Figure 146

Pashler's Machine Gun Corps sweetheart brooch, showing the shrapnel damage. Photo: by kind permission of Bill Fulton.

Figure 147

Menin Gate locket with container for photograph. c.1920s. Silver. Sold on eBay. Image: eBay, 24.5.2014.

Figure 148

Menin Gate locket (reverse) opened to show photograph of Lance Corporal Harry Stanley Gilderthorp, 9771 1st Bn. Royal Warwickshire Regiment. c.1920s. Silver. Sold on eBay. Image:eBay, 24.5.2014.

Figure 149

Unknown woman wearing King's Royal Rifle Corps sweetheart brooch with a locket that may be similar to the one in Figures 147/148.

Image:

<https://www.facebook.com/1388245738129729/photos/pcb.1390082571279379/1390082451279391/?type=3&theater>[accessed 2.11.2014].

Figure 150

Lionel Pearson (Architect), Charles Sergeant Jagger (Sculpture), A. B. Burton (Foundry). *Fallen Artilleryman, Royal Artillery Memorial*, Hyde Park Corner, London. 1921-1925. Bronze, Portland stone. Photo: Author.

Figure 151

Ypres brooch. c.1916-1918. Bronze (?) enamel. Brooch offered on eBay, 18.8.2015.

Figure 152

J.W. Tiptaft & Son, Ltd., Birmingham. *'His Country Called' Advertisement. The Jeweller and Metalworker*, 1 February 1916, p.116.

Figure 153

J.W. Tiptaft & Son, Ltd., Birmingham. *'His Country Called' photo pendant, containing photograph of unknown soldier.*

Image:<https://www.facebook.com/Sweetheart-Brooches-of-the-Great-War-1388245738129729/>[accessed 17.11.2016].

Figure 154

Mourning sweetheart brooch inscribed 'In memory of'. N.d. W.28mm. Image: Badges and Medals, URL:

<https://www.badgesandmedals.co.uk/index.php/product/great-war-in-memory-of-memorial-brooch-for-photograph/>[accessed 17.11.2016].

Figure 155

Mourning sweetheart brooch of the Green Howards regiment inscribed 'DIED ON ACTIVE SERVICE 1915'. Associated with L. Corporal William Marshall, who was killed in August 1915. Image: by kind permission © Green Howards Museum Trust.

Figure 156

Mourning brooch of the Royal Irish Regiment. Bronze (?) enamel. Image:Gordon Power Facebook, <https://www.facebook.com/1388245738129729/>[accessed 2.6.2015].

Figure 157

Mourning brooch with photograph of Sergeant Reginald Harry Ford DCM, MM, 201919 Sherwood Foresters. Cast brass, Perspex, photograph. H4x3cm. c.1918. Collection of Cliff Housley. Image © Cliff Housley, by kind permission, from Cliff Housley *Sweetheart Brooches (and other associated jewellery): The Sherwood Foresters* (Sawley: Miliquest, 2009), p.118.

Figure 158

Union Flag brooch, belonging to Sergeant Major John William Daniels, possibly a gift for his wife, Ada. 1915-1917. Brass (?), enamels. Collection of Royal Sussex Regimental Museum, Eastbourne Redoubt, Eastbourne, East Sussex. Photo: Author, by permission of RSR Museum, Eastbourne.

Figure 159

Unknown woman wearing Queen's Royal Regiment (West Surrey) sweetheart brooch, with children. WWI. Monochrome photograph. Purchased from C & R Spurgin, through eBay. Author's collection.

Figure 160

Sergeant William Davies Royal Welsh Fusiliers, 1914-1915. Image from Peter Metcalfe, *Remembered Again: Recalling Flint's Fallen Heroes of the First World War, Vol.1(A-H)* (Mold: Brown Cow, 2014), p103, by kind permission Peter Metcalfe.

Figure 161

Mary Davies, widow of William Davies, wearing Royal Welsh Fusiliers sweetheart brooch. Image: Peter Metcalfe, *Remembered Again: Recalling Flint's Fallen Heroes of the First World War, Vol.1(A-H)* (Mold: Brown Cow, 2014), p103, by kind permission Peter Metcalfe.

Figure 162

Sweetheart Brooch of the Yorkshire Regiment, given by Private Richard Machin to his mother. 2009. Silver. Image: by kind permission of Ivor Machin.

Figure 163

Iohannes Ambrosius Nucetus, *Ippolita Sforza Bentvoglio*, c.1518. Paper, paint, glue. Page from album showing the portrait's cover open. Biblioteca Trivulziana, Milan. URL: [HTTP://www.storiadimilano.it/arte/bandello_scrima/bandello2.htm](http://www.storiadimilano.it/arte/bandello_scrima/bandello2.htm) [accessed 14.7.2016].

Figure 164

Nicholas Hilliard. *Man Clasping a Hand from a Cloud, possibly Lord Thomas Howard.* 1588. England. Watercolour on vellum mounted onto plain brown card, probably a later addition. Gold lettering. Victoria and Albert Museum. URL: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O16580/man-clasping-a-hand-from-portrait-miniature-hilliard-nicholas/> [accessed 21.3.2016].

Figure 165

John Smart. *Captain W. S. Dawe of the Indian Infantry.* 1787. India. Victoria & Albert Museum. URL: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O82058/portrait-of-captain-w-s-portrait-miniature-smart-john/> [accessed 2.2.2016].

Figure 166

Portrait of a Colonel of the 3rd Foot Guards. c.1798. Watercolour on ivory, with hair ornament behind glass on the reverse. Victoria & Albert Museum, URL: <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O82322/portrait-of-a-colonel-of-portrait-miniature-unknown/>[accessed 2.2.2016].

Figure 167

George Romney. *Mrs. Crouch with a Portrait Miniature of her Husband.* 1787. Oil on canvas. The Iveagh Bequest, Kenwood House, London. Image: © English Heritage.

Figure 168

George Romney. *Mrs. Crouch with a Portrait Miniature of her Husband (detail).* 1787. Oil on canvas. The Iveagh Bequest, Kenwood House, London. Image: © English Heritage.

Figure 169

James Scouler, *Portrait Miniature of an Officer of the Merchant Navy.* 1781. Watercolour on ivory. Victoria & Albert Museum, URL:<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O82237/portrait-of-an-officer-of-portrait-miniature-scouler-james/>[accessed 2.2.2016].

Figure 170

George Romney, *Mrs Crouch.* 1793. Oil on canvas. 127.6 x 100.3 cm. The John Howard McFadden Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art. URL:<http://philamuseum.org/collections/permanent/103820.html?mulR=526231889|7> [accessed 5.4.2016].

Figure 171

George Romney, *Mrs Crouch (detail).* 1793. Oil on canvas. 127.6 x 100.3 cm. The John Howard McFadden Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art. URL:<http://philamuseum.org/collections/permanent/103820.html?mulR=526231889|7> [accessed 5.4.2016].

Figure 172

Edward Tessier. *Sweetheart Brooch with the badge of 11th King Edward's Own Lancers (Probyn's Horse).* 1917. H 3cmxW 2.5xD 0.5cm. Gold, diamonds, rubies, sapphires, emeralds, enamels. National Army Museum, London. Image: NAM, URL:<https://collection.nam.ac.uk/detail.php?acc=1965-10-177-1>[accessed 3.3.2014].

Figure 173

Edward Tessier. *Sweetheart Brooch with the badge of 11th King Edward's Own Lancers (Probyn's Horse) in original Tessier box.* 1917. Gold, diamonds, rubies, sapphires, emeralds, enamels. National Army Museum, London. Image: NAM, URL:<https://collection.nam.ac.uk/detail.php?acc=1965-10-177-1>[accessed 3.3.2014].

Figure 174

Major Dighton Probyn, VC. Commandant 11th Regiment of Bengal Cavalry (Lancers) later 11th King Edward's Own Lancers (Probyn's Horse). 1867.

Image:URL:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/5th_Horse#/media/File:11thblprobyn1867.jpg[accessed 1.7.2015].

Figure 175

Edward Tessier. Sweetheart Brooch with the badge of 11th King Edward's Own Lancers (Probyn's Horse) Reverse, showing the inscription. 1917. Gold, diamonds, rubies, sapphires, emeralds, enamels. National Army Museum, London. Image: NAM, URL<https://collection.nam.ac.uk/detail.php?acc=1965-10-177-1>[accessed 3.3.2014].

Figure 176

Thomas Hazlehurst. Miniature of unknown woman, wearing a portrait miniature. English, 18th Century. Watercolour on ivory. 7.5 x 6cm. Jane B. Tripp Trust, Cleveland Museum of Art, URL: <http://www.clevelandart.org/art/2012.57.2>[accessed 16.5.2016].

Figure 177

Map of Macedonia 1915-1918. Whyllly, Col. H. C., C.B., The History of the York and Lancaster Regiment, Vol. 1, compiled c.1918. p.199.

Figure 178

Battalion Orders, 13 March 1917, 1st Battalion York and Lancaster Regiment.

Image: courtesy of the Archive of the York and Lancaster Regimental Museum, Clifton Park Museum, Rotherham.

Figure 179

Sweetheart brooch, King's Own Royal Lancaster Regiment (reverse) with photograph of unknown boy in compartment. N.D. Brass, paper photograph.

Image: kind permission of Peter Donnelly, Curator, Museum of the King's Own Royal Regiment (Lancaster).

Figure 180

Sweetheart brooch, King's Own Royal Lancaster Regiment. N.D. Brass, paper photograph.

Image: kind permission of Peter Donnelly, Curator, Museum of the King's Own Royal Regiment (Lancaster).

Figure 181

Unknown woman wearing sweetheart brooch with portrait photograph. Black and white photograph on paper. c.1939-1945. Purchased: eBay, seller 6352 201, 2011. Author's collection.

Figure 182

Royal Navy sweetheart brooch with attached photo portrait. C.1939-1945. Metal, enamel, portrait case made from Perspex aircraft canopy. Private collection. Photo by kind permission of William Woodhouse.

Figure 183

Advertisement, Thomas L.Mott, Birmingham. The Jeweller and Metalworker, 1.10.1915, p.1147.

Figure 184

Unknown trooper of The Queen's Own (Royal West Kent) Regiment with his bride. WWI. Photograph. Purchased from market stall, Cambridge, 2016. Author's collection.

Figure 185

Unknown trooper of The Queen's Own (Royal West Kent) Regiment with his bride. (detail).

Figure 186

Photograph of unknown soldier in frame embellished with leaves, flowers, embroidery, butterflies' wings. Nineteenth Century. Exhibited in Forget me Not: Photography and Remembrance Exhibition, 2004, Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam and 2005, George Eastman House, New York.

Image:<https://www.icp.org/exhibitions/forget-me-not-photography-and-remembrance>[accessed 21.8.2016].

Figure 187

Ada Emma Deane. The Two Minute Silence, The Cenotaph, London. 11.11.1922. Glass plate photograph. Barlow Collection, The British Library, London.

Figure 188

WWI parlour with family photographs and images of uniformed soldier (the Prestidge home). Private Collection. Image courtesy of Ian Hook, by kind permission of Taff Gillingham. © Taff Gillingham.

Figure 189

Marie Aitkenhead wearing her Paratroopers Sweetheart Brooch. 19.4.1945 (?). Photograph by kind permission of Chuck Aitkenhead. © Chuck Aitkenhead.

Figure 190

Marie Aitkenhead wearing her Paratroopers Sweetheart Brooch. Detail taken from undamaged enlarged copy of photograph in Figure 190.

Figure 191

Paratroopers, showing the cloth badge on the upper right sleeve which Marie Aitkenhead's sweetheart brooch replicated. WWII. Photograph by kind permission of Chuck Aitkenhead.

Figure 192

Handwritten note on the reverse of Marie Aitkenhead's photograph (Figure 189) with lipstick marks (?). Photograph by kind permission of Chuck Aitkenhead. © Chuck Aitkenhead.

Figure 193

Parachute regiment sweetheart brooch. 1940s. Gilded brass, blue and white enamels. W.46mm. Sold online by Regimental Brooches. Image:© Regimental Brooches, URL:<http://www.regimentalbrooches.com/13715> [accessed 3.6.2016].

Figure 194

Vitrine in 'Society' Gallery, National Army Museum, London, with the Hartley brooch at lower left. 2017. Photo: Author.

Figure 195

Explanatory note next to vitrine in Figure 194. 'Society' Gallery, National Army Museum. 2017. Photo: Author.

Figure 196

Gieves Ltd., Old Bond Street, London. *Royal Navy Crown sweetheart brooch.* 1950s. Gold, diamonds. Private collection. Image: courtesy of Lydia Goodson.

Figure 197

Eddie Mulholland. *Catherine, Duchess of Cambridge attending the 75th Anniversary of the RAF Air Cadets at St Clement Danes Church, London.* 7.2.2016.

Image:© Eddie Mulholland, *The Telegraph*,

URL:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/kate-middleton/12144987/Duchess-of-Cambridge-Kate-celebrates-Air-Cadets-75th-anniversary.html> [accessed 2.1.2017].

**SYMBOLIC JEWELS:
THE MILITARY SWEETHEART BROOCH
IN WARTIME BRITAIN**

Introduction

In January 1886 David Ogilvy, Earl of Airlie and Lady Mabell Gore were married in London. Airlie commissioned an original wedding present for his bride, a gold, diamond and enamel brooch, replicating in miniature the insignia of the 10th Royal Hussars, the cavalry regiment in which he served. The new Lady Airlie wrote in her diary that she was the first woman to wear a regimental badge and that, as her brooch attracted much admiration amongst those who saw it, she created a new fashion in jewellery.¹ By the Second Boer War (1899-1902), the fashion had grown so that soldiers of all ranks gave their loved ones small brooches in imitation of their regimental badges as mementoes before leaving for South Africa. From the beginning of the First World War, replicas of the insignia of every regiment of the British Army, Naval unit and the Royal Flying Corps were available, from costly hand-made versions in gold and precious gems to simple factory-produced copies in brass or enamel. One Londoner, Carol Thomas, remembered that during the Second World War her mother and aunts all wore such brooches and recalled that: ‘they were received as gifts, love tokens or symbols to display that one of your loved ones was “doing their bit”. [...] I do remember that almost every female seemed to wear one’.²

Widely sold in retail stores and by jewellers’ throughout the country and in small shops set up in military camps where personnel could buy last-minute gifts before embarkation, regimental brooches were popular parting love tokens from members of all the armed services to their wives and sweethearts when they left for potentially lengthy separations in wartime. Their tangible presence in the quotidian lives of women across all strata of society maintained links between personnel on the front

¹ Mabell Airlie, *Thatched with Gold: The memoirs of Mabell, Countess of Airlie*, Jennifer Ellis, ed., (London: Hutchinson, 1962), p.52.

² Carol Thomas replied to a request for information about sweetheart brooches, originally placed through WW2Talk.com, an internet forum. Personal Communication, emails, March-July 2011, March 2014. (Appendix 1).

line and civilians on the home front. For this reason they became known generically as ‘sweetheart brooches’, but this thesis will use case studies to show that they communicated much more than romantic devotion and were also gifts to mothers, children, friends and acquaintances, who wore them for a wide variety of reasons. Some indicated solidarity with the country’s aims in time of war, while others were given as fashionable wedding jewellery, visually linking the bride to her husband’s career. They could embody amuletic or talismanic hopes that couples would be safely reunited, indicate status, convey bereavement and incorporate memory. Time-specific, conflict-related objects, they combined the subliminal language incorporated into all insignia with the varied circumstances of their exchange to articulate the complex personal and societal imperatives of wartime Britain.

Advertisements, trade editorials and photographic evidence, together with the considerable numbers of extant examples, indicate that many thousands of sweetheart brooches were made throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, they have been overlooked by historians of jewellery, dress and material culture and no scholarly study has been made that places them in the specific social context within which they had meaning. Hybrid objects, neither official uniform nor simply decorative jewellery, they are generally confined to private ownership or the collections of military museums where, if any are on display, there is seldom detailed explanation to explain their function to the visitor. No major cultural or design museum in Britain holds examples and they are seldom seen today outside military events.

My interest developed from my discovery of a document in the Mass Observation Archives, held at the University of Sussex, while researching a different project for my undergraduate degree. This report recorded how London retailers were questioned in 1939 on their prospects for riding out the war, in the face of coupons and other restrictions. Assistants in Chiesmans department store in Lewisham stated that regimental and Royal Air Force ‘badge brooches’ were selling well, while goldsmiths and silversmiths in Regent Street reported good sales of gold and diamond ‘sweetheart brooches’ (terms unknown to me).³ Further investigation into these objects revealed

³ Report, 11.11.1939, SxMoA1/2/18/1:E: Personal Appearance and Clothes 1938-54.

that they appeared to have slipped from public awareness even though, as Thomas stated, they were commonplace adornments in wartime. For example, on 13 March 2011, John Benjamin, a jewellery expert on the BBC's *Antiques Roadshow*, observed that sweetheart brooches were among the items most often brought to the programme for identification but that families seldom knew what they were, or anything of their histories.⁴

The aim of this thesis, therefore, is to make as complete an examination as possible of sweetheart brooches in order to address this gap in scholarship and in doing so, to address several core concerns about what conclusions might be drawn regarding their significance to those who gave and received them and to the wider visual societal, political and commercial culture of wartime Britain. Military badges identified and precisely defined the wearer's rank, seniority and regiment; they also proclaimed a woman's identity in relation to the giver and as wife, mother or bereaved relative. Throughout, I consider how sweetheart brooches functioned as affective objects, through which women could express the emotions they were expected to suppress in the wider interests of maintaining morale in wartime. Susan Matt, reviewing the history of research into emotions, notes the particular difficulties in recovering traces of transient emotions 'of everyday men and women', rather than political and social elites, that were not written down.⁵ For example, Mabell Airlie wrote about her own brooch, but few first-hand written histories are available, in particular of those Matt describes as 'everyday' women. Claire Langhamer, also, suggests the history of emotions in the twentieth century has neglected the lived experience of 'ordinary lives'.⁶ Michael Roper is concerned to move towards: 'the significance of the material, the experiences, and of the practices of daily life in which emotional relationships are embedded'.⁷ Margaret Gibson believes the relationship between the material and emotional, while quiet and often unspoken, allows grieving relatives to

⁴ John Benjamin, BBC *Antiques Roadshow* 13.3.2011. Personal communication, emails, 23.3.2011.

⁵ Susan Matt, 'Current Emotion Research in History: Or, Doing History from the Inside Out', *Emotion Review*, 3.1. (January 2011), p.119.

⁶ Claire Langhamer, 'Everyday love and emotions in the 20th century', in Mark Hailwood, Brodie Waddell, eds, *The Future of History from Below: An Online Symposium* (2013) URL:<https://manyheadedmonster.wordpress.com/history-from-below/> [accessed 3.8.2018].

⁷ Michael Roper, 'Slipping Out of View: Subjectivity and Emotion in Gender History', *History Workshop Journal*, 59, 2005, p.69.

use ‘rehouse’ the ‘remains of a life now gone’ within personal objects.⁸ The owners of many of the objects analysed here could not be identified. Instead, this once commonly recognised jewellery itself must be investigated for evidence of its emotional meaning since, as Marcia Pointon observes in her analyses of jewellery within material culture, jewels are: ‘objects tangled in discourse’, differing only from written texts in that they are three-dimensional.⁹ Through exploring the thoughts and ideas embedded in giving and receiving sweetheart brooches, this thesis contributes to an understanding of affective objects and emotional histories in wartime and places the brooches within the history of sentimental jewellery.

While ‘sentiment’ may be defined as an emotional response to a person, situation or object, the term ‘sentimental’ is often used negatively to describe excessively self-indulgent, exaggerated evocation of feeling. But Pointon argues that jewels made to incorporate sentiments are aids, through which memories of special occasions long outlive the bodies that once wore them, thus working ‘to link time’.¹⁰ Pamela Fletcher and Carolyn Burdett explain the admiration ‘sentimental’ images often inspired in the Victorian period.¹¹ For Shirley Bury, sentimental jewellery is simply any piece that conveys layers of meaning and is: ‘valued as a tangible expression of emotion’.¹² ‘Sentimental’ jewels are material narratives of emotions, feelings and memories, with complex biographies involving gift-giving and exchange. I argue throughout that whatever the financial value of the brooches, they materialised the same emotions and sentiments for their owners.

Further, I propose that, together with posters, artworks, songs and literature, sweetheart brooches formed part of what Nicoletta Gullace has described as the ‘totality of images’ that formed a pervasive cultural background to Britain in WWI and continued to be highly influential to the views of the civilian population during

⁸ Margaret Gibson, ‘Melancholy Objects’, *Mortality*, 9.4 (2004), p.297.

⁹ Marcia Pointon, *Brilliant Effects: A Cultural History of Gem Stones and Jewellery* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2009), p.4.

¹⁰ Marcia Pointon, ‘Intriguing Jewellery: Royal Bodies and Luxurious Consumption’, *Textual Practice*, 11:3, p.494.

¹¹ See Chapter 1.5, p.72.

¹² Shirley Bury, *An Introduction to Sentimental Jewellery* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1985), p.5.

WWII.¹³ They were ubiquitous visible components of this background material culture, conveying societal solidarity, personal loyalties and official propaganda. Government recruitment campaigns intersected with commercial advertising, employing almost identical messages. They became vital to the fluctuating fortunes of the trade when other types of jewellery were seen as unacceptable luxuries, since manufacturers and retailers could promote the brooches as ‘patriotic purchases’.

Stephen Nathanson defines everyday patriotism as the love of one’s own country because an individual identifies with it, considers it to be special, feels concerns for its well-being and is ‘motivated by love or loyalty to promote and defend its interests’.¹⁴ Allen Frantzen points out that for men in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, these ideas were tied to concepts of knightly chivalry, constructing an ideal of imperial masculinity manifested in protection of family and home and illustrated by contemporary artworks.¹⁵ In September 1914, Lloyd George perceived the emergence of a new patriotism, ‘infinitely greater and more enduring’ that did not rely merely on the ‘maintenance of its glory [...] but also in protecting its homes from distress’.¹⁶ During WWI, women were advised that patriotism for them consisted of persuading husbands, sweethearts and sons to enlist on their behalf.¹⁷ On a practical note, posters told them that dressing ‘extravagantly’ in wartime was unpatriotic, while refraining from spending would aid the war effort.¹⁸ Lou Taylor and Elizabeth Wilson observe that for women in WWII, ‘doing without’ all but the most essential items was universally seen as patriotism.¹⁹ Wartime austerity has been previously researched but this thesis contributes to the debate by considering jewellery within the study of

¹³ Nicoletta F. Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons: Men, Women and the Renegotiation of British Citizenship During the Great War* (New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp.37, 40.

¹⁴ Stephen Nathanson, ‘Patriotism, War, and the Limits of Permissible Partiality’, *Journal of Ethics*, No.13 (2009), p.401.

¹⁵ Allen J. Frantzen, *Bloody Good: Chivalry, Sacrifice and the Great War* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

¹⁶ David Lloyd George, ‘*An Appeal to the Nation*’, Speech delivered at the Queen’s Hall, London, 19.9.1914. <https://www.bartleby.com/library/prose/2175.html>[accessed 30.6.2018].

¹⁷ See Chapter 3.

¹⁸ See Figure 63.

¹⁹ Lou Taylor, Elizabeth Wilson, *Through the Looking Glass: A History of Dress from 1860 to the Present Day* (London: BBC, 1989) p.114.

luxuries and rationing.²⁰ Throughout, the thesis returns to consideration of whether sweetheart brooches demonstrated traditional patriotism or individual loyalties.

Carol Thomas, growing up in a working class family with nothing to spare for luxuries, remembered how the women around her all wore sweetheart brooches, confirming they were perceived as special, treasured items. Moreover, as objects generally given by men but worn exclusively by women the study shifts the predominance of conflict-related art from its emphasis on the male experience towards that of women, their attempts to come to terms with the aftermath of war and the ways in which society permitted them to express their views and emotions. Close examination of photographs of women, alone or with men in uniform, even if often we can no longer identify the subjects, suggests the brooches were given and worn as markers of significant life events, though not always happy ones.

This introduction now outlines the parameters of the study, defining the jewellery it concerns and the reasons for including several closely related items while excluding others. I explain the terms used, the chronology and structure and delineate its geographical scope. Working from a wide selection of brooches as primary sources, the thesis synthesises contemporary documentation, primary archival material and secondary sources to interrogate various aspects of this jewellery. Though no existing scholarship specifically investigates sweetheart brooches, I have drawn on the rich historiography relating to other types of jewellery in order to situate them within the development of sentimental jewels.

Defining a Sweetheart Brooch

Mabell Airlie wrote of her ‘regimental badge’, but that expression refers correctly only to the military insignia her brooch replicated. Throughout, therefore, I use the terms ‘regimental badge’ or ‘military insignia’ to mean the original referents. The terms ‘regimental brooch’, ‘badge brooch’ and ‘sweetheart brooch’ are used interchangeably to refer to the miniature jewels made to copy them, as manufacturers and retailers employed all these expressions in their advertisements.

²⁰ See for example Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Austerity in Britain: Rationing, Controls, and Consumption, 1939-1955* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Focus of the Thesis

This thesis concerns brooches made specifically for women to wear that replicated in miniature the insignia of a military regiment or official wartime unit, made to commission by goldsmiths and silversmiths at one end of the economic spectrum and mass-produced in factories at the other. I investigate Army, Navy and Air Force brooches made from a wide variety of materials, using many different techniques and some to which elements of sentimental jewellery have been added in the form of floral or textual embellishments. Two unusual brooches in the form of Victoria Cross medal insignia have been included because they were the subject of a specific contemporary suggestion that recipients' bereaved mothers should be permitted to wear them. An examination is also made of the range of 'V for Victory' sweetheart jewellery, since that was a significant WWII national campaign with an official emblem. Comparison is made between sweetheart brooches and public memorials such as the Royal Artillery memorial at Hyde Park and the Menin Gate because of the iconography common to both.

The study will show that throughout both World Wars, badges and brooches identified war-workers who had no uniform and those who could not enlist for various reasons and that they asserted the views of civilians in wartime. Other emblems, such as that of the notorious 'White Feather' campaign, explicitly denoted cowardice. To contextualise sweetheart brooches within this culture of badges as markers, therefore, I have addressed devices belonging to groups that operated on the home front in both World Wars such as munitions workers and Air Raid Wardens, since these were all official semi-military operational units and sweetheart brooches were made to replicate all their badges.

Excluded objects

From the mid-seventeenth century, when official uniforms were first issued to the army, personnel would fix pins to metal buttons and collar badges, transforming them into souvenirs and keepsakes for their families.²¹ Such items cause confusion as they are often traded at fairs for collectors of militaria and on the internet as 'sweetheart

²¹ In 1645 the New Model Army soldiers were described as now in uniform: 'redcoats all, the whole army only are distinguished by the several facings of their coats'. Peter Young, Richard

brooches'. They are mentioned but excluded from this study (except where small hand-made details have been added to manufactured brooches), which is confined to the discrete body of jewelled or metal artefacts produced in factories or workshops. Adapted uniform items form part of the vast body of loosely-connected materiality known as 'trench art', that is, artworks of many kinds created by soldiers, sailors and airmen, often from recycled battlefield *matériel*, as personal keepsakes or souvenirs for sale. Trench art frequently incorporated insignia commercially produced for the purpose: for instance, soldiers could purchase machine-embroidered or printed fabric regimental badges to appliqué to 'sweetheart pincushions' as gifts for mothers and wives and they constructed metal jewellery out of bullets or shrapnel. Trench art is, however, a separate study and has been comprehensively investigated and analysed, notably by Nicholas Saunders, whose insights into conflict artworks have nevertheless been invaluable to this thesis.²²

Timeframe of the thesis

The brooches on which the thesis focuses fall within the period from the first known commission in 1886 to the present day. The most recent case studies concern a gift to his mother from a soldier serving in Afghanistan in the 1990s, and a navy brooch currently treasured for its associations with the owner's father that explain why such items may not be considered appropriate wear for the descendants of serving personnel. Sweetheart brooches reached a peak of popularity during WWI and again during WWII. Many of these remain extant and the bulk of the material discussed here is drawn from 1914-1918 or from 1939-1945. During total war it could be generally assumed that the majority of the population was sympathetic to the war aims, or at least supported their relatives in the forces; official propaganda required them to do so and individuals displayed support for their loved ones at the front by wearing the brooches as symbols of their service. Between the wars they were often put aside for a variety of reasons, including the wish to suppress painful memories or the necessity to construct a new life following bereavement. Generally, only families of career

Holmes, *The English Civil War: A Military History of the Three Civil Wars 1642- 1651* (London: Purnell, 1974), p.43.

²² Nicholas J. Saunders, *Trench Art: Materialities and Memories of War*, (Oxford, New York: Berg, 2003).

military personnel continued to wear them, for example, for weddings.²³ Additionally, as one ex-military family stated, at certain times security concerns made it unwise to draw public attention to their army connections.²⁴

However, a key theme throughout is that these brooches evolved through a fusion of familial devices, military insignia and traditional sentimental jewellery and that this melding informed the way in which the brooches served to delineate the wearer within society. To demonstrate this, two sections will also consider some much earlier personal emblems worn as jewellery that were made before this timeframe, since I contend that such jewels functioned to proclaim personal and political allegiances and were thus the precursors and origins of regimental sweetheart brooches. In line with this argument, Chapter 1 therefore addresses the history embedded in the first military devices, since this was essential to an understanding of their significance as gifts of jewellery. A brief consideration of early livery badges similarly demonstrates their effectiveness as powerful signs and their use within personal and diplomatic systems of gift exchange. For instance, interrogation of Elizabeth I's *Rainbow* portrait by Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger (c.1600-1603) draws attention to an early example of conflict jewellery as reciprocal gift. The jewels Prince Albert designed for Queen Victoria and as court gifts frequently referenced military ornamentation while contemporaneous sentimental artefacts expressed emotions through imagery and materiality. Chapter 1 concludes with a close examination of the Airlie brooch, the first in which elements of all these existing jewels were combined. Through these examples I argue for sweetheart brooches' derivation from several previous types of jewellery, becoming in the process a discrete group separate from previous types. In Chapter 5, I look at a further category of earlier sentimental jewellery that provides a useful structure for understanding how sweetheart brooches were handled and worn. Marcia Pointon's research into eighteenth-century portrait miniatures offers useful comparisons in both appearance and function with the jewels on which this thesis focuses.²⁵ Miniatures retained the donor's image within the wearer's space; his portrait might be revealed to others or concealed from them and kept only for the knowledge of the woman who wore the jewelled container. Through several case

²³ See Chapter 4.3.

²⁴ Karen and Gary Skeels. Personal Communication, July 2017, see p.255.

²⁵ Pointon, *Brilliant Effects: A Cultural History of Gem Stones and Jewellery*.

studies I argue that sweetheart brooches with added photographs, hidden or openly displayed, functioned in the same way. In *Treasuring the Gaze: Intimate Vision in Late Eighteenth-Century Eye Miniatures*, Hanneke Grootenboer analyses another discrete, short-lived group of jewels with images that were invested with personal and emotional significance and, like sweetheart brooches, implied ties of loyalty and affection between giver and wearer. Eye miniatures implicitly kept the absent lover watching over and in the presence of the wearer, as I contend sweetheart brooches did.²⁶ Two paintings by George Romney of Anna Maria Crouch suggest that miniatures depicted in full-scale portraits conveyed much about the sitter: I use these paintings to argue that sweetheart brooches functioned in exactly the same way. This section highlights the ways in which, like early portrait miniatures, images within sweetheart brooches were sometimes openly displayed to others but at other times intimately concealed. In the absence of previous academic studies directly addressing these jewels, analysis of similar artefacts has the potential to contextualise them and provide useful ways of engaging with art objects that connect us to the sensory and emotional experience of conflict.

Geographical Scope

Military sweetheart brooches were made and worn in France, Belgium, Canada, Australia, Germany and in America, where they are considered particularly collectable objects. It would be beyond the scope of this thesis, however, to include examples from all these countries and I have therefore confined my study to those made in Britain. Goldsmiths and silversmiths throughout the country made them to commission but could hallmark wherever they chose; I explain the complications inherent in identifying the brooches' makers and reasons why retailers deliberately disguised their origins from their customers. They were made, for example, in Chester and Sheffield but in describing manufacturing and marketing I have focused on London and Birmingham, since they were the two major centres of production and exemplified the brooches' significant contribution to the jewellery trade's fluctuating fortunes.

²⁶ Hanneke Grootenboer, *Treasuring the Gaze: Intimate Vision in Late Eighteenth-Century Eye Miniatures* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

Literature and Scholarship Review

Though many thousands of brooches were made from the late nineteenth and throughout the twentieth centuries, no academic investigation has been conducted into them and they have not been much considered by curators of military history. The only publications that specifically address the subject are several small publications intended as catalogues for collectors. Pamela Caunt's paperbacks *Military Sweethearts I, II and III*, Kenneth Jarmin's *Military "Sweetheart" Brooches* and Nick Snider's *Sweetheart Jewelry and Collectibles* (for the US market) contain information and prices for collectors (though the content is now out-of-date and has largely been superseded by internet trading) but none attempts to analyse the objects' significance or to associate them with individuals.²⁷ *Sweetheart Brooches (and other associated jewellery): The Sherwood Foresters* by Cliff Housley is a more in-depth account of the author's personal collection, dealing specifically with his regiment.²⁸ Housley has researched the original owners of several of his brooches through regimental and public records.

In the absence of existing scholarship on which to draw, however, works relating to theories of personal ornamentation provide useful frameworks for considering jewellery's social and political functions. In 1905, Georg Simmel's definition of the function of jewellery stated that women were naturally passive wearers, their limited power consisting only in their capacity to give pleasure to others.²⁹ By contrast, according to Simmel, men derived power from imposing their will through their actions. Simmel's arguments conform to the traditional binary male and female roles assigned by contemporary society. Often a brooch described here linked the fate of the body of the man who gave it to that of the woman who wore it; neither had choices about their lives in wartime. Jewellery might be employed to indicate attachment, status or bereavement, its significance altering with changing circumstances. But

²⁷ Pamela Caunt, *Military Sweethearts: A Guide for Collectors, 1-3*, (London: Friary Press, 1994); Kenneth Jarmin, *Military "Sweetheart" Brooches* (Boxford: Suffolk, 1981); Nick Snider, *Sweetheart Jewelry and Collectibles* (Atglen: Schiffer, 1995).

²⁸ Cliff Housley, *Sweetheart Brooches (and other associated jewellery): the Sherwood Foresters* (Sawley: Miliquest, 2009). Housley is Secretary of the Military Brooch Collectors' Club and kindly supplied a copy of his book and some of his research.

²⁹ Georg Simmel, *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, [1908], trans., Kurt H. Wolff (Glencoe: Free Press, 1950), p.339.

arguably some women challenged their place within society through the messages conveyed by their jewellery, as the study will show. More recently, interesting insights into jewellery with agency and with expressly political connotations are offered by former US Secretary of State Madeline Albright's short book *Read my Pins: Stories from a Diplomat's Jewel Box*, in which she describes how she deployed her personal brooch collection to make challenging visual statements.³⁰ Albright's actions subvert Simmel's suggestion that women's jewellery indicates passivity since, as a powerful politician in her own right, faced with negotiating within cultural settings that frequently denigrated women, she selected the brooches she wore to meetings with the express intention of employing their provocative imagery to criticise and incite reactions from politicians and military leaders. When, for example, Saddam Hussein's government referred to her as a 'serpent', she defiantly wore a snake brooch to a meeting with the Iraqi negotiating team.³¹ Albright employed her jewellery to bring to politics 'the mute eloquence of pins with attitude'.³²

Continuing this idea, I have drawn on Pointon's extensive analyses of the power politics of jewellery and especially the ways in which it is 'bound up with non-verbal exchange'.³³ I depart, however, from Pointon's emphasis on the essential monetary importance of jewellery that invariably related its financial price to its sentimental worth, arguing instead that many sweetheart brooches were not costly pieces yet were treasured for their associative value.³⁴

In WWI an exchange of views in national newspapers revealed how public expressions of mourning began to be suppressed in the interests of public morale. In her research into the gendered articulation of grief, Lucy Noakes concludes that in WWII women's outward expressions of sorrow were effectively silenced by the same requirement to maintain a 'stiff upper lip'.³⁵ Noakes' observations on appropriate

³⁰ Madeline Albright, *Read my Pins: Stories from a Diplomat's Jewel Box* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009).

³¹ Albright, *Read my Pins*, p.17.

³² Albright, *Read my Pins*, p.23.

³³ Pointon, *Brilliant Effects*, p.4.

³⁴ Marcia Pointon, '“Surrounded with Brilliants”: Miniature Portraits in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Art Bulletin*, Vol.83, No.1, March 2001, p.56.

³⁵ Lucy Noakes, 'Gender, Grief, and Bereavement in Second World War Britain', *Journal of War and Culture Studies*, Vol.8,1,2015, p.74.

methods of mourning informed my consideration of brooches and commemorative jewels.³⁶ In *The English in Love: The Intimate Story of an Emotional Revolution*, Langhamer analyses the often difficult negotiation of relationships under the increased pressures of the Second World War.³⁷ Langhamer notes the importance accorded to military rank in the choice of a partner; a woman could display this through wearing a brooch of correspondingly high status, as several examples show. The brooches described here also appear to have functioned as pledges within hasty courtship rituals and sometimes even in place of an engagement ring.

Lou Taylor's *The Study of Dress History* explains that recent dress history studies (encompassing bodily adornment and jewellery) benefit from innovative cross-disciplinary academic methodologies that recognise the 'multi-faceted 'levels' at which clothing functions within any society and any culture'.³⁸ For Taylor, legitimate approaches include object-based research into display and interpretation, social and economic history, oral history, material culture, analysis of literature, and visual sources such as paintings and photography. Dress history may be categorised within interdisciplinary studies of 'the museum, archive, the personal collection, the factory floor, the retail outlet, the film, the internet'.³⁹ In asserting the importance of sweetheart jewellery as art historical objects, this study addresses each of these specialisms.

On the history of jewellery, *Jewellery in the Age of Queen Victoria* by Charlotte Gere and Judy Rudoe, and *Victorian Jewellery* by Margaret Flower and Doris Langley-Levy Moore provide comprehensive details of other types of brooch favoured at the time of the appearance of the first sweetheart brooches but Shirley Bury's *Jewellery 1789-1910: The International Era, Volumes I & II* is the only such publication to include a single reference to regimental brooches.⁴⁰ In *The Triumph of Love*, Geoffrey

³⁶ Noakes, 'Gender, Grief, and Bereavement', pp.72-85.

³⁷ Claire Langhamer, *The English in Love: The Intimate Story of an Emotional Revolution*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

³⁸ Lou Taylor, *The Study of Dress History*, (Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), p.1.

³⁹ Charlotte Nicklas, Annebella Pollen, eds., *Dress history: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, (London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), p.17.

⁴⁰ Charlotte Gere, Judy Rudoe, *Jewellery in the Age of Queen Victoria: A Mirror to the World* (London: British Museum Press, 2010); Margaret Flower, Doris Langley-Levy Moore,

Munn examines sentimental jewels that conveyed messages that lovers might interpret, while Bury's small book *Sentimental Jewellery* gives a brief overview of similar pieces from the V&A's collection.⁴¹ John Patrick Brian's *The Story of English Silver Brooches 1880-1918* looks at simple mass-produced pieces that would have been less expensive but nevertheless popular gifts.⁴² Clothing, badges and jewellery inscribe status, power and hierarchy upon an individual, a central theme of the study. Maria Hayward theorises the use of household liveries and badges as 'put-on' identity through which Tudor servants acquired their master's authority.⁴³ Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass argue that clothing and ornament have long been central to the construction of identity; uniforms and badges materialise rank and status irrespective of the individual who wears them.⁴⁴ More recently, Charlotte Nicklas and Annebella Pollen have observed that dress is a fundamental means, and sometimes the only one, by which people assert and negotiate group and personal identities.⁴⁵

For jewellery manufacturing I have referred to Francesca Carnevali's research into the Birmingham jewellery quarter, Ray Shill's *Birmingham's Industrial Heritage 1900-2000*, nineteenth-century street maps and the many trade directories and contemporary reports such as Samuel Timmins' 1866 *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District*.⁴⁶ Alistair Grant's research into Elkington & Co. describes the introduction of silver-gilding to Birmingham.⁴⁷ James Nye's *A Long Time in the Making: The History of Smiths* and Rachel Lichtenstein's *Diamond Street* give intimate insights into family

Victorian Jewellery (London: Cassell, 1951); Shirley Bury, *Jewellery, 1789-1910: The International Era, Volumes I & II* (Woodbridge: Antique Collectors' Club, 1991), p.751.

⁴¹ Geoffrey C. Munn, *The Triumph of Love: Jewelry 1530-1930* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1993); Bury, *An Introduction to Sentimental Jewellery*.

⁴² John Patrick Brian, *The Story of English Silver Brooches 1880-1918 In Peace and at War* (Bicester: Bound Biographies, 2007). Tony Gray, the publisher, kindly produced and sent me an out-of-print copy of this book.

⁴³ Maria Hayward, *Rich Apparel: Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII's England* (Ashgate: Farnham, Surrey 2009), pp.139-140.

⁴⁴ Ann Rosalind Jones, Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

⁴⁵ Nicklas, Pollen, eds., *Dress history: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, p.1.

⁴⁶ Francesca Carnevali, 'Luxury for the Masses. Jewellery and Jewellers in London and Birmingham in the 19th Century', *Entreprises et Histoire*, 2007, No.46, Ray Shill, *Birmingham's Industrial Heritage 1900-2000* (Stroud: Sutton, 2002); S. Timmins, ed., *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District* [London, 1866] (London, New York: Routledge, 2013).

⁴⁷ Alistair Grant, 'Elkington & Co. and the Rapture of Travel 1841-1961' *Journal of the Antique Metalware Society*, Vol.22, 2014, pp.2-3.

retailers and manufacturing jewellers in London.⁴⁸ David French's *The Regimental System, the British Army, and the British People c.1870-2000* provides invaluable information on the inclusive historical function of insignia within the British Army.⁴⁹ The iconography of many memorial regimental brooches can be directly related to that of commemorative sculptures that depict soldiers (or their absence) through their clothing, analysed by Catherine Moriarty.⁵⁰

Most sweetheart brooches originated as gifts though not necessarily romantic ones. The personal implications inherent in gift-giving posited by Marcel Mauss are particularly useful in considering exchange of brooches as wedding gifts, status objects and mourning jewellery.⁵¹ Most sweetheart brooches originated as gifts though not necessarily romantic ones. The theories of Maxine Berg and of Carnevali regarding jewellery as luxury explain the ways in which personal adornment was viewed within wartime constraints of rationing and deprivation.⁵² Throughout, the meanings attached to brooches will be seen to alter through changing circumstances. The encoded messages that a single brooch might incorporate throughout its lifetime are considered within the theories posited by Igor Kopytoff and Arjun Appadurai that objects, like people, have a biography or 'social life'. Kopytoff proposed that throughout its life an object is a 'culturally constructed entity, endowed with culturally specific meanings'.⁵³ For Appadurai, the catalyst for change is frequently conflict, particularly applicable to this study.⁵⁴ Extensive use is made of images, though not all the subjects could be identified, drawing on Susan Sontag's theories of photographs as records of events and as objects in themselves.⁵⁵ I suggest that Roland Barthes'

⁴⁸ James Nye, *A Long Time in the Making: The History of Smiths* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Rachel Lichtenstein, *Diamond Street: The Hidden World of Hatton Garden* (London: Penguin, 2013).

⁴⁹ David French, *The Regimental System, the British Army, and the British People c.1870-2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

⁵⁰ Catherine Moriarty, 'Remnants of Patriotism: the Commemorative representation of the greatcoat after the First World War', *Oxford Art Journal*, 27.3.2004, p.291-309.

⁵¹ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* [1925], trans. W. D. Halls (London: Routledge, 2002).

⁵² Maxine Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), Carnevali, 'Luxury for the Masses'.

⁵³ Igor Kopytoff, 'The Cultural Biography of Things', in Arjun Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p.26.

⁵⁴ Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things*, p.68.

⁵⁵ Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (London: Penguin, 1977), p.5.

perception of disturbing elements in photographs that cause us to pause and reconsider are especially applicable to images of regimental insignia translated into sweetheart brooches and worn on feminine wedding dresses, since we are aware that they may well be the reason for the short duration of the marriage the photograph records.⁵⁶ More recently, Moriarty has investigated the importance placed by families on photographs as vital records made before their loved ones left, in the knowledge that they might not return.⁵⁷

Methodology and Sources

Given the lack of previous scholarly research and the scarcity of direct written documentation, the primary sources for this thesis are sweetheart brooches themselves. It is unusual to find such a large body of unresearched objects that are of art historical interest, provide anthropological insight and extend knowledge about the material culture of society. Chapter 2 investigates how they came to form a large part of the jewellery produced during both World Wars. Appendix 2 details brooches in museum collections, but as objects often in private ownership and therefore difficult to access, these brooches pose particular challenges to research. However, several approaches were initially explored.

In October 2015 the British Legion agreed to publicise my request for information to their members (as the families of ex-military personnel) who might own brooches, or be aware of family members who had given or received them, through a short editorial (copy written by them) in *Legion*, their printed and online magazine. Six replies were received, of which two are analysed here.⁵⁸ Several members of military veterans' groups with particular interest in both World Wars responded to similar appeals, providing useful background information and photographs, which are individually

⁵⁶ Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans., Richard Howard, (London: Cape, 1982).

⁵⁷ Moriarty, Catherine, 'Though in a Picture Only': Photography and Commemoration', pp.30-47, in Gail Braybon, ed., *Evidence, History and the Great War: Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2001).

⁵⁸ John Keetley, see Appendix 1 and pp.214-215; Skeels, p.255.

credited.⁵⁹ An online website was set up with a request for information, though this produced no response; similarly local history groups expressed interest but had no examples to offer.

In addition to the brooches themselves, therefore, the following archives form the main basis of my research. Through this archival documentation I was able to explore the histories of hitherto unresearched brooches and to compile as complete a picture as possible of the way this jewellery was manufactured, perceived within society and employed by women to fashion identities. The Airlie family were prolific letter-writers and Mabell Airlie's unpublished writing and published memoirs are now in the British Library. All the Airlie papers currently available to the public were consulted. They provide an intimate picture of the Airlies as a couple before and during their marriage and of Lady Airlie's life and memories after her husband's death and helped to construct context for the first brooch's commission. Her grandson David Ogilvy, the current Lord Airlie, provided further details by phone and confirmed some information missing from the documentation, though he did not know the present whereabouts of his grandmother's brooch.⁶⁰ I was eventually able to trace the brooch to the collection of the King's Royal Hussars in Wiltshire and to examine and photograph it there.⁶¹

In Birmingham, my research at the Library of Birmingham's Wolfson Centre for Archival Research into the original surviving available ledgers of jewellery companies and records of their network of suppliers informed the sections on jewellery made in the area and the way the trade functioned. Lindsey Straughton of the British Jewellers' Association provided personal knowledge about the history of the area.⁶² Also invaluable for this section was research into the BJA's Birmingham archives, where past publications of *British Jeweller*, the main trade publication, are kept.

⁵⁹ For example, WW2talk.com; longlongtrail.co.uk; norfolkinWW1.org. Some examples offered were not regimental sweetheart brooches within the definition of the study; these were not included. Appendix 1.

⁶⁰ Lord Airlie, Personal Communication, letter, telephone. 14.9.2015.

⁶¹ Personal communication, Captain Thomas W. Kirkham, Unit Intelligence Officer, The King's Royal Hussars. My thanks to Captain Kirkham for arranging my visit to the KRH on 6.12.2016.

⁶² Lindsey Straughton, Marketing Manager, British Jeweller's Association, Personal communication, visited 18.11.2014.

Many editorials and advertisements in *British Jeweller* show the trade adapting to wartime restrictions and loss of workers. Dr. Alistair Grant provided much helpful background information and documentation from his own research as an enthusiast for Birmingham metalwork. For jewellery practices in London I consulted the charter and records of the Goldsmiths' Company and documents in the Goldsmiths' Library. In the V&A's National Art Library the ledgers of royal jewellers Carrington & Co., (who probably made the Airlie brooch) provided information on individually commissioned nineteenth-century jewels.

Sixtyone regimental museums in Britain were visited in person or contacted by email or phone with requests for information regarding brooches in their collections, whether they were displayed in the museum or on searchable online databases and whether any could be associated with named individuals. Appendix 2, Table 1 details their responses. Many curators were extremely helpful in providing details of objects in their stores and in facilitating research and photography in their archives and collections. The Assistant Curator of the Royal Mechanical and Electrical Engineers, Reading, for example, offered to contact donors of the four brooches in their collection.⁶³ Two had since died, but two responded. Previously, neither had known anything of their relatives' donations to the museum. Table 2 details museums of social history and museums of design approached, though no major cultural museums, for example, the British Museum, the Museum of London and the V&A, own examples.⁶⁴ Table 3 lists jewellers and other associations visited or approached for information. A few brooches were found in small temporary displays responding to current World War anniversaries, for example in National Trust houses but again, no useful information was attached to them. In 1990, RAF Cosgrove included several examples in a temporary exhibition but have none on permanent display.⁶⁵ RAF Hendon curates temporary annual exhibitions around Valentine's Day including some of the RAF Museum's collection of approximately 100 brooches but focuses on their

⁶³ Juliet Turk, Assistant Curator, REME Museum of Technology, Reading. Personal Communication, emails, 13.11.2014. See Atkin, p.50, and Appendix 1.

⁶⁴ Beatrice Behlen, Senior Curator, Fashion and Decorative Arts, Museum of London. Personal Communication, emails, 12.4.2017.

⁶⁵ Andrew Cormack, Curator, Royal Air Force Museum, London, personal communication, 14.4.2011.

function as romantic keepsakes rather than any other significance.⁶⁶ In 2005 Jonathan Whitson, Assistant Curator at Brighton Museum curated a small exhibition of ‘meaningful jewellery’ entitled *Read Me* at Sussex University Library but this did not include sweetheart brooches, and Brighton Museum holds no examples.⁶⁷ Though it concerns a different aspect of sentimental communication, Annebella Pollen’s research into Edwardian and Victorian Valentine cards, included in the *Rules of Attraction* project at Brighton’s Royal Pavilion, confirms the contemporary popularity of encoding messages into imagery.⁶⁸

The Mass Observation Archive, held at the University of Sussex, is a rich source of contemporary opinions on jewellery and ‘keeping up appearances’ from WWII. From 1937, a group of paid full-time and part-time investigators and unpaid volunteers collated information in the form of a diary recorded on the 12th of each month. From the outbreak of war in 1939 this was extended to completing a full diary or a questionnaire on an eclectic range of subjects. Lack of strict guidance as to how reports were to be compiled meant Mass Observation’s methods were the subject of criticism from the start that they were not rigorously conducted.⁶⁹ The unstructured nature of many of the questionnaires means generalisations cannot be drawn from them, yet they are valuable since they often allow us to hear contemporary voices commenting on ‘the small domestic and personal aspects of life which can appear too trivial to record’.⁷⁰ No report specifically addressed the subject of regimental brooches, but mention of them can be found across various MO topics including ‘Dress’, ‘Shopping’, ‘Women in Wartime’ and ‘Propaganda’ and comments by members of the public illuminate the ways in which personal adornment was viewed within constraints of rationing and deprivation. In the ‘Shopping’ topic, for example, jewellers’ views on the effects of the blackout on their sales and retailers’ opinions on the adoption of military styles provided useful context throughout the study.

⁶⁶ Clare Paul, RAF Museum London. Personal communication, 2.3.2018.

⁶⁷ Stella Beddoe, then Senior Keeper and Keeper of Decorative Art, Brighton Museum & Art Gallery, Brighton said the Museum had never been offered brooches but would accept them if they were donated. Personal Communication, letter, telephone, 3.5.2011.

⁶⁸ Annebella Pollen, ‘Love Letters and Hate Mail’, *Rules of Attraction* project (Royal Pavilion, Libraries and Museums, Brighton and Hove, 2007-8).

⁶⁹ Dorothy Sheridan, ‘Mass Observing the British’, *History Today*, 1.7.1984, p.42.

⁷⁰ Sheridan, ‘Mass Observing the British’, p.46.

Further primary sources include advertisements, editorials, and fiction in newspapers, journals and magazines together with letters and diaries, some unpublished. It cannot be assumed that letters to newspaper columns necessarily reflected the opinions of the general public; nevertheless, with these caveats they record issues that strongly concerned individuals at the time. Jewellers' archives from the National Art Library at the V&A were searched for details about the cost of regimental brooches and jewellery produced at the same time. Army archives, public records and census details have allowed some new information relating to ownership of the brooches to be established and for correction of some previous details.⁷¹ Voice recordings in the Imperial War Museum's archives give direct access to the memories of some of those who lived through both world wars.

For practical information on jewellery making, a visit to the conserved premises of Smith & Pepper, now part of the Museum of the Jewellery Quarter, gave insights into a Victorian and early 20th century factory and demonstrated workshop practices using original equipment still in use until the 1980s. Phil Marr, designer and goldsmith of Heathfield kindly demonstrated some of the hand-operated tools still in use that a craftsman renting a small workshop or benchspace might have employed and confirmed that some of these were identical to those used by medieval jewellers.⁷²

It is unusual to find a brooch, an image of its owner and its accompanying history, but wherever possible this has been done and the thesis includes case studies of a wide variety of brooches of differing types across all the services. Lack of direct documentary evidence may be one reason why no previous studies have been undertaken, since, as Giorgio Riello observes, historians have traditionally been reluctant to engage with objects without corroborative documentation.⁷³ As will become evident, brooches often became separated from their biographies for a variety of reasons. For example, William Woodhouse, a collector who supplied the photograph of a brooch containing an image of a sailor (fig.182) stated: 'As far as the

⁷¹ See especially the Fleming Hartley brooch, Chapter 5.

⁷² Phil Marr, *Metalsmiths* +, Heathfield, East Sussex.

⁷³ Giorgio Riello, 'Things That Shape History: Material Culture and Historical Narratives', in K. Harvey, ed., *History and Material Culture* (London: Routledge, 2009), p.29.

story behind them goes they do not have one. Most of these brooches come from house clearance where the owner has died, so the story dies with them'.⁷⁴ Alternatively, they come into the collections of museums with more obviously military artefacts such as uniforms or medals and their story is lost, however interested the curator may be. For example, a little sweetheart brooch made of brass set in a heart-shaped Perspex backing is in the collection of the REME museum.⁷⁵ It was given to his wife Rene by Edward Arthur Atkin just before he left for the D-Day landings in June 1944 with his REME unit, attached to the Scots Guards. Eventually Atkin donated it to the museum, together with his medals, but without any documentation relating to the brooch.⁷⁶ Their son Terry Atkin was contacted by Juliet Turk, Assistant Curator of the REME museum, following which he wrote to me that he knew his mother had always treasured the brooch but had not known of his father's donation to the museum. In this way the family histories relating to these emotive objects can easily be lost.⁷⁷

Objects, for Riello, are the starting point for 'asking better questions', since finding the complex meanings in such things can illuminate history. For art historians, the enquiry begins with interrogation of the object and military badge brooches are of interest since they involved not only sentimental attachments and fashionable adornment but perceptions of national and personal identity, patriotism and memorialisation.

Thesis Structure

The study is structured thematically, revealing repeated patterns of usage and of importance to groups and individuals. Five chapters will investigate the varied (and often overlapping) significance of military badge brooches to different sectors of society: the military and their families, the jewellery trade, wartime governments, individuals who wore the brooches and those depicted in images.

⁷⁴ William Woodhouse. Personal communication, email, 7.4.2011. (See Appendix 1).

⁷⁵ Access No:E:09.0226.09.

⁷⁶ Personal communication, Terry Atkin, phone, 13.11.2014 and written documentation, 17.11.2014.

⁷⁷ Riello, 'Things That Shape History', p.29.

The first, *Military Insignia to Personal Adornment*, traces the origins of military badges, their designs and functions, in order to establish how far badges, and by extension badge brooches, articulated identity. The Royal Artillery insignia typifies the way all insignia describe forces' history through visual imagery and text. Royal Artillery brooches of widely varying values demonstrate how the badge eventually transmuted into jewellery for women. To situate military brooches within the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century discourse of jewellery as communicative device I draw on other sentimental jewels popular at that period, from costly pieces designed for Queen Victoria and Florence Nightingale to simple printed patriotic pins worn by children during the Boer War. I examine the history of badges as identifiers and the popularity of images that reinforced traditional binary concepts of male action and of women awaiting their return, a concept incorporated into sweetheart brooches. In 1886, sentimental jewellery and military insignia were combined in the brooch commissioned for Lady Airlie. Synthesising unpublished Airlie family papers and letters and Lady Airlie's diary (extracts from which were published in her edited memoirs) I speculate on the reasons why Airlie was inspired to commission this original jewel as a wedding present.

Chapter 2, *Sweetheart Brooches and the Jewellers: Making and Selling the Brooches*, turns to the importance of the brooches to the fortunes of the jewellery trade and to makers of buttons and badges. During both World Wars, faced with shortages of materials and skilled workers, and with opposition to sales of luxury items at times of austerity, manufacturers and retailers found opportunities to market them as patriotic objects. I examine retailers' deliberate obfuscation of their true origin with the aim of enhancing the perceived value of objects thought to be made in London and look at methods of constructing both hand-made and machine-made brooches.

Chapter 3, *Wartime Governments, Gendered Propaganda and the Sweetheart Brooch*, investigates military sweetheart brooches as propaganda objects. In WWI, government placed women at the forefront of recruitment campaigns, exhorting them to persuade their male relatives to enlist and to see this as their own war service. The extensive use of badges and brooches to identify those employed in war work and conversely, to vilify those out of uniform, suggests their importance as propaganda objects. Commercial advertising appropriated these messages, promoting the brooches as

patriotic signs identifying women's sacrifice. In WWII conscription removed the need for recruitment but women wore their brooches to support the forces and as protection against attacks on those not in uniform. Badge brooches were produced for the military, auxiliary forces and to support government propaganda campaigns. Within the context of the myth of the hero and its necessity in raising public morale, I consider the effect of a propaganda campaign on the lasting monetary value and aura surrounding a brooch given by a celebrated Second World War pilot.

In Chapter 4, *'Every Female Seemed to Wear One': Wearing Sweetheart Brooches in Wartime Britain* I look at the multiplicity of reasons for women to wear them. Though often symbols of romantic love and particularly popular for brides, they were also fashion items, indicators of status and of self-fashioning. During both World Wars they functioned as amulets and talismans and inevitably often became commemorative objects. An unusual WWI brooch awarded to a woman for bravery under fire, and two brooches replicating Victoria Cross medals are analysed here.

In Chapter 5, *Brooches with Images, Images of Brooches*, I turn to several regimental brooches to which photographs have been added and to images featuring the brooches, contextualising them within the history of much earlier portrait miniatures.

Photographs individualised the jewellery, creating intimate objects that displayed the giver's likeness to the public gaze or concealed it exclusively for the knowledge of the woman who wore it. Like portrait miniatures to which, as explained earlier, they are related, these small jewels allowed photographs to be worn close to the body, looked at and held in the hand, creating the illusion of the absent loved one's continued presence. Gillian Rose, among others, theorises the crucial affective power of photographs to evoke the continued presence of the dead.⁷⁸

Many images in this thesis would not be considered valuable in art historical terms and indeed would never have been expected to be viewed outside the family album yet they evoke, as Geoffrey Batchen asserts: 'the immediacy of the moment of

⁷⁸ Gillian Rose, *Doing Family Photography: The Domestic, The Public and the Politics of Sentiment* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), p.89.

personal grief, right here in the present’.⁷⁹ Some are ‘found’ objects, some bought over the internet, others in museum collections; some were taken in local studios before painted backdrops and printed as postcards for distribution to friends and family. The subjects are frequently unidentifiable but little speculation is necessary to recognise that such photographs were often taken hurriedly in wartime with the prospect of imminent separation and the knowledge that such images might be all that remained. The pictures may be contained within jewellery or depict brooches within photographs; in either case, as Pollen observes: ‘through heightening, containment and framing, they condense and concentrate the experience that they picture’ and this concept is further explored in this section.⁸⁰

This introduction has set out the aims of the thesis: broadly, to recover a neglected group of objects once familiar to the majority of women in Britain and worn on a daily basis and to argue for their inclusion with the history of affective objects and of emotive jewellery. While emphasising their emotional importance in the highly charged circumstances of war, these brooches connoted more than romantic sentiments; by interrogating their origins, the practicalities of their manufacture and their complex and changing significance to individuals and society, these five chapters take a more nuanced approach to these brooches. Like other items that embed emotions and histories, they tell us much about the circumstances in which they were made and circulated. As Saunders states, ‘Nowhere other than in war are people’s social lives more insistently determined by their relationship to the objects which represent them, and through which they come to know and define themselves’.⁸¹

⁷⁹ Geoffrey Batchen, *Forget me Not: Photography & Remembrance* (New York, Amsterdam: Princeton Architectural Press, 2004), p.93.

⁸⁰ Annebella Pollen, *Mass Photography: Collective Histories of Everyday Life* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2016), p.13.

⁸¹ Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.1.

Chapter 1

Military Insignia to Personal Adornment: The Origins of the Sweetheart Brooch

1.1. Introduction

This chapter describes the origins and development of sweetheart brooches. It proposes that sweetheart brooches were often not simply copies of badges but blended two existing types of adornment: military insignia, previously the exclusive preserve of males, and sentimental jewellery that conveyed messages of love or mourning through the language of gemstones, flowers or textual puzzles. A Royal Irish Rifles brooch reveals this fusion (fig.1). The ‘angel harp’ is embellished with a winged female figure above a bow from which a trumpet is suspended. At the top is an imperial, or king’s crown. The brooch is decorated with diamonds and enamels giving it a superficially feminine appearance entirely at odds with the fierce reputation of the regiment, gained from its action in the Napoleonic wars, the Boer Wars and throughout WWI. On a green enamelled scroll is the regimental motto ‘Quis Separabit’ (‘Who will separate us’), originally a political message.⁸² But this could equally be interpreted as a lover’s pledge; to those accustomed to decoding the meanings conveyed by Victorian sentimental jewellery described in this chapter, the message of this piece would be easy to decipher.

Regimental insignia lend themselves to unusual and beautiful jewels when imitated in gold and precious stones. A brooch dated 1914, for example, comprises the Royal Scots Fusiliers’ Scottish thistle with nine diamond flames representing a fired fusil, (a flintlock musket) or grenade, referencing the explosive shells embroidered on trench bombers’ uniform sleeves (fig.2). The martial imagery gives an undeniably masculine appearance; worn on the tightly corseted dresses that signified femininity in the social construct of the 1880s, these brooches must have appeared remarkable and unconventional. Sparkling diamonds, rubies and emeralds made visual connections

⁸² Derived from the Order of St. Patrick, founded in 1783 to reward Irish holders of high office on whose support the government of the day depended.

with the gleaming metallic badges of nineteenth-century uniforms. There is tension too between the uncompromisingly masculine skull and crossbones of the 17th/21st Lancers' badge (the 'Death or Glory Boys') and the fine workmanship and valuable gemstones used to replicate it (fig.3). Both are incontrovertibly bellicose, the aggressive imagery in contrast to the delicate floral and foliate designs common to much Victorian sentimental jewellery.

To demonstrate this amalgamation of insignia and jewellery, the chapter first traces the origins of the visual messages contained within military badges, then moves to consider the development of emblems as identification in battle. Badges derived from heraldic images and medieval *imprese*, indicating familial and political affiliations and came to narrate each unit's history, fostering a sense of inclusivity excluding, by definition, other groups. Heraldic jewels were exchanged as diplomatic gifts within negotiations relating to political treaties and marriages. I consider ways in which badges contributed to persuasive material culture: in court paintings they supported dynastic claims while inexpensive brooches worn by schoolchildren reinforced the late nineteenth-century atmosphere of imperial patriotism. Next I look at jewellery popular during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, created specifically as expressions of emotion. Like military insignia, sentimental jewellery's purpose lies in its communicative capacity: jewels encapsulating the 'languages' of flowers and gemstones, visual puzzles and textual wordplay flourished at this period. Finally, I argue that in 1886 these two strands converged in the brooch Airlie commissioned for his wife. In appearance this piece fused the historical imagery of Airlie's regimental badge with the valuable materials often seen in sentimental brooches; in function it blurred the distinction between an identifier of his career and a jewel that spoke of their personal relationship. Sweetheart brooches thus assimilated and extended the traditions of historic military devices while incorporating the emotional significance of the circumstances in which they were gifted between individuals, becoming in the process a separate and distinct category of jewellery.

Firstly, a case study of the badge of the Royal Artillery exemplifies the translation of regimental insignia to military sweetheart brooches. Versions made in materials varying from costly precious gems to simple base metals illustrate the brooches available to serving personnel across all the armed forces.

1.2 The Gunners' Badge

In 1940, Regent Street jeweller Charles Packer claimed: 'badge brooches are rapidly becoming the most popular form of modern jewellery' and offered for sale a Royal Artillery brooch with a working, turning gun carriage wheel set with diamonds.⁸³ Like all military insignia, the badge of the Royal Artillery, known as the 'Gunners', reflects their operational function and history (fig.4). The Royal Artillery originated with a permanent artillery regiment raised at Woolwich by George I under Royal Warrant in 1716, replacing the temporary 'traynes' that since the battle of Crécy (1346) had been drafted as required for specific campaigns and then disbanded.⁸⁴ Army regiments carry flags, known as colours, featuring their insignia and battles successfully fought but the Royal Artillery regard the guns as their regimental colours. The gun therefore takes prominent position on the badge, which depicts a 9-pounder rifled muzzle loader c.1871, with the rammer that forced the charge into the 'mule' or muzzle, lying diagonally to the left of the carriage wheel.⁸⁵ The regiment's motto 'UBIQUE' ('EVERYWHERE') above the gun carriage expresses its presence in every field of war, while the scroll across the base reads 'QUO FAS ET GLORIA DUCUNT' ('WHERE RIGHT AND GLORY LEAD').⁸⁶ For soldiers of the regiment the badge articulates its long history. For a woman, a replica sweetheart brooch conveyed additional layers of significance, representing also the relationship between donor and recipient.

Royal Artillery brooches typify the many variations available across the armed services. From 1914-1918 *The Illustrated London News* published a weekly magazine, *The Illustrated War News*, subtitled 'Being a Pictorial Record of the Great War' and covering, through articles and photographs, the progress of campaigns on all

⁸³ Advertisement, *The Bystander*, 10.1.1940, p.55.

⁸⁴ Firepower: Royal Artillery Museum, URL:<http://firepower.org.uk/explore/the-james-clavell-library-and-archives/>[accessed 5.1.2014].

⁸⁵ Firepower: Royal Artillery Museum, URL:<http://firepower.org.uk/explore/the-james-clavell-library-and-archives/>[accessed 5.1.2014].

⁸⁶ 'FAS' specifically denotes a sacred duty. Firepower: Royal Artillery Museum, URL:<http://firepower.org.uk/explore/the-james-clavell-library-and-archives/>[accessed 5.1.2014].

fronts and at home.⁸⁷ At Christmas 1914 the publication contained a photograph of Royal Artillery soldiers on the Western Front, shown: ‘in action loading the gun’, forcefully bringing the realities of warfare to those at home (fig.5).⁸⁸ In *Great War Deeds* for May 1916 the Goldsmiths & Silversmiths Company advertised an RA brooch in gold, enamel and diamonds at £5.10s.0d, or with a gold wheel at £3.5s.0d (fig. 6). Plain gold or enamel brooches of any regiment could be supplied for £1.17s.6d, each ‘being modelled directly from the original’. The purchase of a brooch was thus clearly conflated with patriotic support for the troops who were regularly depicted in the publication. A photograph from around this date shows a young woman who has pinned her fashionable tie around the collar of her blouse with a Royal Artillery brooch (fig.7). Square-cut sapphires and rubies on a gold and platinum 1930s version (fig.8) give it an Art Deco appearance. This would have been a costly piece of jewellery, undoubtedly a gift from an officer. At the opposite end of the financial scale is a small brooch with an Royal Artillery badge within a lucky wishbone, still attached to the ‘Souvenir’ card on which it was sold, priced 8s.6d. (fig.9). It is undated, but was probably made during WWII. A photograph of Lance-Bombadier Ron Goldstein taken in 1942 shows the Royal Artillery badge on his uniform cap (fig.10). This would have been a simple metal monochrome badge similar to the one in fig.4. Shown in fig.11 is the corresponding metal and enamel sweetheart brooch Goldstein gave his wife, Nita, at around the same time. Nita’s brooch is not made of costly materials, but is valued for its associations and she wears it when they attend AJEX Parades and ceremonial regimental occasions.⁸⁹

It is difficult to estimate accurately how the price of a brooch might relate to the income of a soldier, sailor or airman. Pay and living costs varied enormously from one regiment to another so that officers sometimes chose regiments on the basis of affordability. French notes that at the end of the nineteenth century: ‘Junior officers in the Royal Artillery and the Royal Engineers could expect to be able to live on their

⁸⁷ Archive.org.

URL:<https://archive.org/stream/nsillustratedwar07londuoft#page/n7/mode/2up>[accessed 15.3.2015].

⁸⁸ *Illustrated War News*, 23.12.1914, p.38.

⁸⁹ Ron Goldstein. Personal Communication, 21.9.2014. (Appendix 1). AJEX (The Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen and Women) Parades are held annually at the Cenotaph the week following Remembrance Day.

pay, although some extra cash from outside sources such as their parents never came amiss' while cavalry subalterns needed a considerable annual private income to subsidise their salaries.⁹⁰ At the same date, a private soldier's annual income was just over £34, from which rations were deducted.⁹¹ In 1914, A Royal Field Artillery Lieutenant-Colonel received a daily rate of 28s.0d, plus some living expenses.⁹² The Goldsmiths & Silversmiths' brooch costing £5.10s.6d, therefore, would have represented approximately 4 days' pay. Botley & Lewis of Reading advertised their range of brooches as 'desirable and useful keepsakes' priced between 1s.0d and 12s.6d. An RA gunner then earned 1s.2½d per day; for this he might purchase a small silver and enamel brooch at 2s.6d or a 9ct gold one at 12s.6d (approximately 2 and 10 days' pay respectively). Naval pay ranged from 3s.6d. per week for 'boys 2nd class' to 52s.6d. for skilled artificers. Highest paid were Royal Engineers (Lieutenant Colonels at 38s.0d daily) and Royal Flying Corps: a Wing Commander was paid 38s.0d. per day (a Mechanic 2nd class earned 2s.0d.).⁹³ By 1938 an experienced RA Captain received £1.3s.6d daily; the following year platinum brooches with small diamonds, costing between £6.15s.0d and £30 were advertised, with made-to-order versions costing up to £80.⁹⁴ These figures give an approximation only of the relative values of the brooches. For officers with private incomes, their military salaries were less relevant and they could, of course, commission hand-made jewellery according to their means. Between the diamond versions and those of base metal were variations in the quality and number of gemstones, whether real, paste or marcasite jewels were used and the quality of gold, all of which affected the price.⁹⁵ The range of Royal Artillery brooches is typical of those manufactured for all the forces, making them available in some form to everyone.

⁹⁰ French, *Military Identities*, pp.51-53.

⁹¹ This represented about 65% of a semi-skilled labourer's wage. French, *Military Identities*, pp.52-53.

⁹² Elizabeth Bruton, British Army and RE Rates of Pay, 1914-1915, URL:<http://blogs.mhs.ox.ac.uk/innovatingincombat/british-army-royal-engineers-rates-pay-1914-1915>[accessed 23.4.2015].

⁹³ RFC recruitment poster, 1914. Also listed on the poster were uniform, living allowance, food and 'medical attendance'.

⁹⁴ *British Jeweller*, Vol.7, No.3, November 1939, p.25.

⁹⁵ Paste is hand-cut glass polished with metal powder and sometimes backed with metal foil to appear like gemstones. Marcasite jewellery is made from pyrite, ('fool's gold') not the mineral marcasite, which is too brittle.

Insignia like the Gunners' badge worn on the body 'work as inscriptions' to be interpreted.⁹⁶ To examine how these badges and brooches acted as mnemonics to forces and civilians alike I turn next to their development from their origins on the battlefield to jewellery for women in wartime.

1.3 Banners and Badges 'To Avoide Confusion'

In 1639, Robert Ward's treatise *Animadversions of Warre* advised on the organisation and conduct of an army in peace and war and the duties of every rank within it.⁹⁷

Responsibility for company identification, he states, falls to the Colonel:

hee ought to have all the Colours of his Regiment to be alike both in colour and in fashion to avoide confusion, so that the Souldiers may discerne their owne Regiment from the other Troopes; Likewise, every particular Captaine of his Regiment may have some small distinction in their Colours, as their Armes, or some Embleme, or the like, so that one Company may be discerned from another⁹⁸

The importance of visual differentiation between companies, and between an army and its enemy in the field might seem self-evident. However, Barbara Donagan describes disasters during the English Civil War (1642-1649) that were blamed on 'want of colours', when soldiers could neither identify a central rallying point nor separate friend from foe.⁹⁹ Visual identification was essential when few enlisted men were literate and privately raised troops wore coats in colours of their colonel's choice, making it impossible reliably to distinguish one side from the other by appearance. Trade in clothing taken from prisoners and the dead muddled identification further.¹⁰⁰ Only after the Civil War were scarlet army uniforms

⁹⁶ Jones, Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, p.3.

⁹⁷ Robert Ward, 'Gentleman and Commander', *Animadversions of Warre*, London, printed by John Dawson and are to be sold by Francis Eglesfield at the signe of the Marigold in Pauls Church-yard, 1639. Online URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-122>[accessed 4.4.2014].

⁹⁸ 'The office and duty of a Colonell', Ward, *Animadversions of Warre*, pp.204-205.

⁹⁹ Barbara Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp.114-115.

¹⁰⁰ Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649*, p.116.

standardised.¹⁰¹ Royalist Civil War soldiers sometimes sewed silver badges onto their clothing but cap badges were not generally worn until 1800 when the tall shako headgear was adopted as a regular part of British army uniforms.

Obviously it was crucial that commanders transmitted orders coherently in the chaos of the battlefield. Audible communication by drums, fifes and trumpets were developed but distinctive colours (i.e. flags, or standards) allowed for visual identification. Decorative on the ceremonial parade ground, they were essential on the battlefield, providing rallying points for dispersed troops and identifying their commander's location. Colours were such highly symbolic objects, whose loss signified humiliation, that standing orders (remaining in force today in most modern armies) required their destruction if in danger of capture by enemy forces. Colours were never destroyed, battlefield wear and tear being perceived as honourable damage. When too fragile for use they are ceremonially 'laid up' in the regiment's town of origin. Colours were and are venerated, esteemed as 'affording a record of the services of the Regiment and furnishing to the young soldier a history of gallant deeds'.¹⁰² Embroidered names of successful campaigns and battle honours reinforce these histories.¹⁰³ Early standards were at the whim of the commander who paid for them until 1751, when Royal Warrant prohibited the use of personal arms on clothing and colours. Since banners communicated ideologies and identities, commanders often put careful thought into the messages conveyed.¹⁰⁴ Mottos made religious claims for divine support to motivate troops or secular jibes to demoralise the enemy. After 1751, regiments received official badges or numbers for buttons and uniforms.¹⁰⁵ Thereafter, colours were ceremonially presented to the regiment by the monarch and consecrated at religious services expressly planned to reinforce notions of inclusivity. In 1854 'A Cavalry Officer' wrote to *The Times* asserting that while criticisms could be made of the army's structure and training:

¹⁰¹ R. M. Barnes, *A History of the Regiments and Uniforms of the British Army* (London: Sphere, 1972), pp.220-221.

¹⁰² PRO WO 32/6701. Ellice to GOCs at Home, 17.1.1882. Quoted in French, *The Regimental System*, p.88.

¹⁰³ For a detailed explanation of the Childers regulations see French, *Military Identities*, pp.88-90.

¹⁰⁴ Donagan, *War in England 1642-1649*, pp.115-116.

¹⁰⁵ R. J. Wilkinson-Latham, *Discovering British Military Badges and Buttons*, (Oxford: Shire, 2002), p.4.

The peculiarity of the English army has always been what I may term the regimental system, and its excellence is intimately connected with it. [...] The honour, the fair name of the individual regiment, the desire of all in it to maintain that name, has ever been the keystone of our military arch.¹⁰⁶

When the 1881 Childers reforms restructured the infantry regiments, cap badges were introduced as a means of visibly establishing individual units' identities.¹⁰⁷ Insignia were always intended to create a sense of inclusivity and also 'enhanced each regiment's sense of separateness'.¹⁰⁸ Every possible means to establish trust and cohesion were essential since at any time the regiment might require a soldier to sacrifice his life in its service.¹⁰⁹ A badge thus articulated a unit's history and could be deciphered as written text:

To wear a badge is to pledge one's loyalty: to wear a badge of a regiment with a glorious history, is to adopt all the past traditions of the force, all the failures and successes of the men who have gone before, as a sacred personal trust.¹¹⁰

The importance of visible distinguishing marks in encouraging recruitment and fostering cohesion and loyalty was always clearly understood. When in 1940 the British Expeditionary Force was issued with practical plain battledress, senior officers expressed concern that: 'esprit de corps, particularly in the infantry, will suffer if soldiers in battle dress are not permitted to carry on them an emblem showing the regiment to which they belong'.¹¹¹ Military families too were familiar with insignia and by extension the brooches that replicated them. In wartime, most civilians would also have recognised the symbols and ranks of the husbands and lovers of the women who wore them, though arguably that became less true in peacetime when they began to disappear from visual culture. Some of these devices were newly conceived designs and many can be dated by the way they were adapted to take into account regimental amalgamations or changes of monarch but others derived from ancestral

¹⁰⁶ A Cavalry Officer. 'Our Cavalry Reinforcements.' *The Times* (London), 1.12.1854, p.5.

¹⁰⁷ Nicholas J. Saunders, Paul Cornish, Editors, *Contested Objects* (London, New York: Routledge, 2014), p.120.

¹⁰⁸ French, *Military Identities*, p.85.

¹⁰⁹ French, *Military Identities*, p.79.

¹¹⁰ *Badges and Emblems of the Services* (London: N.A.G. Press Ltd., 1940), p.3.

¹¹¹ Minutes of the Proceedings of and précis prepared for the Army Council, 6.8.1940. PRO WO. 163/48/ACM(AE)15. Quoted in French, *Military Identities*, p.86.

heraldic images already in use as family livery badges and jewels. The following section discusses some of them and their significance in the development of badges as identifiers.

1.4 Badges, Devices and Brooches

In his study of badges and emblems, Michael Powell Siddons asserts they functioned to proclaim ownership and identity, to define hierarchy in war and as decoration on monuments and jewellery. Powell Siddons observes that when, in *Henry VI*, Clifford challenges the Earl of Warwick: ‘Might I but know thee by thy household badge’, Shakespeare is drawing attention to heraldic emblems as markers of family and political allegiances.¹¹² Warwick’s response foregrounds his own family’s device:

Now, by my father’s badge, old Nevil’s crest,
The rampant bear chain’d to the ragged staff,
This day I’ll wear aloft my burgonet,¹¹³
[...] Even to affright thee with the view thereof.¹¹⁴

Family badges thus materialised past feuds and hostilities so that merely the sight of them would terrify an enemy, as do all effective insignia. Alfred Gell observed the performative capacity of conflict-related objects such as decorated shields, made not for aesthetic purposes but to evoke fear in an opponent.¹¹⁵ An emblem depersonalises the individual, subsuming him or her to the group it symbolises and embodying the power, or lack of power of the group. (For instance, from 1921 the swastika, appropriated from ancient cultures including Buddhism, became what Zybnek Zeman calls Nazism’s “hypnotic, repetitive backcloth”.¹¹⁶ Easily recognisable, its simple shape encapsulated Nazi ideology without the need for text.)

¹¹² Michael Powell Siddons, *Heraldic Badges in England and Wales* (Woodbridge: Published for The Society of Antiquaries of London by Boydell Press, 2009), Vol.1, p.xii.

¹¹³ A helmet.

¹¹⁴ William Shakespeare, *Henry VI Part 2*, Act V.1.

¹¹⁵ Alfred Gell, *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), pp.5-6.

¹¹⁶ Zybnek Zeman, 1973, *Nazi Propaganda*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), p.9.

In the late fourteenth century, knights formed teams to compete in tournaments and wore livery badges and emblems as ‘arms for peace’.¹¹⁷ The knight’s ‘entry’ or first appearance was the occasion for constructing his identity through the colours and devices he and his retinue wore (fig.12).¹¹⁸ Froissart’s *Chronicles* describe the royal tournament at Smithfield of October 1390 when mounted knights paraded through the city of London, each led on a silver chain by a lady ‘richly ornamented and dressed’, identified by emblems on their shields.¹¹⁹

According to the *Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi* (1377-1390), Richard II adopted the white hart as his personal emblem at this tournament. The Wilton Diptych was painted as a portable altarpiece for Richard’s private devotions and the white hart appears prominently throughout. The diptych shows Richard with Edward the Confessor and Edmund, presented to the Virgin and Child by John the Baptist, his patron saint (fig.13) The altarpiece is protected by hinged covers, the left painted with Richard’s coat of arms and the right with his white hart, a crown and chain around its neck.¹²⁰ The emblem is woven into the king’s red and gold robes and on his cloak is a jewel with the same device (fig.14). Behind the Virgin is a company of eleven angels, nine of whom wear Richard’s white hart brooches, making a bold claim through his emblem for divine support. The Treasure Roll inventory of Richard’s jewels (dated 1388-1389) in the National Archives at Kew indicates Richard owned several hart brooches of gold, jewels and enamels, some with pearls on the antlers and that he gave these as diplomatic gifts.¹²¹ Richard’s marriage to seven-year-old Isabella in Calais on 4th November 1396 sealed lengthy peace negotiations between England and France. According to the Treasure Rolls, Charles VI and Richard II exchanged valuable jewellery as diplomatic tokens: Richard sent white hart brooches and Charles

¹¹⁷ Powell Siddons, *Heraldic Badges in England and Wales*, Vol.1, p.2. See Vols.1-3 for a comprehensive study of early badges.

¹¹⁸ George R. Kernodle, Portia Kernodle, ‘Dramatic aspects of the medieval tournament’, *Speech Monographs*, 9:1, p.163.

¹¹⁹ Jean Froissart, *Chronicles of England, France and Spain*, [14C], Trans. John Bouchier, Lord Berners, Ed. G. C. Macaulay, (New York: MacMillan, 1904), Chap.XXI. Online edition: Internet Archive, URL: https://archive.org/stream/chroniclesoffroi00froiuoft/chroniclesoffroi00froiuoft_djvu.txt[accessed 2.4.2016].

¹²⁰ Dillian Gordon, ‘A New Discovery in the Wilton Diptych’, *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol.134, No.1075 (Oct.1992), p.662.

¹²¹ National Archives, Kew, Ref: TNA:PRO,E.101/411/9.

a collar with his broomcod emblem fashioned in gold and jewels.¹²² A contemporary chronicler reported that when they met at Ardres the treaty was sealed by exchange of gifts and each wore the other's emblem in reciprocal goodwill gestures.¹²³ Badges worn by the participants and their followers thus made visible statements relating to the treaty itself and to the political allegiances the parties to it wished to proclaim.

Throughout the Wilton Diptych, devices and emblems express loyalties and assert political claims. The original white hart brooch is believed to have been made of gold finished with *émail en ronde bosse*, a skilled technique involving applying enamels to irregular or rounded high relief shapes, commonly used for gold jewellery and ornamental items in the Medieval and Renaissance periods. The diptych shows pearls applied to the deer's antlers on Richard's jewel, although those worn by the angels are less elaborate, as his real followers' would have been. Less valuable copies of the badge have been found, such as a lead version in the British Museum, confirming they were distributed amongst all levels of his household. Badges like Richard's white hart speak of carefully orchestrated presentations of royal lineage through emblems, establishing the importance of the exchange of jewelled brooches within diplomatic negotiations. Henri Estienne, in *The Art of Making Devises*, stated the advantage of communicating ideas in this way since 'it declares the matter more plainly: For the Embleme is properly a sweet and morall Symbole, which consists of picture and words, by which some weighty sentence is declared'.¹²⁴

¹²² John Cherry states that contemporary written descriptions of the peascod collar sent to Richard by Charles VI 'differ markedly' from the image in the Wilton Diptych. The painting may depict a generic collar or, as Cherry suggests, the collar described in the inventory may refer to another version sent as a gift. John Cherry, 'Late Fourteenth-Century Jewellery: The Inventory of November 1399', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol.130, No.1019, Special Issue: English Gothic Art (Feb.1988), p.139. Sydney Anglo notes the difference between personal emblems, eg. the white hart, Richard III's boar and dynastic ones, eg. the Plantagenet broomcod. Sydney Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kinship* (London: Seaby, 1992), p.122.

¹²³ The Chronicler of Saint-Denys, I, t.2, pp.466-67, quoted in Glynnis M. Cropp, Alison Hanham, 'Richard II from Donkey to Royal Martyr: Perceptions of Eustache Deschamps and Contemporary French Writers', *Parergon*, Vol.24, No.1, 2007, p.123.

¹²⁴ Henri Estienne, *The Art of Making Devises* [1645], trans. by Thomas Blount, of the Inner Temple, London, to be sold at the Angell, Ivie Lane, Chap.IV, <http://www.ebooksread.com/authors-eng/henry-estienne/the-art-of-making-devises> [accessed 11.3.2015].

Family retainers acquired their lord's power through wearing his emblem, believing they could intimidate others with impunity, a problem about which Commons petitioned Parliament regularly throughout the fourteenth century, objecting: 'those who wear them are, by reason of the power of their masters, flown with such insolent arrogance [...] it is certainly the boldness inspired by their badges that makes them unafraid to do these things and more besides'.¹²⁵ Maria Hayward's analysis of Tudor and Elizabethan clothing shows that livery was supplied to men and women of great households to identify servants at all levels and officials displayed their authority through uniforms and badges.¹²⁶ Livery devices demonstrated familial and political allegiances and were transformed into jewels for diplomatic exchange. They were applied to religious and secular objects and identified officials and armies. Jones and Stallybrass describe objects worn on the body, whether clothing, armour or jewellery, as the means by which an individual's social identity is recognised.¹²⁷ Peter McNeil and Giorgio Riello observe that arts, riding and other skills necessary to the cultivated courtier, combined with sumptuous clothing and jewellery, created 'collective mentalities that structured hierarchies of modern European hierarchies and behaviour'.¹²⁸ Clothing and ornament created monarch, guild member or household servant, while exchange of jewels sealed a marriage.

Additionally, giving and receiving gifts of such recognisable tokens established networks of personal and political patronage and implied future claims that both parties might make upon each other. Personal gifts of jewellery have always held special significance since they imply intimate relationships between donor and recipient.¹²⁹ Honor, Lady Lisle, wife of Henry VIII's Lord Deputy in Calais, frequently distributed gifts among friends, family and her husband's political

¹²⁵ Chris Given-Wilson, 'Richard II and the Higher Nobility', in Anthony Goodman, James Gillespie, Eds., *Richard II The Art of Kingship*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), p.271-275.

¹²⁶ Hayward, Maria, *Rich Apparel*, pp.138-139.

¹²⁷ Jones, Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing* pp.2-3.

¹²⁸ Peter McNeil, Giorgio Riello, *Luxury: A Rich History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p.69.

¹²⁹ Barbara J. Harris, 'Women and Politics in Early Tudor England', *The Historical Journal*, 33.2. (1990), p.266.

connections in expectation of reciprocity in future influence.¹³⁰ In 1535 she sent the courtier Thomas Culpeper such a gift with an accompanying letter, coyly stating:

‘I send you two bracelets of my colours, according to your desire. They are of no value, but that it was your gentle request to have them. They are the first that ever I sent to any man. [...] I thank you heartily for the ring you sent me’.¹³¹

Honor Lisle understood the complex rituals of gift-giving by which favours were sought and influence negotiated within court circles by exchange of objects marked with family signs, as her bracelets ‘of my colours’ appear to have been and the tone of her letter acknowledges the intimate connotations of giving jewellery to a man.

Elizabeth I’s *Rainbow* portrait (c.1600-1603, attributed to Marcus Gheeraerts the Younger) is commonly read by art historians through the bejewelled, embroidered and painted motifs on the Queen’s clothing and the rainbow in her hand.¹³² (fig.15). These complex symbols are understood to articulate the Queen’s personal and regnal attributes, framed within allegorical images. Less obvious is a tiny jewelled gauntlet brooch, almost hidden on her ruff, close to her face (fig.16). Roy Strong states that though some scholars have suggested the gauntlet symbolises Elizabeth’s role as ‘Defender of the Faith’, there is no precedent for this interpretation.¹³³ Strong believes the painting depicts a real jewel, a brooch imitating the Queen’s glove worn by the Earls of Cumberland and Essex, who were her champions at the Ascension Day Tilts.¹³⁴ In Nicholas Hilliard’s small painting of George Clifford, 3rd Earl of Cumberland, the Earl is armoured for his first tournament as Elizabeth’s champion around 1590 and wears her glove, identified as her favour by the tiny embroidered

¹³⁰ Arthur Plantagenet, Viscount Lisle, *The Lisle Letters*, Vol.2., Ed. By Muriel St. Clare Byrne (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1981).

¹³¹ Lady Lisle to Thomas Culpeper, 14.10.1535. RO.612. ‘Henry VIII: October 1535, 11-20’, in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 9, August-December 1535*, Ed. James Gairdner [London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1886], 195-218. *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol9/pp195-218>[accessed 7.2.2015].

¹³² The rainbow (peace) and text ‘*Non sine sole iris*’ (‘no rainbow without the sun’) and the emblems on her clothing are generally understood to refer allegorically to Elizabeth’s reign. For a detailed analysis see for example, Roy Strong, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Pimlico, 2003), pp.156-161.

¹³³ Strong, *Gloriana*, p.160.

¹³⁴ Strong, *Gloriana*, p.160.

crown, doubled over and pinned to his hat by a jewel (fig.17). On the ground lie the Earl's gauntlets, similar in appearance to the jewelled brooch in the Rainbow painting. If Strong's interpretation of the brooch as the mark of royal favour in the context of courtly chivalry is accepted, then the Queen wore this jewel in recognition of the favoured courtier who entered the tournament on her behalf.¹³⁵ Though this fight was theatrical, like Clifford's (probably imaginary) armour, it was undoubtedly dangerous. I suggest this jewel should therefore be compared in concept and function to much later military badge brooches, since both Clifford's gauntlets and the Queen's matching brooch were signifiers identifying them as two parties in a circular narrative of affiliation in warfare.

Queen Elizabeth's brooch was an early example of jewellery that articulated the connection between women and conflict-related objects. 'Trophy' jewels appropriated images of weapons and depicted them with symbolic hearts wounded by love. Popular lovers' gifts, the contrast between aggressively masculine weaponry and amatory messages projected through gleaming gemstones prefigured the tension achieved through the military sweetheart brooches illustrated herein. A beautiful brooch (c.1750) now in the Victoria & Albert Museum depicts a plumed helmet, bugle, fluttering standard, rifle and canon in silver and rose-cut diamonds around a central diamond-set shield (fig.18). Two arrows and a flaming torch reflect details commonly included in amatory trophy jewellery. There is no record of who gave or received this jewel but the precise rendering of the military hardware suggests it might have been commissioned as a gift by a soldier.

Prince Albert's well-documented artistic interests extended to the jewellery he designed for Queen Victoria to commemorate intimate family occasions and contemporary events, often presenting a distinctly military appearance. In the Royal Collection is a brooch given to Victoria in 1842 to celebrate the birth of their first son Albert Edward in 1841, in gold and white enamel set with pearls, emeralds and rubies in the form of Prince of Wales feathers (very similar in form to that later commissioned by Airlie). This brooch of course, was not given to make a connection to the military forces but was designed to recognise the new baby's pre-eminence in

¹³⁵ Clifford fought for Elizabeth in naval battles.

the royal succession. This was the prince's own emblem, later adopted by several regiments as their own.

In 1855 Prince Albert designed another brooch, this time as a mark of royal appreciation for Florence Nightingale's work in the Crimea (figs.19, 20).¹³⁶ Like later military brooches, this was a hybrid object, not simply decorative jewellery but given in the absence of any appropriate medal that could be awarded at the time to a woman for war work. There is tension between the militaristic design and the pacific texts inscribed on it. The red and white enamel Cross of St. George represented England, with the royal cypher and Queen's crown in diamonds. Around the edge in gold on black enamel is inscribed: 'Blessed are the merciful', the first part of the seventh beatitude from the Sermon on the Mount, reflecting the deep religiosity of Victoria and Albert.¹³⁷ According to *The Illustrated London News*, the golden rays represented 'the glory of England' while 'three brilliant stars of diamonds illustrated the idea of the light of Heaven shed upon the labours of Mercy, Peace, and Charity'.¹³⁸ 'Crimea' in gold on blue enamel referenced the Crimea medal's ribbon, awarded to officers and men of the army and navy of the 1854-56 campaign. The reverse was inscribed: 'To Miss Florence Nightingale, as a mark of esteem and gratitude for her devotion towards the Queen's brave soldiers, from Victoria R. 1855'. The various components encapsulated Victoria's figurative role as military head of her country and her strong religious views, indicated by her accompanying letter:

Windsor Castle, [January] 1856.

Dear Miss Nightingale,

You are, I know, well aware of the high sense I entertain of the Christian devotion which you have displayed during this great and bloody war, and I need hardly repeat to you how warm my admiration is for your services, which are fully equal to those of my dear and brave soldiers, whose sufferings you have had the privilege of alleviating in so merciful a manner. I am, however, anxious of marking my feelings in a manner which I trust will be agreeable to you, and therefore send you with this letter a brooch, the form and emblems of

¹³⁶ *The Illustrated London News*, 2.2.1856, p.5, stated: 'The design is said to be from the pencil of the Prince Consort, by whom it was intrusted to the hands of Mr. Garrard, the Crown jeweller, for execution'.

¹³⁷ King James Bible, Mark 5:7.

¹³⁸ 'The Queen's Present to Miss Nightingale', *The Illustrated London News*, 19.1.1856, p.58.

which commemorate your great and blessed work, and which, I hope, you will wear as a mark of the high approbation of your Sovereign! It will be a very great satisfaction to me, when you return at last to these shores, to make the acquaintance of one who has set so bright an example to our sex. And with every prayer for the preservation of your valuable health, believe me, always,

yours sincerely,

Victoria R.¹³⁹

Nightingale replied from the Barracks Hospital at Scutari: 'Your Majesty's beautiful present will be to me an object of tender affection recalling the assurance that our Sovereign's heart is in this cause.'¹⁴⁰ But the very appearance of a medal, that Victoria and Albert had been at pains to incorporate into their gift, apparently rendered it unwelcome to her. This sentence was her only reference to the brooch, while the remainder of her letter concentrated on hospital nursing requirements. Though she admired the troops, Nightingale had little time for militarism, repeatedly writing in letters and diaries of her preference for practical good works. In 1850, after a visit to the military displays in Vienna's Belvedere Palace she wrote: 'the knight delights not me, nor his armour either'.¹⁴¹ She wore the brooch 'reluctantly, as it resembled a military badge'.¹⁴² Nightingale's sister persuaded her it would be diplomatic to wear the Queen's gift and Lady Hornby, wife of the British Commissioner to Turkey saw her wearing it at the 1855 Christmas Day reception at the British Embassy in Scutari.¹⁴³ Seeing her plain black clothes and short hair, cut 'like a child's', Hornby at first thought she must be a nun.¹⁴⁴ She described Nightingale:

¹³⁹ Queen Victoria to Florence Nightingale, January 1855. *Letters of Queen Victoria*, Volume III, 1854-1861, by Queen of Great Britain Victoria, Arthur Christopher Benson and Viscount Reginald Baliol Brett Esher, Editors. Project Gutenberg eBook, URL: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/28649/28649-h/28649-h.htm#pageiii.158> [accessed 12.9.2015].

¹⁴⁰ Letter, Florence Nightingale to Queen Victoria, 1.12.1855, Royal Collection, VIC/MAIN/F/4/15.b.

¹⁴¹ Letter from Florence Nightingale (to her mother?), July 1856, *Florence Nightingale: The Collected Works*, Vol.7, Lynn McDonald, Editor, (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2004), p.449.

¹⁴² Charlotte Gere, Judy Rudoe, *Jewellery in the Age of Queen Victoria*, p.44.

¹⁴³ Lucy R. Seymer, 'The Nightingale Jewel', *American Journal of Nursing*, Vol.55, 5., May 1955, p.549.

¹⁴⁴ Nightingale's hair was cut short when she caught 'Crimean Fever' (probably haemorrhagic fever) in the Crimea earlier in 1855. Dorothy Erskine Muir, *Florence Nightingale*, (London, Glasgow: Blackie & Son. Ltd., 1946), pp.122-123, 127.

Her dress, as I have said, was black, made high to the throat, its only ornament being a large enamelled brooch, which looked to me like the colours of a regiment surmounted with a wreath or laurel, no doubt some graceful offering from our men.¹⁴⁵

Lady Hornby may have thought Florence Nightingale's jewel looked like a regimental badge but there is no evidence of such a brooch made for a woman at this early date, although several of Queen Victoria's jewels closely resembled military orders.

Instead, Nightingale's gift was specifically designed by Prince Albert to give the appearance of a commemorative award, as the *Illustrated London News* noted: 'It is to be worn, not as a brooch or ornament, but rather as the badge of an order'.¹⁴⁶

The 'Nightingale Fund' was then fund-raising across the country and the empire to establish nursing schools under her training system. Probably Nightingale would have preferred the Queen to donate the jewel's considerable cost to practical nursing equipment. However, the brooch, quickly becoming known as the 'Nightingale Jewel', aroused such public interest that on 2 February 1856 the *Illustrated Times* printed further details and a picture for its readers (fig. 21).¹⁴⁷

The costly Nightingale Jewel was much admired, but not all brooches and emblems were such high status objects. Ephemeral souvenirs and music-hall songs provide us with evidence of the material connections between conflict and sensory experiences. The next section evaluates the nature of some of these items and the way they combined to create a landscape of wartime imagery.

1.5 'An Atmosphere of Patriotic Fervour': Tin Badges, Paintings and Music-Hall Songs

Until the long-drawn-out battles of attrition that characterised the First World War, young men would read the adventure novels of G. A. Henty and Rudyard Kipling and

¹⁴⁵ Letter, Lady Hornby to Mrs. Vaillant, quoted in Rosalind Nash, *A Short Life of Florence Nightingale* (London: Forgotten Books, 2013 [Original publication 1923]), p.163.

¹⁴⁶ 'The Queen's Present', *The Illustrated London News*, 19.1.1856, p.58. In 1907 Nightingale became the first woman to be awarded the Order of Merit.

¹⁴⁷ 'The Nightingale Jewel', *The Illustrated Times*, 2.2.1856, p.109.

take from them a romanticised view of fighting for empire overseas. General Sir James Marshall-Cornwall, aged twelve at the outbreak of the Boer War in 1899, observed that these stories of heroic deeds fostered his military ambitions: ‘My early schooldays were thus passed in an atmosphere of patriotic fervour and martial enthusiasm. We all wore in our buttonholes little souvenir portraits of our favourite Generals—Roberts, Kitchener, Methuen, Baden-Powell.’¹⁴⁸ A simple tin badge of the type Marshall-Cornwall described, (fig.22) is printed with the portrait of Major General Sir Hector MacDonald, who became a household name following the battle of Omdurman (1898). J. Francis & Co. of Birmingham advertised ‘The Kharki Brooch’ (an early example of a type of sweetheart brooch, depicting the rifle and broad-brimmed hat worn in the Boer War) to be worn in support of those fighting: ‘To uphold the Empire’s fame in the South African campaign’(fig.23).¹⁴⁹ As the ‘Great War’ progressed, however, Saunders states it was almost inconceivable that images of generals would be worn in the way Marshall-Cornwall describes.¹⁵⁰ As French points out, the conflict ‘undermined the glamour of war and the nobility of unquestioning patriotism’.¹⁵¹

Edmund Blair Leighton’s 1911 painting *Stitching the Standard* fits within Marshall-Cornwall’s idealised view of imperial warfare (fig.24). A woman sits on the battlements of a romanticised medieval castle bathed in soft light, applying a black eagle device to a golden silk standard, evidently for her lover to carry.¹⁵² Only two years later, on 15 December 1913, Major Reggie Chenevix Trench wrote to his fiancée Clare Howard: ‘I envy the knights of old time who could go off and perform deeds of “derring-do” for their loves’.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁸ General Sir James Marshall-Cornwall, *Wars and Rumours of Wars: A Memoir* (London: Leo Cooper, 1984), pp.1-2.

¹⁴⁹ As evidence of how this atmosphere permeated the national consciousness, Richard van Emden calculates that more than 6100 children born in 1900 were named Baden, 1000 Powell, while over 700 were christened Mafeking; 800 girls were named Ladysmith or Kimberley after Boer War sieges. Richard van Emden, *Boy Soldiers of the Great War* (Bidford: Headline, 2005), p.12.

¹⁵⁰ Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.30.

¹⁵¹ French, *Military Identities*, p.44.

¹⁵² This eagle device is unidentifiable, presumably imaginary.

¹⁵³ Trench Archives, Reggie Chenevix Trench to Clare Chenevix Trench, 7.8.1917, quoted in Anthony Fletcher, ‘Patriotism, Identity and Commemoration: New Light on the Great War from the Papers of Major Reggie Chenevix Trench’, *History*, 90, 4 (300) (October 2005), p.534. Trench was killed on the Western Front in March 1918.

Some contemporary art critics such as Roger Fry decried popular ‘sentimental’ paintings as ‘evidence of degraded taste’.¹⁵⁴ Nicola Bown reminds us that to call a painting (or indeed, anything else) sentimental is still an ‘unarguable condemnation, which no work of restitution has been able to shift’.¹⁵⁵ But Carolyn Burdett’s review of Tate Britain’s 2012 *Victorian Sentimentality* exhibition interrogates the responses such artworks inspired in spectators when they were originally shown. Work that was ‘touching in its pathos’ was particularly admired: it should tell a story that prompted moral reflection.¹⁵⁶ Two paintings by John Everett Millais with military themes, *The Order of Release, 1746* and *Portrait of John Charles Montagu*, a retired Yeoman of the Guard, elicited consideration of how brave men might also have ‘tenderness in them’.¹⁵⁷ Pamela Fletcher argues that successful ‘sentimental’ Victorian paintings worked by addressing a viewer who recognised himself or herself in the narrative: ‘connected to them through communal bonds of shared emotion and everyday experience’.¹⁵⁸ The term ‘sentimental’ is often derided today but the concept Fletcher describes is recognisable in modern artworks that now might be pronounced ‘relevant’ to their audiences’ concerns. Leighton’s painting, referencing nineteenth-century medieval revivalism, invites the viewer to construct a narrative, contemplating notions of chivalry and the romantic bond between the woman depicted and the unknown man who will bear her banner in battle, with its subtext of separation and potential loss. The same construction would be placed upon a woman’s sweetheart brooch, with its heraldic allusions to regimental history and battle campaigns, achieved not by her but by her husband or lover. The absent man who had given her the brooch would go into battle wearing the badge it replicated, fighting under the same insignia. The device on the banner and on the brooch articulated the reciprocal connection between them.

Eastman Johnson’s 1872 painting, *The Girl I Left Behind Me*, (fig.25) was inspired by a traditional eighteenth-century army marching song, *The Girl He Left Behind Him*. A woman looks out uncertainly from a promontory onto a stormy landscape probably

¹⁵⁴ Carolyn Burdett, ‘Victorian Sentimentality at Tate Britain’, *Victorian Literature and Culture*, Vol.42, 1, March 2014, p.155.

¹⁵⁵ Nicola Bown, ‘Tender Beauty: Victorian Painting and the Problem of Sentimentality’, *Journal of Victorian Culture*, Vol.16.2, p.218.p.215.

¹⁵⁶ Burdett, ‘Victorian Sentimentality at Tate Britain’, p.155.

¹⁵⁷ Burdett, ‘Victorian Sentimentality at Tate Britain’, p.155.

¹⁵⁸ Pamela Fletcher, ‘“To wipe a manly tear”: The Aesthetics of Emotion in Victorian Narrative Painting’, *Victorian Studies*, Vol.51,3, Spring 2009, p.463.

representing the fog and confusion of war.¹⁵⁹ As in *Stitching the Standard* she is waiting, though this image is much less tranquil: she stands alone, buffeted by strong winds. The wedding ring on her left hand is almost at the centre of the painting; evidently she is waiting anxiously for her husband's return. The song was still popular during WW1, the lyrics even linking the singer's sweetheart to precious jewellery:

I hope to see my jewel again
For her my heart is breaking¹⁶⁰

Another popular WWI song, by Irving Berlin, '*I'm gonna pin my medal on the girl I left behind*', acknowledged that waiting was the woman's role, as difficult as that of the soldier who recognises that: 'A braver hero would be hard to find'. Images in paintings, posters and songs link directly to the sentiment behind sweetheart brooches. Medals and badges were markers both for military personnel and civilians, through the assumption that women's vital role was to keep the home for his return. In these circumstances the potential for marketing badge brooches to link parted couples was readily appreciated. Botly & Lewis of Reading were among many jewellers who appropriated this concept for their advertisements (fig.26):

‘The Girl he left behind him
Will be proud to wear
The Badge of his regiment or ship’

Retailers also played on the understandable anxieties of men serving far from home or held as prisoners-of-war, that the girlfriends and wives they left behind might not wait for them for what was, after all, an unknown length of time. In 1940, 'Fed Up' wrote to the *Manchester Evening News* advice columnist to ask whether she might reasonably go out with 'another boy who often asks me' because: 'Since my boy was

¹⁵⁹ Johnson was not a soldier but witnessed battle himself. Smithsonian Art Museum Exhibition Label, 2006.

¹⁶⁰ '*The Girl I Left Behind Me*', traditional.

called up I've hardly gone out anywhere'.¹⁶¹ She was sharply advised to consider her feelings if the situation were reversed, but it was a concern to men posted abroad. German leaflets dropped over British troops in Europe claimed women were being seduced by Americans stationed in Britain in their absence. Advertisers played on these fears: for example, in 1941 an advertisement claimed: 'She Won't Forget You if She's Wearing Your Regimental Brooch (fig. 27).'¹⁶² A sweetheart brooch was a visible marker of 'ownership' that its giver might hope would discourage other, unwanted suitors, signalling the wearer was unavailable in the same way that an engagement or wedding ring would do. Chapter 5 will elaborate on the concept of a sweetheart brooch's function as a constant reminder of the absent giver.

So far I have investigated the development of military cohesion through visual images, culminating in the design of badges and heraldic jewels that helped to foster loyalty and project identity. Uniform cap and collar badges had long been given to women as sought-after souvenirs, unofficially and against military regulations.¹⁶³ However, the fashion for specially designed military sweetheart brooches for women, begun towards the end of the nineteenth century, created a new type of adornment. It brought together two strands, heraldic military emblems and traditional sentimental jewellery, into one jewel. Sweetheart brooches formed a new group of jewels that emerged in response to a specific set of circumstances, incorporating their own emotional vocabulary during wartime separation. It is appropriate, however, to contextualise them within the wider history of sentimental jewellery, not least because design elements appearing on Victorian sentimental jewels were often added. Next, therefore I consider some aspects of sentimental jewellery that were eventually incorporated into sweetheart brooches

1.6 Sentimental Jewellery: Puzzles, Flowers and Meaningful Stones

The term 'sentimental jewellery' is used historically to describe items of personal adornment designed to convey encoded messages of personal affection, religious

¹⁶¹ 'She's so lonely now', *Manchester Evening News*, 12.1.1940, p.4.

¹⁶² Allans, Advertisement, *Newcastle Journal and North Mail*, 10.10.1941, p.2.

¹⁶³ Frank Richards, *Old Soldiers Never Die* (Sleaford: Philip Austen, 1994 [1933]), p.14.

devotion, memorialisation of a loved one or loyalty to a monarch or political cause. They commemorated notable family occasions such as births, marriages or deaths. The word 'sentimental' is generally seen as conveying notions of over-romanticism but the Oxford English Dictionary defines 'sentimental value' as 'the value of a thing to a particular person because of its associations'.¹⁶⁴ This definition fits the concept of jewellery well since its consequence to the recipient seldom depends exclusively on its monetary worth but on the transformative power of its attachment to individual lives and the propensity of individuals to confer special meaning upon gifts of jewels. Some of the brooches examined here were no doubt also valued as the costly pieces they were but others, machine-made and inexpensive, conveyed equally significant messages between giver and wearer.

Since the essence of sentimental jewellery was to record significant events or impart meaning, wordplay within the design was of great importance. Elaborate forms of communication were also devised that could be decoded through the use of materials or visual images when no text was present. Pointon states this uncertainty was intentional: viewers 'knew how to play with the possible ambiguities of meaning around jewels and jewellery'.¹⁶⁵ Jewels were intended for observation and interpretation by others. For Georg Simmel, jewellery's significance lay beyond commodity, its value existing in 'the visual delight it offers to others'; jewellery provoked attention, increasing and intensifying the 'sphere' of the person wearing it: 'the personality, so to speak *is* more when it is adorned'.¹⁶⁶

Encoding endearments into jewellery without explicit text appealed to the Victorian enjoyment of playfulness and ambiguity to which Pointon refers. Jewellers developed ingenious methods of conveying messages through floral symbolism, using initial letters of polychromatic gemstones to spell out messages, or creating visual puns to be decoded. Many of these novelties began with valuable jewellery given in court circles but their ideas were appropriated by those who made more affordable mass-produced

¹⁶⁴ *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 7th Edition, J. B. Sykes, Editor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p.958.

¹⁶⁵ Marcia Pointon, *Brilliant Effects: A Cultural History of Gemstones & Jewellery* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2009), p.49.

¹⁶⁶ Simmel, *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, p.340.

versions. Jewellery was also designed to perplex the mind while deceiving the eye. The British Museum's Hull Grundy Collection contains a gold stick-pin (fig.28) combining pattern, image and text. The pin is decorated with an enamelled bee (denoting sweetness and thus love) that has landed on a cross with the letters D O N T enamelled on its four sections: decoded, therefore, the message reads 'DON'T BE(E) CROSS'. Incorporating the fashionable concept of *trompe l'oeil* jewellery, the insect appears real when pinned to clothing, conveying the message that the bee, searching for sweetness, has alighted on the object of the lover's affection. Prices varied from £21 for a diamond version to 3s.6d for a popular copy in silver made in 1878, an instance of manufacturers copying costly originals and producing their own inexpensive versions.

The symbolism of flowers was widely employed to convey multiple messages on sentimental jewellery; later they were often added to military badges to make sweetheart brooches with additional romantic meanings. Flowers could denote meaning without words, but interpretation could be complex. George Dunlop Leslie's painting *The Language of Flowers* (1885) depicts two young women with a trug full of blossoms, one of whom consults a book for their meanings (fig.29). Robert Tyas's *The Language of Flowers; or Floral Emblems of Thoughts, Feelings and Sentiments* (1869), was one of several such treatises. Tyas observed: 'it is natural that we should make choice of objects that are mixed up with our daily life, when we desire to give expression to our opinions or feelings by means of symbols rather than words'.¹⁶⁷ The language of flowers, he proposed, 'lends its charms to friendship, to gratitude, to filial and maternal affection'.¹⁶⁸ Flowers were particularly appropriate for conveying sentiments between people since their beauty and scents readily recalled memories of emotional importance:

Many of these are associated in our minds with seasons of joy and sorrow, of pleasure and pain. Many of us have, laid up in some hidden spot, dried specimens of one flower or another, which was gathered by, or presented to us at a time of unusual happiness, or on an occasion of intense grief. [...] they take us back into the past, and they help us in a remarkable degree to revive all

¹⁶⁷ Robert Tyas, *The Language of Flowers; or Floral Emblems of Thoughts, Feelings and Sentiments* [London, New York: George Routledge & Sons, 1869], Digital, URL: <https://archive.org/stream/languageofflower00tyas#page/n9/mode/2up25.2.2015> Preface, p.v.

¹⁶⁸ Tyas, *The Language of Flowers*, p.ix.

the little incidents, pleasant or painful, connected with the time when we first became possessed of them.¹⁶⁹

As flowers could denote emotions and convey affectionate messages, so the symbolic potential of precious metals and gems was employed through a ‘language’ of stones. Lapidaries’ treatises, describing gemstones’ powers and characteristics, derived ultimately from Greek sources.¹⁷⁰ Particular values became traditionally attached to them and thus to the jewellery in which they were set, though scholars consistently argued that no credence should be given to superstitious beliefs regarding such magical properties. Francis Bacon was clear about this in the sixteenth century but he understood that: ‘There are many things that work upon the spirits of man by secret sympathy’.¹⁷¹ For Bacon:

So much is true: that stones have in them fine spirits, as appeareth by their splendor; and therefore they may work by consent upon the spirits of men, to comfort and exhilarate them.¹⁷²

Bacon’s view was to be reflected in the many sweetheart brooches carried as amulets in both World Wars, though their owners may not have believed implicitly in their protective powers.¹⁷³ For example, because it was the hardest stone the diamond was believed to represent a resolute, steadfast character. As late as 1940 a London jeweller told Mass Observations: ‘Diamonds are selling most – it is rather queer, diamonds according to ancient legend are also the battle stone – for courage and safety in battle’.¹⁷⁴ In his treatise *Precious Stones: Their History and Mystery*, William Jones noted ‘there is a rich vein of romance and poetry connected with

¹⁶⁹ Tyas, *The Language of Flowers*, p.vi.

¹⁷⁰ Joan Evans, *Magical Jewels of the Renaissance Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Particularly in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922). pp.15-17.

¹⁷¹ Francis Bacon, *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, and Lord High Chancellor of England in Five Volumes, Vol.I.* [16thC], (London: J. Rivington & Sons, 1778), pp.4-5.

¹⁷² Bacon, *The Works of Francis Bacon*, pp.4-5.

¹⁷³ See Chapter 4, ‘Hope it Will Bring You Luck’ for a very similar exchange of views in the press on the efficacy of charms in 1915.

¹⁷⁴ Secretary, National Jewellers’ Association, interview 28.3.1940. SxMOA.TC4.1.N.

precious stones'; they could be 'made use of instead of words, for the purpose of giving expression to thoughts'.¹⁷⁵

A nineteenth-century brooch (fig.30), for instance, combines the language of stones with floral symbolism, demonstrating the complexities that could be incorporated into a single item of sentimental jewellery. Chased gold is intertwined in a technique reminiscent of the woven hair especially popular for mourning jewellery throughout this period. Hair, almost the only part of the body that would not decay, might be exchanged as a sentimental keepsake and plaited with that of a lover or a deceased relative to form a memento mori. G. F. Parsons, advertising the ability to work a curl of hair 'artistically' into a brooch or locket in *The Lady's Newspaper* in 1862, claimed a lock of hair was: 'held dear by all'.¹⁷⁶ In the brooch in fig.30, sixteen diamonds signify strength and steadfastness and five oval and four round turquoises recall the blue of forget-me-nots which, representing true love in the language of flowers, were a popular choice for gifts to bridesmaids and considered fashionable yet suitable for young girls.¹⁷⁷ Turquoises were believed to retain their colour according to their giver's constancy.¹⁷⁸ Queen Victoria gave her twelve bridesmaids highly symbolic turquoise German eagle brooches holding pearls for purity in their talons, with ruby eyes for passion and diamond beaks for eternity, made by Charles du Vé of London.¹⁷⁹ This idea later developed into a fashion for giving sweetheart brooches as wedding gifts from bridegroom to bride, often with matching versions for the bridesmaids, an idea explored further in Chapter 4.

These were expensive jewels but other versions were available for those who could not afford so much. A gold dove brooch set with turquoise and diamonds, c.1890,

¹⁷⁵ William Jones, *Precious Stones: Their History and Mystery* (London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1880), pp.v-vi.

¹⁷⁶ *The Lady's Newspaper*, 6.12.1862; p. 83.

¹⁷⁷ Gold, Diamond and Turquoise Brooch, V&A Collection, Museum No.M159-2007, V&A, London, URL:<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O144689/brooch-unknown/>[accessed 12.12.2015]. Frances Rogers, Alice Beard, *5000 Years of Gems and Jewelry* (New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1947) p.255, quoted in Jean Arnold, *Victorian Jewelry, Identity and the Novel* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), p.21.

¹⁷⁸ Edwin Streeter, *Precious Stones and Gems: their history and distinguishing characteristics* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1877), p.180.

¹⁷⁹ Charlotte Gere, *Love and Art: Queen Victoria's Personal Jewellery* (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2012), p.10.

carried the message of true and constant love (fig.31). The Goldsmiths & Silversmiths' Christmas range for 1899 included a gold brooch comprising two swallows joined by a gold chain priced at £2.10s.¹⁸⁰ Several hand-drawn brooch designs in Smith & Pepper's Order Books (figs.32, 33) feature images of doves or bluebirds; later these were often added to regimental brooches, appropriate motifs representing the hoped-for safe return of the absent lover.¹⁸¹ Accustomed to the vocabulary of sentimental jewellery, Victorians would have had little difficulty in interpreting regimental sweetheart brooches and the floral or textual motifs that were frequently added to them.

Jewels designed by Prince Albert frequently referenced military imagery to commemorate imperial victories but no precedent has so far been found for a woman's brooch that specifically replicates the insignia of a military regiment until the appearance of the jewel that Lord Airlie commissioned as a wedding gift for his bride in 1886, the subject of the next section.

1.7. 'A New Fashion in Jewellery': The Airlie Brooch

On 19th January 1886 Lady Mabell Gore and David Ogilvy, Earl of Airlie, were married at St. George's, Hanover Square in London. The wedding was reported extensively in the press as the most fashionable event of the previous twelve months, attended by 'A large and aristocratic congregation' including the Prince of Wales and his eldest son, Prince Albert Victor.¹⁸² It was not only a society occasion but reflected Airlie's career: uniformed officers and men of the 10th Royal Hussars (Prince of Wales' Own), the cavalry regiment in which the Earl was a serving officer, formed a guard of honour and the Prince of Wales was invited both as family friend and Colonel of Hussars.

¹⁸⁰ Goldsmiths and Silversmiths advertisement, *Illustrated London News*, 9.12.1899, 842.

¹⁸¹ *W. Bolus & Co. Ltd. Order to Smith & Pepper*. 4 November 1911. Smith & Pepper Order Book, p.47, O/N.W9198.W10. Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham.

¹⁸² 'Marriage of the Earl of Airlie', *The Dundee Courier & Argus and Northern Warder* (Dundee, Scotland), 22.1.1886; p.7.

Newspapers described the numerous gifts received by the couple (fig.34). These list quantities of jewellery, in the historical tradition of adorning a bride with jewels: ‘His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales gave a superb diamond and sapphire brooch’ and her father, Lord Arran ‘among other presents to his daughter, gave her a diamond and pearl star bracelet, a gold medallion enamelled bracelet’.¹⁸³ In addition:

Earl Cowper gave diamond and sapphire sword pins for her hair; Countess Cowper, diamond crescent; the Duke of Westminster, Indian necklace; the Countess of Dudley, diamond fly brooch [...] Viscount and Viscountess Powerscourt, diamond dove brooch; the Countess of Airlie, diamond and turquoise brooch, Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, diamond crescent [...] Mr and Lady Blanche Hozier, diamond brooch...¹⁸⁴

It can be assumed that all this jewellery was valuable. The gifts from the bride’s father, Lord Arran, probably also had special sentimental family associations since her mother Edith died from tuberculosis at the age of twenty-seven, when Mabell was only four. It is likely some of the jewels given by her father had belonged to her mother, kept for Mabell as the eldest daughter on her marriage. These would have had considerable resonance for her and embodied memories of her mother. Her father perhaps hoped she would wear one of them on her wedding day. She recorded his disappointment at her refusal to wear her mother’s wedding veil, seeing it as a bad omen in view of her early death (though she did wear a small piece of her mother’s bridal wreath in her hair).¹⁸⁵ As she was so young when her mother died she could have had only limited memories of her and personal objects such as jewels carry poignant reminders of their absent owner. As Pointon describes: ‘Jewelry, bequeathed as heirloom or gift, carries narratives of continuity’.¹⁸⁶ Historically, clothing and

¹⁸³ ‘The Marriage of Lord Airlie: The Wedding Presents’, *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, 21.1.1886, p.7.

¹⁸⁴ ‘The Marriage of Lord Airlie’.

¹⁸⁵ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, p.52. Mabell Airlie kept diaries, correspondence and family papers throughout her life. In 1926 she began to collate them into her memoirs. But with full-time commitments as close friend and Lady-in-Waiting to Queen Mary, publishing several biographies and working with the Red Cross, the memoirs were largely compiled but uncompleted at her death in 1956. Her papers were given to the British Museum, now deposited at the British Library and have all been consulted for this thesis. The diaries (also held by the British Library) are quoted in the memoirs but currently unavailable for viewing. Her grandson, the present Earl of Airlie, confirms the quotations used in *Thatched with Gold* are accurately transcribed (Personal communication between Lord Airlie and author: correspondence 3.9.2015, 15.9.2015, telephone, 14.9.2015).

¹⁸⁶ Pointon, “‘Surrounded with Brilliants’”, p.55.

jewels were commonly transferred from a mother on the occasion of her daughter's marriage, a significant life event when: 'the very materiality of things makes them particularly absorbent of emotion and thus perfect for forging and consolidating human associations'.¹⁸⁷

In addition to many items of jewellery given by family and friends 'The bride received some beautiful jewels from the bridegroom'.¹⁸⁸ Of all these gifts, the jewel that Lady Airlie chose to wear on her wedding day, and the only one she wrote about in her diary, was the regimental brooch given by her new husband (figs.35, 36):

My going away gown was of dove grey velvet, under a cloak of grey cashmere lined with shell pink satin and trimmed with chinchilla. With it I wore the brooch given me by David – the badge of the 10th Royal Hussars in diamonds. He had had it specially designed for me, and thus I was the first woman to wear a regimental badge. As I was rarely seen without it after our marriage, other Army wives copied me, and a new fashion in jewellery was created.¹⁸⁹

Lady Airlie believed that her brooch was the first of its kind. Several jewels of pseudo-military appearance have been described here but no earlier example has been traced of one replicating regimental insignia made specifically for a woman, suggesting she was correct in her belief. What then might have inspired Lord Airlie to commission this original gift as a wedding present for his bride? Pointon argues that eighteenth-century jewelled miniatures should be analysed in conjunction with the intimate letters that often accompanied them, so that material artefact and written text are understood as one.¹⁹⁰ It is rare to find sweetheart brooches with accompanying documentation but the nineteenth-century culture of almost daily letter-writing provides context for Airlie's gift that is often absent from other examples, allowing the couple's letters and this jewel to be read together.

¹⁸⁷ Michelle O'Malley, 'A Pair of Little Gilded Shoes: Commission, Cost, and Meaning in Renaissance Footwear', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 63,1 (Spring 2010), p.33; Evelyn Welch, 'New, old and second-hand culture: the case of the Renaissance sleeve', in *Revaluing Renaissance Art* Gabriele Neher, Rupert Shepherd, eds. (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

¹⁸⁸ 'The Marriage of Lord Airlie'.

¹⁸⁹ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, p.52.

¹⁹⁰ Pointon, "'Surrounded with Brilliants'", esp. pp.64-67.

The occasion of his marriage might have marked the end of Airlie's army career. His parents' hoped he would manage Cortachy, the family's 69,000 acre Scottish estates in Angus, but his ambition was always to join the army, in his family's long-standing tradition. He eventually persuaded them to allow him to train at Sandhurst and had already served in India, Afghanistan, Egypt and the Sudan.¹⁹¹ When he inherited the earldom in 1880 he promised to spend his leaves at Cortachy, but resisted his mother's requests to leave the army. In a personal account of her husband's life written after his death, Mabell Airlie wrote:

If he gave up the Army, he gave up all that made life worth living to him. The Army life, as he led it, meant to him all that was noble, elevating and romantic. Those who knew him best felt that [...] every fibre of his being [...] was entwined in his profession.¹⁹²

Airlie's letters show he held the nineteenth-century view of idealised empire. Army life was the honourable calling to which he aspired and which he planned to make his lifetime career. His close identification with his regiment was the core feature of army life described earlier, essential to good morale and the camaraderie that enabled soldiers to function as a disciplined unit in the face of the enemy. In 1887 the Adjutant General (the most senior officer, responsible for army personnel) reminded officers that:

Love of his regiment, and a regard for its reputation, soon come to the young soldier [...] He should learn to feel, through the manner in which he is dealt with by his Capt. and his Lt. Colonel, that they are solely actuated by this regimental feeling; by their love of the army and the deep interest they take in the reputation of all their comrades of every rank.¹⁹³

When he proposed on 6 November 1885, however, Airlie wondered whether he could expect his wife to accommodate herself to the disruptions and hardships of army life.¹⁹⁴ 'If I had to give up what I wished my life to be for the sake of my wife I

¹⁹¹ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, pp.43-45.

¹⁹² Mabell Airlie, *The Happy Warrior, An Account of the Life of Lord Airlie*, undated, p.55. British Library collection, MS 82845.

¹⁹³ A. Alison, Circular to GOC's Districts and Corps, 1.1.1887. PRO WO 32/8731. Quoted in David French, *Military Identities*, p.76.

¹⁹⁴ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, p.51.

should be content.’ he wrote.¹⁹⁵ But understanding how much the army meant to him, she refused his offer to resign his commission.

Besides the most important question, David asked me only one other – whether I wanted him to leave the Army. He said that he was perfectly willing to make the sacrifice for my sake. I said “No”, though hardly realizing at the time to what I was committing myself.¹⁹⁶

It is clear from Airlie’s letters that though he was prepared to give up his cherished career for his wife’s sake, he greatly appreciated her refusal to do so and the sacrifices her decision would demand of her: ‘But with your help I need not care less for the Regiment through loving you. God bless you for understanding’.¹⁹⁷

The following day he wrote to her: ‘I so much want you to love the Regiment, which has up to now meant more to me than *all things* on earth.’¹⁹⁸ He hoped that now he had found his future wife ‘who is above *everything* to me, I want her to be kind and grow to love it too’.¹⁹⁹ With this in mind, Airlie’s imaginative gift of a diamond brooch in the form of his beloved regiment’s badge can be understood as an intimate and meaningful jewel. In the tradition of Victorian sentimental jewellery he had commissioned a symbolic gift visually representing all he valued, to give to the woman who had given him the opportunity to continue the career he loved. The Clan Ogilvy and Earls of Airlie both held coats of arms that he might have commissioned for the brooch but he did not choose these devices. As this chapter demonstrates, sentimental amatory jewels generally focused on feminine designs of flowers, foliage and messages conveyed through the language of stones but this jewel traversed the hitherto separate spheres of the exclusively male nineteenth-century military and the feminine domestic space then generally allotted to women. It would have been a highly unusual piece for a woman to wear at the time, representing as it did the badge of an occupation open exclusively to men. With his gift Airlie offered his bride a symbol of the world he hoped she would love as he did.

¹⁹⁵ Airlie, *The Happy Warrior*, Lord Airlie’s Diary, 25.11.1885.

¹⁹⁶ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, p.50.

¹⁹⁷ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, p.51.

¹⁹⁸ Lord Airlie to Mabel Gore, letter, 6.11.1885, Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, p.51.

¹⁹⁹ Lord Airlie to Mabel Gore, undated letter, Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, p.51.

The brooch is now in the collection of the King's Royal Hussars, based at Tidworth, Wiltshire, into which the 10th Hussars were amalgamated in 1992. It is made of 18 carat white gold set with 200 diamonds to replicate the three Prince of Wales feathers that comprise the 10th Hussars' insignia, shown on the diagonal pouch belt of Airlie's uniform (fig.37).²⁰⁰ The diamonds are 'rose-cut', usually done in Amsterdam and popular in the nineteenth century, resulting in a stone with a flat base and up to twenty-four facets, pointed at the apex with a gleaming appearance rather than the glitter of modern brilliant-cut stones.²⁰¹ Diamonds and a delicate gold band make up the crown binding the feathers. In gold lettering on a curling blue enamel ribbon, now slightly worn, is the regimental motto 'Ich Dien' ('I Serve').²⁰² Many regimental mottos were aggressively warlike, but this text was completely apposite for the personal message Airlie wished to convey. As this chapter has shown, Victorians took pleasure in jewellery that communicated through puzzles, images and texts that the recipient might decode and this motto could also be read as a romantic pledge from one individual to another. The precious materials and jewelled representation of the life that had meant more to Airlie than 'all things on earth', with the apt text that could be read as conveying his devotion to his wife, combined to create a highly meaningful gift.

The brooch is still in a box marked Carrington & Co. of Regent Street. Carrington (founded 1780) were court jewellers, holding royal warrants from Queen Victoria, Prince Albert, Edward VII, George V and the Russian court. Carrington's order books (c.1870-1930) are held at the National Art Library but records for 1884-1887

²⁰⁰ Personal Communication, Toby Brayley, Assistant Curator, *HorsePower*: Museum of the King's Royal Hussars, Winchester, February 2016. Regimental tradition states the first Prince of Wales, the Black Prince, appropriated the ostrich feathers device in tribute to blind King John of Bohemia, killed in battle against him at Crecy, though there is no historical evidence for this. Siddons states John of Bohemia's crest was actually vultures' wings; ostrich feathers may have been introduced by Philippa of Hainault (married Edward III 1328). Siddons, *Heraldic Badges in England and Wales*, p.178. Collars with Anne of Bohemia's ostrich feathers are listed in Richard II's jewel inventory (1399). King's Royal Hussars, URL:<http://www.krh.org.uk/insignia.html>[accessed 23.1.2016].

²⁰¹ Herbert Tillander, *Diamond Cuts in Historic Jewellery 1381-1910* (London: Art Books International, 1995).

²⁰² During WWI the idea of instating the Welsh 'Eich Dyn', translating as 'Your Man' (a near homophone) was suggested when German references were out of favour. 'Motto of Prince of Wales', *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, 14.9.1917, p.3.

are missing; it is not possible, therefore, to verify Airlie's purchase.²⁰³ There were only 10 weeks between Airlie's proposal and the wedding, during which (apart from Christmas at Cortachy) he was based in Aldershot so it seems probable he ordered the brooch in London.²⁰⁴ Though it is not possible to be certain, the evidence of the box suggests Carrington made the brooch and their archives confirm they made many valuable commissions. Their records for 1888 and 1889 show orders for diamond brooches costing between £33 and £102 but no directly comparable jewel. It is impossible to estimate its price as the quality, size and number of stones used would materially affect the value and the invoices do not describe commissioned brooches precisely enough for meaningful comparisons.

Lady Airlie asserted that other army wives copied her brooch and she started a new fashion. We cannot know whether they simply admired and mimicked the novelty of an original piece of jewellery or if their own brooches embodied similar concepts to those I argue for here in the case of the Airlie jewel. But many of these women would also have had husbands serving in perilous conditions for long periods in overseas campaigns or trading across the empire. It is probable that for many of them their regimental brooches encapsulated similar significance.

In her diary Lady Airlie contended that after her marriage she was rarely seen without her diamond regimental brooch and official photographs taken throughout her life show the brooch worn prominently on her clothing. In 1901 she was photographed in a luxurious dark silk dress but clearly identified as a widow, mourning the death of her husband, killed in action in the Boer War on 11 June 1900 at Diamond Hill (fig. 38). She stands before a painted backdrop against which formal photographs of couples were commonly taken at this period, the husband standing behind his seated wife; here the solitary figure emphasizes her widowhood. The brooch's trajectory had diverted from its original course. No longer a gift, it became a memorial piece that she wore for the rest of her life in remembrance of her husband retaining, as Marcel

²⁰³ Carrington & Co., 5 volumes of accounts, c.1870-1930. National Art Library (GB), V&A Museum, Manuscript, L.1879-1980 to L.1891-1980.

²⁰⁴ Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, p.51. It is also possible that Carrington designed the brooch but that it was made up by another jeweller, as seen in similar watercolour designs auctioned by Dix Noonan Webb. Personal Communication DNW Militaria Consultant, Dixon Pickup, 23.5.2011.

Mauss described, part of his identity.²⁰⁵ Igor Kopytoff proposes that things, like people, may usefully be considered to have biographies from their initial production to the end of their usefulness. An object may be interpreted throughout its 'life' as a 'culturally constructed entity, endowed with culturally specific meanings', varying at different times and in different circumstances.²⁰⁶ Thus:

an eventful biography of a thing becomes the story of the various singularizations of it, of classifications and reclassifications, in an uncertain world of categories whose importance shifts with every minor change in context. As with persons, the drama here lies in the uncertainties of valuation and of identity.²⁰⁷

Over its lifetime this brooch, like many others, originated with its referent, the military badge, becoming in turn a commodity, a gift, the marker of a marriage and finally a commemorative piece. Hallam and Hockey note that material objects originating in other circumstances may be transformed into aids for remembrance, commemoration and to mediate 'our relationship with death and the dead'.²⁰⁸

In 1939 Mabell Airlie was photographed with her brooch once again conspicuous on her dark dress (fig.39). She did not accept any of several offers to remarry but had a full-time career into old age as Lady in Waiting to Queen Mary and a published author and always maintained her connections with the army. The significance to her of this brooch is evident from the fact that none of her jewellery (other than a bracelet given to her by Airlie's regiment) was mentioned in her will except for this one item. In the will she bequeathed the brooch to the 10th Hussars with the request that it should be worn by the wife of each Colonel of the Regiment 'during the period of his command'.²⁰⁹ The bequest suggests that she saw the brooch as an appropriate jewel for a military wife but too far removed from its original meaning for one of her own

²⁰⁵ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift*, *sinp*.12.

²⁰⁶ Igor Kopytoff, 'The Cultural Biography of Things', p.68.

²⁰⁷ Kopytoff, 'The Cultural Biography of Things', p.90.

²⁰⁸ Elizabeth Hallam, Jenny Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture* (Oxford: Berg, 2001), p.2.

²⁰⁹ Will of Mabel Frances Elizabeth, Dowager Countess of Airlie, GCVO, GBE. 7 April 1956, Clause 5(c).

daughters to wear. However, it is still worn regularly by the current Commanding Officer's wife for mess dinners and formal regimental occasions.²¹⁰

This first regimental brooch was a unique commission, created by a skilled craftsman presumably in discussion with Airlie himself to produce the exact jewel he envisaged.

1.8 Conclusion

This chapter demonstrated that there was a long-standing tradition of badges, pins and brooches worn by everyone from children to servants and courtiers as articles of individual self-fashioning, shared identity and claims to family history. Heraldic military badges and banners evolved for practical battlefield identification but also as projections of power and exclusivity. Jewels were once worn as widely by men as by women but by the nineteenth century such adornments for men were largely confined to cravat pins and to the often spectacular badges worn by the military. Parallel to these, a culture of sentimental jewellery developed, signifying personal emotions of love and separation through the codified languages of flowers and gemstones.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century these two types of jewellery converged with the emerging fashion for military badge brooches for women. Motifs commonly seen on amatory jewellery often appear as an addition to regimental brooches, conveying messages of affection, remembrance and hopes for safe return from danger. Both valuable jewels and simple factory-produced brooches connected women to the armed forces and to other wartime artefacts, songs and images. The chapter has shown that the battles of attrition and unexpected casualty rates of WWI began to temper the previously idealised Victorian patriotic view of empire that saw war as adventure. For most, it was now perceived instead as a grim necessity. For women, sweetheart jewellery spoke of the patriotic duty they were asked to perform and demonstrate, that is, to sacrifice their husbands, brothers and sons to the war and, as the study will later show, to be pleased to be able to do so.

²¹⁰ Personal communication, Captain Thomas W. Kirkham, Unit Intelligence Officer, The King's Royal Hussars, Tidworth, Wiltshire, visited 6th December 2016.

The next chapter examines a range of brooches, the circumstances of their manufacture and their importance to the jewellery trade in wartime.

Chapter 2

Sweetheart Brooches and the Jewellers: Making and Selling the Brooches

2.1 Introduction

In 1916 S. J. Levi of Birmingham advertised in *The Jeweller and Metalworker* that they could supply brooches with any insignia on the front, backed with silk ribbons in the correct colours, ‘an attractive article coveted by all women and girls with friends and relatives in the Army, claiming ‘an enormous demand’ had been created for it.²¹¹ In this chapter I address the manufacture of the many sweetheart brooches made to commission by prestigious jewellers as well as factory-produced versions made by firms like Levi’s, focusing on London and Birmingham, the two main centres of jewellery production. I consider some examples of manufactured brooches to which personalising additions have been made and demonstrate that when changing fashions and wartime shortages caused fluctuations in the fortunes of the jewellery trade in the late nineteenth century and throughout both world wars, jewellers saw in the brooches an opportunity to alleviate falling sales by promoting them as patriotic purchases.

2.2 ‘Unknown Except to the Merchants’: Manufacturing the Brooches in London and Birmingham

The place in which goods are made is important. Carnevali observes that the consumer’s perception of the quality of luxury jewellery is coloured by preconceptions about the status of their place of origin.²¹² London, the capital and perceived centre of fashion, was predictably seen as the source of the most desirable high quality hand-made jewellery although, unknown to customers, many such items were in fact produced elsewhere, often in small Birmingham workshops.

²¹¹ Advertisement, S. J. Levi, *Jeweller and Metalworker*, 15.12.1916, p.1477.

²¹² Carnevali, ‘Luxury for the Masses. pp.57-58.

Differences in the evolution of the jewellery industry in the two cities contributed to this concept. The jewellery trade in both London and Birmingham centred around areas of the cities where goldsmiths and silversmiths were surrounded by the suppliers and skilled artisans they needed. The tradition of goldsmiths in London is older, with metalworkers recorded from the middle of the eleventh century.²¹³ Goldsmiths and associated trades were based in Cheapside, (deriving from the Anglo-Saxon word *ceap*, to barter, and thus a market). The Goldsmiths' Guild was granted its Royal Charter, the terms of which allowed for the exercise of special powers in the regulation of the trade, in 1327. The preamble states that:

all who were of the Goldsmiths' trade were to sit in their shops in the high street of Cheap, and that no silver in plate, nor vessel of gold or silver ought to be sold in the city of London except at our Exchange or in Cheap, among the Goldsmiths.²¹⁴

The Charter clarifies that Goldsmiths (in common with other guilds) intended to raise the status of its wealthier members who could afford premises from which to sell their wares at the expense of poorer itinerant hawkers and to remove 'eveschepings' or street markets.²¹⁵ Guild members attempted to enforce this by excluding 'foreigners' and other tradespeople from the area.²¹⁶ Cheapside was not only a main shopping area but also the principal ceremonial route through the city. When Edward VI progressed through Cheapside on the way to his coronation in 1547, Goldsmiths' Row was decked with tapestries and Guild members lined the route. An eighteenth-century engraving (figs.40, 41) of a contemporary painting of this procession (now lost) shows metal goblets and plate displayed to the public in the shopfronts along Goldsmiths' Row. In 1604, mapmaker John Stow described this street as:

the most beautiful frame of fair houses and shops that be within the walls of London, or elsewhere in England, commonly called Goldsmiths row, betwixt Bread street end and the cross in Cheape [...] the same was built by Thomas

²¹³ Nigel Ramsay, John Blair, *English medieval industries: craftsmen, techniques, products* (London : Hambledon Press, 1991), p.146. Ramsay and Blair note that Canterbury, York, Durham and Coventry, among others, were also early centres of goldsmithing, but London was the main concentration of the industry.

²¹⁴ *Charter of the Goldsmiths, Preamble*, [1327], quoted in George Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, (Frank Cass: London, [1908] 4th edition, 1963), p.79.

²¹⁵ Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, p.73.

²¹⁶ Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, p.79.

Wood, goldsmith, one of the sheriffs of London in the year 1491. [...] these he gave to the Goldsmiths, with stocks of money, to be lent to young men having those shops²¹⁷

In 1912 workman demolishing a 17th-century building at 32-33 Cheapside, to the east of St. Paul's, discovered approximately 500 pieces of Elizabethan and early Stuart jewellery, gemstones and a salt, buried in a chest beneath the floor of an older cellar.²¹⁸ The original premises above the cellar, destroyed in the Great Fire of London, are believed to have been those of a Jacobean goldsmith and the cache to have been his working stock, possibly buried during the Civil War. Now known as the Cheapside Hoard, the find indicates that goldsmiths in the area probably dealt with the wealthy merchant classes rather than court circles.²¹⁹

The area's fortunes fluctuated, but efforts were made to keep it exclusive to genuine London goldsmiths and thus retain its reputation for high quality work. In 1622 goldsmiths complained that 183 'foreigners' were trading counterfeit jewels and in 1634 other shopkeepers had intruded 'whereby that uniform show which was an ornament to those places and a lustre to the City is now greatly diminished'. To prevent this 'all the shops in Goldsmith's Row are to be occupied by none but goldsmiths and all the goldsmiths who keep shops in other parts of the City are to resort thither, or to Lombard Street'.²²⁰ In 1664 Samuel Pepys described Cheapside as a violent place.²²¹ However, royal visits to the Lord Mayor's guilds and pageants restored the area as a site for spectacle until by 1747 Hogarth could imagine Frederick, Prince of Wales, on a tapestry-hung Cheapside balcony in his *'Industrial and Idle Apprentices, No.12'*. In 1804, John Feltham described Cheapside in his *Picture of London* as one of a 'most splendid' number of streets and 'the opulence of multitudes of merchants, traders, and shopkeepers' as indicative of the city's

²¹⁷ John Stow, *A Survey of London* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1876), p.129.

²¹⁸ Now beneath One New Change office and retail development.

²¹⁹ *The Cheapside Hoard*, Museum of London, URL: <http://collections.museumoflondon.org.uk/Online/group.aspx?g=group-20978>[accessed 21.12.2014].

²²⁰ Walter Thornbury, 'Cheapside: Introduction', in *Old and New London: Volume I* (London, 1878), <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/old-new-london/vol1/pp304-315> [accessed 13.2015].

²²¹ Thornbury, *Old and New London: Volume I*. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/old-new-london/vol1/pp315-332>[accessed 1.3.2015].

‘prodigious commerce’.²²² By the 1860s many prestigious London retailers with expensive West End premises, including Asprey, Tessier and Hunt & Roskell of New Bond Street, Benson of Ludgate Hill and Garrard in the Haymarket, installed arcaded shop frontages to display their luxury goods.²²³ Many retailers who presented themselves through advertisements in newspapers and journals and on their shop signs as jewellers, in reality had little workshop capacity but outsourced this elsewhere.²²⁴ Most manufacturing jewellers and associated workshops moved to Clerkenwell or Hatton Garden where lower rents allowed pieces to be made more cheaply, largely separating manufacturing processes from retail sales.²²⁵ This practice, as will be described, contributed to problems of attribution.

Jewellery making was not only subcontracted to workshops in London but also outsourced to Birmingham, where there was considerable experience in making decorative buttons and buckles. Birmingham did not have such a long history of goldsmithing and silversmithing, but instead a tradition of more practical metalworking in tools and military armaments.²²⁶ Between 1535 and 1543 poet and antiquary John Leland travelled round Britain noting his observations.²²⁷ In 1538 he visited ‘Bremischam toune’ (Birmingham), arriving via a ‘strete caullyd Dyrtey, in it dwelle smithes and cuttelers’.²²⁸ Here Leland saw many ironworkers who brought:

yron out of Staffordshire and Warwikeshire’; these workers ‘use to make knives and all maner of cuttynge tooles and many lorimars that make byts, and a great many naylor. So that a great parte of the town is mayntayned by smithes’.²²⁹

²²² John Feltham, *The Picture of London, for 1804* (London: Lewis & Roden, 1804), pp.44-45.

²²³ James Nye, *A Long Time in the Making*, p.4.

²²⁴ Nye, *A Long Time in the Making*, p.4.

²²⁵ Bury, *Jewellery, 1789-1910*, 607, for details of workshop conditions and wages.

²²⁶ Ray Shill, *Birmingham’s Industrial Heritage 1900-2000*, pp.1-11. Mason notes references to three fraudulent Birmingham silversmiths in the 1343 Chancery Patent Rolls and a John Goldsmith listed as a townsman in 1382 but there is little evidence of significant early jewellery-making. Shena Mason, *Jewellery Making in Birmingham 1750-1995* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1998), p.2.

²²⁷ The surviving parts of Leland’s notes were finally published in the eighteenth century as his *‘Itinerary’*.

²²⁸ Probably modern Deritend, about 1.6 miles south-east of the modern Jewellery Quarter. John Leland, *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543, Part V* [1538] Ed. by Lucy Toulmin Smith, (London: G. Bell, 1908), p.96.

²²⁹ Leland, *The Itinerary of John Leland, Part V*, p.97.

In 1754 a ‘dictionary of the arts and sciences’ listed Birmingham’s goods as ‘all sorts of tools, smaller utensils, toys, buckles, buttons, in iron, steel, brass etc.’²³⁰

The fashion for paste and gemstone shoe buckles and buttons was brought back from France in 1660 by Charles II, who stated that Birmingham workers were certainly ‘equal to copying them’.²³¹ Items of personal adornment and small metal, enamelled and jewelled treasures such as boxes and chatelaines, known collectively as ‘toys’ were specialisms of the city and an early eighteenth-century traveller in Northern Italy asserted that the ‘fine works of steel’ he had seen in Milan could be found more cheaply and better in Birmingham and London.²³²

These decorative buckles and embellished buttons were small pieces of jewellery in themselves. The button in fig.42 was made of steel ‘gems’, hand cut and polished to resemble faceted diamonds and would have sparkled as they caught the light.²³³ Buttons like this were expensive and embellished clothing exactly as a brooch might have done and were valued as jewellery.²³⁴ In Dante Gabriel Rossetti’s painting of 1879, Jane Morris poses as Beatrice, her hair caught back by a sparkling steel ornament almost identical to this button, reinforcing the close ties between button-making and jewellery (fig.43). In 1866 the Local Industries Committee of the British Association at Birmingham commissioned a series of reports on local trades. The description of button-making pointed out the ‘considerable artistic skill, or educated art’ involved.²³⁵ Birmingham toymakers and button-makers are seen as the precursors of the jewellers who from the 1770s congregated, with the specialist skilled workers and suppliers they required, in an area of approximately 100 acres around Hockley known today as the Jewellery Quarter (fig.44). For example, Firmin & Sons, makers of ‘every form of uniform, livery or badge, and the accessories and accoutrements to

²³⁰ W. B. Stephens, R. B. Pugh, eds, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick: Vol. VII, The City of Birmingham (Vol.7. University of London Institute of Historical Research)*, (Oxford: Oxford, 1964), Stephens, Pugh, eds, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick*, p.92.

²³¹ Mason, *Jewellery Making in Birmingham*, p.5.

²³² Stephens, Pugh, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick*, p.87.

²³³ A collet is a metal clasp to secure a gemstone into a piece of jewellery.

²³⁴ Stephens, Pugh, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick*, p.102.

²³⁵ John P. Turner, ‘The Birmingham Button Trade’, in S. Timmins, Editor, *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District* [London, 1866] (London, New York: Routledge, 2013), p.44.

go with them' began with Thomas Firmin, 'buttonmaker' in Lombard Street, London, in 1677, moving to premises 'at the Red Lion over against Norfolk Street in the Strand'.²³⁶ In 1882 Firmin set up a second factory in Birmingham, manufacturing uniform items and badges there under Royal Warrant. Firmin's expertise in making these items facilitated their production of military badge brooches, still produced by the company today.

However, if goods sold in London benefited from the desirability of pieces originating in the fashionable capital, those made in Birmingham were tainted by its long-standing reputation for shoddy goods, based on poor quality sword blades and fraudulent coinage made in the mid seventeenth century.²³⁷ The very fact that goods could be made there more cheaply lowered their value in comparison with London-made items in the perception of customers who equated high prices with quality.²³⁸ Consequently, though jewellery designed and made in Birmingham often equalled the work of any London goldsmiths, and included costly handmade pieces set with precious stones, London retailers preferred to disguise the fact from their customers. This was revealed by the journalist John Fraser writing in *The Windsor Magazine* in 1897. Investigating the Birmingham jewellery trade and its manufacturing practices Fraser claimed:

Who will acknowledge to wearing Brummagem jewellery? Not many. [...] A jeweller shrinks back with a gasp of horror when you suggest that the clasp he is showing you, and desires you to purchase, is made in Birmingham. [...] No, sir, this clasp is high-class West-End workmanship. So he wants you to believe, and as probably you have been nurtured in the idea that no good can come out of Birmingham, you do believe it. Birmingham has, with respect to its jewellery, received a bad name.²³⁹

For this and the reasons discussed below it is often difficult to be certain of the origins of items. Jewellery was generally marked by the maker with the retailer's name and sold in boxes stamped with the name of the shop or retail company. J. S. Wright's report for the 1866 Birmingham Local Industries Committee covered the jewellery

²³⁶ Firminhouse, URL: <http://www.firminhouse.com/military/military.htm>[accessed 3.2.2015].

²³⁷ Stephens, Pugh, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick*, pp.92,107.

²³⁸ Stephens, Pugh, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick*, p.92.

²³⁹ James Fraser, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', *The Windsor Magazine: an illustrated monthly for men and women*, June 1897, 6, (British Periodicals), p.463.

trade. Wright stated that Edinburgh and Derby had previously been centres of manufacture but now London depended mainly upon Birmingham for its jewellery supplies.²⁴⁰ He saw several reasons for this: concentration of the necessary suppliers of materials and associated trades, ingenuity that encouraged new styles and promoted trade but above all, superior workmanship enhanced by training at the School of Art:

it is only necessary to walk from the Bank to Hyde Park to enable any person to form an idea of the ingenuity, skill, and taste of the Birmingham artisans. The shopkeeper will not voluntarily admit that his articles are Birmingham manufacture, yet we believe we speak within bounds if we say at least one-half of all the gold and silver work seen in the shops of the London jewellers is the production of this town.²⁴¹

Three decades later, Fraser confirmed Wright's view, stating that he had the opportunity of seeing not only:

the manufacture of imitation goods, for which the place is so famous, but of seeing truly high-class work, where the gold is up to standard and the jewels are precious and rare.²⁴² [...] Indeed I saw jewels which would rival any place in the world for beauty of design and excellence.²⁴³

Nevertheless, retail buyers regularly insisted that items must be supplied without identifying makers' marks. Smith & Pepper's ledgers indicate that clients frequently requested the company not to mark their orders, meaning the makers' role in production was effectively untraceable once goods left their workshops. For instance, on 22 March 1911, B.H. Joseph instructed: 'Please do not stamp with your initials'.²⁴⁴ In September 1919, J.S. Greenberg requested: 'Goods to be stamped with our punch sent h/w' and Deakin & Francis stated: 'Would like these goods marked with our

²⁴⁰ J. S. Wright, 'The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades' in Timmins, *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District*. Timmins stressed that Wright was commissioned to write the report because he was an independent journalist observer, unconnected with the jewellery trade.

²⁴¹ Wright, 'The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades', pp.454-455.

²⁴² Fraser, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', p.463.

²⁴³ Fraser, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', p.469.

²⁴⁴ For example, B.H. Joseph & Co., 194, Smith & Pepper Order Book, 22.3.1911, Collections No. 2701/279, 1911-13.C, Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham.

initials' (fig. 45).²⁴⁵ Smith & Pepper always supplied their jewellery in plain, unmarked boxes so retailers could add their own logos and names.

A further reason for confusion in the origins of both handmade and machine-made brooches is the frequent lack of hallmarking. Hallmarking originated in 1300 with a Statute of Edward I, requiring precious metals to be assayed and marked by the London Goldsmiths' Guild's Wardens to prevent fraudulent use of poor quality metals and limit production to their own members. Originally only silver was marked but later gold was included. The London hallmark represents a leopard; from 1363 a maker's mark was added and from 1478 a letter for the year of assaying.²⁴⁶ In 1773 Matthew Boulton, the influential eighteenth-century Birmingham manufacturer and engineer, successfully lobbied parliament for the establishment of a Birmingham Assay Office, believing this would give authority to goods made in the town and break London's monopoly for quality.²⁴⁷ However, regulations did not always require jewellery to be hallmarked. An open letter to Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel in *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper* in April 1846 deplored the loss of public trust and consequent loss of orders to Parisian jewellers through the jewellery trade's failure to address the issue:

In Paris, the purchaser has a guarantee for what he is buying, in everything being hall-marked, and gold and gilt goods not being sold in the same shop; in London, the purchaser knows not what he buys; his eye is caught by the alluring ticket in the window, "Pure Gold," "Fine Gold," "Solid Gold," or "In Gold," words not even known in the workshops; and he purchases what, in the event of his selling again, he finds is very little gold indeed.²⁴⁸

Non-precious metals, which includes many of the brooches this thesis investigates, are not subject to hallmarking. Objects made from precious metals but less than

²⁴⁵ J.S. Greenberg & Co. Ltd., 15.9.1919, Deakin & Francis, 22.9.1919, Smith & Pepper Order Book, p.73, Collections No. 2071/234, 1918-23, Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham.

²⁴⁶ Birmingham Assay Office, URL:<https://theassayoffice.co.uk/assay-office-birmingham/the-story-of-assay-office-birmingham>[accessed 7.6.2015].

²⁴⁷ Birmingham's hallmark is an anchor, derived from the Anchor Hotel, where Boulton stayed. Birmingham Assay Office, URL:<https://theassayoffice.co.uk/assay-office-birmingham/the-story-of-assay-office-birmingham>[accessed 7.6.2015].

²⁴⁸ 'A Goldfinch', *The Jewellery Trade, To the Right Honourable Sir Robert Peel*, *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper*, 26,4,1846, p.5.

prescribed weights (less than 1.00 gram of gold, 7.78 grams of silver or 0.50 grams of platinum or combined totals of precious metals) need not be hallmarked. Pieces that might be damaged by the stamping process and jewellery made before 1950 are also exempt.²⁴⁹ After 1854 only gold wedding rings, mourning rings and watch-cases were legally required to be hallmarked.²⁵⁰ It is therefore often impossible to identify the source of hand-made jewellery. It may have been London-made, produced elsewhere but hallmarked in London, or simply not hallmarked and claimed as the product of a London retailer.²⁵¹ Further, from the 1870s, while Birmingham became an important centre for jewellery design as well as its manufacture, London retailers could choose the decorations they required from illustrations supplied to them but retain rights to the patterns: the designer's part in the process was not acknowledged.²⁵² Many brooches carry the retailer's mark but their maker cannot necessarily be ascertained. Even the most prestigious pieces cannot always be identified since there was no obligation to hallmark pieces made to individual commission. Jewellers could send their work to the Assay Office to be stamped with their mark if they wished but were not legally required to do so.

It is sometimes possible, however, for a brooch's design to indicate its date. A queen's crown or king's crown may give an indication; regimental insignia vary according to date.²⁵³ The insignia of the pascal lamb and flag of Queen's Royal Regiment (West Surrey), for example, altered several times, while the Royal Scots Dragoon Guards existed only between 1941-1946, so their brooches can be dated to that period.

Finally, when Fraser described Birmingham workshops in 1897, he remarked upon the widespread inclination of the jeweller to secrecy. He noted 'He is suspicious of his neighbour. He is not at all desirous that the man down the street should know

²⁴⁹ For the history of hallmarking and current legislation, see Birmingham Assay Office, URL: assayofficebirmingham.com.

²⁵⁰ Mason, *Jewellery Making in Birmingham 1750-1995*, p.71.

²⁵¹ 'Hallmarking Debate', in 'Struck with the Quantity of Gold', Mason, *Jewellery Making in Birmingham 1750-1995*, pp.71-73 and 'Plated Goods and the Assay Office', Stephens, Pugh, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick*, pp.104-105.

²⁵² Flower, Langley-Levy Moore, *Victorian Jewellery*, p.32.

²⁵³ Theoretically a king's crown may have an plain curve at the top while a queen's crown has an indented curve; in practice they are often interchangeable.

anything about the business he is doing'.²⁵⁴ The trade's traditional secrecy extends to the refusal of some in the trade today to reveal their clients, even those dating back over a century. Retailers commonly placed confidentiality requirements on those who made jewellery for them – in effect, gagging orders – that preserved this mystery and still makes tracing jewellery particularly problematic.²⁵⁵

In conclusion, the practice of outsourcing by retailers to workshops in Clerkenwell, Birmingham or elsewhere, while promoting to customers the idea that products are of their own making exacerbates problems of provenance. Many company records were lost or are incomplete.²⁵⁶ In Birmingham particularly many very small firms existed that were either not required to keep formal accounts or whose documentation is lost. The few extant ledgers in the Birmingham Library archives, examined for this study, show signs of partial burning, suggesting they were retrieved while many others were destroyed (see fig.33). High status brooches and machine-made versions were made in both London and Birmingham but the capital was privileged as the source of fashionable, high-class goods. Differentiation between jewellery manufactured and sold in the two cities was simply a 'convenient fiction' designed to confuse the customer.²⁵⁷

Wherever they were made and sold, military sweetheart brooches always by definition reference the giver's insignia but there is scope for considerable variation in materials, scale and embellishments according to cost and the circumstances of the giver. The following section describes a variety of techniques employed in the manufacture of handmade and factory-produced brooches that made them available to all.

²⁵⁴ Fraser, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', p.464.

²⁵⁵ Annmarie Hanlon, Publicity Officer, Deakin & Francis, Birmingham, Personal Communication, 23.1.2015.

²⁵⁶ For example, company archives of Mappin & Webb, dating from 1774, were destroyed by enemy bombing in WWII. Mappin & Webb, Personal communication, 8.4.2011.

²⁵⁷ Carnevali, 'Luxury for the Masses', p.62.

2.3 A Sheet of Metal to a Bright Gold Ornament

Regimental insignia are as intricate in their design as any other kind of jewellery and must be reproduced accurately in whatever materials have been chosen to recreate them. Coloured gemstones of different values might be used and enamels added as backgrounds to gold lettering or to add text. High quality brooches were hand-made using traditional methods by goldsmiths, diamond cutters and setters. The goldsmith would cut the basic form from the chosen precious metal, hammer and shape it to the required thickness and profile and create the collet, or setting, to hold the diamonds. These would be cut and polished by a specialist diamond cutter and the setter would fit the stones into the brooch. Enamels were often used to render the regimental name and motto, allowing subtle colours to be included. Enamel is coloured glass ground to a fine powder, traditionally in a pestle and mortar, and mixed under water to a fine semi-transparent or opaque paste. This may be dropped or painted onto the metal, traditionally with a goose feather quill. The piece is then fired at intense heat in a kiln, (c.1500F) to fuse the enamel to the metal. Once cooled, more layers and colours can be applied as required and refired. Enamel may be applied *champlevé* (laid within a cell which has been etched, die struck or engraved into the metal) or *cloisonné* (where raised cells are created from fine wire). The Kent Artillery Volunteers' brooch in fig.46, c.1910, combines many of these elements. Semi-transparent dark blue enamel has been laid over an engraved background (a technique known as *basse taille*) to give texture that will sparkle when it catches the light, while diamonds depicting the white horse and lion are set in white gold to retain the desirable clarity.

When surveying Birmingham workshops, Fraser observed high-class work, but also: 'the making of a cheap brooch from the time it is nothing but a sheet of metal till it is a bright gold ornament'.²⁵⁸ He described the specialist artisans involved in the many processes required, including rolling metal sheets, making and stamping dies, cutting intricate designs by hand with small fretsaws and raising patterns by means of applied decoration.²⁵⁹ Fittings were soldered to the back and imitation stones added, after which various solutions were applied to create an attractive finish. Division of labour

²⁵⁸ Fraser, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', p.467.

²⁵⁹ Fraser, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', p.467.

for button-making might involve ‘fifty pairs of hands’; medals and brooches involved similar specialisms.²⁶⁰ Each might be carried out on different premises; between each process boys pushed the items in wheelbarrows through the streets between factories and workshops.²⁶¹ The complex and intertwined processes produced a brooch which, Fraser observed, ‘would be sold in a shop for a penny, but the wholesale price of which was only a halfpenny’.²⁶² In 1890, Barnett Brothers of Birmingham sold their hollow silver brooches wholesale at eight shillings per dozen and they retailed at between one shilling and three shillings each.²⁶³ London makers such as Hunt and Roskell outsourced similar brooches to their Clerkenwell workshops.

The difference in labour between expensive jewellery previously made by one specialist artisan worker and the same piece once dies and machinery were employed was clear, as Wright described:

Under the old system the gold would have been beaten out by hand to the thickness required, and then forced into the proper shape by repeated hammering; the edges of the back and front filed that they might join correctly, after which it would be soldered and finished – all this being the work of one person.

Now, a die is cut or engraved, the gold rolled at the steam mill to the requisite gauge, then blanks or discs are cut out by a screw-press, stamped and cut to the exact shape desired (also by the press), all this being done so rapidly, that twenty are produced in the same time as one was formerly made.²⁶⁴

As a result: ‘The low price at which these beautiful ornaments are produced is astonishing. For instance a locket, which in gold might be worth from 15s. to 30s. in metal gilt is produced for a penny.’²⁶⁵ For Wright, the advantage was that attractive jewellery was available to everyone:

There is no valid reason why the factory girl should not display her gilt buckle and brooch of the same design as the golden one worn by the lady of the villa. Art may thus serve the community by cheapening the cost of the beautiful, and

²⁶⁰ *History of Warwickshire*, p.95.

²⁶¹ Maureen Padfield, ‘*Out in the Trade: The Occupational Community of Birmingham’s Jewellery Quarter*’, PhD. Thesis, Warwick University, 1990, p.142.

²⁶² Fraser, ‘Birmingham and its Jewellery’, p.468.

²⁶³ Brian, *The Story of English Silver Brooches*, p.21.

²⁶⁴ Wright, ‘The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades’, p.456.

²⁶⁵ Wright, ‘The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades’, p.461.

affording gratification to the humblest members of society, by superior designs reproduced in the cheapest possible form, and attainable by all.²⁶⁶

Brooches were constructed using the same techniques employed to make the military badges from which they derived, using a drop-stamp machine in which a heavy weight fitted with a die was pulled to the top of the machine and allowed to fall within a guiding frame onto a sheet of the chosen metal laid over the die's negative to create raised patterns (fig.47). The machine might be small or large, depending upon the size of the factory but was usually hand-operated (fig.48).²⁶⁷ The machine was patented in 1769 by a London toymaker and quickly modified by Richard Ford of Birmingham, where toymakers and jewellers soon adapted it to their own requirements.²⁶⁸ The method was the same as that used for making metal buttons and a description of the process in operation at Smith & Wright's factory in 1876 indicates the speed of production and consequent hazards. The operator placed each metal disc to be stamped beneath the weight, pulling and releasing a leather strap, causing the heavy weight to fall:

But the workman is at piece-work, and so goes at it his hardest, passing four or five thousand of these discs between finger and thumb in an hour. [...] he laughs and shows me his hand [...]. He seems to have had bits chopped off it all over.²⁶⁹

Women were also employed on piece-work and were expected to produce 20 discs a minute; if after 3 years a worker had not lost at least one fingertip they were considered too slow.²⁷⁰ A specially valued skill in the production of machine-made badge brooches belonged to the die-sinker, who made the die to impress patterns on the metal. The die-sinker first drew and then engraved image and text into a steel die. The process required considerable skill and the use of gravers of three different shapes to make marks: 'one straight, one straight with the corners rounded, and one semi-circular; some forty or fifty sizes of each of these' might be required.²⁷¹ The

²⁶⁶ Wright, 'The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades', p.461.

²⁶⁷ Stephens, Pugh, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick*, p.127.

²⁶⁸ Mason, *Jewellery Making in Birmingham 1750-1995*, p.29.

²⁶⁹ Quoted in Ray Shill, *Birmingham's Industrial Heritage 1900-2000*, p.34.

²⁷⁰ Curator, Museum of the Jewellery Quarter, 14.3.2014.

²⁷¹ 'Die-Sinking', Timmins, *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District*, p.560.

completed die, around which an iron collar was welded to prevent the steel cracking, was heated and cooled to harden it, then polished using a lapper and was finally ready for use in the press (fig.49).²⁷² Several further impressions might be required for a complicated design (fig.50) and the finished piece might then be completed with coloured enamels or gems. Fig.51 shows a gold brooch and its component parts with the dies used in its construction, made in 1872 by T & J Bragg, a company that manufactured many regimental brooches.

According to Wright, making medals and regimental insignia, which required the same skills later used to make regimental brooches, demanded ‘artistic talent of a very high order’.²⁷³ Finished dies were valuable, so often retained for many years. In 1939 Marples & Beasley of Birmingham (among others) notified customers that they still held the dies they had made for regimental brooches manufactured during WWI and could resume production immediately.²⁷⁴ But Wright noted that despite the considerable artistic skill of the die-makers, the finished goods were brought to market under the name of the company which ‘absorbs the praise justly due to the artist [...] who is the real author of the work’ and deplored the suppression of the recording of the actual makers as distorting the history of the trade. Where makers’ marks were also missing, further difficulty was created in identifying the brooches’ manufacture.²⁷⁵

Smith & Pepper manufactured a vast selection of brooches of assorted designs to order during the early part of the twentieth century. Their premises, kept exactly as they were when the company closed its doors in 1981, are now part of the Museum of the Jewellery Quarter and their records form one of the few surviving jewellers’ archives. Order books covering both World Wars are missing but their records for 1913 indicate that at this point many jewels with sentimental inscriptions were being ordered, possibly in anticipation of uncertain times. In February, for example, retailers Bradley & Cohn placed an order for brooches inscribed with messages

²⁷² ‘Die-Sinking’, Timmins, *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District*, p.560.

²⁷³ Wright, ‘The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades’, p.563.

²⁷⁴ Advertisement, Marples & Beasley, ‘To Meet Today’s Demand’ in *British Jeweller, Service Crests Etc., Special Edition*, Vol.7, No.3, November 1939, p.32.

²⁷⁵ Wright, ‘The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades’, pp.560-561.

including ‘Best wishes’, ‘For Ever’ and ‘Good Luck’ (fig.52).²⁷⁶ Local jewellery factor Adolph Scott ordered brooches between 1911 and 1913, to be decorated with a variety of elaborate floral ‘fancy designs’ on oval and bar shapes.²⁷⁷ Scott is recorded as selling military sweetheart brooches from 1914, probably buying some from Smith & Pepper since he was already a customer.²⁷⁸

Smith & Pepper’s ledgers often refer to previously fulfilled orders and merely request ‘something similar’, indicating the close working relationships that existed within the jewellery district. Frequently, testy remarks appear about quality and threats to cancel if orders are even a day late and completion is required at very short notice but it is evident from the ledgers that retailers allowed their suppliers to make up orders with minimal instruction and the trade functioned largely on the basis of trust. Materials, however, are often specified such as the quality of gold and which semi-precious stones are to be used.²⁷⁹ Towards the end of the nineteenth century women preferred good quality diamond jewellery, but when the Boer War cut off supplies of South African diamonds, other coloured stones such as peridots and tourmalines became popular alternatives.²⁸⁰

Although jewellery’s status was often defined by its supposed place of origin, the method of manufacture appears to have been less important. Consumers were not simply attracted to imitation jewellery by its affordable price, but also by the ingenuity involved in its manufacture.²⁸¹ On 25th March 1840 George and Henry Elkington applied to patent their new method of electro-gilding and in 1843 with pen-maker Josiah Mason set up a large factory in Birmingham’s Newhall Street where, among many other processes, was a ‘toy-gilding shop’.²⁸² Electro-gilding allowed a coating of powdered gold or silver to be applied to jewellery made from base metal,

²⁷⁶ Bradley & Cohn, 6.2.1913, Smith & Pepper Order Book, Collections No. 2701/279, 1911-13,C, Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham.

²⁷⁷ Adolph Scott, 31.5.1911, 20.3.1913, 28.5.1913, Smith & Pepper Order Book, Collections No. 2701/279, 1911-13,C, Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham.

²⁷⁸ See Chapter 2 for Scott’s prosecution under Defence of the Realm Act.

²⁷⁹ Bradley & Cohn, 14.7.1913, Smith & Pepper Order Book, Collections No. 2701/279, 1911-13 “C”, Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham. See also comments on W. Bolus & Co.’s order, fig. 33.

²⁸⁰ Flower, Langley-Levy Moore, *Victorian Jewellery*, p.43.

²⁸¹ Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, p.166-167.

²⁸² Grant, ‘Elkington & Co.’, pp.2-3. Unusually, Elkington employed around 2000 workers.

usually plated with nickel silver (a nickel alloy containing no silver). The piece is immersed in a bath of the anode metal through which an electric current is passed, causing the powdered metal to be deposited on the surface, giving the appearance of finished silver.²⁸³ Elkington made both medals and military brooches. They produced the WWI silver-gilt ‘Liverpool Pals’ brooch in fig.53. The unknown woman in fig.54 wears a similar brooch on her blouse. Elkington’s catalogue of c.1920 shows the company making badges and insignia by Royal Appointment to be sold through their international showrooms (fig.55).

When Birmingham jewellers exhibited at the International Exhibition of 1872 in South Kensington *The London Standard* noted that they also ‘show well in the department of real jewellery [...] and the entire collection is very handsome and costly’.²⁸⁴ But paste jewels and costume jewellery were acceptable wear for women of all levels of society who admired, as previously noted, ingenious modern manufacturing methods.²⁸⁵ *The London Standard* reported excitedly that the London firm of Spiegel and Gorer could by ‘the operation of electro-plating’ convert ‘into the semblance of gold, in the space of two or three minutes, almost any article that may be presented to them’. Edwin Streeter exhibited a collection of machine-made jewellery ‘ranging from the diamond suite of a thousand guineas down to seven specimens of earrings at 30s a pair’.²⁸⁶ This, stated the article, rendered the public a service by bringing such items within the reach of more customers and thus encouraging ‘a better taste’. Never one to undersell his wares, Streeter claimed: ‘It is now an established fact (vide Press Reviews below) that Mr. Streeter’s Machine-made Jewellery is better than Hand-made’.²⁸⁷ In 1867 he published an illustrated work detailing the machinery and processes for machine-made jewellery in which he compared the processes required to manufacture a gold bracelet to those needed to make the same article by hand. It would ‘take a skilled workman *six* days to make by hand; whilst

²⁸³ Shill, *Birmingham’s Industrial Heritage*, p.29.

²⁸⁴ ‘The International Exhibition: Jewellery’, *London Standard*, 27.5.1872, p.5.

²⁸⁵ Bury, *Jewellery, 1789-1910*, p.35.

²⁸⁶ *London Standard*, 27.5.1872, p.5.

²⁸⁷ Edwin Streeter, Advertisement, *Illustrated Times*, 18 December 1869, p.24.

with the aid of the machinery I have described, the same ornament – including the necessary hand-work, such as jointing, polishing, &c- can be made in *two days*'.²⁸⁸

Whenever a new type of jewellery was designed, Birmingham jewellers could produce a version of it, either hand-made in precious metals or machine-made, so that it was quickly made available to all, as Fraser noted:

Birmingham of course is the home of imitation [...] When a particular form of gold brooch becomes a favourite the imitator is soon on the field, so that the servant girl can have something for eighteen pence which for a time, at any rate, will look as good as the brooch her mistress gave four guineas for. As soon as the servant girl wears that patterned brooch it drops out of fashion, and the high-class jewellers design something else.²⁸⁹

Imitation is of course the essential function of sweetheart brooches. Originality is irrelevant, except in the choice of materials. The willingness of women across all boundaries of class to wear brooches of similar appearance, if not of value, might argue for some temporary blurring of class structure during wartime. In 1939 Mass Observations recorded an interviewee who stated: 'With the war snobbery has almost gone'.²⁹⁰ Though this might be debatable, military brooches could be seen to contribute in a small way, through their visual implications of societal solidarity and common aims, to shifting perceptions within society, at least while the conflict lasted.

2.4 'His House as a Workshop'

Some larger companies, such as Thomas Fattorini of Birmingham, built special manufactories but most employed fewer than ten workers and many only three or four, often family members. A characteristic of the Birmingham jewellery trade was the large number of very small family firms located there in the nineteenth and well

²⁸⁸ Edwin Streeter, *Hints to Purchasers of Jewellery, Eighth Edition, Part II* [London: 1867], p.44, reproduced in Patrick Streeter, *Streeter of Bond Street: A Victorian Jeweller* (Harlow: The Matching Press, 1993), p.56.

²⁸⁹ Fraser, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', p.463.

²⁹⁰ Victor Stiebel, Bruton Street, London, 1939, SxMOA1/2/18/2.

into the twentieth century. Introducing the 1866 reports on Birmingham's industrial history, Timmins noted:

Beginning as a small master, often working in his own house, with his wife and children to help him, the Birmingham workman has become a master, his trade has extended, his buildings have increased. He has used his house as a workshop, has annexed another, has built upon the garden or the yard, and consequently a large number of the manufactories are most irregular in style.²⁹¹

In his report, Wright described the equipment required to set up a jeweller's workshop:

All that is needed for a workman to start as a master is a peculiarly-shaped bench and a leather apron, one or two pounds worth of tools (including a blow-pipe), and for material, a few sovereigns, and some ounces of copper and zinc. His shop may be the top-room of his house, or a small building over the wash-house, at a rent of 2s, or 2s.6d per week and the indispensable gas-jet, which the Gas Company will supply on credit. With these appliances, and a skilful hand, he may produce scarf-pins, studs, links, rings, lockets, &c., &c., for all of which he will find a ready market²⁹²

These basic requirements accounted for the proliferation of very small cottage industries operating in the city centre: very little space was necessary and a jeweller might simply rent a bench at which to work. Wright described the jewellery quarter as filled with small gardens, now crammed with little workshops.²⁹³

Small terraced and back-to-back houses in the city centre became homes and family businesses combined so that there was hardly a distinction between them (fig.56). Sometimes more than one business occupied a single house.²⁹⁴ By 1897, Fraser stated: 'The works that are of any size are few. Operations are generally carried on in mean streets in rickety and grimy buildings no larger than a cottage with a number of ramshackle buildings at the back', noting that while there were 'jewellery works, well built and healthy places' many workers operated from homes 'little better than a

²⁹¹ Timmins, 'The Industrial History of Birmingham', p.223.

²⁹² Wright, 'The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades', p.454.

²⁹³ Wright, 'The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades', p.457.

²⁹⁴ M. J. Wise, 'Evolution of the Jewellery and Gun Quarters in Birmingham', *Transactions and Papers (Institute of British Geographers)*, 15,(1949), p.62.

hovel'.²⁹⁵ By the late nineteenth century, as travel became easier, prosperous owners left the city centre, crowded with factories and workshops and moved to the suburbs.²⁹⁶ The family firm of Smith & Pepper, for instance, originally traded from a workshop in the garden behind their home in Vyse Street but in 1909 moved out of their house too and turned over the premises entirely to manufacturing jewellery.²⁹⁷ Until the mid-twentieth century many small concerns changed very little. A photograph from 1970 of a workshop in London's Hatton Garden jewellery quarter shows a jeweller was working in almost identical conditions and with the same basic equipment described by Wright 100 years earlier (fig.57).

Goldsmiths and silversmiths working today have the option of computer-aided design and power tools but the equipment Wright described as necessary for a workman to set up a business in his home in the mid-nineteenth century would be entirely recognisable to a modern jeweller and would hardly have changed from a medieval goldsmith's workshop. Tools for cutting, hammering, engraving and polishing handmade pieces have changed very little and many jewellers today still use and sometimes make their own hand tools, preferring the control that can be achieved for fine delicate work.²⁹⁸ The jeweller's bench, with its cut-out semi-circle and leather apron to catch any remnants of precious metals, and the tools arranged on it, remain identical (fig.58).

As this chapter described, regimental sweetheart brooches were made as individual handmade commissions, as machine-made pieces or a combination of the two. They might be valuable jewels, affordable only by officers with money to spend, or priced to be available to those who could afford very little but wished to give a token of affection and remembrance to a family member before leaving on active service. It is clear, however, that their worth to their owners lay not in the materials from which they were made but in the emotional value invested in the exchange. For example Giles Guthrie, Collections Manager of the Maidstone Museum, owns a small personal collection of sweetheart brooches, including one of the North Staffordshire Regiment,

²⁹⁵ Fraser, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', p.464.

²⁹⁶ Mason, *Jewellery Making in Birmingham 1750-1995*, p.106.

²⁹⁷ Curator, Museum of the Jewellery Quarter, June 2014.

²⁹⁸ Phil Marr, Jeweller, *Metalsmiths* +, Heathfield, East Sussex. Personal Communication.

bought by his great-grandfather as a gift for his wife during WWI (fig.59). Guthrie's great-grandmother wore her brooch throughout the war and following her husband's death in action in the spring of 1918 she continued to wear it in his memory.²⁹⁹ The family was reduced to 'absolute poverty' by his loss and Guthrie spoke of how they could not pay the rent in a 'land fit for heroes'.³⁰⁰ Despite this, it is still treasured in the family as a commemorative object, suggesting the focus of this brooch at least was on the individual who gave it rather than on wider concepts of national patriotism. The tradition of buying these brooches was continued in WWII by Guthrie's great-uncle who fought at Dunkirk, then in India and Burma with the REME and was therefore overseas throughout the war. The metal and enamel brooch he purchased is pictured in fig.60.

Similarly, Carol Thomas recalled:

I came from a very poor working class London family. I don't recall any female family members wearing any other jewellery other than their wedding rings, sweetheart brooches (sic) and maybe a watch. On high days and holidays these would be supplemented with maybe a string of pearls and earrings, possibly an engagement ring (if it wasn't being pawned).³⁰¹

Thomas remembered the brooches she saw worn by family and friends as rarely made of gold but more usually of brass, confirming that even those with very little to spend treasured their brooches. Fig.2 illustrated a valuable diamond Royal Scots Fusiliers brooch of 1914, a piece of jewellery that would have been a costly gift. In 1940 Mrs Bishop wore her Royal Fusiliers brooch with the same insignia on her coat when she posed for a photograph with her husband, who wore the badge on his uniform cap (fig.61). Mrs Bishop's brooch is a much simpler version (though it may be gold) but she clearly wears it with as much pride as the unknown woman in 1914 can be imagined wearing her diamond jewellery.

²⁹⁹ Giles Guthrie, Collections Manager, Maidstone Borough Council Museum & Bentsliff Art Gallery, Personal Communication, phone and emails, 13.4.2011; 5.6.2016. (There are no brooches in the museum collection.)

³⁰⁰ Guthrie, Personal Communication, 5.6.2016.

³⁰¹ Thomas, Personal Communication.

As popular purchases, brooches became an important part of their market for jewellers and retailers. The motives of the trade for promoting them and the advertising techniques they employed will be examined next.

2.5 'The Best Patriotic Emblem': Luxury in Wartime

Frequent fluctuations in the jewellery industry's fortunes were tied to changes in fashion and competition from foreign markets. During the long period when decorative shoe buckles were popular, a considerable part of the jewellery trade was involved in their manufacture. When buckles fell out of favour around 1786 and string fastenings became fashionable, considerable problems were caused to the economy of Birmingham but by the end of the 18th century 4000-5000 people were employed instead on producing elaborate jewelled buttons.³⁰² From the 1820s new techniques, rising prosperity and Queen Victoria's accession led to expansion in the jewellery trade, until in 1913 approximately 70,000 people were employed.³⁰³ In 1885, in response to growing American competition, Birmingham jewellers found themselves in difficulties which they attempted to overcome by reducing prices, with the result that lowered incomes could not support the many workers reliant upon the trade; those still in work were often on half wages.³⁰⁴ Mass-production meant supply exceeded demand.³⁰⁵ An appeal was made to the Princess of Wales to encourage sales by wearing jewellery in the morning (a hitherto unacceptable practice) though this did not produce the hoped-for result.³⁰⁶ In 1887 *The Birmingham Post* urged: 'If our British manufacturers wish to preserve any part of our foreign and colonial trade it is high time they bestirred themselves', since American companies marketed and quality-controlled their goods much more efficiently.³⁰⁷ Towards the end of the century foreign competition greatly eroded the decorative button trade in Britain and by 1914 only the metal button trade remained buoyant, sustained by government

³⁰² Stephens, Pugh, Editors, *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick*, p.102.

³⁰³ R. S. Smirke, *Jewellery: report on Birmingham trades, prepared for use in connexion with the Juvenile Employment Exchange* (London: GB Board of Trade, 1913), p.3.

³⁰⁴ 'Depression in the Jewellery Trade', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 27.7.1885, p.4.

³⁰⁵ 'Depression in the Jewellery Trade'.

³⁰⁶ 'Depression in the Jewellery Trade'.

³⁰⁷ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 6.10.1887, p.6.

orders for uniform buttons for the army and navy and for civilian services such as the police and railway.³⁰⁸ In 1896 J. R. Gaunt & Son of Warstone Parade in the centre of the Jewellery Quarter advertised in Peck's Circular, Birmingham's trade directory, as makers of 'swords, lances, boarding pikes etc.' but also as 'Military, Naval, Railway & Police Button & Ornament Manufacturers', blurring distinctions between swordsmiths, cutlers and buttonmakers and the jewellers (fig.62). Gaunt was one of many companies manufacturing sweetheart brooches throughout the First and Second World Wars; the dies and machinery they already possessed for making buttons and badges were easily adaptable.

Jewellery is always likely to fall within the category of luxury, since it has no use value in the context of modern clothing but is purely decorative. Discourse concerning wartime luxuries veered between perception of their continued production as encouraging trade and therefore employment and diverting resources away from the war effort. Immediately after the beginning of WWI the jewellery trade began to experience problems. Gold supplies were soon restricted.³⁰⁹ In 1915 the Bank of England restricted the use of 'new' gold to essential use, for example, for dental fillings, though reportedly considerable quantities of Russian gold was smuggled into London in the form of gold coins to be made into jewellery.³¹⁰ The Defence of the Realm Act placed a complete ban on platinum in 1916. De Beers Mines understood their diamonds were 'a luxury that did not find a sale in these times' so suspended operations and hoped for better times to come.³¹¹ Birmingham workers were almost all on short time and appeals were made for employers to assist and to subscribe to a National Relief Fund as the trade was 'more seriously depressed than any other local industry'.³¹² In February 1915 a report on local industries confirmed that although, based on Assay Office returns of gold and silver tested, trade in luxury items was showing signs of improvement, 'Birmingham jewellery has suffered most severely from the falling-off in demand which had followed upon the war.'³¹³ Not only were

³⁰⁸ Ray Shill, *Birmingham's Industrial Heritage 1900-2000*, p.83.

³⁰⁹ 'The Withholding of Gold', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 7.10.1916, p.9.

³¹⁰ Rachel Lichtenstein, *Diamond Street: The Hidden World of Hatton Garden* (London: Penguin, 2013), pp.166-167.

³¹¹ 'Diamonds and War', *Daily Record*, 31.12.1914, p.2.

³¹² 'Distress in the Jewellery Trade: an Appeal to Employers', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 27.8.1914, p.3.

³¹³ Prof. Ashley, 'The Prosperity of Birmingham', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 6.2.1915, p.12.

there worsening shortages of precious metals but as the conflict progressed increasing numbers of young men from the trade left to fight. Two Jewellers' Companies were formed consisting, like other 'Pals Battalions', of men from factories or local areas who enlisted together to fight with friends and relatives. Many others changed to heavy industry, causing anxiety that they would lose their skills and the delicacy of touch required for fine work after the war and women came in to take their places, but soon they too left for munitions work.³¹⁴ In September 1916 *The Birmingham Daily Post* summed up the situation:

Before the war 20,000 were engaged in the trade, and between 80,000 and 90,000 or one twelfth of the population of the city, were dependent upon it. Today those figures are reduced by half. [...] Machinery is stilled, tools lie on the bench. You reflect that here you are faced with disaster wrought by war upon what is not only a staple trade of the city [...] but upon a trade intimately bound up with the early years of Birmingham's industrial supremacy, and one calling for the exercise of great artistic taste and much ingenuity.³¹⁵

Strenuous efforts were made to discourage spending on luxury items that diverted manpower and materials from war work, often aimed at women deemed to spend too freely. A 1916 poster advised: 'To dress extravagantly in war time is worse than bad form it is unpatriotic (fig.63). A close watch was kept on retailers:

The War Savings Committee has its investigators in the West End or wherever money is passing freely over the counters. When a jeweller's shop in a northern resort makes a weekly turnover of £8000 the fact quickly finds its way to the offices of the department at Salisbury Square, London.³¹⁶

Newspaper editorials indicate that jewellers across the country understood that shortages of gold and other materials, of skilled workers and of their usual customers at home and overseas would cause severe problems throughout the war and the trade might not easily recover afterwards. They appreciated the need for restrictions: 'When war makes the practice of economy a necessity the cutting down, of course, begins with luxuries'.³¹⁷ Berg describes luxury consumer goods as 'non-necessities,

³¹⁴ 'The Withholding of Gold', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 7.10.1916, p.9.

³¹⁵ 'The Jewellery Trade: How it has been affected by the War', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 14.9.1916, p.8.

³¹⁶ 'Luxuries in Wartime', *Aberdeen Journal*, 16 October 1916, p.7.

³¹⁷ *Birmingham Daily Post*, 'The Jewellery Trade', 14.9.1916, p.8.

but nonetheless important material adjuncts to personal identities, cultural and symbolic display, and social interaction', surely a definition of the brooches investigated in this study.³¹⁸ Berg recognises the 'semiotic virtuosity' of luxury items and the ability of ornamental jewels to articulate relations between production, commerce and individuals.³¹⁹ Carnevali argues that notions of luxury must be considered relative to the individual or society under discussion and that a luxury purchase need not be either unique or expensive but may be defined as something that, while not essential for life, will bring pleasure rather than comfort.³²⁰ In the extreme circumstances of total war, concepts of necessity and luxury were inevitably redefined. At times of rationing, when civilians experienced wearying long-term deprivation of essential items and the constant need to 'make do and mend' a small piece of jewellery, though neither indispensable nor practical, gave pleasure. When rationing and practicality restricted choice of clothing and personal adornment, the small luxury of a sweetheart brooch represented a minor subversion that might be perceived as acceptable, projecting defiant statements of personal loyalties and wider allegiances.

Within these restrictions, jewellers realised the potential for marketing regimental badge brooches as what the *Birmingham Daily Post* called 'patriotic jewellery' when other types of jewellery widely disapproved of as unnecessary luxuries. Military brooches could be promoted as objects of personal adornment that nevertheless referenced concepts of wider societal concern at a time of national danger, thus bypassing issues of luxury. Makers and retailers realised they could use patriotic sentiments to sell the brooches to their customers, advertising them specifically in this way. An advertisement in the *Daily Mirror* described them as 'Patriotic Brooches'.³²¹ J. Banks of Stirling offered, in gilt, silver and gold:

REGIMENTAL RIBBONS
MOUNTED UNDER GLASS AS BROOCHES
THE BEST PATRIOTIC EMBLEM

³¹⁸ Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure*, p.5.

³¹⁹ Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure*, pp.30-31.

³²⁰ Carnevali, 'Luxury for the Masses', p.57.

³²¹ 'Regimental Colours as Brooches', *Daily Mirror*, 11 July 1916, p.4.

A theme throughout this thesis is the interrogation of the extent to which those who gave and bought the brooches considered patriotism the reason for their purchase or whether other motives predominated. Without written documentation it is often only possible to speculate, but wearing a military badge brooch as a patriotic gesture in visual form was certainly used as a marketing tool during both Wars.

Major London retailers targeted their campaigns carefully at customers for their brooches by advertising in appropriate publications. Harrods advertised to *Times* readers that they could supply the badge of any regiment in a variety of metals.³²² Mappin & Webb Ltd. (who manufactured their own brooches) advertised in *the Times* as ‘Silversmiths to His Majesty King George V’.³²³ The Goldsmiths & Silversmiths’ Company placed expensive full colour advertisements in *Colour* magazine for their military brooches in gold or palladium and set with diamond or other precious stones (fig.64).³²⁴ *Colour* was printed monthly between 1914-1932 and aimed at readers interested in the arts. It published an eclectic mix of short stories, poetry, and articles, with high quality reproductions of the work of contemporary British artists such as C. R. W. Nevinson and the Camden and London Groups, including Walter Sickert and Harold Gilman. The cost of this publication suggests a readership able to afford expensive high quality brooches. Shirley Brooks Ltd., Military Outfitters, by contrast, placed their advertisement for ‘Military Crested Brooches, A present your lady friend will appreciate’, priced at only 1s.0d, in *Regiment Magazine*, where it would be seen by all ranks when they bought their uniforms and supplies. The Goldsmith’s & Silversmith’s Company also advertised on the inside front cover of *Illustrated London News* in 1915, in a special supplement entitled ‘Great War Deeds’ (figs.65, 66). This issue was devoted to heroic actions of the forces, accompanied by photographs and illustrations and would also have been bought by civilians. The proximity of the advertisement conflated the Goldsmith’s & Silversmith’s brooches with notably courageous achievements, suggesting to the reader that such a brooch would display the wearer’s admiration for the country’s heroes.

³²² For example, advertisement, *The Times*, 29.11.1916, p.5.

³²³ Mappin & Webb advertisement, *The Times*, 7.6.1917, p.3.

³²⁴ ‘Military Badge Jewellery’, Goldsmiths & Silversmiths’ advertisement, *Colour* magazine, February 1917.

Manufacturing companies generally sold their products direct to retailers who placed orders as required, or worked with factors who acted as salesmen on their behalf. The *Birmingham Evening Despatch* reported the prosecution of one local factor in 1915 that showed how this system worked but also demonstrated the pitfalls for salesmen in wartime.³²⁵ In an early example of an enterprising mail shot, Adolph Scott, jeweller's factor of Great Hampton-street, Birmingham, sent out a large number of circulars requesting information about the whereabouts and numbers of troops so that he could supply brooches with the appropriate regimental insignia they might wish to order, and received many replies.³²⁶ This brought him to the attention of the authorities and led to Scott's prosecution under Section 18 of the Defence of the Realm Act with 'having in his possession diverse letters containing information relating to movements, numbers, and disposition of his Majesty's forces.'³²⁷ Scott's defence told the court:

When the war broke out Mr. Scott met a manufacturing jeweller, who told him there would be a great opening for the sale of regimental badges. Mr. Scott was anxious to take an honest advantage of the sale of this jewellery, which would be in fashion during the period of the war'.³²⁸

Asked in court 'They are given as presents by soldiers to their sweethearts?' and 'There is a great demand for these military badges and brooches?', Scott agreed there was and claimed he already had access to the dies that would enable him to provide brooches for every regiment in the British Army. His defence was that:

It was necessary to get the badges to places where they would sell well, and in order to ascertain what badges he must send to any particular town it was necessary to find out what the exact demand would be in that district.³²⁹

³²⁵ My thanks to Dr. Chris Upton, Reader in Public History, Newman University, Birmingham, for drawing my attention to the account of Scott's prosecution.

³²⁶ 'The word "factor" is always used in Birmingham to denote the dealer or home-merchant who collects goods from the manufacturers, and through his travellers and other connections distributes products to ironmongers, jewellers and shopkeepers generally throughout the country'. Wright, 'The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades', p.454.

³²⁷ 'Defence of Realm Act Prosecution', *Birmingham Evening Despatch*, 25.8.1915, Front page.

³²⁸ *Birmingham Evening Despatch*, 25.8.1915.

³²⁹ *Birmingham Evening Despatch*, 25.8.1915.

The court finally accepted Scott had no sinister motive and fined him £10. The trial demonstrates the extensive trade in military brooches and suggests companies probably sold to military personnel before they left for service overseas. If the brooches were commonly given in person rather than sent home with a letter, this suggests one possible reason for the shortage of documentation. (Though Smith & Pepper's order books for the war years have not survived, pre-war and post-war ledgers show Scott buying from the company, so he probably placed orders for his sweetheart brooches there.) However, a postcard (figs.67, 68) shows a small shop set up in a military camp in Folkestone with a display of sweetheart brooches. John Lewis-Stempel describes camps such as this, the soldier's last stop before embarkation, providing troops with a final opportunity to purchase a few small luxuries and mementoes for their families.³³⁰ In 1916 *The Birmingham Daily Post* reported:

‘Throughout 1915 this trade in war mementoes, military badges, gifts from soldiers to their sweethearts and vice versa in the form of signet rings, brooches [...] and other small articles of what in the trade is spoken of as “sentimental jewellery,” may be said to have grown steadily’.³³¹

From 1939 concerns about extravagance were revived. Jewellery was perceived as luxury that was difficult to justify either to the trade or to customers. Though never explicitly rationed, purchase tax of 100% and drastic quotas on materials limited production and workshops were only allowed to continue if it could be proved they were unsuitable for adaptation to making munitions.³³² But government also sent confusing messages. In 1939, Home Secretary Sir Samuel Hoare urged trading as usual to keep the economy buoyant but at the same time Chancellor of the Exchequer Sir John Simon advised the population to avoid all unnecessary purchases as supplies were needed for the war effort.³³³

³³⁰ John Lewis-Stempel, *Six Weeks: The Short and Gallant Life of the British Officer in the First World War* (Orion: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2011), p.45.

³³¹ *Birmingham Daily Post*, ‘The Jewellery Trade’, 14.9.1916, p.8.

³³² Gerald Carr, ‘In Town this Month, *British Jeweller*, October 1942, p.27.

³³³ Observer's Report, p.349, SxMOA.TC4.1.B.

For those who had to cope with shortages of most essential items, displays of personal adornment were sometimes disapproved of as diverting materials and energy from the war effort and provoked strong reactions. A Stepney housewife, interviewed by Mass Observations in 1940, apparently reflected the attitude of many people. She claimed: 'I bet you've not come across one woman this afternoon who still buys clothes like she used to before the war'. When informed the interviewer had met one who 'liked to look nice at all times', she reacted angrily: 'She ought to be shot ... We've got the war in this house - my son's away - and if it isn't in your house, it's in your neighbour's'.³³⁴ As in WWI, however, military sweetheart brooches appeared to transcend this problem through their link with personnel on active duty and their articulation of societal values and patriotic imagery.

They could again be promoted as essential for identification, as both civilians and military personnel were required to carry identification under the National Registration Act 1939. As early as November 1939 *British Jeweller* produced a special trade 'Service Crests Supplement' which carried many advertisements for sweetheart brooches and suggested there would also be a market for combined identity discs and regimental badges:

suitable not only for civilians who have friends and relatives serving with the forces, who will wish to wear the badge of their regiment, but also for the men themselves, who will also appreciate the personal gift of such a badge.³³⁵

A *Daily Mail* editorial, reproduced in this supplement headed 'Gifts for Love', stated: 'Young men have been spending money on the girls they are leaving behind. They have been buying regimental brooches with small diamonds mounted in platinum. Cost £6.15s to £30. Several, made to order, cost eighty guineas'.³³⁶ Brooches for the Navy, Army and Air Force and the Women's & Home Defence Services were offered alongside this article. Several companies offered brooches with matching identity

³³⁴ Interview, Stepney, London, 25.7.1940, SxMOA, TC18.1.E.

³³⁵ 'Badges and Identity Discs Combined', in *British Jeweller*, Vol.7, No.3, November 1939, p.39.

³³⁶ *British Jeweller*, Vol.7, No.3, November 1939, p.25.

discs or bracelets combined.³³⁷ By December, under the heading ‘Sentiment has it’ *British Jeweller* announced:

Sentimental jewellery is fashion’s latest craze. The war has started it and Birmingham jewellers are turning out by the thousands brooches and pendants surmounted by his regimental crest. [...] Some jewellers are also turning them into identity discs by engraving on the back the wearer’s name, address and national registration number.³³⁸

As previously stated, there is no evidence of men ever wearing sweetheart brooches but here the regimental badge is combined with the practical necessity of wearing identification in battle. Possibly the badge as gift was intended to soften the obvious implications of giving a loved one an identity bracelet that would only be useful in the event of his injury or death.

Advertising to the public, as in WWI, generally concentrated on promoting the brooches as symbols of personal relationships combined with pride and patriotic feelings. W. A. P. Watson offered their flag brooches as ‘Exquisite Patriotic Jewellery’, illustrating them in full colour (fig.69). Thomas Mott pictured theirs within a ‘Victory-V’ logo (fig.70). Bravingtons, a retailer of mid-range jewellery with outlets across London, suggested: ‘Show your natural pride and admiration by wearing the badge of “his” service or regiment (fig.71). Johnson Matthey of Hatton Garden and Birmingham’s Vittoria Street claimed in February 1940 that business was definitely improving and the company would not allow the war ‘or Lord Haw Haw’ to interfere with their business.³³⁹ Demand was so great that one manufacturer, Thomas Mott, even complained about their workload: ‘people not connected with the manufacturing side of our trade cannot possibly appreciate what a strain it has been’.³⁴⁰ Mott’s advertising consistently drew on notions of patriotism. In March 1942 their advertisements were headed: ‘Our Empire’s Air Force – To whom we all owe so much’ above images of their jewellery.³⁴¹ In May that year they claimed: ‘The

³³⁷ For example, Thomas L. Mott Ltd., P. Stanley, W. A. P. Watson Ltd., *British Jeweller*, Vol.7, No.3, November 1939, Special Service Crests Supplement.

³³⁸ ‘In the News’, *British Jeweller*, Vol.7, No.4, December 1939, p.25.

³³⁹ *British Jeweller*, February 1940, p.48.

³⁴⁰ ‘The Demand for Military Brooches’, *British Jeweller*, Vol.7, No.4, December 1939, p.43.

³⁴¹ Thomas Mott Advertisement, *British Jeweller*, Vol.9, No.7, March 1942.

badges of the fighting services of the Empire have more than a decorative value. They are symbols of a great tradition of courage, loyalty and sacrifice'.³⁴²

As the war progressed however, it became evident that emergency regulations were beginning to cause problems. By November 1940 concerns were expressed about the imposition of Purchase Tax and a quota limiting sales to 25% of those of the previous December to May. The jewellery trade recognised:

the unpalatable fact that the modern war machine has no place for luxury production. [...] By making and selling jewellery for the home market, we are retarding the national effort. We are absorbing workers, material and public money which are sorely needed in channels of infinite importance.³⁴³

Absence of hallmarks described earlier contributes to difficulties in dating brooches to a particular year, but based on trade advertisements and editorials, the numbers of brooches manufactured probably declined during the later war years. However, sales of existing stocks were buoyant and they were worn just as much as before, as Chapter 4 will demonstrate. But from 1942 jewellery firms began to succumb to shortages of workers and materials, either closing their doors completely or moving to war work. Palladium was substituted for platinum and other precious metals that had to be conserved for essential purposes.³⁴⁴ In 1942 Watson, manufacturer of regimental brooches, took the front cover of *British Jeweller*, hoping it would be able to supply its trade clients again once victory had been secured.³⁴⁵ In the same edition jewellers Payton, Pepper & Sons stated that all their skilled craftsmen had been 'transferred to work of National Importance', while Thomas Mott were diverting all their energies 'to the National Cause'. In this and subsequent editions, other long-established firms notified their customers that they could no longer supply them until the war was over. Suppliers dependant on the trade were also affected. In December that year, precision toolmakers Eaton & Wrighton of Vyse Street advertised an

³⁴² *British Jeweller*, Vol.9, No.7, May 1942.

³⁴³ W. H. Leese, 'A Quota which will Swell the Dole Queue', *British Jeweller*, November 1940, p.28.

³⁴⁴ Michael Freemantle, *The Chemists' War: 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry, 1915), p.151.

³⁴⁵ *British Jeweller*, October 1942, front cover.

‘interlude’ from manufacture on the grounds that: ‘Jewellery manufacture is almost a thing of the past, and our resources must be turned to other, graver matters’.³⁴⁶

With the cessation of hostilities in 1945 and the gradual demobilisation of conscripted troops, the wearing of military brooches by civilians largely came to seem inappropriate, as after 1918. Reluctance to prolong the display of visual artefacts associated with wartime may have contributed to this. Outside the context of war, sweetheart brooches’ reference to military badges overcomes their function as personal adornment so that generally they are not seen as appropriate wear except for such occasions as regimental reunions and military weddings; Chapter 4 will return to this.

2.6 Uniforms to Brooches

From the time when Mabell Arlie received her wedding gift, regimental brooches became increasingly popular, as she suggested. Those who saw her brooch might well have been officers who would also commission similarly valuable jewels and many examples can be found as well as versions that would have been rather less expensive, though often still only within the purchasing power of officers. There had long been a custom of soldiers sending home pieces of their uniforms as mementoes for their families to wear: the metal badges worn on uniform collars and shoulders (known as ‘titles’) and metal buttons were especially popular and army orders had to be issued to prevent the practice.³⁴⁷ (Eventually metal titles that could catch the sunlight and attract the enemy’s attention were largely removed from battlefield uniforms and replaced with fabric versions.³⁴⁸) Soldiers would sometimes add a pin or bar to turn these into a brooch to be worn on a woman’s coat or dress and prestigious jewellers also sometimes carried out these conversions. In 1889, for example, Captain Lewis White RN paid Carrington of Regent Street 1s.6d for ‘Mkg. Artillery Button into

³⁴⁶ Eaton & Wrighton advertisement, *British Jeweller*, December 1942.

³⁴⁷ R. H. Brade, War Office, ‘The Officers’ Badges Order, Army Council Order’, *The Edinburgh Gazette*, 12.3.1918.

³⁴⁸ Imperial War Museum, URL: <http://www.iwm.org.uk>.

Brooch'.³⁴⁹ Carrington's ledgers show that they made valuable jewelled sweetheart brooches that would have been bought by officers of all regiments.³⁵⁰

The cultural significance of trench art in its many forms has been widely investigated and as explained is considered beyond the remit of this thesis, except where it overlaps with jeweller-made artefacts. Many trench art objects show considerable artistic skill but very few examples of genuinely handmade regimental brooches have been found, probably because the reproduction of regimental insignia under wartime conditions or in small workshops as souvenirs would be beyond the ability of most amateurs. For example, in the collection of the Museum of the King's Own Royal Regiment, Lancaster is a brooch, purportedly one of three made in 1939 by Sergeant Richard Hamblett of the 2nd Battalion for his wife and two daughters (fig.72). Made of mother-of-pearl the insignia is simply and fairly crudely engraved, and marked on the reverse with the date and 'Bethlehem', where Hamblett was then serving. However, Peter Donnelly, the museum's curator, considers that though the donors believed this brooch to have been handmade by Hamblett, this is unlikely.³⁵¹ During WWII there was a thriving trade in mother-of-pearl regimental brooches produced locally in Palestine as souvenirs for sale to troops and examples with different regiments' insignia are quite frequently found. Hamblett's family might have been mistaken about what they were told or possibly family history has been altered through retelling. Artefacts produced under battlefield conditions 'contain within themselves the worlds of their creators'.³⁵² As personal gifts brought back from a conflict zone, these brooches would have had particular resonance for his family, who may have preferred to see them as specially handmade, meaningful artworks. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that this was really one of three pieces crafted by Hamblett himself.

³⁴⁹ Carrington & Co., Accounts p.279, 'Captain Lewis White RN', 3.10.1889, National Art Library (GB), Manuscript, MSL/1980/1879-1891.

³⁵⁰ Carrington & Co: accounts and original designs (c.1870-1930). National Art Library (GB). Manuscript MSL/1980/1879-1981.

³⁵¹ Peter Donnelly, Curator, Museum of the King's Own Royal Regiment (Lancaster), Accession Number KO2467/02. Personal communication, March 2015.

³⁵² Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.4.

However, one unusual handmade sweetheart brooch is shown in fig.73. It depicts the lion and palm tree insignia of the Royal West African Frontier Force, originally formed by the British Colonial Office in 1900 to police the British West African colonies. It was made by a dentist, Major C. R. G. Barrington, who was attached to the RWAFF as a junior Royal Army Medical Corps officer between 1942 and 1943, for his wife, Dr Kathleen Barrington.³⁵³ Records show the brooch was made with the help of dental technicians in Freetown, who would have had access to the gold and possessed the technical skills in dental casting to enable them to create this complicated piece. No information is available about whether those who made this brooch were previously trained in making jewellery or simply transferred their professional technical skills to produce a genuinely exclusive object. Though fine pieces of trench art were produced, this is a rare example of a regimental brooch made by craftsmen not known to be trained jewellers.

Many sweetheart brooches are also found that are transitional pieces, combining elements of the sentimental jewellery popular with Victorians with regimental badges. A silver Boer War Army Service Corps brooch is hallmarked 'Birmingham 1900' but its lozenge-shaped background, ivy leaves and engraved pattern are reminiscent of Victorian amatory brooches (fig.74). Smith & Pepper's ledgers show many orders for very similar pre-WWI brooches engraved with texts, including 'Mizpah' brooches, that similarly combined the two types of jewellery with the addition of an amuletic biblical text.³⁵⁴ Although entirely handmade regimental brooches are rarely if ever found, manufactured ones were often altered or personalised by the addition of photographs, inscriptions or the names of battles and these are included throughout this study.

Conclusion

To summarise, this chapter has examined the manufacture of handmade and machine-manufactured sweetheart brooches and investigated their importance to those

³⁵³ Imperial War Museum,
URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/30070700>[accessed 6.6.2015].

³⁵⁴ See pp.197-198.

employed in the jewellery industry. It has identified problems in tracing their provenance, exacerbated by the culture of secrecy in the trade, issues of hallmarking and the differing reputations of jewellery made in London and Birmingham, the two major manufacturing centres. It investigated the way retailers and manufacturers created a market for the brooches through advertising campaigns carefully targeted at the concerns of the general public and the trade during both World Wars, demonstrating that while most jewellery was considered non-essential at times of austerity and rationing, military badge brooches were deemed acceptable patriotic purchases. Chapter 3 moves to consider how commercial concerns intersected with government policy to promote the brooches as objects through which to disseminate propaganda.

Chapter 3

Wartime Governments, Gendered Propaganda and the Sweetheart Brooch

3.1 Introduction

Badges, emblems and brooches materialise ideas, history and aspirations: next I consider how government propaganda during both World Wars was promoted by visual means, showing how military jewellery became an intrinsic part of the visual culture of wartime Britain. As Gullace points out, government understood the powerful impact of images; propaganda from official and unofficial sources combined to create an ever-present background of images in wartime.³⁵⁵ In this chapter I demonstrate that military badge brooches contributed to this constant visual scenery, placing their messages constantly before the civilian population yet, unlike many other artefacts through which influential advertising was disseminated, they have not so far received scholarly attention as propaganda objects. Sweetheart brooches were marketed commercially as propaganda and patriotic symbols of solidarity consistent with the government's aims. I show that a badge was the primary identification for any group without an official uniform, for example, those exempt from military service or workers such as Air Raid Wardens. Through contemporary accounts I consider the devastating effects of emblems employed by self-proclaimed patriotic groups like the White Feather campaign and the way badges were used to encourage civilian resistance in occupied Europe. Here I situate sweetheart brooches within this widespread use of badges and emblems worn as signifiers. Various forms of conflict-related material culture such as paintings and posters have been the subject of considerable recent research, from which women's adornment has been conspicuously absent.³⁵⁶ This study concentrates on campaigns aimed at and promoted by women, and on sweetheart jewellery as one kind of 'ground-up' propaganda that contributed to

³⁵⁵ Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons*, pp.37, 40.

³⁵⁶ For example, Sue Malvern, *Modern Art, Britain and the Great War* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2004), especially 'Art, Propaganda and Persuasion at Wellington House'; Grace-Ellen McCrann, 'Government Wartime Propaganda Posters: Communicators of Public Policy', *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, (2009), 28:1-2, 53-73; Toby Clark, *Art and Propaganda*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1999); Jo Fox, 'Careless Talk: Tensions within British Domestic Propaganda during the Second World War', *Journal of British Studies*, 51, October 2012, 936-966.

public opinion.³⁵⁷ Finally, within the framework of government propaganda intended to increase public morale at a low point during WWII, I analyse a brooch given by a fêted RAF pilot, indicating the enhancing effect that a celebrated owner may have on an otherwise unremarkable art object.

3.2 ‘That All-important Recruiting-Agency, his Sister or Sweetheart’: Women, Jewellery and Gendered Propaganda in the Great War

At an unknown date during WWI three small girls, Mary, Charlotte and Ellen McCarroll, posed for a formal photograph with their grandmother (fig.75). Each child wears a silver and mother-of-pearl Royal Irish Fusiliers sweetheart brooch, the gift of their father George McCarroll of Lurgan, who was serving in the 9th Battalion (Princess Victoria’s) (fig.76).³⁵⁸ Christine Begg, Curator of the Royal Ulster Rifles Museum, Belfast, is the daughter of the girls’ younger brother, born after the end of the conflict. Begg wrote that her aunts all treasured their brooches and wore them throughout the war:

Having a photograph taken wearing them I think shows how much they mean to them and would have been worn as a way to show support for their father who was away serving in the war. [...] they were obviously well looked after as I know that, all these years later 2 at least still survive.³⁵⁹

Family, in the form of wives, sweethearts, mothers and children, were quickly identified as the most effective target on which recruitment campaigns should focus. McCarroll’s three little girls all wear their brooches to express their support for him. It was soon realised that men might be persuaded to enlist through addressing the families who could not demonstrate such pride.

³⁵⁷ For 20th century propaganda methods see Brendan John Maartens, *Recruitment for the British Armed Forces and Civil Defences: Organising and Producing "Advertising", 1913-63*, unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Sussex, 2013.

³⁵⁸ Christine Begg. Personal communication, email, 3.5.2017. See Appendix 1.

³⁵⁹ Begg, 3.5.2017.

When war was declared on 4th August 1914 the British army numbered only 250,000 men.³⁶⁰ Increased enlistment was imperative and throughout August newspaper advertisements appealed for 100,000 extra recruits for '3 years or until the war is concluded'.³⁶¹ Lord Kitchener (Secretary of State for War) was 'confident that this appeal will be at once responded to by all those who have the safety of our Empire at heart'. Kitchener's expectations of loyalty to 'King and Empire' produced an initial rush of volunteers (to the extent that there were insufficient uniforms and supplies) but recruitment slowed and with unprecedented casualty numbers it was realised that more effective campaigns were essential to overcome the shortfall.³⁶² Age limits were raised, ex-servicemen, married men and widowers with children could enlist, but appeals were placed on newspapers' inside pages and Kitchener refused to countenance more modern advertising methods.³⁶³

It soon became evident that better methods were needed. 'A nation half-awake' did not appear to understand 'the dangers which may even threaten their women and their homes', *The Times* War Correspondent wrote.³⁶⁴ Sir Hedley Le Bas, founder of the Caxton Publishing Company and experienced in commercial advertising, had proposed more up-to-date recruitment campaigns for some time. Exasperated by the War Office's old-fashioned approach, Le Bas believed domestic advertising techniques would be equally effective in persuading men to enlist: the well-established advertising practice of creating an emotional bond between consumer and commodity should extend to recruitment because 'advertising for people to go to a war is just like advertising for people to buy a popular cigarette or a new boot polish'.³⁶⁵ In December 1914 Le Bas was finally permitted to form a 'Voluntary Recruiting Publicity Committee' with Eric Field, Caxton's Advertising Manager as

³⁶⁰ Jonathan Boff, 'Military Structures and Ranks', British Library, URL:<https://www.bl.uk/world-war-one/articles/military-structures-and-ranks>[accessed 3.4.2015].

³⁶¹ For example, *The Times*, 7.8.1914, p.5; 11.8.1914, p.2; 14.8.1914 p.5; *Daily Mail* 11.8.1914, p.4; 14.8.1914, p.4.

³⁶² Conscription was not introduced until 1916. By February 1917 shortfall was 50,000 per month for BEF in France. Brock Millman, *Pessimism and British War Policy, 1916-1918* (London: Routledge, 2001), p.83.

³⁶³ Nicholas Hiley, 'Sir Hedley Le Bas and the Origins of Domestic Propaganda in Britain 1914-1917', *European Journal of Marketing*, 1987, Vol.21, 8, p.36.

³⁶⁴ Henry Norman, 'The War Correspondent and The Nation', 'Our Real Danger', *The Times*, 28.8.1914, p.5.

³⁶⁵ 'Secrecy' Editorial, *Daily Mail*, 19.4.1915, p.4.

Secretary and other experienced advertising executives as advisers. The Committee believed: 'Pure patriotism as a recruiting appeal soon lost its initial force'.³⁶⁶ Instead of abstract patriotic concepts, campaigns focused on individuals and 'ran the gamut of all the emotions that make men risk their lives and all the factors that deter them from doing so'.³⁶⁷ Their direct appeals proved effective. Many years later Irving Jones from Caerphilly in South Wales recalled Kitchener's image on every wall near his home:

And he was always pointing at me. Whenever I passed it; that was the idea. The artist had that in view. [...] I always used to think 'He's pointing at me!' 'We want you!' And it was in my mind all the time.³⁶⁸

Eventually it was claimed: 'there is scarcely a home in the British Isles that has not been reached by some of the display advertisements that have been kept running in 1,500 newspapers and spread on myriads of billboards'.³⁶⁹ Films also encouraged enlistment, as one young recruit, William Dove, remembered:

War had been declared and the following Sunday I went with a friend of mine into Shepherd's Bush Empire to see the picture show there and at the end of the show they showed the fleet sailing the high seas and played 'Britons Never Shall Be Slaves' and 'Hearts of Oak', and you know one feels that little shiver run up their back and you know you've got to do something. I was just turned 17 at the time and on the Monday I went up to Whitehall, Old Scotland Yard, and enlisted in the 16th Lancers.³⁷⁰

But the most powerful campaigns targeted the concept of family. Those who shirked their duty were warned they would be vilified as cowards at the time and when they had to account to their children far into the future. Perhaps the most famous poster, a sophisticated full-colour design, depicts a boy playing with his toy soldiers as his sister points to her book in which she is reading about the war. Their father, in

³⁶⁶ T. Russell, 'Commercial Advertising' [London: Putnam, 1920] p.261, quoted in Hiley, 'Sir Hedley Le Bas and the Origins of Domestic Propaganda', p.36.

³⁶⁷ Russell, 'Commercial Advertising', pp.36, 42.

³⁶⁸ Irving Jones, Imperial War Museum Recordings. IWM:
URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/podcasts/voices-of-the-first-world-war/podcast-3-joining-up>[accessed 7.2.2016].

³⁶⁹ 'Advertising Pays Even Governments: Immense Success of System Organised in Britain by Sir Hedley Le Bas: It Raised Mighty Army', *New York Times*, 6.8.1916, p.8.

³⁷⁰ William Dove, BBC Interview, IWM<
URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/podcasts/voices-of-the-first-world-war/podcast-3-joining-up>[accessed 4.3.2016].

civilian clothes, cannot answer his children's question: "Daddy, what did YOU do in the Great War?" (fig.77). His family's expectations are presented as the reason he should volunteer. This effective concept was proposed by Arthur Gunn, a printer who visualised himself as the father in the narrative.³⁷¹

A less well-known poem by Harold Begbie, *Fall In*, berated the reluctant recruit:

'What will you lack when your mate goes by / With a girl who cuts you dead?'

Reproduced on recruitment posters in 1914, it imagined the vilification of those who refused to fight projected 50 years into the future, when elderly veterans in the 1960s would be required to justify their decisions (fig.78). James Aulich states that effective propaganda 'made hitherto unseen aspects of the population visible to themselves and to others'.³⁷² The Recruiting Committee drew on newspapers' suggestions that politicians' hectoring was less effective than addressing men through 'that all-important recruiting-agency, his sister or sweetheart'.³⁷³ Le Bas was particularly proud of his 'Best Boy' posters 'To the Young Women of London' which women would wave at young men in the street until 'in self-defence', they went to the recruiting offices and enlisted (fig.79).³⁷⁴ As Aulich states, government-sanctioned campaigns and the growing influence of commercial advertisements contributed jointly to the cultural landscape 'as a kind of background radiation'.³⁷⁵ Cross-fertilisation of ideas occurred between government propaganda and commercial publicity, with private individuals and organisations appropriating official images.³⁷⁶

Such cross-fertilisation is exemplified by London retailer Brandon & Co.'s almost verbatim appropriation of the wording of Le Bas's poster to advertise their sweetheart brooches; both used the concept of women shaming unenlisted men (fig.80).³⁷⁷ The girl whose 'Best Boy' was not in uniform must reject him as unworthy: having left

³⁷¹ V&A:URL:<http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O74621/daddy-what-did-you-do-poster-lumley-savile/>[accessed 23.8.2015]. Gunn himself enlisted immediately afterwards.

³⁷² James Aulich, 'Advertising and the Public in Britain during the First World War', in David Welch, Jo Fox, Editors, *Justifying War: Propaganda, Politics and the Modern Age*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2012), p.115.

³⁷³ 'A Fight to a Finish', *The Times*, 31.8.1914, p.4.

³⁷⁴ Hiley, 'Sir Hedley Le Bas and the Origins of Domestic Propaganda', p.44.

³⁷⁵ Aulich, 'Advertising and the Public', p.110.

³⁷⁶ Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons*, p.37.

³⁷⁷ 'Where is your boy?' advertisement, H. Brandon & Co., *The Daily Mirror*, 26 June 1915, p.10.

others to protect her, he was clearly too cowardly to fight himself. Drawing on this concept, Brandon's advertisement asks:

‘Where is your Boy?’; a woman will be ashamed if she cannot wear a badge of the regiment of their husband, father, fiancé or brother and will feel out of place beside others who can proudly wear such an emblem’.

While it might be too cynical to suggest that makers and retailers of military jewellery were motivated exclusively by commercial interests, many certainly took advantage of the surge in sales of patriotic items and promoted them as such, understanding that the emotional narrative intrinsic to these pieces was the key to their appeal.

Women, therefore, were positioned as disseminators of official and unofficial propaganda. They were asked not only to sacrifice their husbands, lovers and sons but actively to persuade their men to sacrifice themselves. Portrayed as the reason men should enlist, they were also the reward awaiting their triumphant return. Those women actively participating in secular, military and voluntary organisations could assert their professional status through the uniforms they wore, often feminised versions of men's uniforms, that validated their claims to citizenship.³⁷⁸ Volunteers such as the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps (WAAC) were defined by the army as civilian ‘camp followers’, a pejorative term. Its founder, Mona Chalmers Watson, sought to ameliorate this by choosing a military-style uniform of khaki jacket, skirt and cap.³⁷⁹ Those without uniforms were frequently issued with badges to add to their own clothing, for example, munitions workers. In 1918 Ethel Alec-Tweedie concluded that a man travelling by public transport would observe women engaged in all previously male occupations on the railway, including ticket inspectors, conductors while: ‘the railway porter will also be a female with badges’.³⁸⁰ But for those who did not have official war work and therefore authorised uniforms, a regimental brooch testified to their individual loyalties and affirmed their position within society.

³⁷⁸ Margaret Vining, Barton C. Hacker, ‘From Camp Follower to Lady in Uniform: Women, Social Class and Military Institutions before 1920’, *Contemporary European History*, 10.3 (2001), pp.362,371.

³⁷⁹ Carol Harris, *Women at War 1914-1918* (Stroud: Pitkin, 2014), p.22.

³⁸⁰ Ethel Alec-Tweedie, *Women and Soldiers* (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1918), p.5.

3.3 Images of Gendered Propaganda

On 4 August 1914 Germany invaded neutral Belgium, burning towns and villages and executing or deporting civilians. Once reporters gained access to refugees, stories of atrocities committed by German troops against Belgian civilians emerged, including accounts of violence against men and boys but notably focusing particularly on disruption of family and violation of women and children. *The Times* noted these reports were ‘so incessant and so widespread that even those who are naturally and rightly suspicious of tales told against an enemy can hardly help being convinced that there is truth in them’.³⁸¹ On 15 September 1914 the newspaper published the Belgian Commission of Enquiry’s report on the Violation of the Rights of Nations and the Customs of War, headed ‘Outrages on Women and Non-Combatants: A Catalogue of Crimes’. These included accounts of multiple rapes and murders of young women by German soldiers in villages near Louvain, killings of elderly men and women and young boys and depictions of drunken, out-of-control soldiers and officers.³⁸²

British newspapers contrasted these with considerate behaviour of British and Belgian nurses towards wounded German soldiers. On 15 August *the Daily Mirror* captioned a photograph of Belgian nurses in Bruges bandaging a wounded German prisoner: ‘The Belgians are chivalrous to their foes and treat them with every consideration’.³⁸³ But on 25 August the newspaper stated: ‘The opposition of the Belgians appeared to madden the invaders, and for the time being, at any rate, they shed all trace of civilisation’.³⁸⁴

The invasion of Belgium was carried out with considerable brutality and many attacks on civilians took place, but some of these disturbing reports were unverified and second-hand. For example, under the heading ‘Atrocities in Belgium’ a *Times* reporter wrote from Paris: ‘One man whom I did not see told an official of the Catholic Society that he had seen with his own eyes German soldiery chop off the

³⁸¹ ‘Atrocities in the Field’, Leader, *The Times*, 10 September 1914, p.9.

³⁸² ‘Atrocities in Belgium: The Official Report’, *The Times*, 16.9.1914, p.6.

³⁸³ *The Daily Mirror*, Saturday 15.8.1914, front page.

³⁸⁴ *The Daily Mirror*, 25.8.1914, pp.6,7.

arms of a baby which clung to its mother's skirts'.³⁸⁵ This correspondent described villages that were certainly destroyed but also reproduced as fact a second-hand account of an act of extreme violence from a man whom he did not interview himself.

Other accounts, such as the notorious 'Dumfries Atrocity Hoax' of late 1914, were pure invention. Kate Hume, a 17-year-old clerk, claimed to have received two letters, one from her older sister Grace as she lay dying in a Belgian hospital and another from a Nurse Mullard describing mortal injuries inflicted on Grace by German soldiers, who had cut off her breasts. *The Dumfries and Galloway Standard* printed the letters in September 1914 and public outrage predictably ensued but when Grace contacted the newspaper to say she was well and had never left England, the paper hurriedly claimed to have uncovered the forgery. Hume was charged under the Defence of the Realm Act with causing alarm.³⁸⁶ Notably, she must have abstracted the sexually explicit details from published atrocity accounts and these initially encouraged readers to believe her fictional letters.

In May 1915 the Bryce Committee, appointed to conduct enquiries into alleged German atrocities, reported its sensational conclusions, some of which were based on unverified testimonies not taken under oath. Some atrocity stories were undoubtedly exaggerated, helping to legitimize British actions and some historians have used these embellishments to argue that no such accounts should be accepted, but were manufactured for propaganda purposes.³⁸⁷ As Emily Robertson points out in her analysis of WWI propaganda: 'of course women and young girls were raped. [...] rape is a fundamental instrument of war'.³⁸⁸ German soldiers' diaries and letters

³⁸⁵ From Our Own Correspondent, 'Atrocities in Belgium', Paris, Aug.27, *The Times*, Friday, 28.8.1914, p.7.

³⁸⁶ 'Terrible Death of a Dumfries Nurse', *Dumfries and Galloway Standard*, Scotland, 16.9.1914, p.2. For a complete account of the trial: 'The Dumfries Atrocity Hoax', Edinburgh, 28.12.1914, *The Times*, 29.12.1914, p.3.

³⁸⁷ Gary Messinger states the Bryce Committee (1915) succumbed to 'myths', questioning why it was 'willing to level charges of a kind that were almost unprecedented in official discourse between European states, thus taking the propaganda war into new realms of bitterness and ethical complexity?'. Gary Messinger, *British Propaganda and the State in the First World War* (Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, 1992), pp.75-76.

³⁸⁸ Emily Robertson, 'Propaganda and 'manufactured hatred': A reappraisal of the ethics of First World War British and Australian atrocity propaganda', *Public Relations Inquiry*, 2014, Vol.3(2), pp.245-266.

confirm they knew their superiors ordered such brutalities.³⁸⁹ But in reality, as Horne and Kramer have demonstrated, most civilian victims were male.³⁹⁰

While British and Belgian women were identified as feminine and nurturing, German women were dehumanised and contrasted as their exact opposite within the rhetoric of ‘otherness’: one poster showed a German nurse pouring water on the ground before a pleading wounded English prisoner (fig.81). It demonised the unnatural female enemy in contrast to the feminine virtues that British masculinity was required to safeguard. Paul Fussell describes this ‘gross dichotomizing’: ‘we’ are here and normal, ‘the enemy’ is there and grotesque.³⁹¹ Philip Taylor categorises propaganda as either ‘divisive’ (lowering the enemy’s morale, creating dissent and panic) or cohesive (raising morale and fostering co-operation and the common interests of one’s own troops and civilians).³⁹² Grace-Ellen McCann points out that much propagandising art promoted reciprocal behaviour, that is, it emphasised the debt owed by civilians to their armed forces.³⁹³ Taylor argues it is always essential to motivate armies to fight by publicising their deeds to the public at home to create a sense of mutual identification.³⁹⁴

‘Soldiers fight better if they know that their families, friends and the civilians who are waiting for news of their deeds from afar support their actions. [...] But a just cause none the less has to be marketed to a wider audience in order to justify not so much ‘why they fight’ but rather ‘why we must support them’.³⁹⁵

³⁸⁹ John Horne, Alan Kramer, *German Atrocities 1914: A History of Denial* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2009), p.234. See also Emily Robertson, ‘Propaganda and ‘manufactured hatred’; A reappraisal of the ethics of First World War British and Australian atrocity propaganda’, *Public Relations Inquiry*, 2014, Vol.3(2), pp.245-266 for a consideration of the historical basis for atrocity propaganda and the perceived necessity for depicting the enemy as barbaric.

³⁹⁰ Horne, Kramer, *German Atrocities*, p.420.

³⁹¹ Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p.75.

³⁹² Philip M. Taylor, *Public Diplomacy, Propaganda and PSYOPS*, <http://leeds.ac.uk/what-propaganda>[accessed 3.11.2014].

³⁹³ Grace-Ellen McCann, ‘Government Wartime Propaganda Posters’, p.56.

³⁹⁴ Philip M. Taylor, *Munitions of the Mind: A History of Propaganda from the Ancient World to the Present Era* (Manchester, New York: Palgrave, 2003) p.12.

³⁹⁵ Taylor, *Munitions of the Mind*, p.13.

The sinking of the Cunard liner *Lusitania* on 7 May 1915 by a German submarine off the Irish coast, with the loss of 1,201 largely civilian passengers and crew, was declared a war crime.³⁹⁶ Posters headed: 'Remember the Lusitania' called for recruitment on this basis.³⁹⁷ Bonnie White suggests the realities of British civilian bodies washed up on British shores encouraged increased recruitment in areas previously largely unaffected by the war.³⁹⁸ As Gullace has demonstrated:

In addressing such issues as the invasion of Belgium, the sinking of the passenger liner *Lusitania*, or the shooting of nurse Edith Cavell, the British created a highly sexualised image of German monstrosity and used it to market an evocative, sentimental, and deeply gendered version of the conflict to an international and domestic public.³⁹⁹

British government recognised that emotional images of women and children could be employed to great effect as powerful propaganda and the moral basis for a 'just war'. Belgium was personified through posters and political cartoons as a violated woman, victim of the German 'Rape of Belgium'. A poster of 1915, 'Women of Britain say GO!' conflates the Belgian crisis with concepts of home and family, depicting a woman beside her young son, her arm protectively around a girl; beyond their window British forces march to war (fig.82). The girl has been described as the woman's daughter, but her costume identifies her as Belgian.⁴⁰⁰ This alters the narrative to one of nurturing British women offering sanctuary in their homes (and the binary opposite of the previous image) while the army fights for their protection and on behalf of violated Belgium, personified as a female refugee.

Atrocity accounts, then, framed propaganda campaigns devised by the Allies, providing persuasive themes that appealed to masculine protective instincts. Effective

³⁹⁶ *The Times* (London), Saturday, 8.5.1915, pp.9,10. Exact numbers of losses vary.

³⁹⁷ 'Remember the 'Lusitania'', poster, Unknown Artist, 1915. Printed by A. White & Co., London. Art.IWM PST 5127. IWM London.

³⁹⁸ White, 'Volunteerism and Early Recruitment Efforts', p.659.

³⁹⁹ Gullace, *The Blood of Our Sons*. p.19. For a detailed account of the establishment of the sexualised iconography of wartime propaganda, see Chapter 1, 'The Rape of Belgium and Wartime Imagination'.

⁴⁰⁰ 'Women of Britain say 'GO'! Poster, 1915, National Recruiting Committee. NAM, URL: <http://www.nam.ac.uk/microsites/ww1/videos/sell-war-women-britain-say-go/#.VtbnHxj4WCQ> [accessed 27.11.2016].

propaganda justified Britain's intervention in the war in the eyes of the British public, convincing the population of the necessity of the sacrifices asked of them and encouraging voluntary enlistment.⁴⁰¹ In this narrative, the man who refused to fight for his country, personified as feminine, would himself be perceived as emasculated. Some women employed this suggestion to intimidate. A porter on the Great Western Railway at Bath (a reserved occupation he would not have been permitted to leave) received a postcard signed 'Scoutmistress, Bath Girl Scouts' on which was written: 'Seeing that you cannot be a man not to join the Army, we offer you an invitation to join our Girl Scouts as washer up' (fig.83).⁴⁰² In August 1914 an 'Englishwoman' took a front-page classified advertisement undertaking: 'to FORM and EQUIP a REGIMENT of WOMEN for the FIRING LINE if lawn tennis and cricketing young men will agree to act as Red Cross nurses to such regiment', while another immediately below (possibly from the same person) claimed to be preparing "A COWARD'S CATALOGUE" for those whom my gifts of PETTICOATS have failed to arouse to their duty'.⁴⁰³ It is not, of course, possible to confirm whether these anonymous authors were in fact female. In this atmosphere it was necessary to demonstrate one's situation by wearing, if not a uniform, then a badge or brooch as a statement of solidarity with the war effort. The tone of many advertisements for military badge brooches promote them as patriotic signifiers to be worn in support of the troops and the war aims.

3.4 'Choose the Proper Sort': Women as Reward

In her song '*I'll Make a Man of You*', music-hall entertainer Clara Beck drew on this gendered narrative. With the help of women in the audience, Beck claimed, she could solve the recruitment crisis: 'For I turn all suitors from me/ But the sailor or the Tommy'.⁴⁰⁴ The song's *double entendres* referenced the sexual favours men might

⁴⁰¹ The Military Service Act was passed in March 1916, imposing conscription on single men aged 18 to 41 except for the medically unfit, and exempt essential workers. Later conscription was extended to married men and the age limit raised to 50. Conscientious objectors could apply for exemption.

⁴⁰² Postcard to E. A. Brooks. Collection of Imperial War Museum, London. IWM. URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/>[accessed 23.2.2016].

⁴⁰³ *Times* (London), 31.8.1914, p.1, (capitals as the original).

⁴⁰⁴ '*I'll Make a Man of You*', 1914. Music and lyrics, Arthur Wimperis, Herman Finck.

expect if they would ‘take the shilling’, as Beck sang to her admiring audience: ‘It makes you almost proud to be a woman/ When you make a strapping soldier of a kid’. Men were invited onto the stage to enlist before the audience in a way that made it still more difficult to resist. Another famous music-hall singer, and male impersonator, Vesta Tilley, became known as ‘Britain’s best recruiting sergeant’ for her performances. Her song ‘*Jolly Good Luck to the Girl that Loves a Soldier*’ advised women: ‘when choosing a sweetheart, choose the proper sort’ because the only man worthy of them was a soldier: ‘Find the military man who’s really worthy of the name/ Who’s never behind when duty’s to be done’.⁴⁰⁵ The lyrics reminded women of the pride they would feel when accompanied by a man in uniform. Her act was clearly popular with the troops, who begged her to wear badges they took from their uniforms. Tilley stated:

You should see the letters I get from the boys at the Front. They send me such requests as ‘Please Miss Tilley, will you wear this badge when you sing the Army of Today’s Allright.’

If I were to wear all they send me I should be covered all over with badges.⁴⁰⁶

But Tilley’s performances also subverted contemporary notions of sexual demarcation through her alternative personae of army officer and rank-and-file soldier. Appealing directly to men in her audience through her femininity, as Beck did, Tilley also extended the male impersonation element of her act to allow her to speak to both men and women. In January 1917, *The Tatler’s* front cover pictured her performing her new song ‘*Six Days Home on Leave*’, before a troop train on which she has apparently just arrived from the front (fig.84). Wearing muddied boots and the sleeveless sheepskin jerkin issued to troops to protect them from the cold, she carries a German *pickelhaube*, a popular battlefield trophy and source of danger, since they were often booby-trapped. The photograph presents Tilley as an experienced soldier, with the

⁴⁰⁵ Vesta Tilley, singer, ‘*Jolly good luck to the girl that loves a soldier*’, Fred W. Leigh, Kenneth Lyle, 1906.

⁴⁰⁶ Vesta Tilley, quoted in Maggie Andrews, Adrian Gregson, John Peters, *Worcestershire’s War: Voices of the First World War*, Ebook:
 URL:<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=9CBVBQAAQBAJ&pg=PT5&lpg=PT5&dq=Worcestershire%27s+War:+Voices+of+the+First+World+War&source=bl&ots=TruEEVAqMB&sig=QZtvMwpCnQBgUGl59d73ocPt5JU&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwihyeC77KLZAhVHJsAKHSxgAfAQ6AEIXjAI#v=snippet&q=badges&f=false>, p.23,[accessed 1.12.2017].

right to expect others to fight as she has done, a situation that the structuring of society of her time would never have allowed. The knowledge that she was, in fact, a woman added the subliminal message that men must fight as she did or be branded less than masculine. Tilley's act thus enabled her to speak directly to men in her persona of experienced soldier and, through the knowing lyrics of her songs, as a woman to her female audience to encourage their men to enlist.

This approach achieved considerable success. For instance, in Tilley's audience one night in autumn 1914 at the Palace Theatre, Manchester, were Percy Morter and his wife Katie, who had been given tickets by a friend. The memory of their helplessness in the face of this coercion was still in Katie Morter's voice in the BBC recording she made in later life; she would never have gone, she said, had she known it was a recruitment drive.⁴⁰⁷ She described Tilley's beautiful golden gown and:

the officers and the tables all set out recruiting. She also had a big Union Jack wrapped round her and she introduced that song 'We Don't Want to Lose You But We Think You Ought to Go' and 'Rule Britannia' and all those kind of things. And then she came out off the stage and walked all round in the audience, up and down either side, down the middle and the young men was getting up out of the theatre and following her back again and when she got to our - where we was - I don't know what happened but she hesitated a bit and she put her hand on my husband's shoulder - he was on the end seat - the men was all following her down, he got up and followed her down too and they all went on the stage and they was all recruited and gave their names and received the King's shilling at that time. And then he came home - we came home that night and I was terribly upset and I said I didn't want him to go and be a soldier, because I didn't want to lose him, I didn't want him to go at all. But he said, 'We have to go,' he said, 'There has to be men to go and fight for the women otherwise, he said, where should we be?' And he eventually persuaded me that it was all for the best.⁴⁰⁸

Tilley's powerful act employed not only propaganda songs but visual prompts such as the Union flag she wore, personifying her as Britannia. Percy Morter accepted the paradigm that coerced men to fight 'for the women' and joined the 9th Battalion, the Loyal North Lancashire Regiment. He went to France in 1915 and on 7 July 1916

⁴⁰⁷ Katie (Kitty) Morter (later Eckersley), BBC, 'The Great War Interviews', 1960s, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/p01tcxp4/the-great-war-interviews-2-katie-morter>[accessed 15.3.2015].

⁴⁰⁸ Morter, BBC. URL: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/p01tcxp4/the-great-war-interviews-2-katie-morter>[accessed 15.3.2015].

was killed at the Battle of the Somme. The performances of Tilley, Butt and others presented the soldier as the sexualised romantic hero to which every right-thinking woman aspired for a husband and the brave volunteer every mother was proud to call her son. Women were legally prevented from fighting in front-line warfare but they could present themselves vicariously as active participants through wearing copies of their men's badges as simple metal or jewelled brooches, indicators of their sacrifice. Katie Morter's account makes it clear that many women made this sacrifice under duress. The brooches they wore often supported their husbands, sweethearts and brothers as individuals rather than through patriotism or jingoistic enthusiasm for war.

409

Whole families sometimes wore replicas of military insignia in support of their enlisted relatives. Fig.85 depicts the family of an unnamed soldier of the Royal Army Medical Corps, identified by the badge on both uniform sleeves. His young son wears his badge on the lapel of his jacket, while his wife has a miniature RAMC brooch, the staff of Asclepius with an entwined serpent, surmounted by a laurel wreath and crown.⁴¹⁰ The RAMC carries no battle honours because it takes part in every battle in which the army fights and is non-combatant, but it had a particularly high casualty rate. The anxious expressions on the faces of the soldier's wife and child belie any suggestions of jingoistic enthusiasm for war in this studio portrait.

3.5 'Shaming these Laggards': Symbols, Badges and Jewellery in World War I

Three weeks after war was declared, *Times* reader Henry Jones perceived a serious recruitment problem. The previous day: 'while Lord Kitchener was telling of the bravery of our wounded and dead, while he was asking for men to take their places, every lawn tennis court in the space near me was crowded by strapping young

⁴⁰⁹ For a more recent example, see Richard Machin's brooch, p.215-217.

⁴¹⁰ Military badge brooches are always smaller than the original insignia. This is probably because the Defence of the Realm Act (1914) forbade the illicit sale of military badges: their size differentiates them from the originals. See also 'Army Council Order', War Office, 1.3.1918, forbidding unauthorised manufacture or sale of officers' badges. *The Edinburgh Gazette*, 12.3.1918, p.977.

Englishmen and girls.’⁴¹¹ ‘Is there no way of shaming these laggards?’ Jones asked: ‘The English girl who will not know the man – lover, brother, friend – that cannot show an overwhelming reason for not taking up arms – that girl will do her duty and will give good help to her country’.⁴¹² The following day Lord Esher, President of the County of London’s Territorial Force Association, called for volunteers:

I appeal to all mothers to let their sons come into the service of the King. At such a time as this no girl should be seen abroad with a youth who is not wearing the King’s uniform.⁴¹³

Pressure on women to act as recruiting officers thus began immediately. Some enthusiastically joined in the cause. On 5th August, *The Daily Mail* published an open letter ‘To the Women of England’ from Baroness Orczy, author of popular adventure novels featuring her hero ‘the Scarlet Pimpernel’.⁴¹⁴ Orczy announced that for a woman who could not serve on the front line herself, military service consisted of sacrificing her men to the fight. Positioning herself as England’s voice she asked: ‘I want your men, your sweethearts, your brothers, your sons, your friends – will you give them to me? Will you use your influence that they should respond one and all’.⁴¹⁵ Invoking the gendered expressions of government propaganda she described:

The savage foe who wherever he goes destroys, burns, and devastates entire cities, whole villages, countless homesteads, and leaves numberless women and mothers, old people and small children homeless and to starve. Give me your sons that I may save you from a similar fate.

While Orczy’s letter, like Kitchener’s King and Empire posters, called upon her readers’ patriotism and self-interest, it addressed them very differently, recalling Le Bas’s professionally targeted approach.⁴¹⁶ Orczy’s photograph smiled directly out at the reader and the letter was composed as if from a friend. ‘You know me, don’t

⁴¹¹ Henry Arthur Jones, ‘To English Girls’, *The Times*, 29.8.1914, p.9.

⁴¹² Jones, ‘To English Girls’.

⁴¹³ Lord Esher, ‘The Call to Arms’, *The Times*, 27.8.1914, p.3.

⁴¹⁴ Emmuska Orczy, ‘To the Women of England’, *Daily Mail* (London), Friday 4.9.1914, p.3.

⁴¹⁵ In fact, many women were anxious to be allowed to go on active service, as reports showed. See ‘Women’s Wish to Help at Front’, *The Daily Mirror*, 11.8.1914, p.3. However, only fully trained nurses were permitted to go to the front lines.

⁴¹⁶ Official input into this letter has not been established, but its manipulative approach suggests the hand of experienced propaganda writers might have been involved.

you?’ she wrote, suggesting readers of her books would trust her when she asked them to join ‘The Women of England’s Active Service League’, whose purpose was to influence at least 100,000 of ‘our sweethearts, our brothers, our sons, and our friends to offer themselves at once to the nearest recruiting officer, to serve their country.’ As: ‘Your devoted comrade and friend’ Orczy asked readers to return to her private address a form pledging ‘never to be seen in public with any man who being in every way fit and free for service has refused to respond to his country’s call’ (fig.86). Each would be named on the League’s ‘Roll of Honour’ and receive a badge ‘which you will always wear and of which you will be very proud’. No image has been found of the badge, but it was described as of military style. Approximately 20,000 women responded and Orczy received a letter of commendation from the King.⁴¹⁷

Orczy’s protagonist was characterised as the ideal chivalrous Englishman, a formidable fighter and head of a secret society, the ‘League of the Scarlet Pimpernel’, reflected in the title of the women’s League she created and identified by an emblem, the flower. Orczy wrote: ‘We have thrilled with enthusiasm over the brave doings of his league’. Her letter conflated her carefree hero’s exploits with army service, minimising the horrors of warfare and implying that enlistment would lead to light-hearted adventure.

For Orczy and others, withdrawal of female approbation to shame men into enlisting was the military service in which women could participate.⁴¹⁸ She argued that a woman ‘cannot shoulder a rifle’ but could wear a quasi-military badge for her efforts in persuading men to carry a rifle on her behalf. It was not enough to comply with her call to arms; women should wear the League’s badge as a visible sign to prove this had been done. For many others, the material manifestation of the fact that their loved one was serving in the armed forces was a regimental brooch.

⁴¹⁷ Lucy Noakes, *Women in the British Army: war and the gentle sex, 1907-1948* (New York: Routledge, 2006), p.43.

⁴¹⁸ Orczy was less whole-hearted in sacrificing her own family members. In her memoirs she wrote: ‘My son was too young and we were too old to be of any use ‘out there’: and all that I want to recall is the way my home life and my work were affected by that terrible cataclysm’. Orczy, Emmuska, *Links in the Chain of Life* (London: Hutchinson, 1947), pp.134-135.

While Orczy urged women to wear a badge to proclaim their patriotic duty done, the White Feather Campaign employed another token to humiliate men who apparently shirked their responsibilities. In August 1914 Admiral Charles Cooper Penrose-Fitzgerald, a retired naval officer living in Folkestone, conceived the idea of persuading thirty women to go through the town presenting a white feather to ‘every young “slacker” found loafing about the Leas, deaf or indifferent to their country’s need, just to remind them that British soldiers are fighting and dying across the Channel’.⁴¹⁹ The practice was repeated in other south coast ports, in London and across the country. The white feather as a symbol of cowardice derived from *The Four Feathers*, a popular adventure story by A. E. W. Mason, published in 1902. Its protagonist, Harry Faversham, resigns his commission just before his regiment leaves to suppress an uprising in Egypt, leading to accusations of cowardice and the presentation of feathers by his fiancée and three comrades, before he is finally redeemed by courageous acts. The practice referred to the white tail feather that indicated a game bird of poor stock and therefore one unlikely to show fighting prowess.

The conflation of military service with masculinity caused great distress to men humiliated in this way, not least because they had often attempted to enlist but had been rejected as underage, too old, or disabled. William Weller, a Wolverhampton architect in his forties, exempt from military service on medical grounds and because of his essential war work, received a white feather. He kept it (unusually, because of the humiliation involved) together with the accompanying anonymous letter in which he was advised that ‘the Most Noble Order of The Trench Dodgers’ enclosed their ‘insignia’.⁴²⁰ Boys much too young to enlist were targeted. The ten-year-old brother of a soldier was sent a message reading: ‘What a promising boy you were! [...] Whilst your brother goes to war, riding gallantly, the town all sees your ways.’⁴²¹ In Camden Town S. C. Lang was approached by two girls who gave him a white feather:

⁴¹⁹ ‘Women’s War’, *Daily Mail*, (London), 31.8.1914, p.3.

⁴²⁰ ‘Rare World War I White Feather Found in Wolverhampton’, BBC News Online. URL: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-birmingham-15684022>[accessed 1.3.2016].

⁴²¹ Leon Watson, ‘What a Chicken you are’, 18 May 2014. *Mail Online*, URL: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2631822/What-chicken-The-shameful-story-boy-aged-TEN-handed-white-feather-labelled-coward-First-World-War.html#ixzz41qy8XEeH>[accessed 1.3.2016].

they said to me ‘Why aren’t you in the army with the boys?’ So I said ‘Well I’m sorry but I’m only 17.’ ‘Oh, we’ve heard that one before and I suppose you are also working on work of national importance?’ [...] Then a sergeant came out of one of the shops and said to me ‘Did she call you a coward?’ I said ‘yes’ and I felt very indignant at the time. He says ‘Well come across the roadway to the drill hall and we’ll soon prove that you’re not a coward’.⁴²²

The practice was contentious at the time and women were later resented for their enthusiastic efforts in encouraging recruitment.⁴²³ Helen Hamilton’s contemporary poem, *The Jingo Woman* expressed this view:

(How I dislike you!)
Dealer in white feathers,
Insulter, self-appointed,
Of all the men you meet,
Not dressed in uniform⁴²⁴

The campaign illustrates how much emphasis was placed on visible signs that indicated an enlisted man. As Saunders observes, there was ‘a wartime language of symbols’ to be read. It was possible to:

look at a man you meet on the leave-train’ and tell from his cap-badge and chevrons whether he has had a safe position. His neighbour who has one chevron and two wound-stripes has had a very different war’.⁴²⁵

The phrase ‘in uniform’ was synonymous with ‘enlisted’; conversely to be out of uniform was to be labelled a ‘shirker’ or a coward. The disapproval and ostracism shown to apparently fit young men in civilian clothes were powerful incentives that ran through much propaganda of this period and caused real anguish to men in reserved occupations. Vera Brittain’s uncle, aged only 35 and ‘miserably anxious’ to enlist, was consistently refused permission to do so, as she recorded:

⁴²² S. C. Lang, BBC Interview, 1963. IWM Sound Recording No.4154.

⁴²³ Nicoletta F. Gullace, ‘White Feathers and Wounded Men: Female Patriotism and the Memory of the Great War’, *Journal of British Studies*, Vol.36, 2, Twentieth-Century British Studies, April 1997, pp.187-188.

⁴²⁴ Helen Hamilton, *The Jingo-Woman*, c.1914, in Catherine Reilly, Editor, *Scars Upon My Heart: Women’s Poetry and Verse of the First World War* (London: Virago, 1981), pp.47-49.

⁴²⁵ Charles Carrington, *Soldier from the Wars Returning* (London: Hutchinson, 1965), p.158, quoted in Saunders, *Contested Objects*, p.125.

I am getting more and more ashamed of my civilian togs,' he wrote unhappily to me about the beginning of 1917, 'and I shrink from meeting or speaking to soldiers or soldiers' relatives, and to take an ordinary walk on a Sunday is abominable. I cannot do anything to alter matters, for even if I walked out of the bank and joined up, I should in all probability be fetched back at once'⁴²⁶

Brittain was incensed by the 'gross failure of understanding in high places' that left civilians in similar circumstances open to being branded as 'shirkers'. Understanding the importance to society of visual markers, she called for workers to be allowed some kind of uniform that might prevent this: 'He was not permitted even to discard the trappings which brought him humiliation.'

Many symbols were in fact issued in an effort to address this problem, though not always successfully. Edward Stanley, Lord Derby, initiated a scheme in 1915 to increase voluntary recruitment of older married men, who were advised they would be called up only when unavoidable.⁴²⁷ To attest to this, a red crown badge on an armband was issued. Fred Spurgin (1882-1968), designer of comic patriotic postcards, produced one to promote the Derby scheme (fig.87). It draws again on the idea of women as reward for patriotic duty, depicting an attractive girl with a delighted young man wearing the Derby armband. The strapline: 'This little thing is to be put on your arm – and that little thing's to be put on your knee' refers unashamedly to the woman who will be his once he volunteers.

It was assumed that obvious disability (such as poor sight or severe injury) would offer protection from vilification, so exemption badges were not always issued but wounds and even amputations were not invariably visible. Convalescent or badly wounded men were sometimes accosted in public because they were not in uniform.⁴²⁸ Leonard Mundy, badly injured at Ypres and recently discharged from hospital, was recovering from serious leg wounds at home. One day, wearing his 'civvies' he took his mother into Northampton to see a popular play:

⁴²⁶ Vera Brittain, *Testament of Youth: An Autobiographical Study of the Years 1900-1925*, (London: Virago, 2014 [1933]), p.278.

⁴²⁷ Derby Scheme 1915, URL:<http://www.1914-1918.net/derbyscheme.html>[accessed 2.1.2017].

⁴²⁸ See for example, Gullace, 'White Feathers and Wounded Men', pp.187-188, 196, 199.

Just as we got to the corner there was a bunch of girls [...] One of these girls came straight across from where they were and put a white feather in my pocket and I never said anything because I knew what it meant. But my mother – didn't she fly in a temper! She told these girls [...] not only was I in the army but I was wounded. [...] They said they were sorry, and they made a terrible fuss [...] but it took her a time to get over that.⁴²⁹

In an attempt to counteract this problem, a badge known variously as the 'War Badge' and the 'Silver War Badge' was issued to indicate honourable discharge on medical grounds.⁴³⁰ Each was numbered on the reverse and a 'King's Certificate of Discharge' was issued, bearing the holder's name, regiment and date and inscribed: 'Served with Honour and was disabled in the Great War'. For example, in 1917 Private Harry Harrop of the 2/5th Cheshires/8th Berkshires was severely wounded and issued with a medal to prove it; the documents carefully record its number (fig.88). The young man in fig.89 wears this badge. His haunted, unfocussed expression (widely known as 'the thousand-yard stare') suggests distress, and perhaps that he is indeed ashamed of not being in uniform. He may have sustained a severe injury not evident in the half-length photograph or was disabled by a gas attack, common reasons for medical discharge though the certificates state only 'Sickness' or 'Wounds' as cause of discharge: 'Par.392(xvi)' indicates only 'no longer physically fit for war service' with no further details. Images of War Badge veterans are frequently half length, suggesting photographers sometimes avoided recording missing limbs or other injuries; possibly he may be suffering from shell shock.

Many firms issued employees with company badges, until these were made illegal in August 1915 when the War Office issued official 'On War Service Badges' to essential munitions workers, railway engineers and shipyard workers. These were numbered on the reverse to prevent unauthorized transfer, but no record survives of the names of workers to whom they were issued and they were not recalled after the war. Alfred Armitage's employment as a Sheffield steelworker gave him reserved occupation status, entitling him to an 'On War Service' badge (fig.90). Nevertheless, he enlisted, with his friends, in the King's Own Yorkshire Regiment, until in May 1916 he was repatriated with a severe shrapnel wound in his knee. He was then issued

⁴²⁹ Leonard Hawtin Mundy, BBC Interview, 1980, IWM Sound Recording No.5868, Reel 4.

⁴³⁰ The Silver War Badge was issued from September 1916 to anyone invalidated out on grounds of wounds, sickness or age, who served for over a week from 4.8.1914.

with a ‘Silver War Badge’, wound certificate and medals.⁴³¹ Armitage’s various badges therefore indicated his status throughout the conflict.

Badges and brooches, then, were important signifiers of status and occupations within society in wartime Britain and could attract admiration or indicate censure. A badge of affiliation was symbolically important, recalling longstanding traditions of giving tokens and favours before battle. Doris Beaghan was on holiday in France on the outbreak of war in August 1914 and recalled the British Expeditionary Force landing at Le Havre. She vividly remembered the welcome they were given, ‘the French people all excited, madly waving dashing about, rushing up to the soldiers, pulling off their buttons as keepsakes’.⁴³² Badges worn by men and women clearly articulated their wartime status to those around them but for women, regimental badge brooches performed the same function and could be read in the same way.

3.6 Viewing the War from the Front and the Home Front

Catriona Pennell’s analysis of public opinion at the outbreak of war concludes that for the most part the British people did not back the war, even at the beginning, in a spirit of unthinking bloodthirsty enthusiasm but ‘their support was very often carefully considered, well-informed, reasoned, and only made once all other options were exhausted.’⁴³³ For Pennell, the majority of the population then steeled themselves to further the war effort as a necessity, but ‘not necessarily in an overtly enthusiastic and jingoistic manner’.⁴³⁴

If, as I have argued, women were the main focus of propaganda, what was their response to this requirement that they should act as government recruit agents?

⁴³¹ Europeana Collections, Alfred Armitage, URL:https://www.europeana.eu/portal/en/record/2020601/contributions_17174.html[accessed 21.1.2018].

⁴³² Doris M. A. Beaghan, BBC Interview, 1963. IWM Sound Recording No.4012.

⁴³³ Catriona Pennell, *A Kingdom United: Popular Responses to the Outbreak of the First World War in Britain and Ireland*, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2012, Introduction, p.1. URL:<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com.ezproxy.sussex.ac.uk/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199590582.001.0001/acprof-9780199590582-chapter-1?print=pdf>[accessed 7.2.2016].

⁴³⁴ Pennell, *A Kingdom United*, p.6.

Defence of home and family was the prevalent message to men but for women, required to persuade lovers and sons to go to war, sacrifice was presented as their military duty. Orczy's letter presented women with an impossible choice: 'The brand of a coward' – what English mother would want this term applied ever after to her son'.⁴³⁵

A young Londoner called Caroline Rennles became a munitions worker at Slade Green and later Woolwich. She recalled that during the Great War she was 'very patriotic' and would challenge any man not in uniform: 'if you saw a chap out in the street you know, you'd say 'Why aren't you in the army?', you know. Oh we thought it was marvellous to go to the war.'⁴³⁶ By the Second World War, in the light of mature reflection and experience, she had revised her views and 'would not have told anybody to go'.⁴³⁷ 'They didn't realize what war was' she said when interviewed in 1975, 'Well no-one did'.⁴³⁸ The reality of war was brought home to civilians when films of soldiers in action on the Somme were shown in cinemas in 1916.⁴³⁹ From 1915 the War Office provided badges to women 'munitionettes' like Rennles, initially to wear on their own clothes (fig.91) and later on their 'uniform' overalls (fig.92). Personified by the Parliamentary Recruiting Committee as 'The girl behind the man behind the gun', they saw themselves as part of a production line that led directly to the trenches.⁴⁴⁰ However, the brooch on its original card (fig.93) suggests copies were also given as gifts, possibly to their mothers, suggesting they perceived themselves (as they were) as another branch of the fighting forces. Such pieces were therefore identical in form and function to other regimental sweetheart brooches. Writer and journalist Ethel Alec-Tweedie fictionalized such women in her story of a young parlourmaid who becomes a 'munitionette'. Knowing this work would be even

⁴³⁵ Orczy, 'To the Women of England'.

⁴³⁶ Caroline Rennles, Interviewed by Margaret A. Brooks, 19 February 1975. IWM., Department of Sound Records, Ref: 00566. <http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/80000562>[accessed 11.11.2015].

⁴³⁷ Rennles, Interview, IWM.Ref: 00566.

⁴³⁸ Rennles, Interview, IWM.Ref: 00566.

⁴³⁹ There were criticisms that the films were unsuitable for public viewing but they were generally favourably received by relatives. See exchange of letters, 'The Somme Films', *The Times*, 31.8.1916-6.9.1916.

⁴⁴⁰ 'The girl behind the man behind the gun' poster, colour photolithograph by unknown artist, published by the Parliamentary Recruiting Committee, 1918. National Army Museum, London, URL:<http://www.nam.ac.uk/online-collection/detail.php?acc=1989-06-78-1>[accessed 1.2.2016].

harder than domestic drudgery but seeing it as her own military service, she tells her fiancé, Tom, as he leaves for ‘somewhere in France’:

While you are at the front firing shells, I am going into a munition factory to make shells. [...] it will be much harder work, but it will be my bit, and every time you fire your gun you can remember I am helping to make the shells.⁴⁴¹

‘Munitionettes’ were exposed to dangerous chemicals and the very real risk of explosions.⁴⁴² In the poem ‘Munition Wages’ a worker is aware that: ‘We’re all here today, mate/ Tomorrow – perhaps dead’ so she makes the best of the situation, combating fear with bravado and boasting of her high pay:

I’ve bracelets and jewellery,
Rings envied by friends;
A sergeant to swank with,
And something to lend.⁴⁴³

Munitions workers were indeed known for spending their wages on jewellery. *The Birmingham Daily Post* observed in 1916: ‘business in the cheaper lines had made a very good recovery, owing mainly to the decided tendency on the part of munition workers to spend a part of their high wages on the cheaper kinds of jewellery’.⁴⁴⁴

Cicely Hamilton’s poem ‘*Non-Combatant*’ described the frustration of women who wished to help the war effort in practical ways themselves, rather than persuading others to fight, but were told instead to ‘go home and knit’: ‘In all the length of all this eager land/ No man has need of me’.⁴⁴⁵ When Dr. Elsie Maud Inglis, founder of the Scottish Women’s Hospitals, proposed a scheme for women’s medical units to cooperate with the Royal Army Medical Corps on the Western Front, she was told by the War Office: ‘My good lady, go home and sit still’.⁴⁴⁶ In August 1914 *The Daily*

⁴⁴¹ Alec-Tweedie, *Women and Soldiers*, p.29.

⁴⁴² For example, fatal factory explosions occurred at Silvertown, Essex, 19.1.1917, and Chilwell, Nottinghamshire, 1.7.1918.

⁴⁴³ Madeline Ida Bedford, ‘Munition Wages’, in *Scars upon my heart*, p.7.

⁴⁴⁴ ‘The Jewellery Trade’, *The Birmingham Daily Post*, 14.9.1916, p.8.

⁴⁴⁵ Cicely Hamilton, ‘Non-Combatant’, c.1914-1915, in *Scars Upon My Heart*, p.46.

⁴⁴⁶ http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/womeninuniform/swh_intro.htm[accessed 2.3.2016]. Inglis, Hamilton and others ignored this, setting up field hospitals on fronts including France and the Balkans, funded by the London Suffrage Society.

Mirror reported crowds of women ‘in every kind of costume’ anxious to offer their services to the Red Cross.⁴⁴⁷ ‘The women are most anxious to go on active service’ the *Mirror* reported, describing a cross-section of society including ‘down-at heel little working girls and society women who had driven up in expensive cars’. But only fully qualified nurses could go immediately to the Western Front. The *Daily Mirror* printed a photograph of Red Cross nurses captioned: ‘Those wearing riding breeches will enter the firing line on horseback, as it will facilitate them in their search for the wounded on the battlefield. Hats off to these plucky women!’.⁴⁴⁸ Women would not be given close combat roles in the British Army until 2016.⁴⁴⁹ But those who were not permitted to take up practical war work were required to encourage their male relatives to do so on their behalf, and as Orczy proposed, wear a brooch to display they had done so.

Jay Winter warns against drawing conclusions about the ideas of those who fought in the war from the fiction, verse and autobiographies of men who wrote about it because their views may not be representative and they came from a small, highly literate section of British society.⁴⁵⁰ This must also be true of women. There can be no way of knowing the views of those who did not write down their experiences or feelings, or confined them to personal diaries. There was pressure from society not to express opinions that undermined the war effort but to send only positive messages to their men at the front. But women’s poetry and fiction, less well-known than that of the soldier poets, conveys some of the thoughts and ideas specific to them. Ruth Comfort Mitchell, for example, in her poem ‘*He went for a soldier*’ concludes by asking: ‘How much longer, O Lord, shall we bear it all? [...] In seas of blood and tears? [...] They are braggart attitudes we’ve worn so long, They are tinsel platitudes we’ve sworn so long’.⁴⁵¹ Publicly expressed comment, however, was largely constrained by censorship and the necessity for a united front during hostilities. Private thoughts

⁴⁴⁷ ‘Women’s wish to help at the front’, *The Daily Mirror*, 11.8.1914, p.3.

⁴⁴⁸ *Daily Mirror*, 9.12.1914, p.2.

⁴⁴⁹ ‘Ground Close Combat Roles Open to Women’, 8.7.2016. MOD, URL:<http://www.army.mod.uk/news/28632.aspx>[accessed 23.10.2016].

⁴⁵⁰ Jay M. Winter, *The Great War and the British People* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p.284. Pennell agrees with this viewpoint and has attempted to counter it by researching oral interviews and newspaper accounts of less literate people.

⁴⁵¹ Ruth Comfort Mitchell, ‘He went for a soldier’, in *Scars upon my Heart*, p.75.

were expressed more easily after the war. Conscientious objector Eric Dott described the suppression of anti-war feeling by the Defence of the Realm Act (DORA) 1914:

... which put a very strict limit on what you could say, or do, or write that might be interpreted as against the interests of the country in wartime. They were repressing anti-war feeling, repressing it very severely and strongly. And if you were known to have spoken, or said, or written anything that might be critical of the war effort [...] they would call that treason. And you would be put in prison for it.⁴⁵²

Further, DORA effectively not only prohibited any personal criticism of the war, but also criminalised any form of critical or satirical art.⁴⁵³

3.7 'Every Mother's Son'

Alongside invoking sexualised masculinity, recruitment campaigns specifically targeted mothers. Popular music-hall songs, some commissioned by government, addressed mothers directly. In 1914 F. V. St. Clair performed his song '*Follow the Drum*', or '*Every Mother's Son is Ready to Carry a Gun*' at 'all the leading music halls', donating proceeds to relief funds. The lyrics refer repeatedly to 'Mother England', 'our Mother country' and 'Motherland' conflating, as Vivian Newman points out, notions of home with those of the patriotic mother who gives her son to save her country.⁴⁵⁴ Orczy called for women to urge their sons to enlist 'or he will for ever after be called a craven and a coward, and you, his mother, will be ashamed to look all brave men and women in the face'.⁴⁵⁵ Women themselves equated their own sacrificial role with their sons'. Ethel Alec-Tweedie, whose younger son was killed in 1917, observed that women 'surrendered their own blood to the country' because men became fighters but women were also soldiers by default since they gave birth to sons

⁴⁵² Eric Dott, BBC Interview, IWM URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/podcasts/voices-of-the-first-world-war/podcast-49-a-total-war>[accessed 3.4.2015].

⁴⁵³ Samuel Hynes, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (London: Pimlico, 1992), p.80.

⁴⁵⁴ Vivien Newman, *We Also Served: The Forgotten Women of the First World War* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books, 2004), p.15.

⁴⁵⁵ Orczy, 'To the Women of England'.

‘an achievement outside men’s power (worse luck)’.⁴⁵⁶ Now they must give ‘The boys whose rearing had cost these women long years of toil and anxiety’ while putting a brave face on their losses. The mother of Company Sergeant-Major John Clark of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers received a letter (typical of many) confirming her son’s death in France that repeated the prevailing concept of willing maternal sacrifice in the face of perceived threats to family:

You now rank with many thousands of mothers who have lost their sons in defence of their country [...] If they had not fought for us, our dear land would have been overrun by a barbarously cruel enemy, our women would have been outraged, our children and old folk tortured and massacred. [...] Be thankful to have had such a son and to have made such a sacrifice.⁴⁵⁷

Women were required not just to sacrifice their sons but to appear thankful to do so. Mothers as well as wives were often the recipients of sweetheart brooches as gifts: many soldiers and sailors, after all, were very young.⁴⁵⁸ The youngest known combatant was Sidney Lewis, who enlisted aged 12 and was only 13 when he fought for 6 weeks at the Somme, before his mother discovered where he was and demanded his return.⁴⁵⁹ Newspapers frequently printed personal appeals offering rewards for the return of lost, treasured regimental brooches. A typical advertisement in 1917 requested the return of a brooch engraved ‘ “Arthur to Mother” as a ‘keepsake’.⁴⁶⁰ Chapter 4 describes a brooch made for a mother who lost three of her four sons in little over a year, not a unique loss and advertisements for brooches were sometimes targeted specifically at mothers of serving personnel.

An example of the view that unwavering support must be shown for the fighting troops is the infamous ‘Little Mother’ letter. In August 1917 *The Morning Post* printed a letter from ‘Tommy Atkins’ (slang for a British soldier) who demanded to

⁴⁵⁶ Ethel Alec-Tweedie, *Women and Soldiers* (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1918), p.1.

⁴⁵⁷ Letter Arthur Shipman to Mrs. Hughes, 28.10.1916. Quoted in Peter Metcalfe, *Remembered Again: Recalling Flint’s Fallen Heroes of the First World War, Vol.1(A-H)* (Mold: Brown Cow, 2014), pp.75-76.

⁴⁵⁸ The official age of enlistment was 18, 19 for overseas service. Van Emden considers 250,000 is a conservative estimate of underage boys who enlisted, as many gave false names and their true ages may never have been discovered. He estimates 10-12% of soldiers may have been underage. Van Emden, *Boy Soldiers of the Great War*, pp.313-322.

⁴⁵⁹ ‘Joined at Twelve’, *The Daily Mirror*, 18.9.1916, p.4.

⁴⁶⁰ *Hull Daily Mail*, 4.6.1917, p.4.

know, as ‘a common soldier three years steady at the front’ whether he and his comrades were to be allowed a say in peace negotiations or whether these would be decided by a ‘lot of stay-at-home-to-save-their-skins Pacifists and Cowards!’.⁴⁶¹ He was assured:

We women pass on the human ammunition of “only sons” to fill up the gaps, so that when the “common soldier” looks back before going “over the top” he may see women of the British race on his heels, reliable, dependent, uncomplaining.⁴⁶²

Robert Graves, among others who had experienced frontline warfare, famously found the bellicose attitude of civilians incomprehensible and satirised this letter in his autobiography *Goodbye to All That*: ‘We could not understand the war-madness that ran everywhere, looking for a pseudo-military outlet. The civilians talked a foreign language, and it was newspaper language’.⁴⁶³ Gullace states many people were shocked to see women who enthusiastically ‘donned the aspect of the state’ by offering their feminine rhetorical powers in the service of government propaganda.⁴⁶⁴ The artist C. R. Nevinson recalled the ‘appalling jingoism’ at Uppingham, the public school he attended during the Boer War.⁴⁶⁵ In July 1914 Vera Brittain attended Speech Day at Uppingham (where her brother Edward and future fiancé Roland Leighton were pupils) and heard the Headmaster tell the boys: ‘If a man cannot be useful to his country, he is better dead’.⁴⁶⁶ This militaristic tone was evident at other schools – Manchester Grammar School was one of many that advertised both uniforms and military badge brooches for sale in its school magazine (fig.94).⁴⁶⁷

⁴⁶¹ ‘Tommy Atkins’, *The Morning Post*, 9.8.1917, p.6.

⁴⁶² ‘A Little Mother’, A Mother’s Answer to “A Common Soldier”, *The Morning Post*, 15.8.1917, p.6. There were suggestions that ‘Little Mother’ did not exist and the letter was government propaganda but *The Morning Post* later identified her as Bella Howell-Jones of Bristol, 19.9.1917, p.6. See Christopher Martin, ‘The Date and Authorship of the Letter from ‘A Little Mother’, *Oxford Journals (Arts and Humanities)*, Notes and Queries, (2015) Vol.62, 3, pp.447-450.

⁴⁶³ Robert Graves, *Goodbye to All That* (London: Penguin (New Edition), 2000 [1929]), p.283.

⁴⁶⁴ Gullace, ‘White Feathers and Wounded Men’, p.186.

⁴⁶⁵ Mark Bostridge, Alan Bishop, Editors, *Letters from a Lost Generation: Roland Leighton, Edward Brittain, Victor Richardson, Geoffrey Thurlow* (London: Abacus, 1999), p.4.

⁴⁶⁶ Brittain, *Testament of Youth*, p.70.

⁴⁶⁷ For example, advertisement for military badge brooches by Lewis & McIntyre, Civil and Military suppliers, in *Ulula*, the Manchester Grammar School Magazine, February 1916, Issue 323, p.8. and other issues. I would like to thank Dr. Alistair Grant for drawing my attention to this magazine.

Schools celebrated Empire Day annually and marked anniversaries of famous battles; the Scout movement, though professing not to promote militarism, was organised on the military model. Positive concepts of army life and glorious warfare had long been promoted in public schools, where sport was considered preparation for military leadership across the Empire.

But the Little Mother's rousing sentiments reached a wide audience. 75,000 copies were distributed, endorsed by the Queen. Angela Woollacott notes of munitions workers, but probably true of most women: 'After the powerful initial war fervor of the later summer of 1914 subsided, they too, like the soldiers who volunteered or were conscripted, endured the war as a grim, patriotic necessity'.⁴⁶⁸ If, as Woollacott argues, 'those on the home front who opposed the war were a vilified minority in every class', they must have found it politic to refrain from expressing anti-war views.⁴⁶⁹ 'Little Mother' voiced the concerns of many that their sacrifices were only bearable if they could feel that blood was not 'spilt in vain'. For the bereaved it must have seemed that only victory could justify their losses.

Because so little contemporary written material is available to tell us about military badge brooches it is often only possible to speculate about the various personal meanings attached to them by their owners. No doubt for some they were what Graves described as 'pseudo-military' objects. For a woman who could not fight herself, it was uniform of a kind through which she could display her patriotic feelings. For others, it would have associated her only with a loved individual 'doing his bit'. In the photograph from 1917 of Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Richardson, for example, though Mrs Richardson's clothing and furs suggest some affluence, she wears no visible jewellery other than the prominent sweetheart brooch that replicates her husband's cap badge, indicating its importance to her (fig.95). The insignia is the bugle of an infantry regiment, possibly the Durham Light Infantry. Richardson was probably on leave and would shortly have had to return to his regiment. The photograph would have been a significant record for them since by this date the probability of injury or death would have been well understood. A hand-written

⁴⁶⁸ Woollacott, *On Her Their Lives Depend*, p.200.

⁴⁶⁹ Woollacott, *On Her Their Lives Depend*, p.7.

message on the reverse indicates the couple had their picture made into a postcard to send to friends in 1917. Local photographers printed short runs of their studio photographs as postcards for their customers to distribute in this way.⁴⁷⁰ In an era when cameras were less common, these cards were a popular way to send photographs of weddings and of men leaving for military duty to family and friends.

The couple in fig.96 have gone further in expressing family solidarity: their baby's pacifier is attached to a ribbon by a sweetheart brooch. The very young soldier wears a Loyal North Lancashire Regiment cap badge and his wife has a matching sweetheart brooch on her blouse. Through their brooches the whole family supports the young soldier who will soon leave them to join his regiment. When this separation occurred, the brooch, combined with the photograph, was a tangible reminder of the absent husband and father. Conflict-related art objects often reflected soldiers' urgent need to leave visible reminders of themselves before a battle so that some tangible sense of their existence remained in the event of their death.⁴⁷¹

Though it is often impossible now to put a name to individuals in early photographs, their brooches allow us to take some steps towards identifying them. Women often posed alone, holding or wearing a photograph of the absent lover and wearing his regimental brooch. While the woman wore the jewel as a keepsake and amulet, a copy of the image was often kept by husbands or sweethearts on the front line where they fulfilled the same function; in others, women wear their brooches on mourning clothes. The brooches' various functions will be further investigated in Chapters 4 and 5.

3.8 'Wear the Brooch of his Regiment': Women, Jewellery and Propaganda in World War II

On the outbreak of war in 1939 the fashion for military sweetheart brooches for women was revived. Manufacturers had retained the ability to recreate the brooches

⁴⁷⁰ Known as 'real photographic' ('R.P.') to distinguish them from cheaper lithographic or rotary prints.

⁴⁷¹ Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.123.

they had produced throughout the Great War, and could supply retailers with any regiment's insignia in a variety of materials at short notice. Shops throughout the country bought in supplies in anticipation of renewed demand and advertised: 'Wear the badge of his regiment' (see fig.71). In 1914 it was necessary to coerce men to enlist but this war would be fought by a conscripted army, supported by the home front.⁴⁷² Propaganda therefore had a different focus: to persuade the population at home to engage with 'The People's War' and encourage women into jobs to free men for front-line fighting.⁴⁷³ This led to somewhat mixed messages: women's traditional role of maintaining home and family was presented as their patriotic duty in the fight against Hitler while simultaneously they were needed for war work in factories, the countryside and, this time, in the forces. Yet the binary distinction between roles of men at the front and women at home persisted. Corinna Peniston-Bird and Emma Vickers state that the 'combat taboo' – the prohibition on women in front-line roles – had to be maintained to uphold the traditional social order in which male superiority dominated.⁴⁷⁴ An ATS (Women's Auxiliary Territorial Service) poster enticed women to enlist by claiming: 'They can't get on without us' (fig.97) and a Ministry of Health poster: 'She's in the Ranks Too!' declared: 'Caring for Evacuees is a National Service', attempting to equate women's traditional caring role with military service.⁴⁷⁵ Both aimed at convincing women that their supportive roles equalled those of front-line troops.

While all women's war work was vital, its essential function was to free men for front-line fighting. Women in the ATS would not fire the guns depicted in the poster but spot enemy aircraft. They were therefore encouraged to see themselves as a vital link in the chain culminating with the fighting forces at the front. In a mirror image of munitions workers of the Great War an MoI film, *Jane Brown Changes her Job*, sees

⁴⁷² The Military Training Act (May 1939) allowed for limited conscription; full conscription began on 3.9.1939, the first day of the war. From 1941 women were subject to conscription. <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/private-lives/yourcountry/overview/conscriptionww2/>[accessed 2.4.2017]

⁴⁷³ David Clampin, *Advertising and Propaganda in World War II: Cultural Identity and the Blitz Spirit* (London, New York: I. B. Tauris & Co., 2014), p.xvii.

⁴⁷⁴ Corinna Peniston-Bird and Emma Vickers, Editors, *Gender and the Second World War* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p.6.

⁴⁷⁵ See IWM, URL: <http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/19995>[accessed 21.9.2015].

the eponymous Jane moving from working as a typist to making Spitfires at a factory where her achievement is to 'put another plane in the shed for the boys'. Though women carried out dangerous, vital roles, Jane would not be flying the Spitfires in combat.⁴⁷⁶ In these circumstances, regimental brooches were worn in support of the fighting forces that women were still unable to join.

The wartime imagery noted by Gullace was mobilised again as propaganda in WWII. Advertising methods were now more sophisticated and propaganda was targeted via newspapers, leaflets and the BBC.⁴⁷⁷ To reach a wider audience, posters were exhibited in department stores.⁴⁷⁸ The artist Mary Fedden (1915-2012), who held ambivalent views about the war and sympathised with conscientious objectors, nevertheless applied the skills acquired at the Slade School of Art to painting Mol propaganda murals in Harrods, which gave over a section of the store for this purpose.⁴⁷⁹ These included recruitment murals for the Women's Land Army, in which Fedden previously served. The 80,000 strong Land Army performed agricultural and forestry work previously undertaken by men. A metal badge was part of the Land Army uniform, with a variation for its forestry section, the Land Army Timber Corps. All branches of the women's nursing services, the Women's Mechanised Transport Corps and even the Entertainments National Service Association (ENSA) had their own badges, and corresponding sweetheart brooches. These can still be ordered from Birmingham jewellers.⁴⁸⁰ However, genuine original examples are rare and sellers often claim that uniform badges are sweetheart brooches; it can be difficult to distinguish between them. Since men would not have worn them, as we have seen, they would probably have been gifts from women to sisters or mothers.

⁴⁷⁶ *Jane Brown Changes her Job*, Ministry of Information, 1941.

<http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/1060006264>[accessed 1.12.2015]. See Susan L. Carruthers 'Manning the Factories': Propaganda and Policy on the Employment of Women, 1939-1947', *History*, 1990, Vol.75 (244), p.9. Women did fly aircraft in non-combat roles: for example, delivering them between airfields.

⁴⁷⁷ Maartens, *Recruitment for the British Armed Forces and Civil Defences*, p.108.

⁴⁷⁸ Entry 11.10.1939, SxMOA TC43:5, 2d.

⁴⁷⁹ Mary Fedden, 'Work Suspended', in *What did you do in the war, Mummy?: Women in World War II*, Edited by Mavis Nicholson (London: Pimlico, 1996), p.55.

⁴⁸⁰ For example, Award make a gold and diamond Women's Army Corps brooch to commission in Birmingham's Jewellery Quarter. URL: http://www.awardmedals.com/womens-royal-army-corps-9ct-gold-diamond-brooch-p-12720.html?cPath=24_315_132[accessed 7.7.2016].

3.9. Symbols, Badges and Jewellery in World War II

Women wore sweetheart brooches to signal their support but other symbols that had circulated in WWI also resurfaced. Several suicides were reported of young men who had been sent white feathers with letters accusing them of cowardice, in a revival of the White Feather League's activities. In 1940, 17-year-old Bernard Sills joined the Essex Regiment but was discharged as under-aged. When he received a card on Christmas Eve with two white feathers and the anonymous message: 'My Xmas gift to you Yellow', he shot himself.⁴⁸¹ A boy named Cyril Wray living in Oxford volunteered for service but because as an apprentice he was exempt, had not yet been called up. He was sent two white feathers and was so distressed he killed himself.⁴⁸² Servicemen who were honourably discharged as permanently unfit received a certificate but not the King's medal that identified them as having served. Efforts were therefore made to persuade government to issue a badge specifically to protect against such attacks. In 1942 *The Daily Mirror* reported the case of an East End cinema manager, a Dunkirk veteran, who was sent two white feathers on a card reading: 'You would look better in uniform than in evening dress. You have been warned'. The newspaper argued 'because he has no badge to wear, he is exposed to the jibes of ignorant and prying people. Give him - and others like him - a "buttonhole" and they will be spared these insults'.⁴⁸³

Mass Observation archives indicate strong disapproval for those who were not identified as contributing to the war effort from early on, and saw badges and clothing as essential in avoiding censure. In 1939 Mary Joyce, Editress [sic] of Manchester's *Woman's Wear News* stated that girls wanted to wear uniforms even when they were not absolutely required to do so, for example, in the Women's Voluntary Service (WVS).⁴⁸⁴ As part of a survey regarding rationing with the London Drapers' Chamber of Trade, Mass Observations interviewed John Dannhorn, Director of Corot Ltd, and his assistant, Miss Fraser, who said many women customers requested clothing resembling uniforms:

⁴⁸¹ 'White Feathers Killed Him', *Daily Herald*, 3.1.1942, p.3.

⁴⁸² 'White Feathers Upset Boy: Coroner Condemns Cowardly Act', *The Evening Telegraph*, 9.6.1943.

⁴⁸³ 'Badge will beat white feathers', *The Daily Mirror*, 1.17.1942.

⁴⁸⁴ Mary Joyce, *Woman's Wear News*, Interview 7 December 1939. SxMOA.TC18, 2.

She says women ask for copies of uniforms eg officer's greatcoat. It's this awful desire to wear an armlet or ARP badge or something. Women seemed to long to wear uniform of some kind and a young woman she knew who had joined the WAAF said "in six months' time anyone who isn't in uniform will be spat at." Dannhorn says "It gives them a superiority over civilians, I suppose. Puts them into a class by themselves".⁴⁸⁵

Mavis Nicholson suggests another reason why women chose to wear some military identification: badges, like uniforms, signalled independence for young women.

Before the war even adult women were still expected to obey their fathers unquestioningly:

Father could still require his grown-up daughter to come home at a set hour; to dress in a 'respectable' way; to avoid any male company he found objectionable. The only release from this authority was to get married, which often meant changing one form of dependence for another. [...] Instead of finding uniform irksome, most girls seemed thrilled to wear it. It was the outward sign of their freedom from parental restraint.⁴⁸⁶

Civilians on essential war work were given badges as identification, since often they had no other official uniform. 1.4 million people served as voluntary Civil Defence workers, mostly local Air Raid Wardens who enforced the blackout, co-ordinated civil defence responses and assisted with first aid during bombing raids.⁴⁸⁷ Applications were invited from 'responsible men' (though one sixth were women).⁴⁸⁸ Until May 1941 wardens had no uniforms but wore their own clothing with a steel helmet and wellington boots but were issued with an armband and identifying badge. By 1943, 1.5 million women were employed in essential industries and a further 470,000 in the Auxiliary Territorial Service, the Women's Royal Naval Service and the Women's Auxiliary Air Force.⁴⁸⁹ Sweetheart brooches were made to replicate all these service badges.

⁴⁸⁵ John Dannhorn, Director, Corot Ltd., London, and Miss Fraser, Assistant to Director. Interview 15.12.1939. SxMOA, TC18:2.

⁴⁸⁶ Mavis Nicholson, ed., *What did you do in the war, Mummy?: Women in World War II*, p.5.

⁴⁸⁷ 'Air Raid Precautions' BBC-WW2 People's War. URL: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/timeline/factfiles/nonflash/a6651425.shtml> [accessed 20.1.2016].

⁴⁸⁸ 'Air Raid Precautions' BBC-WW2 People's War.

⁴⁸⁹ Tessa Stone, 'Creating a (Gendered?) Military Identity: the Women's Auxiliary Air Force

Just as in the Great War, badges and brooches worn by women were closely related to government propaganda campaigns. The 1942 poster 'Keep mum she's not so dumb' was part of the 'Careless talk costs lives' drive, depicting Army, Navy and Air Force officers surrounding an attractive woman who is clearly taking note of operational secrets they are indiscreet enough to reveal.⁴⁹⁰ Its American equivalent was the 'Loose lips sink ships' slogan. Several variations on this theme were made as brooches in the form of padlocked lips in silver or enamel, also worn in Britain (fig.98).

One type of symbolic jewellery closely related to regimental badge brooches was widely produced in Britain to indicate general support for the war aims rather a personal relationship. The BBC inaugurated the 'V for Victory' Campaign with the aim of encouraging resistance throughout occupied Europe. Victor de Laveleye, of the exiled Belgian cabinet, broadcast through the BBC for the French language Radio Belgique. On the evening of 14 January 1941 de Laveleye announced:

I am proposing to you as a rallying emblem the letter V, because V is the first letter of the words 'Victoire (victory) in French, and Vrijheid' (freedom) in Flemish: [...] the victory which will give us back our freedom, the victory of our good friends the English. Their word for Victory also begins with V...⁴⁹¹

Understanding the effectiveness on occupied peoples' morale of positive propaganda, de Laveleye urged listeners to place this simple symbol everywhere under the eyes of the occupying forces: the letter V worked in both languages and was easy to scribble quickly on any surface in the dark. The populace would know they were surrounded by sympathisers:

All the patriots of Belgium must have a rallying emblem; let them multiply this emblem around them; let them see it written everywhere; let them know that they are legion. Let the occupier, by seeing this sign, always the same,

in Great Britain in the Second World War', *Women's History Review*, 8,4, 1999, p.606.

⁴⁹⁰ Harold Forster (artist) for H.M. Stationery Office, 'Keep mum she's not so dumb' poster. 1942.

⁴⁹¹ Victor de Laveleye, BBC Radio broadcast, 14 January 1941, quoted in translation in Charles J. Rolo, *Radio Goes to War: The Fourth Front* (Putnam's: New York, 1942), p.174. For part of the original French broadcast: Flanders News BE, URL:<http://deredactie.be/cm/vrtnieuws.english/News/1.1865551>[accessed 2.2.2016].

infinitely repeated, understand that he is surrounded, encircled, by an immense crowd of citizens eagerly awaiting his first moment of weakness, watching for his first failure.⁴⁹²

‘V’ signs appeared chalked on pavements, walls and vehicles and even built into cobbled pavements and walls. On 27 June the visual symbol was audibly reinforced by BBC broadcasts of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, the first bars of which corresponded to the Morse code sign for ‘V’ (three dots and one dash) a simple rhythm that could be tapped out in any situation. On 20 July Winston Churchill extended the campaign to British propaganda, employing the hand gesture that became characteristic of his wartime photographs.⁴⁹³ The Victory sign was widely applied to packaging and advertisements, although advertisers were officially discouraged from inappropriate use of serious wartime propaganda messages for fear of undermining their true meaning.⁴⁹⁴ The public could purchase ‘Victory-V Stickers’ and the symbol appeared on other ephemera, part of the totality of visual wartime imagery.

This simple theme, with its associations of victory, freedom and solidarity with occupied peoples overseas and shared aims at home, is expressed by a black enamel, pearl and silver ‘Victory’ sweetheart brooch (fig.99). Another incorporates the letter ‘V’ with laurel leaves, the word ‘Victory’, the colours of the French and English flags and even the Morse code (fig.100). Once the concept became familiar to the public, the single letter effectively conveyed the message: one symbol functioned as powerfully as any written political text. The letter became simply a shape; recognized immediately by English, French and Flemish speakers alike, it conjured up inspirational images of future freedom and hope. ‘Victory’ brooches were available in a wide variety of materials: in the IWM is a little red felt version with a safety pin for fastening to clothing, affordable by everyone with a few pence to spare.⁴⁹⁵ The

⁴⁹² Laveleye, BBC Radio broadcast, 14 January 1941.

⁴⁹³ Jean-Michel Veranneman, *Belgium in the Second World War* (South Yorkshire: Pen and Sword Military Books, 2014), p.77.

⁴⁹⁴ David Clampin, *Advertising and Propaganda in World War II*: pp.58-59. Clampin quotes Mass Observation records showing that in the first two months of the V for Victory campaign, 30 advertisers incorporated it into 188 advertisements.

⁴⁹⁵ Imperial War Museum, London. IWM URL: <http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/30084561> [accessed 1.3.2016].

symbol emerged from this period of the war to become an intrinsic part of the specific visual culture of the time.

Churchill and De Laveleye understood the powerful morale-boosting effect on an occupied people of ubiquitous, subversive symbols. Gilly Carr has researched the wearing of symbolic badges as resistance against military occupation in the Channel Islands.⁴⁹⁶ Constant surveillance by German forces maintained unequal power relations over the islands' population, whose acts of 'non-compliance and insubordination' had to remain concealed from all but trusted family and neighbours.⁴⁹⁷ The Victory campaign was not directed at the Channel Islands for fear of further endangering the population, but broadcasts were picked up there, and two islanders began to make badges for family and friends, filing down coins to make a 'V' shape around the king's head. They could not be worn openly but were pinned inside jacket lapels and shown briefly to others to signal group solidarity against the common enemy.⁴⁹⁸ These brooches embodied several layers of meaning: the monarch's image on the coins from which they were made incorporated concepts of Britishness, the nationality which they hoped and intended to retain after the war while their subversive nature and the vital secrecy involved signalled resistance between the islanders.⁴⁹⁹

But of all badge brooches, those of certain personnel were perceived as more glamorous than others, with those connected to RAF pilots seen as particularly alluring. Doris Melling wrote in her Mass Observation diary in 1942: 'Probably the WAAF is more popular because everyone is thrilled with the exploits of the airmen and navy and wants to be associated with these units'.⁵⁰⁰ Whenever possible the War Office publicised heroic deeds and successful operations as morale-boosting propaganda. A sweetheart brooch linked to one such event during WWII and the

⁴⁹⁶ Gilly Carr, 'Coins, Crests and Kings: Symbols of identity and resistance in the Occupied Channel Islands', *Journal of Material Culture*, 17(4), 2012, pp. 327-344.

⁴⁹⁷ Carr, 'Coins, Crests and Kings', p.333.

⁴⁹⁸ Carr, 'Coins, Crests and Kings', p.334.

⁴⁹⁹ Carr, 'Coins, Crests and Kings', p.329-331.

⁵⁰⁰ Doris Melling, Diary entry, 2.5.1942, MOA. Quoted in *Mass-Observation: Britain in the Second World War*, Sandra Koa Wing, ed., (London: The Folio Society, 2007), p.123.

almost mythologised individual with whom it was associated reveals how brooches with such associations retain their special interest while others are lost to history.

3.10. Creating the Hero: Guy Gibson's Gold Wings Brooch

In May 2014 a 9 carat gold and enamel sweetheart brooch depicting the wings and crown insignia of an RAF Wing Commander's badge was sold in an auction of antique objects (fig.101).⁵⁰¹ The pre-sale estimate was £300-£500 but following rapid competitive bidding the brooch was finally sold to an anonymous buyer for £11,200. The brooch, though a good example of its kind, was unremarkable except that, unusually, it was accompanied by original documentation explaining the singular circumstances in which it was given and received.

This brooch was a gift from Wing Commander Guy Gibson to Joyce Meade, the Women's Auxiliary Air Force (WAAF) secretary who helped him prepare the proofs of his memoirs for publication. Gibson was among the most admired RAF pilots of WWII, famous for leading 617 Squadron in Operation Chastise, bombing raids on German dams in the industrial Ruhr and Eder valleys on the night of 16-17 May 1943.⁵⁰² Better known as the 'Dambusters', this daring operation was presented by Government to the British public as morale-boosting propaganda and Gibson, (fig.102) then aged only 24, was a celebrated figure, further glamourised by the posthumous publication of his book *Enemy Coast Ahead* and later by a film, *The Dam Busters* (1955).⁵⁰³ That the raids themselves were only partially successful and resulted in considerable loss of life amongst the aircrews was suppressed in the

⁵⁰¹ Burstow & Hewett, Auctioneers, Battle, East Sussex. Auction: 21.5.2014.

⁵⁰² Gibson's book refers to the raid as 'The Dambusters'; the film was entitled '*The Dam Busters*'.

⁵⁰³ *The Dam Busters* (1955) was directed by Michael Anderson and based on the books *Enemy Coast Ahead*, Guy Gibson (London: Pan, 1946) and *The Dam Busters*, Paul Brickhill (London: Evans Brothers, 1951). Richard Todd, a leading actor and officer in the wartime Parachute Regiment, played Gibson.

interests of public morale. The survivors were lauded as heroes, and Gibson was awarded the Victoria Cross.⁵⁰⁴

Perceiving his propaganda value, the Air Ministry pressured Gibson to write about his flying exploits but, anxious to return to flying duties, he produced the memoirs only reluctantly.⁵⁰⁵ Richard Morris argues Gibson was unaware of being manipulated by 'RAF propagandists', who anticipated his book would be 'irreverent, yet generally favourable to Bomber Command' at a time when Strategic Air Offensive was under considerable criticism for its policy of 'carpet bombing' German cities and consequent numerous civilian deaths.⁵⁰⁶

The Air Ministry seconded Meade to type the proofs. Based on Gibson's mediocre command of written English (indicated by his letters, records and known reluctance to write the book in the first place) doubts have been raised over whether he wrote it without considerable help with grammar and editing.⁵⁰⁷ Probably Meade gave substantial assistance in correction and preparation of the proofs. On 18 September 1944 Gibson wrote to her from RAF Coningsby, Lincolnshire: 'I am enclosing a little gift in the form of a gold RAF brooch in deep appreciation of the work you put in on my book' (fig.103).' This was the sweetheart brooch, a replica of the Wing Commander's badge on his uniform jacket.

On the evening of the following day, 19 September, Gibson's Mosquito plane was shot down over Steenberg in the Netherlands while returning from a raid over Germany and he and his navigator were killed. The letter to Meade, and her reply of 21 September thanking him for the gift, were returned to her by the Air Ministry. Both letters and the envelope were auctioned with the brooch, providing complete provenance.

⁵⁰⁴ Amanda Mason, *The Incredible Story of the Dambusters Raid*, IWM, URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/the-incredible-story-of-the-dambusters-raid>[accessed 7.7.2015].

⁵⁰⁵ Richard Morris, *Guy Gibson*, (London: Viking, 1994), p.224-5.

⁵⁰⁶ Morris, *Guy Gibson*, p.225.

⁵⁰⁷ Morris, *Guy Gibson*, pp.221-225.

In the 1946 introduction to *Enemy Coast Ahead* Sir Arthur Harris, Commander-in-Chief of Bomber Command, remarked of Gibson: 'His outstanding skill [...] marked him out early for command'.⁵⁰⁸ But though his courage was undisputed, Gibson did not in fact distinguish himself in his ground school examinations and as a flyer was classed 'average'.⁵⁰⁹ He was mainly distinguished early in the war by surviving when so many died.⁵¹⁰ Gibson wrote: 'The losses in percentage in any one air raid are not unduly high – rarely above ten per cent – but remember this used to go on for sixty missions [...] out of a squadron of twenty-five crews, not many are left at the end of three months.'⁵¹¹ Harris also claimed: 'He was not only admired but loved by all who knew him.'⁵¹² This was disputed, however, particularly by those of lesser rank such as juniors and ground crew, who found him contemptuous and nicknamed him 'the Bumptious Bastard'.⁵¹³ He was known to amuse himself by flaunting the rules, with reckless flying that caused aircrew to be wary of him.⁵¹⁴

At that point in the war, however, the Allies, Bomber Command and the British public all needed a resounding success. Gibson was the hero they needed and to keep his public image untarnished he was in effect 'apotheosized by the Air Ministry's publicity machine'.⁵¹⁵ Removed from active service as too valuable an asset to risk, when he did persuade his superiors to allow him to fly again he was unprepared for the mission on which he was killed, as Harris later admitted.⁵¹⁶ His death at the age of 26 (though not unusual for fighter pilots) further glamourised his memory. The brooch that replicated Gibson's own RAF 'wings' incorporated the heroic aura surrounding him when he sent it to Meade; the price achieved at auction 70 years later indicates it retained this aura even then.

⁵⁰⁸ Arthur Harris, 'Introduction', Guy Gibson, *Enemy Coast Ahead: Uncensored: The Real Guy Gibson* [London: Michael Joseph, 1946], (Manchester: Crecy, 2003).

⁵⁰⁹ Morris, *Guy Gibson*, pp.18,20.

⁵¹⁰ Morris, *Guy Gibson*, Prologue.

⁵¹¹ Gibson, *Enemy Coast Ahead: Uncensored*, Foreword and Dedication.

⁵¹² Arthur Harris, 'Introduction', Guy Gibson, *Enemy Coast Ahead*.

⁵¹³ Morris, *Guy Gibson* pp.31-33, 34. 36.

⁵¹⁴ Morris, *Guy Gibson*, pp.25-26.

⁵¹⁵ Morris, *Guy Gibson*, Prologue.

⁵¹⁶ Harris, 'Introduction', Gibson, *Enemy Coast Ahead*.

Gibson obviously felt the brooch was an appropriate gift in appreciation of Meade's assistance in preparing his memoirs, a task he found arduous. The gift suggests Gibson was aware it was fashionable; probably members of his crew had bought similar brooches for wives or girlfriends. Meade was neither of these and his gift confirms that sweetheart brooches were not only given in romantic relationships. Clearly he understood this was a present that would create for Meade an appropriate reminder of their collaboration on the book about his celebrated exploits. The brooch itself was not a specially commissioned piece of jewellery but nevertheless transferred to her a little of his own fame since, as Marcel Mauss asserted: 'to make a gift of something is to make a present of some part of oneself'.⁵¹⁷ Gibson must have known she would gain pleasure from wearing this visible mark of his appreciation, as indeed she stated in her letter of thanks. Meade wrote: 'Your unexpected letter reached me this morning and was a delightful surprise. I assure you I shall wear the little brooch with great pride.'⁵¹⁸ Gibson must have known she would gain considerable kudos from it, displaying as it did her connection to one of the most famous flying aces of WWII. In *The English in Love*, Claire Langhamer reveals the priorities of a young WAAF in 1942:

Competitive factors in the Great Man-Chase are under the following headings: quality; quantity; intensity. The decisive qualities are rank/wings; looks; money; youth in that order. [...] Rank is unbelievably important. There's a Wing Commander here whose only redeeming feature is that he's young. He isn't good looking, he's owned to be a great bore; [...] Yet he could go out with any woman on the station that he cared to ask: no-one would refuse. And all this rests purely on his 3 rings and wings.⁵¹⁹

The Wing Commander's 'rings and wings' gave a woman equivalent acquired standing when she was out socially with him, while the gift of a Commander's or pilot's wing brooch allowed her to maintain this status whenever she wore it. How much more status would be achieved by wearing the badge of an acknowledged war hero.

⁵¹⁷ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift*, p.12.

⁵¹⁸ *Letter, Joyce Meade to Guy Gibson*, 21.9.1944.

⁵¹⁹ SxMoA32/3/E, WAAF:Reports from an Observer, 1941-2. 'The Great Digby Man-Chase'. 2-3. Quoted in Langhamer, pp.63-64.

This brooch was a less personal gift than some of those discussed here since it was not exchanged within an intimate, romantic relationship but a more formal one. Gibson and Meade had worked closely together for several months but their letters were addressed in the correct manner of the time, appropriate to their relative ranks, to 'Miss Meade' and 'Wing Commander'. Conventional alternatives might have been a signed photograph (Gibson was widely photographed in his RAF uniform as part of the positive propaganda the Air Ministry wished to publicise, and his image was well-known) or, had he lived long enough to see publication, a signed first edition of the book Meade helped to produce. However, jewellery always conveys special meaning; Gibson did not choose to give her, for example, a bracelet or similar personal item, but a gift that specifically refers to his own RAF service and through it, to his celebrity. The pride and admiration with which Joyce Meade expected to wear this piece of jewellery would have reflected her association with a fêted national hero through the brooch's capacity to retain traces of its giver. The brooch would be seen by others and recognized for what it represented: notably in her letter she stated explicitly she would wear the brooch 'with great pride'. It articulated the carefully constructed narrative of Gibson's life and achievements the Air Ministry wished to promote. Gibson wrote: 'When it [the book] does get published I shall make another little gift to you so that you can buy something for yourself.'⁵²⁰ This offer Meade declined; the brooch and his comments were thanks enough.

In view of his death only the following day it must have become for her, in addition to the pride it engendered, a memorial object. Servicewomen were permitted to wear one small piece of jewellery provided it was not visible on their uniform and she might of course have worn it on her civilian clothes. In 1945 Joyce Meade married; there is no way of knowing whether, or in what circumstances, she wore the brooch thereafter since she left no written record.⁵²¹ However it was evidently of significance to her since she kept the brooch, the letters and even the envelope in which they were returned to her advising of his death in action, until her own death in 2000, when she bequeathed them to a friend, on whose behalf they were sold at the 2014 auction.⁵²²

⁵²⁰ *Letter, Guy Gibson to Joyce Meade*, 18.9.1944.

⁵²¹ Marriage Certificate, Joyce Meade to Walter Harris, 4.8.1945, Stoneleigh, Surrey.

⁵²² Burstow and Hewett. Personal Communication, 5.6.2014.

Many RAF badge brooches were made throughout WWII but the exceptionally high value placed upon this one reflects several factors. The sale took place almost exactly 71 years to the day after the raids and 70 years from the date of the gift, during official commemorations of several significant WWII anniversaries. Artefacts connected to the Dambusters raids are highly sought after by collectors and because of this there is a thriving market offering fake items, increasing the monetary value of any with demonstrable provenance. They relate to propaganda regarding British heroism and valour seen as vital to positive morale not just when victory was uncertain but later, during the post-war years, when rationing and hardships persisted. During the 1940s and 1950s, film-makers enhanced these narratives, taking as their protagonists real-life military heroes such as Gibson and the amputee pilot Douglas Bader. Ten years after Gibson's death the film *The Dam Busters* excised all reference to his marriage and many girlfriends, leaving his portrayal as a 'Boy's Own stereotype'.⁵²³ Ross Collins argues that the legend of the hero is essential in constructing acceptable narratives by which people may be inspired to go to war and sacrifice their own lives.⁵²⁴ Thus myths and news stories become intertwined with propaganda: 'mythic war narratives celebrate the hero: his sacrifice, his nobility as a soldier, his proud masculinity' and it is not necessary to reflect war's actualities. Myths, especially the cult of the fallen soldier, are used to justify war and make sense of incomprehensibly appalling situations.⁵²⁵

3.11 Conclusion

This chapter has shown that in WWI propaganda focused particularly on women by positioning them as the cause for which men should go to war and the prize awaiting them on their victorious return. It has investigated the promotion of regimental brooches by government and the jewellery trade as expressions of official propaganda and national pride during both World Wars, demonstrating the way material culture

⁵²³ Morris, Guy Gibson, Prologue. *The Times* reviewed it at the time as 'the last word' in honest war films, though it removed all criticism of Gibson.

⁵²⁴ Ross F. Collins, 'Myth as Propaganda in World War I: American Volunteers, Victor Chapman and French Journalism', *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 2015, Vol.92(3), p.644.

⁵²⁵ Collins, 'Myth as Propaganda in World War I', pp.644-645.

directed towards the British population encouraged enlistment, boosted morale, and promoted wartime solidarity. Films, books, music-hall songs, uniform badges and brooches worn by women blended into a complex visual landscape of wartime imagery and individuals utilised these objects to reflect societal views from the ground up. It has shown that military badge brooches, first visible during the Boer Wars, became specially significant within the visual culture of the Great War and into World War II, periods when uniforms, badges and insignia were of particular importance in self-identification for civilians. They formed strong connections between those at the front and those on the home front who identified with the fortunes of individuals and the units in which they served.

But at the end of both conflicts, painful memories meant that emotive visual military reminders of the war like sweetheart brooches were largely set aside and often forgotten. Vera Brittain despaired that once peace was declared in 1918, the experiences of those who had been involved in any capacity were marginalised. No-one wanted to hear about them: ‘And no-one talked heroics now, and we/ Must just go back and start again once more’.⁵²⁶ Saunders too notes public distaste for conflict-related objects in the interwar period.⁵²⁷ But during the war years they were ubiquitous. Employing contemporary documentation, letters, diaries and fictional writing, therefore, the thesis now moves to examine the multidimensional reasons why so many individuals chose to give the brooches and so many women wore them.

⁵²⁶ Brittain, ‘Survivors Not Wanted: The Lament of the Demobilised’, *Testament of Youth*, p.427.

⁵²⁷ Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.225.

Chapter 4

‘Every Female Seemed to Wear One’: Wearing Sweetheart Brooches in Wartime Britain

4.1 Introduction

Chapter 3 established that government and commerce promoted regimental sweetheart brooches to women as propaganda symbols during both World Wars. The aim of this section is to consider other reasons why women themselves chose to wear them. As I have argued throughout this thesis, sweetheart brooches articulated many sentiments in addition to romantic ones. This chapter synthesises primary sources including editorials, advertisements and wedding reports in local and national newspapers, original photographs, fiction and Mass Observation archives to investigate how and why women wore their brooches. Firstly, sweetheart brooches were poignant symbolic parting gifts but also fashionable items. Rationing did not apply in WWI; from 1941, however, strict rationing obliged women to exercise ingenuity to ‘make do and mend’ at a time of overwhelming shortages. Every adult was allocated 66 coupons each year and a woman could purchase new 1 coat, 1 dress, 2 blouses, 1 skirt, 1 pair of shoes, 3 pairs of stockings, underclothing, handkerchiefs and gloves, assuming she could afford them.⁵²⁸ Jewellery, which was not rationed, allowed women to subvert the rules and brooches became fashionable accessories.

Secondly I examine their popularity as wedding gifts from groom to the bride and often her bridesmaids, linking their dresses to his uniform. Thirdly I look at the way brooches functioned as social markers to fashion an identity from symbols that represented another’s status. The next section addresses brooches exchanged as amulets and talismans and the revival of superstition in the face of industrial slaughter at a time when individual lives were subsumed to the exigencies of war. Finally, in the context of unimaginable losses, some were translated into pieces through which mourning might be mediated; examples are examined of specially made mourning brooches and others whose function altered to become memory objects.

⁵²⁸ Anonymous, ‘Clothes rationing in Great Britain’, *Monthly Labor Review*, 07.1941; 53, 000001, p.73. The same number of coupons was required regardless of cost.

4.2 ‘A Nice Jumper and Skirt, with Lots of Jewellery’⁵²⁹: Sweetheart Brooches as Fashion

In 1916 a *Daily Mirror* reporter wrote: ‘Yesterday I noticed a girl wearing a regimental badge, in brooch form, attached to the top of her shoulder. I suppose this is “the latest” in regimental souvenirs’.⁵³⁰ As has been shown, sweetheart brooches had been made long before this date but they were now becoming more widespread as fashion items. The young woman in fig.104 wears her white enamel Royal Artillery brooch on the collar of her blouse. ‘Vogue’s Vanities’, a fashion column published in *The Sketch* in 1915, illustrated soft, unstructured skirts and blouses with a scarf: ‘of thick silk, which may be had in regimental colours’, patriotic and practical but smart because ‘dowdiness, even in wartime, is unpardonable’.⁵³¹ The woman in fig.105 wears such a blouse, and has pinned her fashionable wide silk tie with a Yorkshire Regimental brooch.

An unknown young woman wears her Royal Flying Corps sweetheart brooch at the neck of her blouse as she poses for a formal photograph with a young man in uniform (fig.106). The soft blouse and skirt she wears are very similar to those advertised by Marshall and Snelgrove in 1917 in a feature on modern clothing entitled ‘The Woman of Today’.⁵³² The airman has no unit or speciality badges on his uniform, suggesting it has only just been issued. Very high losses amongst aircrew required constant hasty deployment of new flyers so uniforms were often supplied without insignia, which would be issued later but the jacket’s pattern dates it to between 1916-1918, so the photograph must also be from that period.⁵³³ British WWI military command did not routinely photograph recruits, so this image, typically the work of a professional studio photographer at a time when families might not necessarily own a camera, might well be the only record the family retained of this airman. The photographer has isolated the figures from any background, highlighting the simplicity of their

⁵²⁹ Mary Joyce, *Woman’s Wear News*, 7.12.1939.

⁵³⁰ ‘A New Style’, *The Daily Mirror*, 16.10.1916, p.10.

⁵³¹ Carmen of Cockayne, ‘Vogue’s Vanities’, *The Sketch*, 3.11.1915, p.104.

⁵³² ‘The Woman of Today’, *The Globe*, 19.11.1917.

⁵³³ RFC suffered deaths in training and combat of approximately 25%. RFC 1914-1918, URL:<http://www.airwar1.org.uk/>[accessed 21.2.2015].

mirrored postures and clothing, from which only the embroidered shoulder titles on his jacket and the brooch she wears allow us to infer the narrative within the image. The brooch is the only visible jewellery the woman wears. It is not possible to see whether she is wearing rings and as their identities are not recorded we cannot know whether she was his wife, sweetheart or sister. However, this image is a typical illustration of the exchange of brooches in the context of what was evidently a significant personal relationship and the reason why 'sweetheart brooches' came to be the generic term for this type of jewellery.

Women in uniform in their own right also wore them, sometimes in defiance of regulations. Members of the WAAC (Women's Auxiliary Army Corps) were only permitted to wear a wedding ring and their Women's Legion badge on their greatcoat but this rule was often ignored as sweetheart brooches, particularly RFC wings, appear quite frequently in photographs.⁵³⁴ In fig.107, for example, three Postal Service officials wear brooches on their uniforms: respectively the Royal Artillery, Canadian badge and Queen's Royal (West Surrey).

Brooches were also given outside the context of personal relationships. In 1918, just after the Armistice, forty-one injured soldiers recuperating at Morningfield Hospital, Aberdeen were given a Christmas party, with gifts distributed by local well-wishers. Men were given parcels containing tobacco, a tie and notecase but each female patient received 'a handsome silver and mother of pearl regimental brooch to mark the year of victory'.⁵³⁵ The soldiers would have had uniforms and badges of their own and in hospital would have worn their regimental insignia on their 'hospital blues'. The women patients may or may not have had personal connections with the local regiment but clearly it was thought appropriate to give them a patriotic brooch to celebrate the Armistice.

In WWII brooches were frequently suggested as fashionable and attractive accessories that could enliven evening or day dresses, coats or hats. Members of the armed forces were required to wear their uniforms when off duty. This caused problems when

⁵³⁴ Andrew Cormack, *British Air Forces, 1914-18*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Osprey, 2000), p.41.

⁵³⁵ 'Patients Enjoy a Christmastide Treat', *Aberdeen Evening Express*, 18.12.1918, p.2.

socialising, since ‘when a private and brigadier are in the same party, the private would be embarrassed in his battledress against officers’ uniforms’.⁵³⁶ It also created difficulties for women, some of whom thought it inappropriate to wear long evening dresses when dining or dancing with a companion in uniform, believing it would make their partner feel awkward at a time when dressing was formally codified. By now many women were enlisted and were ordered to wear uniform when out socially. By December 1939 Mary Joyce claimed evening dresses were seldom seen: ‘If I went into a restaurant in a *décolleté* evening gown and sat next to a woman in service uniform, I should feel most embarrassed’.⁵³⁷ The rule was unpopular with women and the fashion trade, already suffering losses through rationing. Manchester’s *Women’s Wear News* published an open letter asking its members to petition their MPs to permit female personnel to wear ‘mufti’ embellished with ‘small regimental badges’ or brooches when off duty because:

The war will not be won by insisting on officers, officer cadets and full blown privates dancing, dining and theatreing [sic] in service uniform or battle dress, or by women wearing slovenly clothes fearing they would be conspicuous in the appropriate gown. Explain [to your MP] that it is much more likely to be lost that way – many thousands of people’s incomes are dependent on the fashion industry.⁵³⁸

There was even a suggestion that some retailers planned to encourage a revival in evening dresses by paying women to go into ‘high-class’ restaurants in elaborate gowns to shame others into dressing ‘correctly’ in evening clothes, an idea that met with strong disapproval.⁵³⁹ Joyce also mentioned pragmatic concerns for women: evening dress was ‘impractical in case you needed to get quickly to an air raid shelter.’ She proposed instead: ‘daytime length’ frocks, or a nice jumper and skirt, with lots of jewellery’.⁵⁴⁰ Women not in uniform were employed more than ever before and therefore required practical clothing: ‘they are doing a real job of work. Everyone who comes in here is connected with some war work or other – ambulance

⁵³⁶ H. Scott, Mercia Ltd. SxMOA.TC18:2,A.

⁵³⁷ Joyce, *Women’s Wear News*, 7.12.1939, SxMOA, TC18:2.

⁵³⁸ Open letter to the fashion trade, *Women’s Wear News*, 7.12.1939.

⁵³⁹ Mary Joyce, *Woman’s Wear News*, 7.12.1939, Dr. Barber, Secretary, Retail Distributors’ Association, London, 15.12.1939, SxMOA, TC18:2.

⁵⁴⁰ Joyce, 7.12.1939.

driving, canteen, looking after evacuees...'⁵⁴¹

But women disliked being forced to wear uniform off-duty. In Scotland women in the ATS (Auxiliary Territorial Service) pleaded to be allowed to wear their own clothes. They complained: 'Our sweethearts are tired of the sight of uniforms. [...] When they take us out for the evening they want to see pretty dresses, furs and silk stockings and not severely cut khaki'.⁵⁴² 'Their point of view was easy to understand' a Commandant told *the Daily Mirror*; something must be done because of 'growing whispers of dissension in the feminine ranks'.⁵⁴³ Eventually women were permitted to wear their own clothes when off duty, 'provided they have obtained permission from a superior officer'.⁵⁴⁴ The War Office refused to extend this to the ATS in England, though rules could be circumvented: 'In many cases an officer told the girl to get her uniform cleaned, and this gave her a chance to wear something a little more attractive to men'.⁵⁴⁵

Some women favoured fashions influenced by military uniforms: others dismissed this as affectation, preferring more obviously feminine clothing.⁵⁴⁶ In 1939 *The Western Morning News* was just one paper that noticed an early fashion for military styles for women:

On the whole, military activity has influenced women to adopt, in a decidedly modified form, the style and cut of uniform which the various women's National Service Organisations set.⁵⁴⁷

Lederer of Regent Street offered 'purses like Air Force forage caps, blue with a gold pip and gold RAF badge' (in fact, a brooch).⁵⁴⁸ In November 1939 the *Derbyshire Times* wrote: 'Hats go Military' to go with military-style coats; 'Nearly all have a little diamond regimental brooch perched in the front of the hat, or a Naval crown or

⁵⁴¹ Victor Stiebel, Bruton Street, London, 1939, SxMOA1/2/18/2.

⁵⁴² 'A.T.S. Girls Win Dresses Plea', *Daily Mirror*, 8.1.1940, p.10.

⁵⁴³ *Daily Mirror*, 8.1.1940, p.10.

⁵⁴⁴ *Daily Mirror*, 8.1.1940, p.10.

⁵⁴⁵ *Daily Mirror*, 8.1.1940, p.10.

⁵⁴⁶ Ann Seymour, *Woman and Beauty*, 5.12.1939, SxMOA1/2/18/2.

⁵⁴⁷ 'Fashions for Wartime', *The Western Morning News*, 29.9.1939, front page.

⁵⁴⁸ Lederer, Regent Street, London, 11.11.1939. SxMOA1/2/18/1/E.

Air Force wings outlined in platinum and brilliants' (fig.108).⁵⁴⁹ In 1939 a black velvet beret based on the Irish Rifles' traditional green caubeen was sketched at a London fashion show, illustrating a brooch replicating the Rifles' harp cap-badge and feather hackle (fig.109). In 1940 Mass Observations surveyed hat fashions in two London areas with different demographics, the West End and Notting Hill Gate and noted a trend for hats with military influences. When the survey was repeated in 1941, however, there was 'a total absence of military hats'. Observers concluded:

The reason for this must surely be that those women who went in for this type of hat earlier in the war have now been absorbed into the various women's services, and therefore are able to wear real military caps.⁵⁵⁰

The survey did however notice a fashion for hats embellished with 'V for Victory' brooches: 'formed from feathers or other 'appendages' fixed to the hat'. During an hour's observation in the West End, '13 such V-hats were seen'.⁵⁵¹ Some women wanted a change from constantly thinking about the war, preferring 'feminine clothes to please men on leave'.⁵⁵² But as the fashion designer Victor Stiebel pithily observed:

I definitely don't think there will be any of that glamour-girl waiting at home for the men to come home sort of thing – it's impossible to know when the men are coming home on leave anyway – you can't just wait about indefinitely in a chiffon nightdress.⁵⁵³

By 1941, however, 'Penelope Page' suggested in *The Gloucester Journal*:

More and more "masculine dress styles are falling into disfavour, and there is a big return to the distinctly "feminine".

[...] Certainly one notices a good deal of "war-time" wear in semi-uniform effects, but only on a restricted scale, and in special circumstances of war work, etc., but women in general are keeping to their own fashions.⁵⁵⁴

⁵⁴⁹ *Derbyshire Times*, 17.11.1939, p.2.

⁵⁵⁰ Survey of Ladies' Hat Fashions 1.8.1941. SxMOA1/2/18/5/E.

⁵⁵¹ Survey of Ladies' Hat Fashions 1.8.1941. SxMOA1/2/18/5/E.

⁵⁵² Jean Smith, Fashion Group, Chelsea, London, 29.11.1939. SxMOA1/2/18/2.

⁵⁵³ Victor Stiebel, London, 29.11.1939. SxMOA1/2/18/2.

⁵⁵⁴ Penelope Page, 'Wartime Wear', *Gloucester Journal*, 25.1.1941, p.15.

Newspapers and magazines agreed that ‘keeping up appearances’ in attractive clothes helped morale. Even if they did not wish to wear obviously military fashions, a piece of jewellery could make a more discreet statement. The unknown woman in fig.110 wears a Yorkshire regiment brooch on the lapel of her coat. Women who before the war always changed into formal evening dress for dinner no longer invariably did so but alternatives were suggested:

Although “dressing for dinner” is almost unheard of in war-time, many women like to get out of their work-a-day clothes in the evening. Some change into a neat blouse and skirt that can be worn with a little regimental badge brooch⁵⁵⁵

London retailers Mappin and Webb offered regimental brooches as desirable Christmas presents: ‘Badge jewellery is at the moment in demand. Set with fine diamonds in platinum and with enamelling they are correct in every detail. Many of them make beautiful hat brooches’.⁵⁵⁶ In 1940 *The Standard*, reporting on a race meeting at Newbury, featured a photograph of Mrs. Goode, ‘wife of the trainer’, wearing a valuable jewelled regimental brooch on her silk turban and drew attention to this fashionable adornment (fig.111).⁵⁵⁷ If her husband was a trainer possibly her brooch was not worn for him (though he may have been ex-military) but perhaps for a brother or other relative but it indicates regimental brooches were also fashion items.

It seems then, that as in WWI there was no real consensus about a single fashion style. Practical considerations, such as suitability for work and the ability to get quickly to air-raid shelters also dictated what could be worn and women adapted whatever clothing they could obtain in difficult wartime circumstances.⁵⁵⁸ But whatever advice fashion magazines gave their readers, they frequently proposed the addition of a sweetheart brooch as an attractive accessory. Carol Thomas’s recollections of her family circumstances in wartime London suggest for many there was very little surplus money for purchasing jewellery, yet she recalled that almost all the women she knew wore such a brooch.⁵⁵⁹ Regimental sweetheart brooches were ubiquitous during both World Wars and needed no interpretation to a population familiar with

⁵⁵⁵ ‘Lady Jane’, ‘Yesterday I Heard’, *Gloucester Journal*, 19.10.1940, p.15.

⁵⁵⁶ ‘Round the Shops’, *The Times*, 4.12.1939, p.2.

⁵⁵⁷ *The Standard*, 22.2.1940, p.9.

⁵⁵⁸ ‘Wear Siren Suits in the Air Raid Shelter’, *Aberdeen Press and Journal*, 29.8.1940, p.2.

⁵⁵⁹ Thomas, 30.3.2011.

uniforms of all kinds. They would once have been recognised and understood by all. They provide an interesting study of the way in which objects once valued and visible may fall from common knowledge as time and circumstances alter.

4.3 'Wartime is Wedding Time'

Jewellery is one of the most recognised methods by which societies throughout history have marked and communicated women's marital status.

Chief among the occasions upon which jewellery changes hands are marriages and births. [...] Indeed jewellery not only stands as a symbol of the special occasions it commemorates (its economic worth translated by the act of giving into transcendent value), but may actually represent those occasions by acting as a place for inscribing texts which literally act as mnemonics.⁵⁶⁰

Scholars have addressed societal rituals and codes surrounding bridal jewels in earlier cultures and the ways in which a woman's marriage jewellery was an eloquent sign system denoting her precise situation as bride, wife and mother, markers of availability, marriage and ownership.⁵⁶¹ Sumptuary laws in Renaissance Florence, for example, decreed that women might wear specific items of jewellery at their marriage and for three years afterwards, then a 'necklace alone and only one brooch for another three years, and after that it is entirely forbidden them the power to bear any of the above said things' delineating precisely her marital situation.⁵⁶² Adrian Randolph notes that the jewels she wore allowed the bride to be 'legible and her physical and legal transition unambiguously inscribed upon her body'.⁵⁶³ Acceptance of jewellery constituted acceptance of a marriage.⁵⁶⁴

⁵⁶⁰ Pointon, 'Intriguing Jewellery', pp.493-494.

⁵⁶¹ For example Adrian W. B. Randolph, 'Performing the Bridal Body in Fifteenth-Century Florence', *Art History*, 21,2, June 1998, pp.182-200.

⁵⁶² C. Mazzi, *Due provisioni suntuarie fiorentine [1472]*, quoted in Randolph, 'Performing the Bridal Body in Fifteenth-Century Florence', p.189.

⁵⁶³ Randolph, 'Performing the Bridal Body in Fifteenth-Century Florence', p.189.

⁵⁶⁴ Adrian Randolph, 'Unpacking Cassoni: Marriage, Ritual, Memory', in *The Triumph of Marriage: Painted Cassone of the Renaissance*, A. W. B. Randolph, J. M. Musacchio, A. Chong, Eds, (Boston: Gutenberg Periscope, 2008), pp.18-19.

Bridal jewels of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, however, have generally not been the subject of such detailed research. Wedding rings for men were largely revived by jewellers in the mid-twentieth century for commercial benefit and during WWII rings were commercially marketed as ‘manly objects’ to overcome social prejudice against ‘feminising’ jewellery. Advertisements linked images of the masculine, uniformed soldier with the family and way of life for which he was fighting, reflecting the premise of the WWI recruitment campaigns.⁵⁶⁵ During the circumstances of total war, in addition to conventional gifts of engagement and wedding rings, military sweetheart brooches became associated with marriage, extending concepts of identity and ownership from the purely personal to the husband’s wider occupation in a way that rings did not do. The Airlie brooch evidently functioned in this way and subsequent brooches worn as wedding jewels continued this rhetorical decoration of the bride. As I have suggested, suitable regimental mottos could also be re-interpreted as pledges of love and loyalty, acting as the textual mnemonics to which Pointon draws attention.

In his empirical studies of the exchange and circulation of gifts, Mauss articulated social ties and obligations initiated by gift-giving.⁵⁶⁶ As an anthropologist Mauss was not primarily concerned with issues of art history but his theories can usefully be applied to explain the reasons for the commission and circulation of art objects and the ways in which these became associated with those who gave and owned them. The central tenet of Mauss’s argument is that no such thing as a pure, disinterested gift exists, but that the first exchange initiated obligations to accept and reciprocate, setting up complex webs of alliance and carrying with it interpersonal, political and possibly religious connotations. For Mauss, the function of marriages (essentially the exchange of women between men) was to create allegiances between groups as part of a ‘general and inclusive contract’ that he calls ‘total prestation’.⁵⁶⁷ By this he means exchanges should be understood within the context of society in its entirety. Betrothal and marriage contracts involved complex rituals of gifts exchanged and reciprocated

⁵⁶⁵ Vicki Howard, ‘A “Real Man’s Ring”: Gender and the Invention of Tradition’, *Journal of Social History*, Vol.36, 4, 2003, pp.837-838. Wedding rings were worn by men until the first half of the 19th century, when most Englishmen gave up the custom. Diana Scarisbrick, *Rings, Jewelry of Power, Love and Loyalty* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2007), pp.100-101.

⁵⁶⁶ Mauss, *The Gift*, p.16.

⁵⁶⁷ Mauss, *The Gift*, pp.6-7,18.

between the couple themselves and their families. Understanding how gifts circulate illuminates societal rules and power structures. For Mauss, people and things are inextricably intermingled resulting in specific objects becoming inalienable, that is, precious because invested with family sentiment or memory. Regardless of their monetary value such artefacts, while they retain these precious associations, should not be sold or parted with since they retain within them the essence of the giver and the circumstances of the gift. Marriage was one such circumstance about which Mauss states: 'Presents put the seal upon marriage and form a link of kinship'.⁵⁶⁸

Like other bridal jewels, regimental badge brooches can be understood not only as personal adornments presented by the bridegroom to the bride but essentially as signifiers of his own status, wealth and rank, in the same way that Renaissance brides were marked by their marriage jewels as their husbands' possessions and visible displays of his honour. There could be no precisely reciprocal exchange of jewellery, since the groom already possessed the original badge on his uniform. The bride herself and her future children were the implicit exchange, as historically they had always been. While a wedding ring joined her to her husband and his family, the brooch positioned her within the wider network of his military career and colleagues.

Regimental brooches were not only given as wedding gifts but may also have been seen as stages in the usual formal courtship rituals of the early twentieth century. In the year from March 1915 a surge in marriages was recorded before soldiers, sailors and airmen left for active duty, with a further increase when conscription was introduced the following year.⁵⁶⁹ People no longer deluded themselves that the war would be over quickly and married while they still could though (or perhaps because) they knew they might not survive. Courtships were conducted hastily. In 1916 Peter Robinson wrote to his girlfriend Dorothy Harris:

there are so many things I wish to do before we go. Things are so different from peace-time when one can take one's time and not be importunate. I almost blush when I try to imagine what you think of me for turning up so often and being so bold. [...] I can assure you that in peace-time if I had seen you every day for a month it would still be a case of Miss Harris and Mr.

⁵⁶⁸ Mauss, *The Gift*, p.25.

⁵⁶⁹ Winter, *The Great War and the British People*, p.251.

Robinson and not for another six months would I have dared to give you even a 9-carat gold cap badge.⁵⁷⁰

Soldiers historically gave their girlfriends actual cap badges (though this was frowned upon by the authorities and eventually banned). But Robinson must have referred here to a gold sweetheart brooch he would have given Harris had there been time to wait, suggesting that this was not an unusual gift between couples and a recognised stage in courtship.

The custom of newspapers recording wedding gifts persisted until the 1970s and allows us to see in detail the gifts newly married couples received. While the monetary value of presents obviously varied according to families' means, these lists indicate very similar customs of gift-giving. Items given jointly to the couple typically consisted of practical items for their new home but gifts to the bride herself were frequently jewels, with regimental brooches featuring often as the groom's gift. In 1908 *The Times* reported a London society wedding at the Guards Chapel. A special reception was held the previous day for guests to admire the wedding presents (fig.112). The bride's many gifts of jewellery, including from the King, were valuable enough to be displayed in glass cases. The groom, Henry Streatfeild, gave his bride two brooches with the insignia of his regiment, the Grenadier Guards. At the other end of the economic spectrum, the *Middlesex Chronicle* reported the marriage in 1916 of Bandsman Harry Langford, a stretcher-bearer wounded at the battle of Loos, and Lilian Took, who nursed him in hospital in Epsom. Though much less wealthy than the Streatfeilds, they followed the same traditions: 'The happy couple were the recipients of handsome and useful presents' and the groom presented Middlesex Regimental brooches to all the bridesmaids.⁵⁷¹ Many other newspapers record gifts to the bridesmaids of regimental jewellery, usually simpler, less costly versions than the bride's. In Falkirk in 1923 Miss Forbes married Captain Alistair Richardson of the King's Dragoon Guards, one example of career soldiers (though generally not civilians or conscripted soldiers) continuing the tradition of gifting regimental brooches between the wars. The bride wore a diamond regimental brooch with her

⁵⁷⁰ Harry 'Peter' Robinson, 71st Siege Bty, South African Heavy Artillery, to Dorothy Harris, Letter 19.3.1916. NAM, Accession No.2013-01-1.

⁵⁷¹ 'Romantic War Wedding: A Wounded Warrior & His Nurse'. *Middlesex Chronicle*, 2.12.1916. p2.

antique lace dress and the groom gave each of her eight bridesmaids 'a crystal heart pendant with enamelled regimental badge'.⁵⁷²

Seated against a painted studio backdrop Rose Heller posed in her fashionable ankle-length, drop-waisted satin wedding dress for a formal portrait with her new husband, Frederick Fahie, following their marriage on 11 May 1918 (fig.113). Lance Corporal Fahie was categorised medically fit for 'Home Service Only', so served with the Royal Engineers Inland Water Transport (Poplar).⁵⁷³ Rose's bobbed hair and stylish shoes and dress show her awareness of contemporary fashions, moving from long, corseted Edwardian gowns towards the simpler styles of the 1920s. On the bodice of her dress she wears a brooch corresponding to her husband's badge, probably a gift from him. Records show Fahie was a draper's assistant before enlisting, so this brooch was unlikely to have been an expensive piece of jewellery.⁵⁷⁴ It represented not just the connection between the couple but the reason why they would be parted (though Fahie's poor health prevented an overseas posting, he was still posted away from home with his regiment). Nevertheless, like many brides, Rose chose to wear this brooch on her wedding dress. Like many others the couple had their photograph made into a postcard to send to friends and family with a hand-written message on the back (fig.114). My copy (found on eBay) may have been one of these but is not addressed or stamped, suggesting it was posted in an envelope. This photograph was not just an image but a physical object in itself: as Pollen observes: 'photographs – inscribed on the reverse as well as displaying an image on the front – may be seen as tangible and purposeful performances with work to do as well as images to show.'⁵⁷⁵ Fahie survived only a year after his marriage, dying in August 1919.⁵⁷⁶ Rose never remarried.⁵⁷⁷ This is a visual record of one wedding of many during the Great War

⁵⁷² "Marriages." *The Times*, 11.4.1923, p.15.

⁵⁷³ British Army Service Records, 1914-1920, URL:<https://www.ancestry.co.uk>[accessed 10.5.2017]. Royal Engineers Inland Water Transport kept transport and communications functioning in France and the UK.

⁵⁷⁴ British Army Service Records, 1914-1920, URL:<https://www.ancestry.co.uk>[accessed 10.5.2017].

⁵⁷⁵ Pollen, *Mass Photography*, p.13.

⁵⁷⁶ Fahie was discharged medically unfit 28.3.1919, possible cause of death was tuberculosis, though it is difficult to read. WWI Soldier's Documents, WO363, British Army Service Records, 1914-1920, URL:<https://www.ancestry.co.uk>[accessed 10.5.2017].

⁵⁷⁷ Rose Fahie, URL:https://www.ancestry.co.uk/interactive/7579/ons_d19671az-0319?pid=38287687&backurl=http://search.ancestry[accessed 10.5.2017].

that are now only recorded in such images and official documentation, the groom in uniform and the bride wearing her sweetheart brooch, confirmation that they were popular jewellery for weddings and possibly almost the only tangible evidence for Rose of her short marriage.

Between the wars military brides continued the fashion for wearing regimental brooches on their wedding dresses. In 1920, for example, Joan Davies married a well-known WWI 'flying ace', Flying Officer Southey, in London. The groom wore his uniform with its Royal Flying Corps badge; the bride's corresponding sweetheart brooch can be seen on the neckline of her dress (figs.115, 116). This detail clearly shows that brooches were identical in form to the badges they replicated but smaller in scale so there was no possibility of confusion with the original. It also indicates visually that the bride is now positioned within his world, not the reverse. Like clothing, jewellery serves to signify inclusivity or exclusivity within society. A military uniform is the ultimate sign, excluding others from the group that wears it; indeed its original purpose was to define the 'other' as the enemy. The gift of a regimental brooch represents a kind of honorary membership of the group, bestowed on the woman who wears it as part of the wedding ornamentation that defines her as a bride.

During WWII, when wedding dresses were often difficult to come by jewellery, which was not rationed, provided embellishment to ordinary clothing. Hurried wartime marriages might not allow time to organise a traditional wedding and women often wore a suit or their best day dress. In April 1940 the *Lincolnshire Echo* noted: 'Wartime, it would seem, is wedding time, for marriage statistics show that the figures for the past six months are well up on the preceding year and the graph is mounting steadily.'⁵⁷⁸

Brides today cannot always choose their time, as their peace-time predecessors could, the wedding must often be fitted in with the hurried and sometimes unexpected leave of the bridegroom, and we are getting hundreds of rushed, impromptu weddings which, if truth be told, when looked back on after years, will be rather a matter of regret to the brides.⁵⁷⁹

⁵⁷⁸ 'Wedding Bells at Whitsun: This Year's Fashions for Brides', *Lincolnshire Echo*, 19.4.1940, p.3.

⁵⁷⁹ 'Wedding Bells at Whitsun', *Lincolnshire Echo*.

However, the writer advised on planning. Whenever possible women would prefer a traditional white wedding dress, ‘Despite the fact that suit weddings are the usual thing for hurried functions only the wealthy can afford a dress which is to be a wedding dress only’ so most would ask a dressmaker to create something that could be worn afterwards.⁵⁸⁰ In London in 1940 girls told Mass Observation that a pink wedding dress would be a good choice because: ‘it could be worn afterwards. If she had a white one everyone would know she was wearing her bride’s dress’.⁵⁸¹ Enlisted women, like servicemen, were expected to wear their uniforms on their wedding day but some rebelled against this unpopular ruling. Odette Bullock was due to leave for France with the ATS in February 1940 and was granted forty-eight hours compassionate leave for her wedding. She was determined to marry in white because, she complained, she had worn her uniform every day since joining up a year earlier.⁵⁸² The rule was waived to allow her to wear a traditional dress. Rationing meant that often women could not get enough fabric or sufficient coupons for a special dress so brides in America donated their own wedding dresses to a ‘pool’ of clothes to be lent to brides from the women’s forces and to nurses.⁵⁸³

But even if the perfect dress was unobtainable and compromises had to be made, the fashionable wedding could be themed around the groom’s uniform instead. Bridal bouquets could be tied with ribbons in the regimental colours, for example.⁵⁸⁴ *The Lincolnshire Echo* suggested:

The wartime bride should be particular in her choice of accessories [...] This year it often takes the form of a brooch incorporating his regimental badge. Most of these regimental badge brooches are very handsome and anyone would be very proud to wear one. If possible his regimental colours should be introduced somewhere.⁵⁸⁵

⁵⁸⁰ ‘Wedding Bells at Whitsun’, *Lincolnshire Echo*.

⁵⁸¹ Interview, Petticoat Lane, 1940, SxMoA1/2/18/1/E.

⁵⁸² *The Daily Mirror*, 14.2.1940, p.5.

⁵⁸³ Mrs John Whitehouse, President of the American Federation of Women’s Clubs, arranged for women such as Eleanor Roosevelt to donate wedding dresses, which were identified with a small gold label and loaned to as many brides as possible. WW2 Peoples’ War, Article ID A2795097, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/stories/97/a2795097.shtml>

⁵⁸⁴ ‘Double Wedding in Scarborough’, *Leeds Mercury*, 18.10.1929, p.3.

⁵⁸⁵ ‘Wedding Bells at Whitsun.

In August 1940 a bride was described as wearing a regimental brooch set on mother-of-pearl on her mustard coloured coat.⁵⁸⁶ When Barbara Wyers married her RAF fiancé in January that year, *The Daily Herald* announced she was setting a new fashion with the regimental badge brooch she wore on the lapel of her suit and printed her picture with a detail of the brooch and the watch she had attached to it with a ribbon (fig.117).⁵⁸⁷ In fact, the idea was far from new, as this study has shown: for military brides the custom had never really gone away following the 1914-18 war, and by November 1939 was clearly re-established, as *The Liverpool Daily Post* announced:

War-time brides like their mothers during the last war, are choosing jewelled regimental brooches as wedding gifts from their soldier husbands. Lady Anne Walpole, who is to be married on Saturday to Major Eric Palmer, will wear on the corsage of her wedding dress the badge of the Duke of Lancaster's Own Yeomanry.⁵⁸⁸

A photograph in *The Sketch* showed Palmer in military uniform and the bride's regimental brooch pinned to the bodice of her satin dress (fig.118). The Duke of Lancaster's Own Yeomanry badge consists of a red Tudor rose surrounded by a wreath of gold leaves and surmounted by a crown. The bridesmaids' photographs were published in *The Tatler* but it is not possible to tell from the black-and-white images whether Walpole co-ordinated the colours of her wedding with the regimental colours.⁵⁸⁹

Written accounts described sweetheart brooches worn in different configurations. In 1941 one bride wore her diamond brooch on the heart-shaped neckline of her cream satin wedding dress while in 1944 another gathered her veil with her diamond and ruby brooch (an idea also mentioned in 1920).⁵⁹⁰

In the Second World War, as in the First, some couples felt they could not afford to have protracted engagements as they once did and rushed to marry while they could. Mary Fedden was careful not to become attached to any of her boyfriends: It was

⁵⁸⁶ *Bedfordshire Times and Independent*, 9.8.1940, p.2.

⁵⁸⁷ 'Bride's R.A.F. Fashion', *Daily Herald*, 26.1.1940, p.5.

⁵⁸⁸ 'Regimental Brooch', *Liverpool Daily Post*, 21.11.1939, p.6.

⁵⁸⁹ 'A Norfolk Wedding', *The Tatler*, 6.12.1939, p.338.

⁵⁹⁰ 'Child's Century-Old Dress', *Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer*, 7.4.1941, p.5.

much easier that way, I think, because you kept on losing people [...] it would have been a series of miseries', but she remembered how 'you had that feeling when you were talking to someone that they might be killed tonight, and it might be the last time you'd see them [...] and became passionately fond of them in a short time'.⁵⁹¹

Because of this, wartime uncertainties meant traditional courting timescales fell away:

'Hurried marriages, friends getting suddenly engaged, boys and girls trying desperately for a good time in the argument that "next week may be too late ...".⁵⁹²

Badge brooches may have conveyed commitment in the same way as an engagement ring, as a long-running fiction serial 'War Comes to Alys', published over several years in *The Sunday Post* suggested. In one episode the eponymous Alys has travelled to Alexandria to meet her lover, Michael, whom she considers to be her fiancé because: 'She was wearing Michael's diamond regimental brooch, but no ring. He had written he was sending her the brooch instead of a ring'.⁵⁹³

Outside of wartime, brooches remained traditional gifts at military weddings. At their marriage on 19th November 1973, for instance, Captain Mark Philips gave Princess Anne a wedding present of a brooch set with diamonds and rubies representing the double headed eagle of Emperor Franz Josef I of Austria, the insignia of the Queen's Dragoon Guards', the regiment in which he then served. Mauss defined objects that incorporated family histories and meanings as inalienable objects, not to be parted with so long as that significance remained. When the marriage ended in divorce, however, this brooch ceased to be an inalienable object in Maussian terms. When visiting regiments for which she holds honorary commissions Princess Anne wears regimental brooches with the appropriate insignia but she no longer wears this particular jewel. It is on display as part of the Royal Collection at St. James's Palace, but it no longer expresses the marriage it was once given to celebrate.⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁹¹ Fedden, Mary, 'Work Suspended', in *What did you do in the war, Mummy?*, Nicholson, ed., p.56-57.

⁵⁹² RAF interviewee, SxMOAFR64.US9, 29.3.1940.

⁵⁹³ Maysie Greig, 'War Comes to Alys', *Sunday Post, Dundee*, 19.10.1941, p.13.

⁵⁹⁴ Royal Collection, URL:<https://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/2014665/a-gift-from-bridegroom-to-bride>.

I have focused here on sweetheart brooches given in the context of marriage. They also functioned to display individual identity and status, the subject of the following section.

4.4 Self-Fashioning: Sweetheart Brooches as Identity in Wartime

In a military sense, a decoration is defined as an emblem conferred and worn as an honour. Decorative jewellery would be defined differently, as personal adornment. Military badge brooches are hybrid objects, part insignia, part ornament. They are unusual jewels since they are worn to recognise another's occupation or achievements and differ from other jewellery that is generally chosen because its appearance complements a woman's own style or clothing, or because it is currently fashionable. It would be considered unacceptable for civilians to wear a military uniform to which he or she was not entitled: in fact, so many men attempted to acquire medals or badges to which they were not entitled, to pretend they had enlisted or to obtain financial benefits, that it was necessary to legislate against wearing or supplying 'naval or military decorations by unauthorised personnel'.⁵⁹⁵ Courts imposed harsh penalties. In 1918, a deserter from The King's Yorkshire Light Infantry, charged with wearing a Royal Engineers' uniform with a wound stripe to obtain by false pretences 'two cups of tea and four slices of bread and butter' was sentenced to twelve months' hard labour.⁵⁹⁶ Army regulations still state that criminal proceedings will be taken against anyone seeking to benefit from 'wearing any order, decoration, medal, ribbon or emblem awarded to another'.⁵⁹⁷

But this did not apply to women's replica brooches, which were made smaller than the originals and thus could not be mistaken for them. Instead, women acquired with the jewels something of an honorary position within the military unit which the emblems represented. For instance, on 23rd April 1942, Ellen Taylor was given compassionate leave from her job to travel from her home in Nottingham to Portsmouth to meet her

⁵⁹⁵ 'The Craze for Soldiers' Badges', *Yorkshire Evening Post*, 26.4.1917, p.3.

⁵⁹⁶ 'A Deserter's Fraud', *North-Eastern Daily Gazette*, 3.7.1918.

⁵⁹⁷ Army Dress Regulations (All Ranks), Part 13, Ministry of Defence, PS12(A), January 2012. Section 2, 13.05.

husband, whom she had not seen since their wedding three months earlier. They planned several days' together while HMS Sidmouth, the minesweeper on which he served, was refitted but on the first night, news of the fall of Singapore caused all leave to be cancelled and he was recalled to his ship. Interviewed by the BBC in 2004, Taylor recounted how the following morning, unnerved by heavy overnight air-raids on the harbour where she was lodging and unable to see her husband, she had to make the long, difficult journey back to Nottingham alone. She remembered how the sweetheart brooch she wore on her coat identified her to a stranger as a navy wife:

In London I had to change trains. I tried to put sixpence into a slot machine to buy a bar of chocolate. The money kept falling out of my trembling hands. A sailor noticed the Navy brooch on my coat. He helped me and took me to the Nottingham train.⁵⁹⁸

As Pointon observes, jewellery attracts attention and having done so conveys a message to the beholder: 'It is thus that an object materially and aesthetically constructed is bound up with non-verbal exchange'.⁵⁹⁹ Jewellers understood the way in which jewellery could catch and hold the viewer's interest and convey social significance: 'It is on the jewel that the eye is wont at first to rest; it is the jewel which catches the eye most rapidly during motion. The jewel is, in a certain sense and measure, a kind of badge and honorary distinction'.⁶⁰⁰

The sailor who assisted Taylor interpreted the information her brooch conveyed. Seeing her obvious distress he might, of course, have helped her anyway but she specifically mentions the brooch, suggesting it was this that drew his attention and implying they discussed it at the time. Taylor's anecdote confirms that the inclusivity and camaraderie between those wearing the uniform of a unit was extended to civilians who were immediately recognisable as comrades' families by their military brooches; because of this they too were identified as belonging within the group.

⁵⁹⁸ Ellen Taylor, 9.4.2004. WW2 People's War.
URL:<http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/stories/16/a2507816.shtml>[accessed 5.7.2014].

⁵⁹⁹ Pointon, *Brilliant Effects*, p.4.

⁶⁰⁰ *The Jewellers, Goldsmiths and Watchmakers' Monthly Magazine*, IV, 1862, pp.60-61. Quoted in Pointon, *Brilliant Effects*, p.4.

4.5 Rings and Wings: Sweetheart Brooches and Status

While jewellery for men (other than discreet pieces such as tiepins and cufflinks) had largely fallen from favour in western culture by the beginning of the twentieth century, spectacular jewels have always played an essential part in creating and maintaining the peacocking pageantry of royal occasions, political ceremonial and military parades. Clothing, medals and decorations identify royalty, rank, seniority and history. As Jones and Stallybrass point out, people acquire identity through the putting on of specific garments or adornments:

For it was investiture, the putting on of clothes, that quite literally constituted a person as a monarch or a freeman of a guild or a household servant. Investiture was, in other words, the means by which a person was given a form, a shape, a social function, a “depth”.⁶⁰¹

The crown and accoutrements, clothing, even colours operated within sumptuary laws to signal authority regardless of the individual who wore them. Military uniforms place the wearer precisely within a power structure, enabling rank, rather than the individual, to be recognised and thus hierarchies to function. But specialist badges and medals provide, as Richard Marshall points out, ‘a counter-stimulus towards individuation’.⁶⁰² Badge brooches characterised by sparkling diamonds and costly gemstones conveyed obvious narratives of wealth and power disparity but there is evidence that for women in wartime, affluence was not invariably the most important consideration. Arguably, perceptions of class within civilian society may have been temporarily somewhat blurred but within the Army, Navy and Air Force, serving personnel’s families were (and largely still are) linked to their rank.⁶⁰³ One correspondent stated that regimental badge brooches were sometimes replaced to correspond to promotions, since some insignia also denoted rank. David Dickens

⁶⁰¹ Jones, Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing*, p.2.

⁶⁰² Richard Marshall, ‘Stigmata: Military Insignia and the Recognition of Wounded Combatants during the Great War’, WWI Centenary, URL:<http://www1centenary.oucs.ox.ac.uk/?p=2446>[accessed 30.1.2017].

⁶⁰³ This system largely continues to the present, with housing allocations, separate mess arrangements for officers and many other differences according to rank.

(previously of the Queen's Royal (West Surrey) regiment) provided photographs (fig.119) of two regimental brooches belonging to his late wife, Teresa, explaining:

The one with 'lamb on star' is a Queen's Surreys one which I gave her as a wedding present in Jan 67. The other one relates to the large Queen's Regiment which actually came into being in 1966 and I gave that to her I think in about 1978 when I was about to be promoted to command 1st Battalion Queens and couldn't have the COs wife wearing the wrong badge!⁶⁰⁴

Dickens' brooches were made to his own specification by Garrards and he confirmed: 'It was traditional for officers' wives to wear their regimental brooch at any regimental function and some pretty well wore them all the time'.⁶⁰⁵

Wealth, however, was not necessarily the highest criterion for desirability in a potential boyfriend. As the WAAF quoted by Langhamer observed in 1942, high rank was considered more important than good looks or money.⁶⁰⁶ Her comments suggest power dynamics at work not so much between the couple (the woman quoted has little real respect for the officer she describes) as between one who could attract a high-ranking boyfriend over her friends who had to make do with one of lesser status. The Wing Commander's 'rings and wings' the WAAF aspired to gave a woman equivalent acquired standing when she was out socially with him, while the gift of a Commander's or pilot's wing brooch allowed her to maintain this status whenever she wore it.

Each member of an RAF aircrew had his own operational expertise (there were women pilots who delivered planes between airfields but none flew in operational combat at this date) without which the complete unit could not function. Each occupied a place within a clearly defined hierarchy, with the pilot in the senior position.⁶⁰⁷ On the uniforms of the members of a 1944 Lancaster bomber crew (fig.120) are badges distinguishing each speciality. The pilot, Owen Cook, is identified by his double-winged badge; following the usual custom the aircrew was

⁶⁰⁴ David Dickens, Managing Trustee, Surrey Infantry Museum. Personal communication, emails, 17.7.2014.

⁶⁰⁵ Dickens. Personal communication, 22.7.2014.

⁶⁰⁶ Langhamer, *The English in Love*, pp.63-64.

⁶⁰⁷ Pilots could hold various rankings but always commanded the crew.

known by his name.⁶⁰⁸ RAF badge brooches were made to replicate each individual specialism, such as Navigators and Air Gunners (a particularly hazardous occupation) but the kudos afforded by a pilot's brooch would have been especially desirable (figs. 121, 122, 123).

4.6 Medals and Brooches

A further feature enhancing the desirability of individual brooches would have been the fame attached to individuals known for notable feats of bravery, as Guy Gibson's brooch illustrated. As far could be ascertained, very few brooches were ever made in the form of medals awarded for bravery, because it would be deemed inappropriate wear for anyone other than the recipient.⁶⁰⁹ Jewellers were warned it was an offence to supply copies of medals to 'any person other than those to whom such decorations or medals have actually been awarded': they must satisfy themselves that the order was 'bona fide'.⁶¹⁰ However two, both in museum collections, are described here.

In 1915, a correspondent to *The Times* called for a special exception. 'An Anglo-Saxon' drew attention to the many men awarded medals:

... who have died gloriously or fallen mortally wounded in the act of winning them, and who consequently never lived to wear the decorations they had won. In such instances only is it for consideration whether – with a view to doing honour to the memory of the dead hero – his mother might not be permitted to wear (as a brooch or otherwise) the decoration or medal thus posthumously awarded to the gallant son she had given to her country.⁶¹¹

The writer insists the suggestion refers only to mothers and to posthumous awards, equating soldiers' sacrifice of their lives in battle with their mothers' sacrifice of their sons. His argument that these women be allowed to wear the medal brooches to

⁶⁰⁸ If, as frequently happened, the pilot was lost the crew would be renamed after his replacement.

⁶⁰⁹ It is generally accepted that widows/widowers and children of deceased service personnel may wear their relatives' original badges and medals, though only for certain occasions such as funerals and commemoration parades.

⁶¹⁰ 'The Craze for Soldiers' Badges', 1917.

⁶¹¹ 'An Anglo-Saxon', 'Mothers of Heroes', *The Times*, 13.7.1915, p.7.

honour 'the memory of the dead hero' conflates the women's bodies with those of the dead soldiers.

Whether this suggestion was officially adopted is not recorded but there is one such brooch in the Royal Green Jackets Museum in Winchester. Two weeks after the letter was written, on 30 July 1915, Second Lieutenant Sidney Clayton Woodroffe was killed at Hooze near Ypres aged only 19, commanding an inexperienced platoon of the Rifle Brigade. He was posthumously awarded the Victoria Cross for conspicuous bravery.⁶¹²

The Victoria Cross is Britain's highest award for bravery in battle, created at the instigation of Thomas Scobell, a Liberal MP and ex-naval Captain. Following the Crimean War, Scobell proposed a new award 'to be bestowed on the army and navy for personal merit, to which every grade might be admissible'.⁶¹³ Previously the Order of the Bath was the highest award, given only to senior officers. Rank-and-file soldiers only received a general campaign medal, regardless of individual actions. Queen Victoria and Prince Albert took personal interest in the medal, approving its design in discussions with Lord Panmure, Secretary of State for War. Victoria insisted the text should read 'For Valour', not 'For the Brave' as the first proposal suggested, lest this implied not all her troops were courageous.⁶¹⁴ On 5th February 1856 *The Gazette* published the Royal Warrant's terms. The award was:

to place all persons on a perfectly equal footing in relation to eligibility for the Decoration, that neither rank nor long service, nor wounds, nor any other circumstance or condition whatsoever, save the merit of conspicuous bravery, shall be held to establish a sufficient claim to the honour.⁶¹⁵

⁶¹² Woodroffe has no known grave. URL: <https://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=8043268&ref=acom> [accessed 7.10.2016]. He is recorded on the Menin Gate Memorial and on a memorial unveiled in 1915 in his home town of Lewes.

⁶¹³ Captain Scobell, 'Order of Merit for the Army and Navy', 'Last Night's Proceedings in Parliament', *The Belfast Daily Mercury*, 20.12.1854.

⁶¹⁴ Victoria Cross instituted: URL: <http://www.victoriacross.org.uk/aahistor.htm> [accessed 2.1.2017].

⁶¹⁵ Panmure, The War Department, 'The New Order of Valour', *The Globe*, 5.2.1856. Since its introduction in 1856, 1358 medals have been conferred on 1355 individuals.

Like every Victoria Cross Woodroffe's medal is a simple bronze Maltese Cross with a royal crest in the centre. It was originally believed that Victoria Crosses were cast from Russian canon captured at Sevastopol, which would have defined the medals as trench art objects.⁶¹⁶ Victoria stated: 'We are desirous [they] should be highly prized and eagerly sought after by the officers and men'.⁶¹⁷ They were deliberately intended to be plain, masculine objects, of no monetary value but esteemed only for what they symbolised.

Woodroffe was the youngest of four brothers: seven weeks earlier, on 9th May, his brother Kenneth had died in action at Neuve Chapelle and another brother, Leslie, would be killed at Hooze in June 1916. Sidney Woodroffe's VC was presented to his parents by George V at a private investiture at Buckingham Palace on 29th November 1916.⁶¹⁸ Henry and Clara Woodroffe thus lost three of their four sons to the war in just over a year and as the regimental record states, their grief must have been 'too awful to contemplate'.⁶¹⁹ There is no record of who commissioned Mrs. Woodroffe's miniature Victoria Cross brooch, but it seems likely it was the gift of her husband and must have been worn by her in memory of their son and in mourning for him.

But though the Woodroffe brooch is immediately recognisable as a Victoria Cross, it could never have been mistaken for its referent. In appearance it is its binary opposite (figs.124, 125). The brooch is a little over half the size of the medal, delicate and made of gold, enamels and diamonds. On the reverse, known only to Woodroffe's mother and close to her body when she wore the brooch, are engraved her son's initials, 'SCW', and the date of his death. It is a jewel of commemoration and mourning, its skilful miniaturisation and the value of its materials perhaps representing for her something of what she had lost.⁶²⁰

⁶¹⁶ Chinese guns from Woolwich Barracks, unlikely to have been in the Crimea were used. The metal proved unsuitable for die-stamping so the medals were cast. www.victoriacross.org.uk[accessed 2.1.2017].

⁶¹⁷ 'The New Order of Valour', *The Globe*, 5.2.1856.

⁶¹⁸ Lt. Gen. Sir Christopher Wallace, Major Ron Cassidy, *Focus on Courage: The 59 Victoria Crosses of the Royal Green Jackets* (Hampshire: RGJ Museum Trust, 2006), p.189.

⁶¹⁹ Wallace, Cassidy, *Focus on Courage*, p.112.

⁶²⁰ It was kept until its recent donation to the museum by a descendent.

The second medal brooch also replicates a Victoria Cross and is in the small collection of brooches in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich. In 1919, Lieutenant Augustus Agar was awarded the Victoria Cross and Distinguished Service Order for commanding raids on the Bolshevik Baltic Fleet in Kronstadt Harbour, a Russian naval base in the Gulf of Finland, during British interventions in the Russian Civil War. Much later it was revealed that the raids were attempts to extract a British intelligence agent from Russian interrogators; therefore the reason for Agar's award was never publicised and it was known as the 'mystery VC' (fig.126).⁶²¹ National secrecy may be one reason why Agar did not commission the copy until some 35 years later, after his retirement from the navy. It was made for his second wife Ina and is of white gold embellished with diamonds (fig.127).

The reasons for the gift of this brooch can only be speculation but other than the suggestion of a brooch for the bereaved mentioned above, it is difficult to conceive of circumstances in which a replica Victoria Cross would have been thought an appropriate jewel for someone to wear who has not earned the medal in their own right. The brooch made for Sidney Woodroffe's mother falls within the criteria suggested by *The Times* letter-writer: she wore her brooch because her son could not wear the posthumous medal he had earned. It is more difficult to speculate about the reasons for Agar's gift since he survived; possibly it was worn as a status symbol, as some other military brooches were. However, wearing even a replica medal to which one was not entitled was officially considered inappropriate; Agar himself would only have worn his own VC on certain formal occasions.

On 29th June 2016 Gareth Johnson MP sponsored the 'Awards for Valour (Protection) Bill' through the House of Commons. Echoing parliamentary legislation of 1917, this sought 'to prohibit the wearing or public display, by a person not entitled to do so, of medals or insignia awarded for valour, with the intent to deceive'.⁶²² The Defence Committee stated: 'Deceitful wearing of medals insults rightful recipients and damages the integrity of the honours system' and that imposters who impersonated

⁶²¹ Harry Ferguson, *Operation Kronstadt* (London : Hutchinson, 2008).

⁶²² The Bill passed its third reading in February 2017. It was considered likely to progress but is currently in abeyance. URL:<http://services.parliament.uk/bills/2016-17/awardsforvalourprotection.html>[accessed 7.6.2017].

veterans for financial gain must be deterred.⁶²³ It seems likely that this is the reason why so few brooches were ever made in the form of medals.

4.7 Lady Congreve's Brooch

Chapter 1 noted the award of a military-style brooch to Florence Nightingale in recognition of her achievements in the Crimea. The only known regimental brooch awarded to a woman for bravery under fire is in the Royal Green Jackets' Museum in Winchester. The museum holds the records of the Congreve family, of whom General Sir Walter Congreve and his eldest son, Brevet Major William Congreve, both of the Rifle Brigade, were the only father and son of one regiment both awarded the VC. Sir Walter's wife, Lady Cecilia, volunteered as a nurse on the Western Front and was awarded the Croix de Guerre for her bravery in caring for her patients when the field hospital in which she was working came under shellfire in 1918.⁶²⁴ In recognition of her courage, Prince Arthur, Duke of Connaught, Colonel-in-Chief of the regiment, presented Lady Congreve with an RGJ Rifle Brigade brooch, now displayed in the museum. This is a singular award because Cecilia Congreve was not, of course, herself enrolled in the Royal Green Jackets but was the wife and mother of members of the regiment. The brooch enrolled her in a kind of honorary membership not available to women at the time, in recognition in her own right of her war work and including her within the regiment in a way that, as I have sought to show, was often a function of these jewels.

4.8 'Hope it will Bring you Luck': Sweetheart Brooches as Amulets and Talismans

In 1915 *The Devon and Exeter Gazette* reported: 'Many a soldier has left England for active service wearing a "charm" given him by some dear relative or friend with the hope that it may protect him from danger on the battlefield'.⁶²⁵ The *Gazette* was

⁶²³ Maev Kennedy, 'MPs Call for 'Walter Mitty' Law to Prosecute Fake Military Heroes', *The Guardian*, 22.11.2016. www.theguardian.com/politics [accessed 23.11.2016].

⁶²⁴ Royal Green Jackets Museum, Winchester.

⁶²⁵ 'W.G.W.W.', 'Amulets and Charms: Battlefield Insurance', *The Devon and Exeter Gazette*, 8.2.1915, p.8.

unsurprised that ‘amid all the enlightenment of the twentieth century’ amulets were frequently found on soldiers’ bodies, pointing out: ‘Charms played a prominent part in the British soldiers’ lives, during the South African war, as they are doing today’. In his analysis of art and conflict, Gell observed: ‘Wherever one finds conflict there one finds abundant deployment of all kinds of decorative art. Much of this art is of the variety known as ‘apotropaic’.⁶²⁶ Sweetheart brooches often amalgamated traditional good luck symbols and regimental insignia to create objects that might give reassurance in dangerous times when personal agency was virtually non-existent; brooches were also offered for sale together with a good-luck charm for the soldier or sailor to carry. This section considers several brooches and closely related objects sold with them that would, it was hoped, bring good luck both to fighting forces and their families at home and demonstrates that the brooches themselves were worn as amulets.

Good luck tokens favoured by military personnel were sometimes considered to be contrary to religious beliefs and therefore disapproved of. In 1915 *The Lincolnshire Chronicle* fulminated against ‘the prevalence of all classes of a belief in the power of amulets, mascots, charms, and talismans, to protect their owners or wearers from evil’ indicating, the newspaper suggested, ‘a return to medieval superstition’.⁶²⁷ In August 1915 ‘A Soldier’s Mother’ wrote an angry letter to *The London Standard* regarding soldiers who carried ‘idolatrous’ amulets into battle.⁶²⁸ The following day a correspondent, David Ockham, wrote a response in *The Globe* to the ‘vehement protest against the use of mascots by soldiers which the writer stigmatized as absurd and heathen nonsense’.⁶²⁹ Ockham suggested that ‘behind the amulet, as behind so many superstitious beliefs, there lies a profound scientific truth which is nothing more or less than that of the tremendous power of auto-suggestion’:

Suppose a soldier [...] is presented with a mascot before going into the trenches, and that he really does believe, even in a half-hearted and possibly shame-faced fashion, that it will in some way ward off a bullet or a shell. He may be neither the better nor the worse fighter on that account, but I fancy that an imagined security may help to give him somewhat greater ease of mind.

⁶²⁶ Gell, ‘*Art and Agency*’, p.83.

⁶²⁷ ‘Modern Idolatry’, *Lincolnshire Chronicle*, 4.9.1915, p.11.

⁶²⁸ ‘A Soldier’s Mother’, *London Standard*, 24.8.1915, p.5.

⁶²⁹ David Ockham, ‘Mascots, Amulets and the “Mons Angels”’, *The Globe*, 25.8.1915, n.p.

Among British troops, unprecedented sales indicated ‘quite a craze’ for ‘touchwood’ charms, any piece of wood that could be carried about the person and touched for luck.⁶³⁰ There was no consensus about the origin of this superstition but *The Lincolnshire Chronicle* suggested it lay in Eastern ‘veneration of relics of the Holy Cross’. London jewellers H. Brandon & Co., offered *Daily Mail* readers a free ‘Lucky Touchwood Charm’ made from ‘sacred oak’ with silver or gold additions with every regimental sweetheart brooch purchased (fig.128), claiming these ‘lucky talismans’ were:

thousands of years old; in fact nobody knows how old they are, right back in the beginning of things they were used and believed in as bringers of Good Luck, Happiness and Prosperity, guarding the wearer against ill-luck and misfortune.⁶³¹

The sweetheart brooch would have been a gift for a woman but the touchwood charm would probably have been carried by the soldier, sailor or airman, creating a link between the separated couple.

A popular author, Edwin Radford, also refuted ‘A Soldier’s Mother’s’ suggestions in *The Bury Free Press*:

They tell me that a whole battalion of men went to the front, each man with Touchwood about him. And why not? [...] I would not give sixpence for Touchwood, nor for any neck charm or amulet. I should duck to the bullet though I had a baker’s dozen of amulets about me. But I know the taint of old idolotries [sic] is in my blood, and in the blood of us all. Neither orthodox faith nor pure science has made sure of us.⁶³²

Ockham and Radford both understood that such amulets were worn in hopes that charms would mediate for their owner in times of extreme danger. Radford observed, ‘they are mascots to help a man in the fight [...] the human nature in us turns to

⁶³⁰ ‘Modern Idolatry’.

⁶³¹ H. Brandon & Co., *Daily Mirror*, 8.5.1915, p.12.

⁶³² Edwin Radford, ‘Mascots or Idols’, *The Bury Free Press*, 6.10.1917, p.3. Radford (1891-1973) wrote a series of murder mysteries and later a book on superstitions, charms and spells: E. Radford, M. A. Radford, Editors, *The Encyclopedia of Superstitions* (London: Rider, 1948).

them'.⁶³³ Robert Graves was a sceptic but remembered how in 1915, at Fricourt on the Somme, he was told by his adjutant that there had been 'about five hundred casualties in the ranks since Loos, and not a single officer'. Graves recalled:

Then he suddenly realised that his words were unlucky. Everybody jumped to touch wood but it was a French trench and unrevetted. I pulled a pencil out of my pocket; that was wood enough for me.⁶³⁴

'Touchwood' was also incorporated into a popular mascot known as 'Fumsup'. J. C. Vickery of Regent Street, London, maker of regimental brooches, advertised 'Fumsup' charms to send 'To Your Friend on Active Service' and gold and pearl lucky heather brooches 'For Parting Souvenirs' (fig. 129).⁶³⁵ 'Fumsup' was a mascot doll with a gold, silver or khaki cloth body and a wooden head. Small enough to be secreted in a uniform pocket, its wooden head could be touched for luck and its articulated arms made the universal 'thumbs up' sign signifying approval, or good fortune, thus combining two superstitions. Vickery offered a gold or silver identification bracelet with an oval plaque on which could be engraved the owner's name, regiment and religion to ensure his body would be buried with the correct rites, a more pragmatic view than the hopeful charms might suggest.

Vickery advertised in *The Graphic*, a weekly newspaper of influence in the art world, founded by William Luson Thomas, an artist and social reformer. It rivalled *The Illustrated London News*, perceived by Thomas to be unsympathetic to artists and writers of the day and featured editorials covering the arts, literature and science by leading writers and illustrations on heavy paper by well-known artists.⁶³⁶ *The Graphic's* advertisements would have been aimed at those who could afford to buy such a publication which, at sixpence, was more expensive than its rival and beyond the reach of many, suggesting it would have been bought by officers. This seems to confirm *The Lincolnshire Chronicle's* views that belief in amulets and talismans crossed all classes.

⁶³³ Radford, 'Mascots or Idols'.

⁶³⁴ Robert Graves, *Goodbye to All That* (London: Cassell, 1958), p.172.

⁶³⁵ *The Graphic*, 17.6.1916, p.810.

⁶³⁶ Writers and artists for *The Graphic* (published 1869-1932) included Thomas Hardy, Anthony Trollope, Beatrice Grimshaw, Helen Allingham and Frank Brangwyn.

One prolific amateur collector of talismanic and amuletic objects was Edward Lovett (1852-1933). Lovett wrote, lectured and corresponded with fellow collectors and curators, including those at the Wellcome and Pitt Rivers Museums. In a lecture at the Horniman Museum in December 1916 entitled ‘The Influence of War on Superstition’ he stated: ‘nearly every man now fighting carried a mascot, usually beneath the clothing’, which he felt illustrated how superficial the veneer of modern sophistication really was when faced with the unknown.⁶³⁷ Just after the Great War, Lovett published a book, *Magic in Modern London*, in which he described numerous amulets carried by soldiers and officers, often stitched into uniforms without their knowledge by wives or mothers.⁶³⁸ These included coins sewn over the position of the heart, in the belief that the monarch’s image (officially God’s anointed representative and thus able to intercede for them) would offer protection, a custom dating at least from the Crimean War.⁶³⁹ Almost without exception Lovett’s subjects denied the efficacy of such charms, but carried them. Two wounded soldiers he interviewed scoffed at the idea, but then one:

showed me an old farthing with a hole through it. [...] “I had two narrow shaves and I reckon that thing saved my life. I got a nasty scratch, but it might have been a lot worse”.

[...] they both said that they didn’t believe in that silly rot – only they didn’t say “silly”.⁶⁴⁰

Lovett himself refuted the notion that the objects he amassed offered effective protection on the battlefield but when his own younger son left for the front, Lovett insisted that he wear an amulet.⁶⁴¹ Such illogicalities help to explain the proliferation of lucky mascots as defence against the arbitrary nature of contemporary industrial warfare.

Some brooches combined traditional charms with insignia. A typical example of those bought by Boer War soldiers is a sweetheart brooch in the National Army

⁶³⁷ ‘The War and Superstition’, *The Herald*, (London), 9.12.1916, p.3.

⁶³⁸ Edward Lovett, *Magic in Modern London* [1925] (Boscawen: Red Thread Books, 2014).

⁶³⁹ Lovett, *Magic in Modern London*, p.4.

⁶⁴⁰ Lovett, *Magic in Modern London*, p.4.

⁶⁴¹ Wellcome Trust, URL: www.wellcomecollection.org/whats-on/exhibitions/charmed-life [accessed 1.3.2017].

Museum's collection that demonstrates this uneasy fusion of superstition with military formality (fig.130). In what became known as Black Week, in December 1899, the British sustained three serious, unexpected defeats by Boer troops, resulting in the loss of almost 3,000 men. In response, the British Government raised the Imperial Yeomanry, based on standing infantry regiments to which large numbers of mounted volunteer troops were added.⁶⁴² The first contingent of approximately 10,000 men and 550 officers was formed in early 1900, when this hollow silver brooch was mass-produced in Birmingham. Made only 14 years after the Airlie brooch, this was an early example of a sweetheart brooch commercially produced in large numbers. Birmingham silversmiths recognised opportunities presented by troops leaving for a foreign war, most of whom could not afford to commission expensive individual pieces of jewellery but who would look for an appropriate keepsake for wives, sweethearts and mothers to remember them by. Beneath the crown are the Imperial Yeomanry's initials within a horseshoe, ancient symbol of good fortune. The horseshoe is inverted, though later horseshoes were often reversed to prevent the luck from 'running out'. At the Horniman Museum is a copper horseshoe made from the casing of a German shell engraved 'WAR 1917', worn as an amulet by a soldier on the Western Front.⁶⁴³ Jewellery made from battlefield *materiel* (particularly shrapnel or bullets that had already killed or maimed the owners) was believed to incorporate potent apotropaic powers to protect from further injury.⁶⁴⁴ Transforming objects that had injured into a piece of jewellery was to neutralise them, depriving similar projectiles of their ability to wound; touching them before battle combined pagan superstitions with Christian belief in divine intervention to protect.⁶⁴⁵ (The mother of Leonard Mundy, who was so incensed when girls gave him a white feather, had a brooch made from part of the copper bullet removed from his leg.)⁶⁴⁶ Another brooch, now in the London Science Museum, consists of a tin horseshoe engraved 'Good Luck' and is believed to have been worn by a WWI soldier of the Middlesex

⁶⁴² South African Military History Society,
URL:<http://samilitaryhistory.org/vol136sw.html>[accessed 9.9.2016].

⁶⁴³ Horseshoe amulet, donated by Edward Lovett, Horniman Museum, URL:
<http://www.horniman.ac.uk/object/19.114>[accessed 4.1.2017].

⁶⁴⁴ Saunders, *Trench Art*, pp.99-100.

⁶⁴⁵ Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.100.

⁶⁴⁶ Mundy, IWM Sound Recording No.5868, Reel 4.

Regiment.⁶⁴⁷ Both are from Lovett's collection. The woman in WWI wears an inverted horseshoe brooch with what appears to be a Royal Artillery badge in the centre (fig. 131). Her plain dark blouse suggests she may be in mourning, though this can only be speculation. An RAF horseshoe brooch from WWII shows they had changed very little by this date (fig.132).

While soldiers needed the solace of potent mascots for themselves, they also wanted objects to keep their loved ones at home from harm. From January 1915, when German Zeppelins first dropped bombs on East Anglia, the home front and the battlefield were no longer separate. The war was so close it was audible from the south of England: at Batemans, his house in Burwash in Sussex, Rudyard Kipling could hear distinctly the gunfire at Passchendaele, 100 miles away.⁶⁴⁸ A soldier might carry a small charm to touch for good luck and give his wife or sweetheart a brooch with the same symbol to connect them. Sweetheart brooches incorporated the idea that both partners should wear a symbolic jewel, in this case two versions of the regimental badge, reviving the traditional concept of reuniting two halves of a significant object when parted lovers were reunited. In the Foundling Hospital Museum in Bloomsbury, London, for example, is a collection of small everyday tokens, often split into two parts, such as embroidered fabric hearts or small inexpensive lockets. One half would be left with the baby and the other kept by the mother in the faint hope that one day they might be reunited; if the parent were illiterate and could not leave written identification, the hope was that the child could be recognised by the object and the halves made whole.⁶⁴⁹ The majority of tokens in the collection are coins and medals, often cut in half.⁶⁵⁰ Some were bent into a curved 'S' shape, transforming them into a love token of the time and suggesting parents left their babies an object that symbolised their feelings at parting from them.⁶⁵¹

⁶⁴⁷ Horseshoe brooch, donated by Edward Lovett, Science Museum, URL:<http://collection.sciencemuseum.org.uk/objects/co103751/brooch-in-the-shape-of-a-horseshoe-with-a-riding-crop-united-kingdom-1914-1918-brooch-amulet>[accessed 21.3.2017].

⁶⁴⁸ Charles Carrington, *Rudyard Kipling: his life and work* (London: Macmillan, 1955), p.439.

⁶⁴⁹ This seldom happened, because the Hospital's policy was to rename the children, eliminating their previous biographies to give them, it was believed, a fresh start.

⁶⁵⁰ Janette Bright, Gillian Clarke, *An Introduction to the Tokens at the Foundling Museum* (London: Foundling Museum, n.d.), p.9.

⁶⁵¹ Bright, Clarke, *An Introduction to the Tokens at the Foundling Museum*, p.11-13.

Sometimes treasured sentimental jewellery was left. The frequency of commemorative campaign medals suggests some of those admitted to the Hospital may have been the children of soldiers who were either killed or had abandoned their families. Many Victorian sentimental jewels featured a split heart representing separation or death and soldiers often embroidered heart-shaped pincushions with regimental badges as gifts.

In May 1913 Smith & Pepper's ledgers record an order for 9ct gold 'Mizpah' brooches that closely relate to these emotive tokens.⁶⁵² 'Mizpah' refers to a quotation from Genesis 31:4, usually engraved or stamped on the front but occasionally on the reverse: 'Mizpah; for he said, The Lord watch between me and thee, when we are absent one from another', referring to the Hebrew word for a watchtower.⁶⁵³ Originally referencing an agreement between two men, it came to signify the emotional bond between lovers that neither separation nor death could break and was therefore a popular text often added to regimental brooches. It was sometimes inscribed in full, though the single word could stand metonymically for the whole, and its popularity indicates the familiarity with scripture common at the time. Many were made in gold, in silver with applied gold or inexpensive hollow silver versions. A request for samples of 'the very cheapest brooches you make, but nothing that will not be satisfactory' from Wells & Son, placed in 1908, gives an idea of the wholesale cost then; 9ct gold brooches were priced at 2s.9d, 3s and 3s.6d.⁶⁵⁴ The comparatively large firm of Ward Brothers of Branstons Street, Birmingham (among many others) made these brooches from their foundation in 1887 and even had as their cable address 'Mizpah, Birmingham'.⁶⁵⁵ Mizpah brooches remained popular for many years: the owner of one, incorporating the biblical text and ivy leaves for faithfulness, has drilled a hole through which to attach a Royal Engineers' brooch (fig.133). The brooch is engraved 'G VI R', so can be dated between 1939 and 1952, the years of George VI's

⁶⁵² Bradbury Tompkinson & Co., 25.2.1913, Smith & Pepper Order Book, Collections No. 2701/279, 1911-13 "C", Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham.

⁶⁵³ Bury, *Sentimental Jewellery*, p.32 suggests the Mizpah quotation comes from Ruth 1.17 and refers to Ruth's steadfast behaviour to her mother-in-law Naomi. However, it actually originates in Genesis, 31.49.

⁶⁵⁴ Smith & Pepper Order Book, 17.8.1908, p.252, Collections No. 2027/234, 1906-08, "A", Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham).

⁶⁵⁵ *Grace's Guide to British Industrial History: Ward Brothers Birmingham*, URL: http://www.gracesguide.co.uk/Ward_Brothers_%28Birmingham%29 [accessed 1.5.2015].

reign. By then Mizpah brooches were old-fashioned but their message and talismanic function must have outweighed this consideration.

Mizpah brooches demonstrate more explicitly than any others the amuletic function of much sentimental jewellery. The message combined multiple layers of encoded meaning with decorative imagery. The word was often written across two hearts, which, like the tokens, could be separated; a man probably kept his half secretly in a pocket or with his possessions. When the couple was reunited the word was completed and the brooch was once again whole. In fig.134 a WWI uniformed soldier poses for a photograph with a young woman, possibly his wife or sweetheart, who wears a double-heart Mizpah brooch. Those intended exclusively for women were generally decorated with feminine motifs of flowers, ribbons and birds. There is a tension, however, between these and the underlying meanings of the motifs: often forget-me-nots appear for remembrance or ivy for friendship; ribbons are not just for a pretty appearance but recall the ties between the parted couple. The image of a swift is a traditional plea for the swift homecoming of the absent lover: it is easy to see how this notion translated to the absent soldier. Many brooches incorporated masculine military details. One in solid silver, marked Sydenham Brothers of Birmingham, 1889, is in the shape of a heart within a shield, itself a protective military object (fig. 135). The date suggests this brooch's donor was on campaign in Egypt or India. A little King's Own Royal Lancaster Regiment sweetheart brooch incorporates another representation of good fortune in the form of a wishbone (fig.136). This brooch is made of brass and enamel, therefore not hallmarked and cannot be dated precisely but its purpose as an auspicious mascot is clear.

At 6pm on 9 September 1918 Eric Smith wrote a letter to his wife Doris. Smith was serving in France with 206 Squadron RAF of the British Expeditionary Force. He thanked Doris for her letters and gifts of cigarettes ' & golliwog for luck' and wrote: 'Awfully pleased you like your bird and crown and hope it will bring you luck' (fig.137).⁶⁵⁶ 'Bird and crown' was flyers' slang for the eagle and royal crest of the Royal Flying Corps, later the RAF. A member of the Smith & Pepper family firm,

⁶⁵⁶ *Letter, Eric Smith to Doris, 9.9.1918. Smith & Pepper Archives, Museum of the Jewellery Quarter, Birmingham.*

Smith was a jeweller himself and his letter must have referred to the gift of a sweetheart brooch for Doris. The brooch itself is now lost and there is no indication of the materials from which it was made, but it must have been similar in appearance to the one in fig.138. Smith's letter is cheerful but clearly this is for his wife's benefit, as he talks of hoping he might get home leave: 'with a bit of luck, to recuperate your nerves' and of the tantalising way the Western Front and the home front were so close:

we fly half way across the "Channel" to gain height; & you can see all the white cliffs of Dover & the Thames in the distance, it does seem to attract you & feel like cutting your engine off, and gliding down to it. [...] Well I must now close midst the crash of shells, the rattle of machine guns...

Smith survived the war and became Smith & Pepper's manager, but WWI pilots had an average life expectancy of three weeks.⁶⁵⁷ His letter demonstrates the solace of small talismanic tokens exchanged between couples.

To some extent these ideas were still current in WWII. In 1939 the *Newcastle Evening Chronicle* reported a brisk wartime trade in lucky charms.⁶⁵⁸ In 1940 Mass Observation's journal *Us* reported the results of a survey of jewellers regarding the revival of belief in charms, reprinted in *The Liverpool Daily Post*.⁶⁵⁹ Overt superstition had declined since WWI but jewellers reported that war had revived the popularity of lucky charms and that sweetheart brooches held particular amuletic or talismanic qualities:

Regimental badges sell well. It seems to be thought that in some instances women wear these as a sort of charm, at the same time avoiding any ridicule that may come on a displayed belief in amulets. [...] the amulet habit is deep in human nature. [...] Interest in it is reported to have increased.⁶⁶⁰

It was not necessary to believe implicitly in inanimate objects' magical qualities for them to be treasured for the connections they made with home and loved ones and rituals were important. RAF Cosgrove has a collection of talismans carried by

⁶⁵⁷ IWM, URL:<http://www.rafmuseum.org.uk/cosford/things-to-see-and-do/exhibitions/aviation-lucky-charms-mascots/lucky-gremlins.aspx>[accessed 12.12.2016].

⁶⁵⁸ 'A Drug on the Market', *Newcastle Evening Chronicle*, 28.11.1939,p.4.

⁶⁵⁹ 'Luck in War', *Liverpool Daily Post*, 8.4.1940,p.4.

⁶⁶⁰ 'Luck in War'.

bomber and fighter aircrew that their owners believed must not be forgotten or their run of luck would be broken. Materials incorporated meaning. For example, Perspex taken from broken aircraft canopies was sometimes used as covers for photographs, though it required knowledge on the recipient's part that the material came from a damaged aeroplane. As Kopytoff describes, conflict often diverted material from its original trajectory. Once débris of war, it was reconfigured into protective items for adornment. Objects made (or believed to have been made) under battlefield conditions embodied life and death experiences and were valued accordingly as charms.

4.9 Sweetheart Brooches as Mourning and Memory Objects

The importance of personal possessions worn on the body as the site and focus of memory has been the subject of considerable recent scholarly investigation.⁶⁶¹ Margaret Gibson, for example, observes that because objects are so intrinsic to the construction of identity, they play an important role in grieving for the dead.⁶⁶² Nigel Llewellyn states that jewellery helped to extend the process of mourning a death through displaying the fact of bereavement.⁶⁶³ Gifts given in the context of meaningful occasions such as marriage or parting in wartime are affective things, significant because they embody identity and family histories. Even if no longer worn, their owner or their descendants feel they should be retained as memory objects and in the context of the giver's death in war they take on extra significance. Jewellery is often lost through melting down or remodelling but military sweetheart brooches are usually either unsuitable or too personal for this to happen. Jones and Stallybrass draw attention to the propensity of personal objects worn closely on the person to transmit memory, to recall, for instance, 'memories of love (e.g. of the lover for the beloved from whom he or she receives a garment or a ring)'.⁶⁶⁴ Jewellery was historically mentioned in wills as mementoes by which the deceased should be

⁶⁶¹ Hallam, Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture*; Michelle O'Malley, 'A Pair of Little Gilded Shoes, pp.45-83; Nigel Llewellyn, *Art of Death: visual culture in the English death ritual c.1500-c.1800* (London: Reaktion, 2001) p.95.

⁶⁶² Gibson, 'Melancholy Objects', p.285.

⁶⁶³ Llewellyn, *Art of Death*, p.95.

⁶⁶⁴ Jones, Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*, p.204.

remembered by friends and relatives and money bequeathed for jewellery to be made for this purpose.⁶⁶⁵ Because jewellery is so often given to mark significant life events it has the special capacity to recall them in bereavement.

The many images of sweetheart brooches worn by women in wartime suggest that while a relationship lasted they were treasured for their representation of a loved relative or friend. In many cases, however, they were worn throughout the conflict but put away at the end of hostilities. Several reasons might account for this. As previously demonstrated, military families still wore their brooches for certain occasions but for civilians there was often a wish to move on from reminders of war and if relationships ended acrimoniously, the brooches ceased to maintain their original significance. Lengthy involuntary separation during wartime and women's changing expectations of their own capabilities caused many marriages to end: marriage rates remained fairly stable throughout WWII but divorces increased approximately seven-fold. In 1939, 439,694 marriages and 8,254 divorces took place. In 1947, when UK demobilization was finally completed, 401,210 marriages and 60,254 divorces were recorded.⁶⁶⁶

Although strict rules regarding mourning dress had in theory been much relaxed, Queen Victoria observed them throughout her lengthy widowhood and mortality rates required most women to own some mourning jewels during the Victorian era. Mabell Airlie recalled:

We seemed to be in the midst of death from babyhood [...] The deaths came so quickly, one after another, that there was no time to get out of mourning in the intervals, and no one in those days would have considered it fitting for even such small children as we were, not to wear black when a near relation died.⁶⁶⁷

⁶⁶⁵ Susan James, *Women's Voices in Tudor Wills, 1485-1603* (London, New York: Routledge, 2015), pp.77-80.

⁶⁶⁶ Office for National Statistics, 'Marriage Summary Statistics and Divorces in England and Wales 2012', <http://visual.ons.gov.uk>[accessed 7.1.2017].

⁶⁶⁷ Mabell, Lady Airlie, *Memoirs of Lady Airlie's Childhood*, unpublished, The Airlie Papers, British Library, 1880-1950, ADD MS 82837, p.15.

In her doctoral thesis on gendered WWI art, Richenda Roberts argues that literature, art and cultural construct consistently foregrounded men's battlefield experiences while largely ignoring those of the home front, invariably ascribing to women the role of mourners since the 'culturally embedded ethos of imperial masculinity' made it almost impossible for men to mourn overtly.⁶⁶⁸ By 1914, however, women too were strongly discouraged from excessive displays of grief. An exchange of letters in the *Daily Mail* in 1918 argued that women should no longer go into deep mourning.⁶⁶⁹ Anticipating his own death, one soldier on leave forewarned his parents: 'I only hope to goodness if I am 'done in' you won't put on this awful black. It does no good, it depresses all the fellows who come home [...] I gave my promise – which, alas! I had to carry out'.⁶⁷⁰ By the Second World War the official 'stiff upper lip' approach to mourning was engrained. A stoic response to bereavement was officially and culturally endorsed as essential to maintenance of public morale. As Noakes states: 'Good wartime citizenship depended, in large part, on a stoical acceptance of suffering' in the interests of maintaining public morale.⁶⁷¹ Women were advised that visible grief was self-indulgent and should be managed through self-discipline and community work to avoid spreading despondency to others.⁶⁷²

But if overt displays of mourning were deemed unacceptable, it was at least permissible for women to signify their bereavement through wearing their regimental brooches. Jewels that once incorporated happy memories of engagements, weddings or the births of children, may on bereavement occupy sites of ambiguity. Airlie's brooch, originally a treasured wedding gift, was worn for the length of her long widowhood as an object valued for her husband's memory. But its military appearance must also have been a constant painful reminder to her of the manner of his death.⁶⁷³ However, it apparently had no special resonance for her children as she did not bequeath it to any of them. Susan Stewart notes the essential function of an

⁶⁶⁸ Richenda Roberts, 'Art of a Second Order': The First World War from the British Home Front Perspective', Unpublished D.Phil. Thesis, Birmingham, 2012, pp.186, 31-32.

⁶⁶⁹ Elizabeth Scott-Lorimer, 'No Mourning', *Daily Mail*, 8.4.1918, p.2.

⁶⁷⁰ F. M. Bowyer-Bower, 'Soldiers and Mourning', *Daily Mail*, 16.4.1918, p.2.

⁶⁷¹ Noakes, 'Gender, Grief, and Bereavement', p.72.

⁶⁷² Noakes, 'Gender, Grief, and Bereavement', pp.72-85.

⁶⁷³ Her diaries show that this remained a painful subject all her life. Airlie, *Thatched with Gold*, pp.190-191.

heirloom is to create a narrative of ownership; its history is exclusive to the original owner and may hold little meaning for others, unless specifically extended to them.⁶⁷⁴

For instance, in WWI, Gertrude Kearton's sergeant husband gave her a silver Royal Engineers' brooch on a silver pin. Responding to this study her granddaughter wrote: 'I can remember my Granny always wearing it. [...] My Grandfather was Charles William Kearton and killed on the Somme March 18th 1915'.⁶⁷⁵ Gertrude Kearton always wore her brooch in remembrance of her husband, who was buried in France and whose photograph in uniform, captioned 'A Hull Hero' was displayed on her wall throughout her life.⁶⁷⁶ Her granddaughter wrote: 'I always wear it [the brooch] on Remembrance Sunday when I go to our lovely church. [...] The brooch is very special to me and I would never part with it'. For her it is a memory of her grandmother and by extension, memorialisation of the grandfather she never met.

Conversely, the very fact of happy associations was the reason why some people put away objects that caused painful memories. Two WWI brooches retained their emotional power in this way. Both were given, coincidentally, by soldiers of the Princess Louise (Argyll and Sutherland) Highlanders, though their appearance is quite different. Bandsman George Ernest Martin from Liverpool, signed up for Short Service in October 1913 (fig. 139).⁶⁷⁷ He embarked for France with A Company, 2nd Battalion, on 10th August 1914.⁶⁷⁸ In 1916 he was still there, weary and disheartened by the long war of attrition. Martin had given a regimental brooch in the form of a sporran with his regiment's initials and thistle design to his girlfriend Gertie (fig. 140). On 2 July 1916 he wrote to her from France on a pretty five-page, hand-made card, intricately cut and threaded with coloured ribbons that he had bought locally: 'I got it

⁶⁷⁴ Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Durham, London: Duke University Press, 1993), pp.136-137.

⁶⁷⁵ Personal communication, letter, Kearton's granddaughter (Anonymous, name supplied) 18.1.2016. Appendix 1.

⁶⁷⁶ Personal communication, letter, 18.1.2016.

⁶⁷⁷ George Martin's Attestation, National Archives, URL: https://www.ancestry.co.uk/interactive/1219/30972_175723-00875/1277377?backurl=https://www.ancestry.co.uk/family-tree/person/tree/27105995/person/26216691513/facts/citation/120334231692/edit/record#?imageId=30972_175723-00876 [accessed 15.5.2017].

⁶⁷⁸ Rod Mackenzie, Argyll and Sutherland Regimental Museum. Personal Communication, emails, 15.5.2017.

made for you with your initial on as you will notice' (fig. 141). Martin hoped 'the war will finish this year [...] as I am very tired of this life' and continued 'So Gertie although we have not said to each other about being engaged, we are practically'. Martin did not survive the war: only a few weeks later, on 13th August, he was killed in action at High Wood on the Somme.⁶⁷⁹ Fifty-seven years after his death, Gertie addressed a poignant postscript to George on the last page of his card that reveals she never recovered from his loss. She wrote that she had 'only memories & a broken heart' and, of the beloved daughter she had with the man she later married: 'she should have been yours' (fig. 142). Martin's photograph, the card and brooch are now in the Argyll and Sutherland's museum, though not on display. They must have been kept, probably secretly, throughout her life. Martin wrote that he thought the card he bought for Gertie was 'a good souvenir' of France; instead it and her brooch became for her souvenirs of their lost past and unrealised future. Dominiek Dendooven observes that we value such material things for their capacity to evoke memories of people who were once important to us and are important still: 'Memories in material form quite literally offer us a grip on the past'.⁶⁸⁰

Marion Forbes Baird and Arthur Henderson from Paisley in Scotland were also engaged to be married before Henderson enlisted as a 2nd Lieutenant in the Argyll and Sutherlands. On 14th August 1914 his battalion landed in France.⁶⁸¹ On 24th April 1917 (the day after he won the VC as Acting Captain) Henderson was killed in action at Fontaine-le-Croisilles.⁶⁸² Forbes Baird had received from him gifts of a gold necklace and a gold and enamel Argyll and Sutherlands sweetheart brooch. She kept these gifts secretly all her life, as Martin's sweetheart Gertie did; she too married but rather unhappily. Eventually she gave them to her granddaughter Marian, who said: 'I can see now that Arthur's death ruined her life and left a long shadow she did her best to hide'.⁶⁸³ Like George Martin's sweetheart, Forbes Baird ostensibly moved on with her life following her fiancé's death but it was apparently too painful to her to wear

⁶⁷⁹ Rod Mackenzie, 15.5.2017.

⁶⁸⁰ Dominiek Dendooven, 'The Journey Back', in Saunders, Cornish, *Contested Objects*, p.64.

⁶⁸¹ Ancestry.co.uk:database:http://search.ancestry.co.uk[accessed 11.9.2016].

⁶⁸² *Victoria Cross Medals*. East Sussex: Naval and Military Press.

Ancestry.co.uk:database:http://search.ancestry.co.uk[accessed 11.9.2016].

⁶⁸³ Marian Morrison, in Paul Atterbury, *Antiques Roadshow: World War One in 100 Family Treasures* (London: BBC, 2014) p.227.

the brooch or the necklace and she never spoke about them. However, she secretly treasured these inalienable gifts and kept them for her granddaughter.

A recurrent theme regarding the Great War has been that a generation of women was left without the opportunity to marry. The experiences of Bandsman Martin's girlfriend and Forbes Baird suggest that some who did marry continued throughout their lives to mourn the loves they had lost, perhaps cherishing unrealistic memories, idealising the forever-young men who did not return. This suggests one reason why their owners said nothing about their regimental brooches to their families: they would have been unable to speak about them to the men they eventually married but kept the brooches secretly. Their descendents had no knowledge of the brooches or their histories, and often were unable to explain how their mother or grandmother came to own them. But the brooches' association with a beloved person who died in war elevated their importance so that they were kept safe because, as Gibson observes: 'Through death, the most mundane objects can rise in symbolic, emotional and mnemonic value sometimes outweighing all other measures of value – particularly the economic'.⁶⁸⁴

Personal effects, often the only tangible vestiges of the lost loved one and the materials that his body last touched, often approached the status of relics. Deborah Lutz notes that in the late nineteenth century, bereaved people began to distinguish special meaning in the traces left behind in everyday things touched, worn or owned by the dead, calling these 'secondary relics', that is, not actual body parts like saints' relics or even hair jewellery but items that have 'been in contact with a body and might contain residue of it, such as blood, sweat, or tears. Things that prove embodiment, that have the texture of a life lived'.⁶⁸⁵ Pierre Nora also, writing of identity through memory, described how things could recall people: 'Memory takes root in the concrete, in spaces, gestures, images and objects.'⁶⁸⁶

⁶⁸⁴ Gibson, 'Melancholy Objects', *Mortality*, 19.8.2010, p.292.

⁶⁸⁵ Deborah Lutz, *Relics of Death in Victorian Literature and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p.2.

⁶⁸⁶ Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoires', *Representations*, 26, Spring 1989, p.9.

Such traces materialised memory and transformed items worn on the person into mourning keepsakes but precisely because of their bodily associations could be the opposite of comforting. Vera Brittain described unpacking her fiancé Roland Leighton's blood-encrusted uniform, engrained with foul-smelling mud from the battlefield where he was mortally wounded, and its traumatic effect on his mother, sister and herself:

Roland's mother turned desperately to her husband: "Robert, take those clothes away into the kitchen and don't let me see them again: I must either burn or bury them. They smell of death; they are not Roland; they even seem to detract from his memory and spoil his glamour. I won't have anything more to do with them!"⁶⁸⁷

Many less well-known families must have had the same experience. Just before the end of WW1, on 24 August 1918, 2nd Lt. Charles Bodman of the Durham Light Infantry, was killed near Arras on the Western Front. His body was never recovered but the army returned to his widowed mother in Gloucestershire all that remained of him: his uniform, photographs, papers and artefacts he had collected from the battlefield.⁶⁸⁸ Unable to contemplate these reminders she put them into a wooden chest and entrusted it to her surviving son, asking that it be kept safe but not opened. The box was stored in the family's grocery shop until 2015 when the contents were rediscovered, among them a small enamelled sweetheart brooch, perhaps intended as a gift for his mother.⁶⁸⁹ Bodman is commemorated on the Vis-en-Artois Memorial but he had no known grave that his family might visit, even had they been able to make the journey.⁶⁹⁰

⁶⁸⁷ Brittain, *Testament of Youth*, pp.225-226.

⁶⁸⁸ Army Register of Soldiers' Effects, 1901-1929:

URL:[http://search.ancestry.co.uk/cgi-](http://search.ancestry.co.uk/cgi-bin/sse.dll?indiv=1&db=UKArmyRegistersEffects&h=347166&tid=&pid=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=Wcg1&_phstart=successSource&usePUBJs=true&rhSource=2706)

[bin/sse.dll?indiv=1&db=UKArmyRegistersEffects&h=347166&tid=&pid=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=Wcg1&_phstart=successSource&usePUBJs=true&rhSource=2706](http://search.ancestry.co.uk/cgi-bin/sse.dll?indiv=1&db=UKArmyRegistersEffects&h=347166&tid=&pid=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=Wcg1&_phstart=successSource&usePUBJs=true&rhSource=2706)[accessed:25.1.2017]

⁶⁸⁹ Sophie Jane Evans, 'Time Capsule Trunk', Mail Online:3.11.2015:

URL:<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3301675/Time-capsule-trunk-containing-immaculate-belongings-28-year-old-soldier-died-WWI-battlefields-rediscovered-century-later.html>[accessed:25.1.2017].

⁶⁹⁰ UK Commonwealth War Graves,

URL:[https://www.google.co.uk/search?site=&source=hp&q=commonwealth+war+grave+com](https://www.google.co.uk/search?site=&source=hp&q=commonwealth+war+grave+commission)mmission[accessed 3.4.2016].

Despite the rhetoric that required stoical acceptance of loss, complex and conflicting emotions contributed to the concealing of evocative memorial objects too painful to keep visibly displayed within the family home. On 27 July 1917, during what had been thought to be a 'quiet period' between fighting, Charles William Pashler was killed by a stray shell that fell into a reserve trench, normally considered a relatively safe position some way behind the frontline at Monchy-le-Preux near Arras.⁶⁹¹

Pashler's last postcard to his wife, Nellie May, reassuring her that he was well and would write more soon, must have been received by her at the same time as the official notification of his death. As their grandson, Bill Fulton, observed: 'The rollercoaster of emotions for my grandmother can be well imagined' (fig.143).⁶⁹² Fulton recalled that throughout his grandmother's long life (she lived to be 90) her family was forbidden ever to speak about Charles' death.⁶⁹³ Fulton believed she was devastated at his loss but also angry, a sentiment she would have been unable to voice publicly within the responses to grief prescribed by society at the time.⁶⁹⁴ Her anger, Fulton believed, arose from several causes. Pashler's death left his wife to bring up their three small daughters, all under the age of six, alone and without a breadwinner. He had enlisted into the Army Service Corps voluntarily in 1914 at the age of 32, before he was required to do so.⁶⁹⁵ He then transferred to the Machine Gun Corps, an especially high-risk group nicknamed, with some reason, the Suicide Club.⁶⁹⁶ Nellie's views about the war itself are unknown, but its consequences for her were appalling and her anger understandable. None of Pashler's wartime possessions were known to his descendents and Fulton had always believed that his grandmother might have destroyed all the military items through which his death would have been materialised for her, even including his bronze memorial plaque, or 'Death Penny'. For some families these were symbols of pride; for others, mocking reminders to be

⁶⁹¹ Private Joe Ince, letter to Pashler's family, in Bill Fulton, *A Life Rediscovered – 90 Years After: Charles William Pashler (1882-1917)*, (Reprinted courtesy of *The Bulletin* Editor, The Western Front Association, 2007), p.1.

⁶⁹² Fulton, *A Life Rediscovered*, p.2.

⁶⁹³ Bill Fulton, Personal communication, 12.1.2018.

⁶⁹⁴ Fulton, Personal communication, 12.1.2018.

⁶⁹⁵ Largely a logistical transport service.

⁶⁹⁶ The MGC used guns mounted on motor cycles, cars and early tanks, suffering approximately 33% casualty and 20% fatality rates. Forces War Records, URL: <https://www.forces-war-records.co.uk/units/4982/machine-gun-corps/> [accessed 21.1.2018].

forgotten or pawned when times were hard.⁶⁹⁷ In 2007, however, an old briefcase was discovered hidden in the loft of the house belonging to one of their daughters, Fulton's aunt. Inside were Pashler's personal possessions, including his bloodstained pocket diary, pierced by a splinter from the shell that killed him and a mother-of-pearl RMG sweetheart brooch, probably purchased in France and intended as a gift for Nellie May (figs.144, 145, 146). She could never have worn it. The shell that killed her husband and passed through his diary also hit the brooch: it was cracked and chipped and the pin from the back had been ripped away. Like Roland Leighton's uniform, it would have been closely associated with the trauma of his death; the anger Fulton observed in his grandmother suggests the reasons why she would not have wanted the brooch but concealed it with his other possessions. As Carol Acton has noted, women's anger at the deaths of friends and relatives and at their own bereavement was an unacceptable rejection of the code to which they were expected to adhere, leaving silence their only option.⁶⁹⁸ Such considerations must have contributed to the concealment or destruction of wartime memorabilia such as sweetheart brooches and to the documentation connected to them.

4.10 Brooches and Public Memorials

Conversely, for some, a personal object worn on the body kept their loved relative visibly with them, providing them a sense of enduring presence without the battlefield's contaminating touch that so distressed the families mentioned here. A small number of brooches were intended specifically as mourning pieces, some of which share a strong visual vocabulary with commemorative public art. Like many others, Bodman's family was denied the consoling rituals of laying to rest, a funeral service or a grave to visit and adorn with flowers, where they might create a focus of mourning and sense the continued presence of their dead. As Lutz states: 'Immortality consists in being enshrined in others' memories'.⁶⁹⁹ Hallam and Hockey

⁶⁹⁷ See for example, Matthew Richardson, 'Medals, Memory and Meaning: Symbolism and cultural significance of Great War medals', in Saunders, Nicholas J., Cornish, Paul eds., *Contested Objects* (London, New York: Routledge, 2014), p.109.

⁶⁹⁸ Carol Acton, *Grief in Wartime: Private Pain, Public Discourse* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp.43-45.

⁶⁹⁹ Lutz, *Relics of Death in Victorian Literature and Culture*, p.130.

describe the comfort to bereaved families of embellishing graves with objects of significance to the deceased, and their concern that the dead should be remembered through material artefacts.⁷⁰⁰ This was denied to many families whose relatives died overseas, as not only was no body returned for burial but no grave existed that they might at least envisage. Even for those whose relatives' graves were known, the journey overseas was often impossible. Recurring phrases chosen for 'In Memoriam' verses in newspapers, such as 'A grave we may never see' and 'We know not where to find his grave', highlight these concerns.⁷⁰¹ Bodies no longer existed or could not be identified; hastily made burial sites were obliterated by later battles. The British Government decided against repatriation of bodies on grounds of difficulty and expense and claimed it would discriminate against families whose loved ones could not be identified.⁷⁰² (In WWII this was also a bitter regret: 'In Memoriam' verses frequently lament: 'We often mention your name, and wonder how you died'.⁷⁰³)

Several public memorials attempted to address this problem. The Menin Gate to the east of Ypres commemorates British and Commonwealth soldiers who died during the Ypres Salient but have no known grave. The memorial replaced the gravestone on which a dead soldier's regimental badge would have been engraved, a further material connection with the badge brooch a mother or sister might wear in his memory. A silver locket (figs.147, 148) bears a relief image of the Menin Gate with a simple, classically inspired border, in which a photograph of a relative named on the memorial can be placed. This example carries a photograph of Lance Corporal Harry Gilderthorp of the Royal Warwickshire regiment, who died at Ypres in May 1915. The locket may have belonged to his widow, Alice.⁷⁰⁴ The woman in fig.149 wears a King's Royal Rifle Corps sweetheart brooch and a locket of a similar type. Brooches in this design were also made. The burial of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey on 11 November 1920 was similarly intended to substitute for all those with no

⁷⁰⁰ Hallam, Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, p.147.

⁷⁰¹ For example, *County Herald*, 8.7.1921, 11.7.1919, reproduced in Metcalfe, *Remembered Again*, pp.169.

⁷⁰² Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) p.27.

⁷⁰³ 'In Memoriam', *Manchester Evening News*, 14.10.1942, p.7 is just one example of many.

⁷⁰⁴ Ancestry.co.uk.URL:https://search.ancestry.co.uk/cgi-bin/sse.dll?indiv=1&dbid=60454&h=28800&tid=&pid=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=QkW56&_phstart=successSource[accessed 24.5.2014].

known grave, while Lutyen's Cenotaph (1919, replaced with a permanent structure in 1920) was planned as the focus of collective public mourning). Civic memorials in Britain and France typically bear the names of the dead of both wars whose lives might otherwise remain unrecorded.

Sculptors of public memorials often took the depiction of badges and uniforms as metonymic devices to stand in for the body of the soldier, sailor or airman, his presence, his shroud or his absence. Absence was effectively employed to depict death in public and personal commemorative art; the definition of 'cenotaph' is 'a monument to a person whose body is elsewhere: an empty tomb'.⁷⁰⁵ Catherine Moriarty notes that several cenotaphs designed by Edwin Lutyens, for example, are surmounted by sculptures of corpses implied by the draping of uniform greatcoats. Moriarty explains the thinking behind this: by covering the dead body to the neck with his uniform and placing it high on the memorial, Lutyens ensured that the features could not be clearly seen by the spectator: thus anonymised the individual could be perceived as 'every mother's son'.⁷⁰⁶ As with the Unknown Warrior's tomb, the bereaved could believe these sculptures personified their own relative. For his Hyde Park Corner Royal Artillery memorial, Charles Sergeant Jagger insisted on depicting a soldier's corpse against strong opposition on grounds of bad taste, though the body itself is scarcely visible.⁷⁰⁷ Jagger was awarded the MC for his service at Gallipoli and on the Western Front and was determined to reflect war's unglamourised realism, achieving this through his poignant depiction of the fallen soldier's greatcoat, helmet, boots and insignia. Of the body itself only a hand and part of the jaw are visible (fig.150). The dead soldier's accoutrements, often the only objects returned to his family after death, denote the 'simultaneously existing presence and absence of a person'.⁷⁰⁸ Jagger's assemblage of these objects, that together constructed the man as soldier, echoes the 'trophy' designs forming the basis of many military badges and jewels, such as the early Boer War 'Kharki' (fig.23) and an 'Ypres' brooch (fig.151). The latter exemplifies many commemorative 'battle' brooches, though there is some

⁷⁰⁵ *Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982).

⁷⁰⁶ Catherine Moriarty, 'Remnants of Patriotism', p.302.

⁷⁰⁷ Richard Cork, in Michael Walsh, Andrekos Varneva, Editors, *The Great War and the British Empire: Culture and Society*, (London, New York: Routledge, 2017), p.xxiv.

⁷⁰⁸ J. Ash, 'Memory and Objects', in Pat Kirkham, *The Gendered Object* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), p.220.

dispute as to their intention. They may have been worn by women as sweetheart brooches or kept as souvenirs by veterans. (It has been suggested that soldiers sent them home as cryptic messages to inform their families of where they were, though it seems unlikely they would have evaded military censors.) These brooches were generally made and sold in small local shops wherever troops were stationed.

A brooch advertised in the 1916 trade journal by Birmingham silversmiths J. W. Tiptaft & Son (fig.152) was aimed at the ‘mother, sister and sweetheart’ of a soldier, sailor or airman. The oval ‘commemorative photo-pendant’, into which an image could be inserted, was offered in gold, silver or gilt. On a wide border of black enamel the text read: ‘HIS COUNTRY CALLED: HE ANSWERED’, inscribing society’s expectations of its citizens and the female wearer’s pride in his sacrifice and her own (fig.153).

Several similar pieces were made. One for any armed service bears the king’s crown and a wreath of laurels and is inscribed ‘In memory of’ (fig. 154). Another is in the Green Howards Regimental Museum, North Yorkshire. The circular blue enamel frame is inscribed: ‘DIED ON ACTIVE SERVICE 1915’ (fig. 155). It belonged to the family of Lance Corporal William Marshall, though his photograph is now missing.⁷⁰⁹ Marshall was killed in action with the Yorkshire Hussars in Gallipoli on 22 August that year.⁷¹⁰ Others were made specifically for the bereaved wives and mothers of named regiments: for example on the brooch in fig.156 the Royal Irish Regimental insignia has been adapted to become a commemorative object. The usual green shamrocks are now a wreath of blue forget-me-nots, traditionally representative of remembrance in the ‘language’ of flowers, while the motto has been replaced with the text: ‘Lest we Forget’.

The text: ‘IN PROUD AND LOVING MEMORY’, inscribes the memorial function of the Sherwood Foresters’ brooch (fig.157). Cliff Housley, Secretary of the Military Brooch Collectors’ Club, has a collection of Sherwood Foresters brooches and has

⁷⁰⁹ Steve Erskine, Curator, Green Howards Regimental Museum, N.Yorkshire, Personal Communication, email, March 2017.

⁷¹⁰ UK, Soldiers Died in the Great War, 1914-1919, *British and Irish Military Databases*, URL: Ancestry.co.uk[accessed 21.2.2017].

identified the soldier as Sergeant Reginald Harry Ford of 1/5 Battalion Notts and Derby (Sherwood Foresters).⁷¹¹ Ford was killed in action aged 22 during an attack near Pontruet, Northern France on 24 September 1918, for which he received the posthumous DCM. Ford was unmarried at his death and the 1911 census (which records his occupation as 'jeweller's apprentice'), shows he had one older brother but no sisters, so possibly this brooch was bought in his memory by his mother or sweetheart.⁷¹² The brooch makes a strong statement through the combination of text and image and would have left no doubt as to the sacrifice made by the woman who wore it. When Ford enlisted, he stated his occupation as 'lace draughtsman' in the Lace Mill at Long Eaton, Derbyshire. Housley purchased the brooch in Long Eaton in 2006 for 50p from what he described as 'a junk shop'.⁷¹³ Ford had no direct descendants and though the brooch was discovered in the town where he worked, only five miles from his birthplace, it had evidently lost any familial, local or regimental significance. By the time of Ford's death almost every household in the country had lost at least one family member.⁷¹⁴ Brooches like this were once ubiquitous but over time apparently became objects that subsequent generations did not value or recognise. Until the fairly recent revival of interest in the commemorations of both World Wars, memorabilia like this brooch were often felt to be of little worth.⁷¹⁵ This brooch has allowed Ford to be traced and recorded in his regiment's history and may be almost the only means through which his name is now remembered.

In the Royal Sussex Regimental Museum at Eastbourne Redoubt is a Union flag brooch in coloured enamels dated 1915-1917, associated with Sergeant Major John William Daniels, and probably belonging to his wife, Ada (fig.158). The poet Edmund Blunden, who served in the same unit, saw Daniels' death in action on 2 March 1917: 'among the victims was our kind, witty and fearless Sergeant-Major Daniels.'⁷¹⁶ Queen Victoria favoured jewellery featuring symbolic flags and similar

⁷¹¹ Sherwood Foresters Roll, © Cliff Housley, *Sweetheart Brooches (and other associated jewellery): the Sherwood Foresters* (Sawley: Milquest, 2009), p.118.

⁷¹² *British Army Service Records, 1914-1920, Short Service Attestation No.33708; 1911 Census, Derbyshire: Shardlow and Great Wilne No.6.*

⁷¹³ Housley, *Sweetheart Brooches* p.118. Housley owns several other examples of mourning brooches.

⁷¹⁴ Winter, *Sites of Memory*, p.2.

⁷¹⁵ Richardson, 'Medals, Memory and Meaning', p.112.

⁷¹⁶ Edmund Blunden, *Undertones of War*, (New York: Doubleday, 1929), p.187.

brooches depicting Allied flags were made in World War II, but brooches of this type are seldom found.⁷¹⁷ The V&A, which has no British military badge brooches in its jewellery collection, does own two similar American examples. These are miniature replicas of the US flag that bereaved American families are entitled to place in the window of their home, adding a gold star for each family member lost in the service of his or her country.⁷¹⁸ No equivalent scheme exists in Britain.

Many commemorative regimental badge brooches, as shown here, included a compartment for a photograph of the dead. Brooches with an inscription dedicated to the deceased were also produced that were suitable for the widow or family member of a soldier, sailor or airman of any unit to wear, as described. Research for this study leads to the conclusion that often, however, sweetheart brooches given in happier circumstances became mourning jewels through changing circumstances. Typically, during the First World War, when wearing traditional formal black mourning to signal loss of close relatives began to be discouraged, women wore their regimental brooches combined with a portrait brooch or locket pinned to their dress or hung from a chain around the neck.⁷¹⁹

The unknown woman photographed with her small sons in fig.159 is dressed in this way. Around her neck she wears a portrait pendant and on her dress is a Queen's Royal Regiment (West Surrey) brooch. Her expression and those of her children appears melancholy and though it is not possible to verify their situation, the photograph does not seem to record a happy family occasion. The boys are clearly dressed in their best clothes though they are in a rural setting, possibly the family carpentry workshop, and their mother's clothing and jewellery suggest the loss of her husband and the children's father. In these circumstances several messages may be considered. The woman is presenting herself and her children in the light of her bereavement in the service of her country. The soldier has apparently died but the sacrifice is not his alone and she identifies herself in this role. The photograph is performative, evoking the viewer's response to the narrative told by the combination

⁷¹⁷ See W. A. P. Watson's advertisement, Figure 69.

⁷¹⁸ US custom is to add a blue star to the flag for living service members. American Gold Star Mothers is a society formed in 1928 for bereaved mothers, who wear the gold star emblem.

⁷¹⁹ By WWII, when women no longer wore mourning, it becomes impossible to tell whether their brooches were worn in this way without associated documentation.

of sorrowful expressions, formal clothing and military brooch. If the wounded serviceman was evacuated home before his death, the photograph possibly records the family dressed for the funeral. In the many photographs and paintings of Queen Victoria following Prince Albert's death in 1861 she consistently presented herself foremost as a grieving widow. As previously demonstrated, Victoria's enthusiasm for sentimental jewellery extended to the many jewels she wore and distributed to commemorate important family events. The concept of recording the fact of bereavement in a photograph arguably derived from this long tradition of pictures of the widowed queen and from images of bereavement on jewels themselves.

Mary Davies was also widowed during the Great War. Her husband, Sergeant William Davies, (fig.160) enlisted early in the war.⁷²⁰ He landed in Gallipoli in August 1915 but survived only until 14th September 1915, when he died of dysentery in St. Patrick's, one of 24 tented hospitals on Malta where casualties from the Dardanelles were treated.⁷²¹ On her dark dress Mary Davies wears a grenade brooch of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers' that is just visible as Davies' cap badge (fig.161). The brooch may well have become a focus of memory as Mary, like countless other widows, was unable to bring her husband's body home and he was buried in the Military Cemetery, Malta. On the anniversaries of her husband's death she repeatedly chose memorial verses that drew attention to the fact that she could not visit him in what she called his 'soldier's grave, A grave I may never see'.⁷²² The brooches worn by these two women were most likely gifts from their husbands when they enlisted; originally a commodity they next became gifts but finally, through changing circumstances they became instead the medium for memory.

Former serviceman John Keetley described enlisting in 1957 in the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers.⁷²³ He had no particular expectation of a lasting relationship with Jenny, the girlfriend he had met a year earlier, but they corresponded throughout his three years' army service and as a keepsake he gave her a REME sweetheart brooch. In 1961 they married; the marriage lasted for 50 years until

⁷²⁰ Metcalfe, *Remembered Again*, p.104.

⁷²¹ Ancestry.co.uk:UK, Army Registers of Soldiers' Effects, 1901-1929, William Davies 1914-1915 Shrewsbury 235001-236500[accessed 3.4.2017].

⁷²² Davies, 'In Memoriam', *County Herald*, 15.9.1916'.

⁷²³ John Keetley. Personal communication through the British Legion, 24.10.2015.

Jenny's death and throughout that time the brooch was displayed in the couple's home. When deciding which of his wife's belongings must be kept or disposed of, Keetley found a shoe box hidden in her wardrobe containing dozens of love letters. He wrote:

They were every letter I had sent during our courtship while serving the 3 years in REME and I had never known that they had been saved. The letters are still in the shoe box and the brooch still in the china cabinet. They will never be disposed of while I live.⁷²⁴

The letters and love token he sent her now comprise a small collection of objects kept in memory of Keetley's wife as part of the story of their courtship and long marriage. Though he did not know she had kept his letters, he can now visualise her treasuring and storing them, and wearing his brooch while they were apart; he keeps these objects safe and has reconstructed his memories in the light of this new information. The brooch was not worn after he had left the army because, as previously suggested, many women saw military brooches as inappropriate adornments beyond the context of army life. However, it was a significant part of their personal history and was displayed prominently in their home with other precious things and retained after Jenny's death in her memory. Keetley was happy to tell the story of the brooch as it related to their family history for this study since it was a personal, valued object that was, he felt, a special repository of his wife's memory.

A contemporary perception of the significance of military jewellery in conflict situations is exemplified by Private Richard Machin's gift to his mother of a silver regimental brooch. It illustrates the fluctuating meanings of objects that may be reframed according to the context in which they are given and worn. Private Machin joined the army in 2008 and took part in two operational tours with the Yorkshire Regiment in Helmand Province in Afghanistan in 2009 and 2012. His father, Ivan Machin, contacted me for this study on his behalf:

During his first tour, his very proud Mother wore various 'Help For Heroes' badges that gave a clear indication she supported our fighting troops in Afghanistan. Its true to say she took every opportunity to inform people at

⁷²⁴ Keetley. 24.10.2015.

work, at social events and throughout our circle of friends and family how proud she was of her son.

Being aware of this, prior to his second operational tour, my son decided he wanted to give his Mother something more substantial to remember him by and he ordered a silver brooch from Bickerton jewellers in Birmingham.⁷²⁵

Help for Heroes is an organisation supporting wounded service personnel. Private Machin intended the Yorkshire brooch he gave his mother to be a more personal replacement for the generic badge worn by many who support the organisation's fund-raising. The brooch comprises the white rose of York from the Prince of Wales's Own Regiment of Yorkshire, with the lion rampant from the Duke of Wellington's family crest on the Brunswick green of the Green Howards, denoting the Yorkshire Regiment's 2006 formation from three infantry regiments originally raised in 1685 (fig. 162). Ivor Machin explained:

When I asked my son the reasons he gave his Mother the brooch, he said "Its a representation of me who has gone away and as a reminder to others to not forget that me and my mates were fighting a bloody and unpleasant war". He also said he felt it would be a link from him thousands of miles away to his mother at home. In telling me this, he visibly welled up and became emotional.⁷²⁶

The brooch's original purpose was more than a conventional gift of jewellery from a son to his mother but a significant connection between them and an object of constant remembrance for her and others. Worn on her clothing, Machin's brooch kept him present within his mother's personal space. She would never forget that her son was in a situation of constant danger but she wished to draw this to the attention of others at a point when British society was not always so completely engaged and in sympathy with military activity as it would have been during both World Wars. There was also, as Machin's father suggested: 'an element of regimental pride in his choice of gift (I too serve in the Yorkshire Regt in a part time capacity so the family ties are strong)'. In addition, there was a family tradition of giving sweetheart brooches:

⁷²⁵ Ivor Machin, personal communication, emails December 2014-January 2015. Appendix 1.

⁷²⁶ Machin, December 2014-January 2015.

Incidentally, my Father was a National Serviceman in the Royal Signals in the early 1950's who purchased a sweetheart badge for my Grandmother which unfortunately we no longer have. My uncle who was also a National Serviceman in the Royal Artillery in the late 1950's, also bought a sweetheart badge for my Grandmother and this one we still own.⁷²⁷

These anecdotes also confirm my contention that mothers were traditionally recipients of 'sweetheart' brooches given by soldier sons.

Arjun Appadurai proposes that objects may usefully be viewed from an anthropological perspective to consider their changing significance as they move through society and from one individual to another.⁷²⁸ For Appadurai, the life-cycles of objects tend to follow socially predetermined paths from which, in certain circumstances, they may be diverted. He sees these diversions from their specified trajectories as invariably signifying creativity or crisis, either in aesthetic or economic terms.⁷²⁹ Appadurai draws particular attention to war as a likely catalyst for change, especially relevant to conflict-related items such as insignia and to the altered values of memorabilia.⁷³⁰ During his second tour of duty in Afghanistan several soldiers from Machin's regiment were killed in action and at this point the brooch acquired further personal significance:

He did lose several close friends during this tour including one from Huddersfield and when my wife and I went to this soldiers memorial service, my wife wore her sweetheart brooch as a symbol of solidarity with the dead soldiers family and as a mark of pride in what the soldiers of the regiment were achieving. When my wife hugged the Mother of the dead soldier it was an incredibly touching and emotional moment.⁷³¹

A bereaved woman wearing a regimental brooch in memory of a lost family member would elicit sympathy and compassion from others who saw it. For another woman to wear such a brooch in her presence made evocative, silent statements of solidarity between them.

⁷²⁷ Machin, December 2014-January 2015.

⁷²⁸ Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things*, p.3.

⁷²⁹ Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things*, p.26.

⁷³⁰ Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things*, p.26.

⁷³¹ Machin, December 2014-January 2015.

This account reiterates the fundamental contention of this thesis, that sweetheart brooches provided powerful material connections between the home front and the battle front as symbols both of group loyalty and individual pride. This brooch linked the soldiers' mothers to their sons and also to each other. However, Richard Machin was clear about what the brooch did *not* represent for him personally:

my son's brooch was VERY much about his relationship with his Mother and what it represented for both him and his Mum on an emotional level, there was absolutely NO element of patriotism involved. Regimental pride yes, patriotism, no. As my son put it to me, it wasn't about fighting for Queen and Country or for a political reason, it was all about fighting alongside and for your mates and watching each others backs. Thoughts of patriotism or the political reasons for being in a war zone were far from his and his mates minds!⁷³²

Machin's comments reiterate the views of soldiers on the Western Front in WWI, who reserved their strongest loyalties for small, close groups consisting of their immediate comrades, who became 'family' and on whom they necessarily relied.⁷³³

4.11 Conclusion

One of the aims of this thesis was to address the many different meanings embedded in sweetheart brooches. This chapter has looked at them as attractive fashionable and permissible wear during wartime austerity and as symbolic gifts within the framework of courtship and marriage. In addition, brooches conferred something of the giver's rank and status. Many revived older superstitions, incorporating the solace of apotropaic charms for both the soldier or sailor and the woman at home. But whatever the original reason for the gift, as Appadurai asserted: 'Things have no meanings apart from those that human transactions, attributions, and motivations endow them with'.⁷³⁴ The perceived significance of an object may change it, so that it

⁷³² Machin, December 2014-January 2015.

⁷³³ Keith Simpson, 'The British Soldier on the Western Front', in Peter H. Liddle, *Home Fires and Foreign Fields: British Social and Military Experience in the First World War* (London: Brassey's Defence Publishers, 1985), p.147.

⁷³⁴ Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things*, p.5.

becomes diverted from its predetermined biography.⁷³⁵ A jewel may be a transformed from its first function as military insignia into a commodity, to a gift commemorating a family occasion such as a wedding and finally perhaps to part of a collection for visitors to interpret or the memorialisation of a death.

In considering regimental brooches as objects of mourning and memory, this section has shown that brooches were produced specifically for bereaved women to wear. Often, however, brooches remained physically unchanged but their meaning altered as individuals reframed them. For the many families whose lost relatives were not repatriated, the insignia on the brooches provided a link with that engraved on the gravestone that they might never travel to visit.

But objects once valued and highly visible may fall from common knowledge as time and circumstances alter. Experiences of the bereaved like the Bodman and Baird Forbes families account for one reason why artefacts such as sweetheart brooches so often became separated from their family histories. Lt. Bodman's mother was unable either to destroy or contemplate her dead son's personal effects because, as Gibson observes, we use material things to reconstruct identity and the substance of the deceased.⁷³⁶ To destroy his possessions would be to obliterate his memory. Just as many men never spoke of their wartime experiences throughout their lives, so bereaved women often did the same. In this way memory objects like regimental brooches were often lost to later generations.

⁷³⁵ Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things*, p.28.

⁷³⁶ Gibson, 'Melancholy Objects', p.293.

Chapter 5

Brooches with Images, Images of Brooches

5.1 Introduction

The essential function of sweetheart brooches was to express visually the connections between service personnel and their families through their appropriation of military insignia. As argued throughout, sweetheart brooches were a new type of jewel, but they developed from much earlier forms. Chapter 1 explained their evolution from military and familial badges and several examples in the foregoing chapters describe brooches to which some form of image has been added and the way in which regimental mottos might be re-interpreted as intimate messages. In this chapter I demonstrate their development from earlier pictorial sentimental jewellery, focusing on how the inclusion of an image enhanced and individualised the jewel and argue that this placed these brooches on a continuum with portrait miniatures in the way they functioned. Frequently, the brooch would be personalised by the addition of a photograph of the giver in the form of a pendant frame in which a portrait was displayed to the public gaze, within a locket case or, as in one of the examples discussed next, concealed behind the insignia for the consumption and knowledge only of the woman who wore it. The addition of such a likeness fused concepts of military badge brooches with their antecedents, portrait miniatures, as personal jewellery. A comparison of the way they were worn and, in particular, held in the hand, further illuminates the brooches as intimate objects within relationships.

In addition, women were often depicted in full-scale paintings, and later in photographs, wearing their portrait miniatures and brooches, a circularity of images that reinforced the significance of these treasured objects. The first part of the chapter analyses miniatures as significant objects by taking as examples two paintings by George Romney of Anna Maria Crouch and comparing them with several sweetheart brooches containing images. Thereafter the chapter considers how brooches containing photographs, and photographs of women wearing sweetheart brooches, functioned similarly to the portraits of Mrs Crouch, to convey messages about the women depicted in them.

5.2 Portrait Miniatures to Military Brooches

Both military sweetheart brooches and painted portrait miniatures were worn almost exclusively by women and functioned to express loyalty and allegiances or retain family ties at times of separation. Both were small, portable objects worn close to the body that could also be held in the hand; the combination of a painted portrait or a photograph, possibly with a lock of hair, retained the presence of the absent giver. Valuable materials in the construction of their cases or frames often enhanced their value, but their worth might not always lie in costly jewels or metals.

The earliest miniatures were used to decorate books. A manuscript in the Milan Biblioteca Trivulziana (c.1518) contains small portraits depicting Francis I of France and twenty-seven ladies of the Milanese court (fig.163). Stephanie Buck describes how:

These medallions can be opened and closed, thereby inviting the viewer into the seductive game of revealing and concealing the images of the beauties [...] so as to facilitate an immediate, quasi-personal encounter between spectator and figure.⁷³⁷

These pictures with moveable covers clearly link early manuscript illustrations with the jewelled portrait miniatures that emerged shortly after as personal adornment. Viewing both requires similar engagement with the object as the covers are opened and closed to reveal the images within.

Holding miniatures in the hand to examine them closely while keeping them secret was part of the ritual of these personal jewels; further, the act of holding suggested ownership of the person depicted. In his *Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning* (c.1600) Nicholas Hilliard described the way a miniature portrait's effectiveness is heightened by physical intimacy since it 'is to be viewed of necessity in hand near

⁷³⁷ Stephanie Buck, 'Beauty and Virtue for Francis I: Iohannes Ambrosius Nucetus and the Early Portrait Miniature', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 71 (2008), p.198.

unto the eye'.⁷³⁸ In 1588 Hilliard painted the miniature *Man Clasping a Hand from a Cloud*, in watercolour on fine vellum to be placed inside a jewel, in which image and text provide an enigma for the viewer to interpret (fig.164). It depicts a fashionably dressed young courtier, thought to be Lord Thomas Howard (1561-1626). Howard participated in Elizabeth I's Ascension Day Tilts, at which knights publicly displayed their devotion to the queen through allegorical devices on their shields and badges. His right hand holds a woman's gloved hand reaching down from a cloud: interpreted as representing romantic attachment (if the hand is believed to be that of a lover) or fidelity (if the hand is Elizabeth's). Hilliard was not only a painter of miniatures but also a goldsmith with premises in Cheapside, where the Goldsmiths' Guild was based, and would therefore have possessed practical knowledge in this field and a visual vocabulary of metalwork. Hilliard's *Treatise* articulates his understanding of the effectiveness of enigmatic painted images within wearable containers.

Andrea Alciato's *Emblemata* employs the image of clasped hands to express 'faithfulness', while George Wither's *Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Moderne* (1695) has an example of hands emerging from clouds, identifiable as male and female by the style of their sleeves, as in the Hilliard miniature. The verse beneath explains: 'A paire of Loving-Hands, Which, close, and fast-united, seem to be'.⁷³⁹ Stephen Dobranski notes the symbolism of the empty weaponless hand to demonstrate peaceful intent, pointing out that that hand-holding signifies lasting love, and from 1549 the Book of Common Prayer stipulated that bride and groom held hands while reciting their vows as part of the English marriage ceremony.⁷⁴⁰ Hilliard's miniature, therefore, is an early example of a jewel given either within strategies of courtly allegiance or as a personal love token.

Patricia Fumerton sees miniatures within the puzzle games of secrecy and self-

⁷³⁸ Nicholas Hilliard, *A Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning* [c.1600] Robert Kelsey, Rought Thornton, Thomas Grant, Steven Cain, Editors. (Mid Northumberland Arts, 1992), p.87.

⁷³⁹ Andrea Alciato, *Emblemata* [1550], <http://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/alciato/emblem.php?id=A91a190> Emblema CXC [accessed 12.1.2014]; George Wither, *A Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Moderne*, (London: 1635), p.99.

⁷⁴⁰ Stephen B. Dobranski, *Milton's Visual Imagination: Imagery in Paradise Lost* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p.141.

representation enjoyed in the Elizabethan age.⁷⁴¹ Not only were pictures and texts designed to be interpreted, but strategies of disclosing the objects themselves sometimes involved complex manoeuvring, since they were probably not worn on the body but wrapped in layers of paper within locked cabinets, in private rooms into which only favoured visitors were invited. Elizabeth herself allowed only certain acquaintances to enter the innermost sanctum of the small royal bedroom, so that viewing the miniatures was a special privilege reserved for her closest intimates.⁷⁴² Images were not for open display but might be hidden within jewelled covers; Elizabeth kept hers wrapped and labelled with the sitter's name.⁷⁴³ Fumerton describes the enclosed 'miniature in its case, which is essentially a heart of privacy wrapt in ornament'.⁷⁴⁴ It is easy to see that these features of secrecy, disclosure and coded messages appeared in Victorian sentimental jewellery and were incorporated into sweetheart brooches.

As we have seen, commercial expansion and military service overseas were often the occasion for gifts of portrait miniatures and military badges brooches. Artists saw the commercial possibilities of small objects that could easily be sent home to family and friends to maintain ties of affection during long absences. On 6 September 1785, the miniaturist John Smart arrived in Madras, where for ten years he successfully produced portraits of military figures, employees of the East India Company and their families.⁷⁴⁵ Smart's miniature of Captain W. S. Dawe of the Indian Infantry typifies this kind of subject and was probably a memento for family in England (fig.165).

Another soldier's portrait locket contains woven hair, probably that of the sitter, set behind glass at the back (fig.166). Neither artist nor subject is known but the uniform identifies him as a Colonel of the 3rd Regiment of Foot Guards. Hair miniatures became fashionable from the mid-eighteenth century. Hair, literally part of the absent body, added extra significance to sentimental jewellery and in the event of death

⁷⁴¹ Patricia Fumerton, '“Secret” Arts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets', in *Representing the English Renaissance*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), pp.94-98.

⁷⁴² Fumerton, '“Secret” Arts', p.100.

⁷⁴³ Strong, *Artists of the Tudor Court*, p.9.

⁷⁴⁴ Fumerton, '“Secret” Arts', p.100.

⁷⁴⁵ Daphne Foskett, *British Portrait Miniatures: A History* (London: Methuen, 1963), p.111.

might become a relic framed within the jewel. Christiane Holm believes mourning jewellery into which hair has been placed was a powerful conduit for memory. Of an eighteenth-century locket with a *memento mori* design on one side and the deceased's woven hair on the other Holm writes:

Considering the particular form of this jewel as a two-sided locket, the ambiguous arrangement can be interpreted as a variation of the structure of showing and hiding: if the pictorial side of the locket is shown to the viewer, it works like a common mourning memorial; if it is hidden, it is set in contact with the body of the wearer, possibly to his or her warm skin.⁷⁴⁶

The wearer can thus almost reanimate the relic by wearing the jewel next to the living body, as Deborah Lutz describes the performance of 'secondary relics'. The Colonel's jewel may be a mourning piece: the addition of his hair increases its emotional and intimate fetishistic fascination. Queen Victoria was an early enthusiast for miniaturised photographs set into jewellery and after Albert's death enshrined his image and hair in brooches, lockets and pins by Garrards for herself and as gifts for others.⁷⁴⁷ These examples demonstrate the function of miniatures as tokens of love and commitment and show how they were often given by members of the military as mementoes to their families during overseas postings. Military sweetheart brooches that included images of the donor were a natural development of this type of jewellery, illustrated by the following comparison between a portrait miniature depicted in two eighteenth-century portraits by Romney and a sweetheart brooch of 1917.

5.3 Images of a Marriage: Two Portraits of Anna Maria Crouch

In 1787 Lieutenant Rollings Edward Crouch RN commissioned from George Romney a painting of his wife Anna Maria, a well-known actress and singer (figs.167, 168). Wearing a simple pale muslin dress and leaning against a rocky outcrop above the sea, Mrs. Crouch turns her gaze wistfully from the sight of a ship, perhaps her husband's,

⁷⁴⁶ Christiane Holm, 'Sentimental Cuts: Eighteenth-Century Mourning Jewelry with Hair', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol.38, 1, (Fall, 2004), p.142.

⁷⁴⁷ Gere, Rudoe, *Jewellery in the Age of Queen Victoria*, pp.45,56-57.

sailing into the distance. Her book falls forgotten from her left hand while entwined around the fingers of her right is a gold chain from which hangs a miniature of her husband, a memento for her to keep close during his absence. (The miniature closely resembles one by James Scouler dated 1781, now in the V&A. In watercolour on ivory, set in a similar simple gold frame, it depicts a Merchant Navy officer, who would also have been separated from his family through service overseas, wearing a dark blue coat and in an identical pose (fig.169). Romney thus narrates the couple's enforced separation through this small portrait-within-a-portrait.

On 9 January 1785 Anna Maria Phillips and Lieutenant Crouch married secretly by licence in Twickenham.⁷⁴⁸ Mrs. Crouch was already a celebrated actress and singer, making her first appearance at Drury Lane aged sixteen. She performed in operas and numerous musical theatre productions and her soprano voice was said to: 'ravish the ear with its delicacy and melting softness'.⁷⁴⁹ On 12 April 1787 *The Morning Herald's* theatre correspondent saw the painting in Romney's studio and pronounced on its close resemblance 'to that charming performer'.⁷⁵⁰

When Crouch commissioned Romney to paint his wife wearing his own miniature image, they had been married for only two years but Mrs Crouch's fame as an actress and noted beauty had brought her many admirers and she was favourably compared to the famous Sarah Siddons.⁷⁵¹ As Pointon observes, the husband who gave his wife one of these small personal ornaments bearing his portrait was not simply giving a gift of jewellery but also claiming exclusive ownership of her: indeed he possessed almost total legal control over her.⁷⁵² The husband who commissioned a full-size portrait of his wife owned the painting that depicted her, the jewelled miniature and effectively the woman herself. When the painting was displayed in the house, also exclusively

⁷⁴⁸ Marriage certificate of Rollings Edward Crouch and Anna Maria Phillips, 9.1.1785, Church of England Baptisms, Marriages and Burials, Richmond-upon-Thames, St. Mary the Virgin, Twickenham. 'The Year 1785', p.4. No.13.

⁷⁴⁹ James Greig, ed., Footnote to p.280, *The Farington Diary, Vol.1*, 3.7.1801, (London: Hutchinson, n.d.), Online edition URL: <https://ia802705.us.archive.org/31/items/faringtondiary01fariuft/faringtondiary01fariuft.pdf> [accessed 3.2.2016].

⁷⁵⁰ 'Theatrical Intelligence', *Morning Herald*, 12.4.1787.

⁷⁵¹ *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser*, 16.8.1786.

⁷⁵² Pointon, "Surrounded with Brilliants", p.51.

his possession even if bought with her money, this statement of ownership was complete. Each image, the miniature and the painting in which it featured, referenced the other and reinforced this circularity of exclusivity, possession and allegiance; each object spoke to the viewer as effectively as written text.

But the miniature also spoke directly to the woman who wore it. In her close analysis of another related but short-lived type of personal jewellery, eye miniatures, Hanneke Grootenboer argues that these images kept the sitter's gaze constantly present, affording comfort and reassurance that the absent loved one could not provide. The wearer, she suggests, felt the painted eyes watching over her actions: effectively looking over her shoulder. The portrait miniature, providing a more complete likeness than the eye only, kept the absent sitter as a constant reminder, protective but also watchful. Grootenboer cites the example of Auguste Amalia, Duchess of Leuchtenberg, who around 1823 gave her sixteen-year-old daughter Josephine an eye painting and a portrait miniature of herself when she left to marry the Crown Prince of Sweden, arguing that through these jewels, 'imagining her mother's gaze upon her', Josephine could maintain the illusion of her mother's presence and counsel: they functioned as a 'remote instrument of control' by which the Duchess might keep watch over her daughter's behaviour.⁷⁵³

Little paintings worn on and close to the body, and held in the hand for contemplation, were more than decorative jewellery, but brought the absent beloved into the wearer's space. In *The Story of Art* Ernst Gombrich argued for the power the viewer invests in even basic depictions of the human face, while painted or photographic portraits of a beloved individual always retain something of the person represented and are therefore inevitably viewed as 'alive'. Gombrich described our natural reluctance to damage such a picture, perceiving it as sentient and focusing particularly on the image's capacity for vision:

... would we enjoy taking a needle and poking out the eyes? [...] I do not think so. However well I know with my waking thoughts that what I do to his picture makes no difference to my friend or hero, I still feel a vague reluctance

⁷⁵³ Grootenboer, *Treasuring the Gaze*, p.125-126.

to harm it. Somewhere there remains the absurd feeling that what one does to the picture is done to the person it represents.⁷⁵⁴

The portrait miniature thus had agency, acting as conscience and placing the absent loved one constantly with the wearer. Josephine may well have felt her mother's presence, comforting or admonishing through her painted gaze and influencing her behaviour. The woman who, like Mrs. Crouch, wore a miniature of her husband, was under the his constant painted surveillance, a reminder to remain faithful to him or his memory. Similarly a regimental brooch, particularly one with an added portrait, was a material reminder of the giver, as the advertisement maintaining 'She Won't Forget You' (fig.27) suggested.

Most portrait miniatures, like military brooches a century later, were made as gifts and keepsakes, often part of the system of reciprocity between two people in a marriage. The gift of the portrait set up a cycle of obligation requiring fidelity to its subject. Crouch's commission of his wife's portrait depicting his own miniature likeness was undoubtedly intended as a statement of their marriage and mutual commitment when he was away on long voyages necessitated by his naval career. Roy Strong states Mrs. Crouch's pose is reminiscent of the *Unknown Melancholy Young Man*, a miniature by Isaac Oliver painted c.1595-1600, describing the young man's extended fingers and heavenward gaze as reminiscent of a Madonna, implying purity and notes that the rock and storm-tossed ship are emblematic of constancy and devotion.⁷⁵⁵ Romney's composition may have been made with these allegories in mind: if so, it did not guarantee Anna Maria's faithfulness. The year of Romney's painting Michael Kelly, an Irish actor and singer, principal tenor with a Viennese opera company, joined the Drury Lane cast playing the lead opposite Mrs. Crouch. *The Morning Herald* journalist who had so admired Mrs. Crouch's singing praised Kelly as 'the most finished English singer at present'.⁷⁵⁶ Kelly lodged at the Crouch's London home in an arrangement that soon developed into a *ménage à trois*. The artist and diarist Joseph Farington, who chronicled the gossip of London's eighteenth-century artworld, recorded in his journal on 3 July 1801: 'Mrs. Crouch has lived in the same House with

⁷⁵⁴ Ernst Gombrich, *The Story of Art* (London: Phaedon, 16th Edition, 2006), p.38.

⁷⁵⁵ Roy Strong, *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered 1520-1620* (London: V&A Museum, 1983), pp.10, 168.

⁷⁵⁶ 'Theatrical Intelligence', *Morning Herald*, 12 April 1787.

Kelly the Singer many years under suspicious circumstances'.⁷⁵⁷ Playbills show Crouch accompanying his wife and her lover as they toured the country performing in productions in London, Liverpool, Manchester and other cities for the next five years, but eventually he gave up the pretence of their marriage and she and Kelly set up home together.⁷⁵⁸ Crouch declined to pay for or take possession of the painting he had commissioned since it no longer represented the successful marriage it was intended to celebrate and it was still in Romney's studio on his death in 1802.⁷⁵⁹

A second version of the painting of Mrs. Crouch was also found there (figs.170, 171). It is not known who commissioned the later version (although Julius Bryant suggests Romney himself may have decided to paint it because of his known admiration for Mrs. Crouch).⁷⁶⁰ The pictures are very similar in composition though with small but significant variations. On the pages of the book Mrs. Crouch holds a musical score is now visible, identified as *Hush Ev'ry Breeze*, a popular song she sang on 25 April 1793 at Covent Garden, dating the painting to that year.⁷⁶¹ The locket Mrs. Crouch holds is now empty: it no longer contains the image of her now estranged husband.

The two paintings thus describe the course of the marriage between Lieutenant and Mrs. Crouch. In the first she wears his image as a piece of sentimental jewellery and thus declares her love for him; her portrait, probably intended for display in their London home, would have been a statement of their attachment in the early days of their marriage. In the second, estranged from each other and the marriage effectively over, the emphasis is on Anna Maria as actress and singer and her absent husband's image is no longer the focus of her longing. Without the miniature portrait-within-a-portrait in the second painting, the thread between the couple is now missing.

Anna Maria Crouch's miniature was worn in such a way that Lieutenant Crouch's portrait (or lack of it) was visible to all who saw it in the paintings of her, and she

⁷⁵⁷ Joseph Farington, RA, *The Farington Diary, Vol.1*, 3 July 1801, p.281.

⁷⁵⁸ For example, *The London Advertiser*, 13 May 1789, and 15 December 1790 among many others show Kelly and Mrs. Crouch in productions at Drury Lane.

⁷⁵⁹ Julius Bryant, 'Mrs. Crouch', *Kenwood: Paintings in the Iveagh Bequest*, (Swindon: English Heritage, 2012), p.388.

⁷⁶⁰ Bryant, *Kenwood*, pp.388-389.

⁷⁶¹ Bryant, *Kenwood*, p.388.

would also have owned and worn the original locket depicted by Romney. Her fingers entwined around the locket chain draw the viewer's attention to her hand, which was, as we have seen, an important focus of enduring love, and to her husband's likeness in the portrait miniature round her neck. Susan Stewart examines ways in which objects draw attention to themselves through exaggerations of scale:

Miniatures from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century were either ornamental miniatures – circular or oval, and worn on the person as ornaments or jewelry – or cabinet miniatures, larger miniatures placed in oval or rectangular frames to hang on a wall. In both cases, the miniature allowed possession of the face of the other.⁷⁶²

A portrait miniature, Stewart claims, stood for the individual it represented but also for the marriage in which it was given: 'To carry the other's face in a locket is to create a double interiority, the interiority of the bourgeois marriage encapsulated and surrounded by the ring'.⁷⁶³ Further, for Stewart, a miniature acted specifically as 'a mirror of requited love'.⁷⁶⁴ Displaying a portrait as personal adornment was a powerful statement of commitment; therefore, like a wedding ring the miniature would be discarded when the marriage failed and the love was no longer returned. Similarly, many military brooches were set aside because the love affair or marriage they were given to celebrate ended through separation or death.

Mrs. Crouch's miniature and its depiction in the full-size portrait illustrates the part played by art objects in visually and materially articulating a relationship's mutable nature. Military brooches incorporating photographs continued this tradition, as demonstrated by a First World War brooch that encapsulates all the aspects of costly materials, strategies of showing and concealing and representation of close personal commitment described above. In this jewel, the giver's military insignia was represented in gold and precious gemstones for the viewer to see but his likeness was not intended for the public gaze.

⁷⁶² Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (London, Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), pp.125-126.

⁷⁶³ Stewart, *On Longing*, p.127.

⁷⁶⁴ Stewart, *On Longing*, p.126.

5.4 Public Image, Hidden Message: Major Fleming Hartley's Gift

Early in 1917 Major Alan Fleming Hartley gave his wife Philippa a brooch replicating the insignia of the XIth King Edward's Own Lancers (Probyn's Horse), the Bengal regiment to which he was gazetted Lieutenant in 1905 (figs.172, 173).⁷⁶⁵ The brooch is now in the National Army Museum's collection and nothing is known of the circumstances of the gift but close examination of the jewel itself offers a starting point for speculation.

The Hartley brooch was made to commission by the prestigious London firm of Edward Tessier of New Bond Street. It depicts the crossed lances and colours common to all cavalry regiments in rubies and sapphires against a background of *basse taille* enamel in the gold, black, scarlet and blue colours of Probyn's Horse dress uniform. The flamboyant richly embroidered regimental uniforms, approximating to loose-fitting Indian dress, were worn by both British and Indian officers and men, seen in the 1867 painting of Major Dighton Probyn (fig.174). In 1876 the regiment provided an escort for the Prince of Wales, who then became its Honorary Colonel, after which it carried the Prince's title, crest and feather device, represented on the brooch in diamonds, gold, rubies and sapphires, while the motto 'Ich Dien' is in gold on blue enamel.⁷⁶⁶ The jeweller's skill and precious materials endorse the marriage it celebrates and enhance the sentimental value of the gift. Measuring only 3x2.5x0.5cm, the brooch is an exquisite miniature of Hartley's badge and when commissioned would have been a valuable jewel.

Hartley was a career soldier, enlisting at eighteen, rising eventually to the rank of General and spending most of his career in India, where during WWII he held the senior post of Commander-in-Chief, India.⁷⁶⁷ During the First World War he was

⁷⁶⁵ Notice of Promotions 'To be Lieutenants', *The London Gazette*, 17.10.1905, p.6936. Fleming Hartley was originally commissioned 2nd Lieutenant, 68th Durham Light Infantry *The London Gazette*, 8.1.1901, p.160.

⁷⁶⁶ Ronald Harris, *Bengal Cavalry Regiments 1857-1914* (Oxford: London, 1979), p.21.

⁷⁶⁷ *The London Gazette*, 27264, 8.1.1901, p.160; 'Obituary, General Sir Alan Hartley', *The Times*, 8.9.1954, p.8.

seconded to the 1st Battalion, York and Lancaster Regiment but his loyalties obviously remained with the Indian cavalry to which he later returned, since theirs was the insignia he commissioned for the brooch.⁷⁶⁸ The outward statement projected in the public sphere by this piece concerned Hartley's affection for his Indian regiment as well as for his wife. This would be evident to others within their army circle who would recognise its symbolism whenever she wore the brooch and to civilians familiar with military insignia during wartime, as this study has shown.

However, jewellery is recognised as having multiple possibilities for communication. Concealed from public view behind the face of the jewel is Hartley's photograph, held in place by an oval gold border (fig.175). This image was private, its existence known only to the wearer and only visible if the brooch was unpinned and the photograph deliberately revealed. The picture has no protective cover and therefore when the jewel was pinned to clothing it was as close to the body as possible, increasing its intimacy. Photographic portraits hold a special relationship to their subject, relying as they must on the camera's physical proximity to the person recorded.⁷⁶⁹ In this way the photograph's materiality may comprise something of the relic, evoking through sight and touch the sensation of close contact with the person depicted over time and space. Reflecting Hilliard's views that miniatures should be held in the hand and closely examined, Pointon believes that portrait miniatures enter affective discourse through their tactile quality: 'Portrait-objects are distinguished not only by the requirement that they be gazed at but also by the necessity that they be held.'⁷⁷⁰ Such jewels should be touched, opened, held in the hand and worn close to the body so that their secrets and the complex relationships they represent may be appreciated.

Grootenboer further describes small precious containers as intimate spaces where we can in imagination store personal memories, daydreams and private thoughts.⁷⁷¹

⁷⁶⁸ The 1st Battalion York and Lancaster Regiment were also in India at the outbreak of war, which may account for Hartley's secondment to it. Forces War Records URL: <https://www.forces-war-records.co.uk/units/328/york-and-lancaster-regiment>[accessed 1.7.2015].

⁷⁶⁹ Hallam, Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, pp.142-143.

⁷⁷⁰ Marcia Pointon, "'Surrounded with Brilliants': Miniature Portraits in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Art Bulletin*, Vol.83, No.1 (March 2001), pp.63.

⁷⁷¹ Grootenboer, *Treasuring the Gaze*: p.12.

These small objects ‘cancel out the interior world’, creating a space of close intimacy that:

escapes the gaze of others, as a space accessible and visible only to us. Intimacy is thus a refuge from the visible world within a space where one may be seen but is not visible to the eyes of the world.⁷⁷²

The Hartley brooch is very small and delicate, easily concealed in the palm of the hand. Whenever Philippa Hartley touched her brooch she would have been aware of the hidden image: it was reserved for her gaze alone and only when she unpinned the jewel from her clothing and held it in her hand was the photograph visible to her. It offered, only to her, a space in which to think and remember whenever she wished.

Eighteenth-century portrait miniatures were fashionably worn pinned to a dress or a ribbon so that the painted images contained within the jewelled frames were visible to others.⁷⁷³ In Romney’s painting Mrs. Crouch holds her husband’s portrait in this way. The dynamics of opening and closing the container to disclose or disguise the painted images within were an essential part of the diversion. There are also examples of tiny miniatures-within-miniatures, such as the one by Thomas Hazlehurst in fig.176. This unknown woman wears a miniature on a gold chain close against her skin, tucked just inside the neckline of her dress but clearly visible. Its intimate placing means it could only be her husband or lover. Repetitive games of concealing and revealing are evident as the man’s likeness is both hidden and displayed, while the woman might well have been painted wearing the miniature in a further full-scale portrait.

The Hartley brooch varies in this respect from eighteenth-century miniatures worn specifically to be seen by others in that only the outward part is intended for show. The publicly displayed jewelled insignia stands metonymically for the giver, while Hartley’s photograph itself is kept secretly, not for disclosure or the gaze of others. This was a couple who preferred to keep their personal feelings between themselves. Though eighteenth-century fashion decreed portrait miniatures should be viewed, Pointon argues that concealed objects describe a special intimacy:

⁷⁷² Grootenboer, *Treasuring the Gaze*, p.12.

⁷⁷³ Pointon, “Surrounded with Brilliants”, p.51.

The point is – and this takes us back also to jewel cases – that the relationship between the subject and the object of desire is, ultimately a relationship of something secret and hidden, albeit played out in the arena of the visual.⁷⁷⁴

Hartley and his wife were married at St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, on 22 April 1914.⁷⁷⁵ He left for the front at the beginning of the war so at the time of the gift they had been married less than three years and had been separated for most of that time.⁷⁷⁶ He survived to have a long, distinguished army career but many of his regiment were killed in battle, died from wounds or succumbed to disease in the low-lying malarial Macedonian Struma Valley.⁷⁷⁷ In these highly dangerous, uncertain circumstances the brooch can be viewed as similar in form and function to early painted portrait miniatures exchanged as meaningful keepsakes during long separation necessitated by distant military and naval campaigns.⁷⁷⁸ Of the valuable jewelled cases made to enclose such small-scale painted portraits, Pointon states: 'an image introduced into a container made of precious materials fused economic and sentimental value; the worth of the subject was irrevocably endorsed by the precious materials, producing at the symbolic level a sign of unique distinction'.⁷⁷⁹ There are no images available of Philippa Hartley but when she wore the brooch its military imagery would have been a material manifestation of her husband's identity, its emotional value further enhanced by the gold and costly gemstones and the skilful miniaturisation of its original referent, the regimental badge. By contrast, the image of her husband, known only to her but concealed from others, had no monetary value but would have been treasured for its personal resonance.

An additional layer of meaning is incorporated into the brooch. Engraved on the gold band surrounding the photograph is a message, hidden from outward view, reading:

⁷⁷⁴ Marcia Pointon, 'Valuing the Visual and Visualizing the Valuable: Jeweller and its Ambiguities', *Cultural Values*, 3, 1, 1999, p.12.

⁷⁷⁵ 'Marriages', 'Court Circular', *The Times*, 22 April 1914, p.11.

⁷⁷⁶ Col. H. C. Whyllly, C.B., *The History of the York and Lancaster Regiment, Vol. 1*, compiled c.1918. My thanks to John Nash, Archivist, York and Lancaster Regiment, Clifton Park Museum, Rotherham, for assistance with accessing documentation relating to Hartley and the Regiment's movements.

⁷⁷⁷ Cyril Falls, Captain, *History of the Great War: Military Operation., Macedonia* (London: HM Stationery Office, 1935), p.4.

⁷⁷⁸ Pointon, "Surrounded with Brilliants", p.67.

⁷⁷⁹ Pointon, "Surrounded with Brilliants", p.56.

‘A.H. to P.H. 29 DEC. 1916 – 15 JAN. 1917’. Like the hidden photograph, the inscription was known only to the brooch’s wearer. It is reasonable to assume that the dates refer to a time of special significance to the couple but the details are uncertain. The NAM’s records state that Hartley gave his wife the brooch after he returned to France from leave. However, my research conducted for this thesis in the York and Lancaster Regimental Museum’s archives reveal that Hartley was not in France at this time. At the beginning of the war he served with 1st Battalion York and Lancaster Regiment in Vermelles in Northern France but on 25 October 1915 his Battalion sailed from Marseilles to Macedonia where they remained near Salonika until 1919 (fig.177).⁷⁸⁰ Records of officers retiring at rank of General and above are not available to the public but Hartley’s movements can be traced through Battalion archives. These show Hartley in action with his troops on 10 October 1916 near Barakli Dzuma in the Struma Valley several miles from Salonika; on 3 November he assumed Battalion command.⁷⁸¹ He is next mentioned on 13 March 1917, in Battalion Orders relating to Honours and Awards and Ordnance, as Acting Lieutenant Colonel (fig.178). He was still in Salonika then and remained there until April 1919.

In light of this documentation, could Hartley have been in England with his wife on the dates inscribed on the brooch? He was recently promoted to command the Battalion but the winter season of reduced operations had begun so he might have been absent for a time. Whyllly’s *History of the York and Lancaster Regiment* states that between November 1916 and March 1917 the weather was so bad that roads became impassable and ‘no important operations were engaged in’.⁷⁸² Though patrols were carried out and there was frequent ‘contact with the enemy’, fighting was scaled back until full ‘active operations recommenced in early spring’.⁷⁸³

Leave was given in rotation, though troops could usually go only as far as local towns. In 1974 Walter Lunt, an officer with the King’s Liverpool Regiment serving in Salonika, recalled there was very little chance of getting to England on leave.⁷⁸⁴

⁷⁸⁰ Whyllly, *The History of the York and Lancaster Regiment, Vol. 1*, p.155.

⁷⁸¹ Whyllly, *The History of the York and Lancaster Regiment, Vol.1*, pp.195-6.

⁷⁸² Whyllly, *The History of the York and Lancaster Regiment, Vol.1*, p.197.

⁷⁸³ Whyllly, *The History of the York and Lancaster Regiment, Vol.1*, p.197.

⁷⁸⁴ Brigadier Walter Thomas Lunt, Interview with David Lance, 1974, IWM Sound Recording No.300. URL: <http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/80000299>[accessed 2.1.2016].

Captain Falls' *History of the Great War: Military Operations: Macedonia* mentions that men sometimes went without home leave for 2½ years.⁷⁸⁵ John Baines, an officer in the Royal Engineers, wrote to his mother from Salonika on 21 July 1918 that officers posted there in January 1916 were due for leave.⁷⁸⁶ But in fact there was provision for officers and men particularly those who, like Hartley, had served for long periods, to travel home. Lieutenant James Brierley, serving with the 2nd Battalion Norfolk Regiment in the same area, recorded in his diary on 30 March 1916 that he: 'Made the draw for men to go to England with next draft'.⁷⁸⁷ Two weeks later Brierley wrote: 'Major Rugg left the island for Salonika en route for England on leave'.⁷⁸⁸ The journey between Greece and Britain through war-torn Europe by road, train and by sea through waters patrolled by enemy submarines could take up to three weeks. Brierley himself made the journey out from Britain to Salonika in seven days, but he travelled on board *RMS Olympic*, a fast ocean-going sister ship to the *Titanic*. In June 1917 *The London Gazette* records that Hartley received the Distinguished Service Order.⁷⁸⁹ Nothing is known about the circumstances of the award, though it was typically given for gallantry under fire. Possibly he was granted special home leave in consequence of his actions, which probably took place some months before the award was gazetted, was due for leave after long service overseas or travelled to London as part of his military duties.

Hartley probably ordered the brooch from Tessier to be delivered to his wife after he returned to Greece and it is safe to assume it was intended to commemorate a time of special importance to them both in the midst of conflict. Whatever the circumstances, it functioned as a sentimental jewel in that it displayed in miniature the larger world of Hartley's life and work through the insignia of his regiment, while the intimate inscription and his own photograph represented his affection for his wife. Lady

⁷⁸⁵ Falls, *History of the Great War*, p.100.

⁷⁸⁶ John Baines to Elizabeth Baines in *Dearest Mother: First World War letters home from a young Sapper officer in France and Salonika*, eds., Andrew Baines, Joanna Palmer (Solihull: Helion, 2015), p.233.

⁷⁸⁷ *Diary of Lieutenant James Brierley*,

URL:[https://lieutenantjamesbrierley.wordpress.com/page/8/30 March 1916](https://lieutenantjamesbrierley.wordpress.com/page/8/30%20March%201916). My thanks to the compilers of *Norfolk in World War One*, (URL: <https://norfolkinworldwar1.org/>) for drawing my attention to Brierley's diary.

⁷⁸⁸ Brierley, URL [https://lieutenantjamesbrierley.wordpress.com/page/7/15 April 1916](https://lieutenantjamesbrierley.wordpress.com/page/7/15%20April%201916).

⁷⁸⁹ 'To be Companions of the Distinguished Service Order', *The London Gazette*, Supplement, 4 June 1917, p.5468.

Hartley, as she later became, maintained her connection to her husband's Indian regiment all her life. In June 1965, eleven years after her husband's death, *The Times* Court Circular noted her attendance at an Indian Army reunion at the Hurlingham Club.⁷⁹⁰ The specific occasion for the gift of this brooch and thus the meaning of the inscription may never be known, but have been investigated in detail here as an indication of the difficulties in establishing complete histories of even those brooches where provenance is known.

Such objects received as gifts from loved ones were employed within strategies of display, moving between public view and the intimate, private space of the domestic sphere. The design and construction of this brooch show that it was never intended to be visible in its entirety by others. It is instead an object that fused the precious spectacular jewelled container intended for the public gaze with the cryptic message and concealed image, meaningful only to giver and recipient.

5.5 Sweetheart Brooch with Photograph of an Unknown Boy

In the collection of the King's Own Royal Regiment Museum in Lancaster is a small sweetheart brooch that must have functioned for its owner in a similar fashion to the Hartley brooch, though this one would have been at the opposite end of the economic spectrum (figs.179, 180). Made simply of brass in the form of the regiment's badge with a small blue enamel strip for the motto, it contains a compartment in the back. Into this a photograph of a young boy has been inserted, clearly cut to fit from a larger photograph since a woman's hands can be seen on the child's shoulders. Nothing further is known about this little brooch. Its style and the boy's clothing suggest it dates from WWI. It might be speculated that this example was given to a woman by her soldier son and that the mother inserted this image of him as a child but there is no proof of this. The child's photograph is the kind of image that might have been carried by a soldier to remind him of his own son at home but the foliate design means this brooch would only have been worn by a woman, as sweetheart brooches invariably were. A man might have carried it in his pack but would never have worn

⁷⁹⁰ 'Service Reunion', Court Circular, *The Times*, 26 June 1965, p.10.

it. Possibly the brooch belonged to a bereaved mother and the image is of her son as a child. Whatever the relationship it records, the photograph would have been hidden and known only to the wearer, who would have been able to hold it whenever she wished without disclosing its presence. Like 18th century portrait miniatures and Philippa Hartley's valuable jewel this brooch, though of no monetary value, would have been a treasured memory object and perhaps given comfort at a difficult time. The potency of this object lies in its juxtaposition of the child's face with the military imagery and the fact that we cannot now know the narrative attached to it.

5.6 Woman with Navy Sweetheart Brooch

This photograph reconstructs the traditions of depicting portrait miniatures within full-size painted portraits (fig.181). Nothing is known of this woman's history. Neither she nor the sailor whose image she wears can be identified, though her clothing and hairstyle date the photograph to WWII. Her Royal Navy brooch is probably of no great material value but added to it is a young sailor's photograph protected by a cover of a type often constructed from Perspex taken from damaged aircraft canopies, similar to the one in fig.182. There is no way of knowing whether the sailor who gave her this brooch made the holder or bought it ready made. The brooch is attached to a bar pin, probably of silver or glass in regimental colours, a commonly found type.

This blend of manufactured and hand-made 'trench' art personalised the object and associated it with the individual depicted, who might be imagined creating the frame from conflict débris under dangerous conditions. In fact, Saunders notes that often such pieces were made for sale by soldiers with time on their hands and were in that sense not always the personal mementoes they at first appeared to be, but rather commercial objects. Even so, as Saunders observes: 'This was a very personal and emotion-laden kind of trench art whose transformation from objects for killing into items for bodily adornment often contributed to the remaking of individual identity'.⁷⁹¹ Such materials were considered as precious by association as valuable metals and gemstones, because the object was last touched and held in the hand by a

⁷⁹¹ Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.92.

loved relative, making therefore ‘a direct and sensual connection’.⁷⁹²

No other jewellery is visible in this photograph and the brooch is proudly displayed in the same way as many of the portrait miniatures described above, for the gaze of others and to draw attention to the wearer’s connection with the young man depicted. The brooch itself was probably bought for a few shillings and the woman has personalised it with the sailor’s photograph. Its value, then, lay not in the cost of the materials from which the container was made, but in their sentimental value to the woman who wore it and the significance to her of the image itself. In this photograph she constructs her identity partly through his, positioning herself as his supporter in society at a time of total war. But she is also clearly using the brooch as a focus for her personal thoughts, memories and daydreams.

5.7 ‘A Link to Bind’: Uniform Buttons and Hidden Images

Throughout this thesis it has been emphasised that only women wore sweetheart brooches, because they were by definition copies of the badges that were already part of male uniforms. However, although men did not wear such items, they obviously wished to carry comforting images of their families into dangerous combat situations to remind them of home. The London store Derry & Toms offered an ingenious solution because: ‘Every soldier has someone who would like his photo in the button of his regiment’.⁷⁹³ They would provide any ‘Regimental, Territorial and Kitchener’s Army’ button, stamped with the correct insignia and fitted with a compartment at the back to take ‘a miniature photograph’ and offered, for the sum of 1/6d, to reduce the customer’s photograph to fit, completing a ‘link to bind where circumstances part’.⁷⁹⁴ Thomas Mott of Birmingham (maker of sweetheart brooches) made buttons of this type (fig.183). In this way a photograph (or perhaps several) could be worn secretly close to the body, in the way described above as meaningful for portrait miniatures and could be viewed when desired without being seen by others. Once sewn onto the soldier’s uniform these ‘brooches’ were indistinguishable from regulation buttons.

⁷⁹² Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.102.

⁷⁹³ Derry & Toms advertisement, *The Daily Mirror*, 18.1.1915, p.2.

⁷⁹⁴ Derry & Toms advertisement, *The Daily Mirror*, 18.1.1915, p.2.

They would be known only to the man himself but the photographs' presence would be a source of comfort away from home.

5.8 Photography and the Sweetheart Brooch: A First World War Soldier and his Bride

I first consider here a photograph about which very little is known for certain, since it was taken by an unknown photographer and depicts an unidentified couple at an uncertain date during the First World War (fig.184). I use this image to explore the correlation between military uniforms and a bride's military badge brooch within the printed image, the physicality and function of the photograph and brooches themselves.

The gift of a sweetheart brooch, as we have seen, was often the marking of a meaningful life event. Jennifer Green-Lewis notes that photographs have similar narrative potential to convey meaning and memory.⁷⁹⁵ Both are inextricably linked to the act of remembrance, whether they record a happy occasion or memorialise a loss:

Loss and its marker, the will to preserve, are of course central to any consideration of photographs; [...] A photograph is concerned with the way things are but will not remain, or perhaps the way we wish they were, or the way we wish they might remain. The perceived threat that this state will be lost is inherent to the act of photographing.⁷⁹⁶

This was particularly true in 1914. As war was declared many couples rushed to marry before men were sent overseas, though they hoped, initially, that it would all be over by Christmas. Newspapers outlined special arrangements made to allow ceremonies to take place at short notice:

So many Navy and Army officers are applying for special marriage licences that in order to facilitate the issue of such business arrangements have been

⁷⁹⁵ Jennifer Green-Lewis, *Framing the Victorians: Photography and the Culture of Realism* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1996), p.19.

⁷⁹⁶ Green-Lewis, *Framing the Victorians*, p.17.

made for the Faculty Office, Knightrider-street, to remain open continuously both day and night for the next few days.⁷⁹⁷

The situation was repeated in WWII when photographers again reported a welcome increase in wedding bookings. A London photographer observed in 1940 that he ‘had twice the work’ he usually expected:

... weddings, that’s our speciality. And if you knew the number of weddings we have these days. They don’t seem to be able to wait two minutes. Meet the girl, marry her, off into the army straight away. It’s amazing.⁷⁹⁸

This photograph may well record one of these hasty First World War marriages. A young soldier and his bride stand before a conventional backdrop of the type commonly used by studio photographers of the time. It suggests a country house drawing room with a garden beyond the window, evoking the England for which he will shortly be fighting, though his uniform rank suggests he is unlikely to come from such a luxurious home. Many such backgrounds were moveable screens that fused painted portraits with photography, creating a hybrid mixture of reality and fantasy. The soldier’s uniform is incongruous, creating a tension between this unrealistic setting and the idealised view of war that the soldier may still have maintained at this early stage, against the actuality of trench warfare to which we are aware he will shortly be sent. In *Camera Lucida*, Roland Barthes analyses the emotional effects of photographs. Barthes describes the ‘lacerating emphasis’ that knowledge of the fate of those depicted since the photograph was taken could provoke in the viewer. Barthes describes the discovery of a photograph of his mother as a child (an image we never see) and his reaction to his retrospective knowledge of what will become of her:

In front of the photograph of my mother as a child, I tell myself: she is going to die: I shudder, [...] *over a catastrophe which has already occurred*. Whether or not the subject is already dead, every photograph is this catastrophe.⁷⁹⁹

Barthes perceives within certain photographs a disturbing element that attracts the attention, a concept he calls the *punctum*: ‘that accident which pricks me (but also

⁷⁹⁷ *Monmouth Guardian and Caerphilly Observer*, 7.8.1914, p.7.

⁷⁹⁸ Photographer, London, 16.7.1940. SxMOA.TC4.1:C.

⁷⁹⁹ Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* Richard Howard, Translator (London: Cape, 1982), p.96.

bruises me, is poignant to me)'.⁸⁰⁰ The purpose of this wedding photograph was a conventional one familiar to most families, usually less concerned with aesthetics than recording what would normally be a happy event. But two elements here are disquieting in the way Barthes describes. Firstly, though the image records the beginning of a marriage, the soldier is already preparing to leave it: he wears his field uniform and must soon embark on active service. We are aware he may not have survived and if he did not this may well have been the only photograph left to his wife and family.

Secondly, there is an incongruous detail that can be seen: the bride's jewellery consists of a cross on a chain and presumably her new wedding ring, unseen beneath the bouquet she carries. But pinned to the neck of her wedding dress is a sweetheart brooch, a miniature version of the groom's cap badge (fig.185). As already established, sweetheart brooches quickly became popular presents from bride to groom so this may well have been his wedding gift, linking her with his service as a soldier. His badge and her brooch were not the primary focus of the photograph yet the startling juxtaposition of this military symbolism with her feminine, lace wedding dress draws the eye in the way Barthes describes. It is the visible symbol of the war that binds them and that we suspect may permanently separate them.

In this wedding photograph, the cap badge of the white horse of Kent identifies the soldier as a trooper of The Queen's Own (Royal West Kent) Regiment. From 1914 until 1918 the West Kent's 1st Battalion fought on the Western Front and the 2nd Battalion served in Mesopotamia.⁸⁰¹ This wedding must therefore have taken place either just before the outbreak of war or during a short period of leave. In either case the couple would not have had long together after their marriage. As Sontag notes: 'A photograph passes for incontrovertible proof that a given thing happened'.⁸⁰² Photographers were in great demand to record the faces of men before they disappeared to war, perhaps for ever. Moriarty quotes a post-war comment that recalled the fear not only of bereavement but of having no image by which to

⁸⁰⁰ Barthes, *Camera Lucida*, p.27.

⁸⁰¹ Forces War Records website: URL:<https://www.forces-war-records.co.uk/units/3554/queens-own-royal-west-kent-regiment/>[accessed 1.11.2016].

⁸⁰² Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (London: Penguin, 1977), p.5.

remember loved ones: ‘after their short spells of leave from the front we saw our boys off again, with the haunting fear that we should see their faces no more’.⁸⁰³ The poet Marian Allen’s fiancé was killed, aged twenty-two, in an air battle over France in 1917. Allen’s poem *The Wind on the Downs*, written a few days after she received the news of his death, describes the importance to the bereaved of being able to envisage the dead as they were in life. By visualising her lost love’s image, Allen can almost believe: ‘You have not died, it is not true’.⁸⁰⁴

For many of those whose marriages took place hurriedly during wartime, married life lasted only a few days before they were parted for several years, or even permanently by death, and such an image would have been almost the only lasting reminder of the event many years later. It is not possible to discover whether this unidentified soldier survived. If he did not his body, like countless others, would not have been repatriated. When families had no grave to visit, photographs assumed greater significance than they otherwise might, their ‘ghostly traces’ becoming the only remaining presence and thus the focus of memory.⁸⁰⁵ Sontag states that because a photograph is created by light waves reflected by its subject onto a light-sensitive surface, it was felt to retain some essential vestige of the person depicted in a way that no painting, however accurate could do.⁸⁰⁶ Responding to this sense of proximity to the image’s original, Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote in 1843 of her longing for:

such a memorial of every Being dear to me in the world. It is not merely the likeness which is precious in such cases – but the association and the sense of nearness involved in the thing ... the fact of the *very shadow of the person* lying there fixed for ever!’.⁸⁰⁷

Because of this physicality, such images attained something of the aura of the relic for the bereaved. An exhibition entitled *Forget me Not: Photography and Remembrance*

⁸⁰³ Catherine Moriarty, ‘Though in a Picture Only’: Photography and Commemoration’, in Gail Braybon, ed., *Evidence, History and the Great War: Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2001), p.37.

⁸⁰⁴ Marian Allen, ‘The Wind on the Downs’, *Scars upon my Heart: Women’s Poetry and Verse of the First World War*, Catherine Reilly, ed. (London: Virago, 1981), p.1.

⁸⁰⁵ Sontag, *On Photography*, p.9.

⁸⁰⁶ Sontag, *On Photography*, p.154.

⁸⁰⁷ Letter, quoted in *Elizabeth Barrett to Miss Mitford*, Betty Miller, ed., (London: J. Murray, 1954), p.209.

was held in Amsterdam in 2004 and New York in 2005. The exhibition included photographs of soldiers, in frames embellished by their original owners with pressed flowers, butterflies and other emotive objects that in other circumstances might have been left as offerings on a gravestone, transforming the images into personal shrines (fig.186). In an interview with Geoffrey Batchen about the exhibition, Brian Dillon referred to the widespread nineteenth-century belief in photographs' 'revenant affinity with popular spiritualist efforts to decrypt the spirits of the dead'.⁸⁰⁸ Barthes too describes: 'that terrible thing that is in all photographs, the return of the dead'.⁸⁰⁹ But during WWI the return of the dead was not perceived as terrible but rather was longed for. Spiritualism flourished in the context of what David Cannadine calls 'the private denial of death'.⁸¹⁰ Between 1921 and 1924 Ada Emma Deane took a series of photographs purporting to show the faces of dead war heroes floating above Remembrance Day crowds at the Cenotaph in London (fig.187). Newspapers denounced Deane as a charlatan, claiming she had superimposed recognisable faces of famous sportsmen on the image.⁸¹¹ But in desperation many bereaved families refused to accept the fraud, wishing to believe in what Arthur Conan Doyle (an advocate of spiritualism) described as: 'the relief afforded by posthumous messages'. Conan Doyle believed that in a world: 'distracted with sorrow, and which was eagerly asking for help' supposed images of the dead provided 'great solace'.⁸¹²

This wedding photograph then, can be understood as more than a simple commemoration of a memorable family occasion. Its value in retaining the couple's place within their family history is now lost with their identities; possibly the soldier did not survive and consequently they had no descendants. However, it still reflects the specific time and circumstances in which it was taken and conveys the personal and emotional significance with which it was originally invested. Further, the bride's regimental brooch maintains its original connection between the couple as her new husband prepares to leave. Jewellery reminds us of individuals' identities and this

⁸⁰⁸ Brian Dillon, 'Forget Me Not: An Interview with Geoffrey Batchen', *Cabinet*, 14, 2004.

⁸⁰⁹ Barthes, *Camera Lucida*, p.9.

⁸¹⁰ David Cannadine, 'War and Death, Grief and Mourning in Modern Britain', in *Mirrors of Mortality*, J. Whaley, Ed. (London: Routledge, 2012), p.929.

⁸¹¹ 'Spirit Fake Photographs', *Daily Mail*, 21.11.1924, p.7, one of many articles refuting Deane's photographs; others asserted her credibility, eg, 'Proofs of Immortality', *The Northern Whig and Belfast Post*, 15.5.1925, p.5.

⁸¹² Arthur Conan Doyle, *The History of Spiritualism*, Vol.2 (London: Cassell, 1926), p.226.

piece functions not merely as a decorative object but as a constant visual and material link between them. It is likely that this photograph was framed and displayed in pride of place in the family home as a cherished reminder of the occasion and of the absent husband in hopes of his safe return. In the WWI parlour in fig.188 many framed photographs are kept on the wall and on the piano, the central point round which the family would have gathered but the largest, prominently displayed, is the image of a soldier who may have been away fighting or perhaps have died.

The soldier in the wedding portrait might well have carried a copy of it while on active duty and treasured it as a memory of home; photographs were often found amongst the personal effects of the dead. Contemporary images indicate that women continued to wear their regimental brooches on their clothing as cherished amulets to keep them both from harm or a constant reminder of a missing husband's absence. Others suggest that, like the embellished photographs in the *Forget Me Not* Exhibition, they were frequently transformed into objects for the construction of memory and mourning.

5.9 The Paratrooper's Brooch

On D-Day, 6th June 1944, Platoon Sergeant Harry Aitkenhead parachuted into Normandy. Between December 1944 and January 1945 he fought in the Ardennes and on 24 March 1945 parachuted over the Rhine as part of Operation Varsity, the final mass parachute and glider assault of the war. Two treasured objects maintained his link with home. Before he left he gave his wife Marie a Parachute Regiment sweetheart brooch and took a photograph of her wearing it (fig.189, 190). The photograph is an informal snapshot of Marie standing beside a footpath, probably in Cumbria where she then lived with his parents. Pinned to the lapel of her coat is the sweetheart brooch, replicating the 'wings' badge awarded to a soldier on completion of the rigorous Paratrooper qualification course as their son, Chuck Aitkenhead, described:

The one she was wearing represents the paratrooper qualification wings that are awarded to the soldier on completion of a course that includes harsh

physical training at Hardwick Hall (Derbyshire), followed by more training and a series of jumps from both a static balloon and aircraft at Ringway (Manchester Airport). It is only when awarded those wings that he becomes a true British paratrooper. The cloth wings would have been sewn on the upper arm of their tunic or smock.⁸¹³ (fig.191).

On the back is a hand-written note: 'To My Dearest [missing] From Your Loving Wife Marie xxxxx' (fig.192). Across the words are several smudged pink marks that their son very much hoped were lipstick kisses from his mother. The photograph is creased and worn and has been folded to fit into a wallet or pocket. It has clearly been taken out frequently, handled and looked at. At some point it has been torn completely across the centre and mended with whatever was to hand, possibly some form of tape or sticking plaster, covering one word, perhaps 'Harry', 'Husband' or 'Love'. Their son believes that Aitkenhead kept the photograph in his uniform pocket throughout the time he fought through Germany.

The brooch and the photograph of Marie wearing it provided comforting visual links between the couple when separated by war. Each treasured the picture: Harry kept the creased copy with him until they were reunited, while Marie wore the brooch pictured in it while they were apart. By 2014 Marie Aitkenhead was widowed, in frail health and living in residential accommodation. Her sons knew the history of the brooch but were unable to find it among her possessions, but it would have been similar to the one in fig.193. However, above her bed in the nursing home where she lived was a large, framed copy of the photograph of her, wearing the sweetheart brooch, that her husband had carried with him.⁸¹⁴ This image was one that Aitkenhead treasured when far from home and that was significant to his wife, as she kept a copy of it many years later.

5.10 Conclusion

Throughout this chapter I have drawn on Pointon's studies of jewellery in considering how military sweetheart brooches functioned in relation to earlier portrait miniatures

⁸¹³ Chuck Aitkenhead. Personal communication, May 2014. Appendix 1.

⁸¹⁴ Aitkenhead, May 2014.

and on Grootenboer's ideas concerning jewelled images that provided a sense of the absent giver's constant watchfulness. However, where Pointon argues that precious materials were essential to validate the worth of these objects, I suggest that in the case of military brooches other considerations apply. The materials from which they were made might indeed be costly but this was not inevitable. A brooch of no great intrinsic worth might be valued highly because it incorporated significant personal memories; family photographs such as those discussed here might be as important to their owners as portraits painted by significant artists. The varied case studies indicate the agency brought to jewellery by the inclusion of personal images, even though we may not necessarily be able to identify the sitters or (as for instance in the case of the Fleming Hartley brooch) the exact circumstances of the gift. For the bereaved, these were affective objects that retained the continuing presence of the dead.⁸¹⁵ This chapter situates sweetheart brooches within the historiography of jewels, from which it has previously been absent, a key aim of this thesis.

⁸¹⁵ Rose, *Doing Family Photography*, p.89.

Conclusion

The aims of this thesis were to make as complete a study as possible of the development, production, distribution and significance of regimental sweetheart brooches, and to consider them as emotive objects with agency, that marked significant life events. The study aimed also to place them within the historiography of jewellery, from which they have previously been omitted. Often treated by museums as merely adjuncts to male military uniforms, they have generally been viewed only on the surface – that is, their appearance might suggest they are no more than copies of regimental insignia. By taking an anthropological approach, however, the study proposes that this jewellery provides the potential for exploring relationships between people and art objects in the intensified emotional circumstances of total war. Though the brooches often did not alter physically, they often marked women's transitions from wife to widow, or to bereaved mother; they were invested with complex meanings. Through material objects, as Hallam and Hockey point out, the dead and the living find proximity.⁸¹⁶

Conflict artworks of all kinds tended to prioritise male experiences, relegating those of women to a secondary place commensurate with the subordinate role in society that they were expected to resume once hostilities ceased. With the exception of the work of such women artists as Anna Airy, Flora Lion and Olive Mudie-Cooke in WWI, and Evelyn Dunbar and Laura Knight in WWII, paintings, sculptures and official war artists' commissions focused predominantly on male subjects' experience of war.⁸¹⁷ It was not until 2005 that an official memorial to the work of women in WWII was unveiled in Whitehall, near the Cenotaph. Consisting of 17 WWII women's uniforms depicted hanging on hooks, the bronze sculpture bears a superficial resemblance to the Hyde Park Royal Artillery memorial. However, Jagger's greatcoats conceptualised

⁸¹⁶ Hallam, Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, p.6.

⁸¹⁷ MoI and the British War Memorials Committee commissioned several women under official war artists' schemes but none completed commissions. Amanda Mason, URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/6-stunning-first-world-war-artworks-by-women-war-artists>[accessed 3.7.2017]. Kenneth Clark, Director of the National Gallery, chaired The War Artists Commission. Of the 400 artists involved, 52 were women. Of these, only Evelyn Dunbar was given a salaried position; only two women were allowed to travel overseas. Brian Foss, *War paint: Art, War, State and Identity in Britain, 1939-1945*. (New Haven: Yale University Press), p.193.

the absence of the dead; by contrast, the clothing on the Monument to the Women of World War II represented the work that women were required to yield to men after the conflict ended. The sculptor, John W. Mills, stated he was: ‘interested in the concept of these women hanging up their uniforms and going back to their normal lives after the end of the war’. Because of this the design was the cause of some controversy at the memorial’s unveiling.⁸¹⁸

As the thesis has established, military badge jewellery was exclusively worn by women. Largely because of this, it too has been ignored in the history of wartime material culture; this study therefore shifts the emphasis from male uniforms and weaponry, on which regimental museums generally concentrate, towards the concerns and appearance of women on the home front, which has previously tended to focus on subjects such as utility clothing and the constraints of rationing. This previously marginalised jewellery created connections with the uniforms worn by sons, husbands and brothers and embodied complex sentiments, not least changing concepts of patriotism, from the enthusiastic optimism of the early days of WWI to the later support necessary to justify unimaginable losses. Brooches displayed pride in their relatives’ individual achievements but, through different case studies, the thesis also considers how far they may or may not have demonstrated wider patriotism when women were coerced into persuading their men to enlist and thus made complicit in their deaths. Research into these emotive objects, incorporating the meaning of traditional sentimental jewels, offers an original contribution to the history of emotion in times of war.

Collecting, buying and exchanging regimental brooches in the digital age are commonly conducted online. Because of this, they are frequently transferred between individuals whose main interest lies in amassing a complete collection of memorabilia rather than conserving history; in this way they are removed from the public sphere. But they also frequently slip between the categories of objects defined as within the remit of military museums; that is, though they were given by members of the forces, they were not official issue but were made by commercial manufacturers and worn by

⁸¹⁸ ‘Women’s Courage in Second World War Commemorated’, *The Telegraph*, URL:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/1493698/Womens-courage-in-Second-World-War-commemorated.html>[accessed 9.3.2016].

civilian women. Yet they typically come into museum collections as part of private donations that include more obviously relevant items such as medals, uniforms and weapons. Whether brooches are displayed or marginalised depends on the importance placed by individual curators (or their trustees) upon the connections between the members of the forces and their families, not always a priority.

For example, in 2011 the National Army Museum held a major exhibition entitled *Wives and Sweethearts*, focusing on social history artefacts relating to soldiers' love lives, in which two brooches were displayed, one from the Boer War and the other a diamond WWII brooch, though neither had any accompanying history.⁸¹⁹ The NAM's Curator of Fine and Decorative Art stated then that before 2005 the museum refused donations of sweetheart brooches on the grounds that they were not relevant to their activities but expressed the hope that in future more emphasis would be placed on links between army and family.⁸²⁰ The NAM's Royal Charter states a key part of its mission is: 'To interpret and communicate the objects in the Museum's care in ways which inspire, [and] provide enjoyment' from 'diverse audiences' in order to 'reconnect the Army with society'.⁸²¹ In March 2017 the museum reopened after a three-year closure, during which it was completely redesigned at a cost of £23.75 million, half of which was National Lottery funded. Five galleries focus on different aspects of army life, one of which is its connection to civilian society. Of 102 brooches in the collection, nine are now viewable online but only one, the Fleming Hartley brooch analysed in Chapter 5, is displayed to the public. The brooch is in a vitrine in the '*Society*' gallery, labelled only 'sweetheart brooch', with minimal further explanation (figs.194, 195). The visitor can have no understanding of its ownership, provenance or history, or be aware that the photograph and inscription exist behind the jewelled cover. It appears to be in the display case only because it co-ordinates aesthetically with the artefacts surrounding it, since it bears only a tenuous narrative

⁸¹⁹ NAM *Wives and Sweethearts Exhibition*, February-July 2011, Curator Frances Parton.

⁸²⁰ Emma Mawdsley, Curator of Fine and Decorative Art, National Army Museum, London, interview with author, 11.4.2011.

⁸²¹ NAM Account 2009-2010, 'Objects and Activities', URL:https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/247626/388.pdf, p.5.[accessed 30.3.2017].

connection to them. It tells us nothing: it is unclear what the visitor is expected to take away from the exhibit.⁸²²

Jewellery is generally unsuited to museum exhibition, which inevitably disembodies it: as John Pope-Hennessy observed in 1975, the only thing we can be confident about regarding exhibits is: 'that they have been wrested from their settings and alienated from whatever role they were originally intended to perform'.⁸²³ Susan Crane suggests that an object's inclusion in a museum display affirms its significance and places it within the relevant discourse.⁸²⁴ But as Riello observes: 'An object [...] can convey nothing useful unless it is contextualised in relation to other objects'.⁸²⁵

As noted earlier, no cultural museums hold examples in their collections. It is hoped therefore that confirming the brooches as significant wartime artefacts may contribute to their better representation in museums and exhibitions in future. Sweetheart brooches are invariably described as decorative romantic keepsakes. They denoted much more, however, since they were given and worn in many different circumstances and were of commercial and political significance to individuals and to diverse sectors of society. Persistent marginalisation of these jewels by museum practitioners and jewellery historians has resulted in little analysis by any discipline, a lack the thesis aimed to address.

Through an examination of the development of sweetheart brooches from regimental insignia to personal jewels, the study therefore examined the social and cultural significance of regimental brooches from their first appearance to the present day, focusing on the specific circumstances of Britain at war. Jewellery symbolises

⁸²² A decision was made to provide minimal labelling for exhibits in the redesign; further information is sometimes available if asked for; nothing further is available about the brooch (except online). The 'Society' gallery: 'examines how the army has affected everyday life in Britain' through culture, objects, music and language. The gallery staff stated they did not know what the brooch was, originally suggesting the museum did not own any examples. Visit, 21.4.2017.

NAM, URL:<https://www.nam.ac.uk/plan-visit/galleries/society>.

⁸²³ John Pope-Hennessy, *Design in Museums*, *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, Vol. 123, No. 5231 (October 1975), p.717.

⁸²⁴ Susan Crane, ed., *Museums and Memory* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), p.2.

⁸²⁵ Giorgio Riello, 'The object of fashion: methodological approaches to the history of fashion', *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture*, Vol.3, 2011, p.3.

political and personal loyalties and is intertwined with society's commercial imperatives; conflict and material objects are inextricably linked. Because of their close similarity to badges, traditionally devices that reify ideas, brooches in particular have the potential to be eloquent sources of information. The findings of the study contribute to each of the areas outlined below.

Chapter 1, *'Military Insignia to Personal Adornment'*, explored the brooches' development from emblems marking the officers of an élite household or a private army to becoming adornment for women to wear. I examined the materialisation of ideas and identity through bodily adornment, a concept returned to throughout. Military badges incorporated history and inculcated pride in belonging to a group, crucial when its members might be required to die in the unit's service. Until the mid-twentieth century women were legally barred from military enlistment in Britain and until the twenty-first century could not take up combat roles. However, through wearing the emblem of a unit they could not join, they obtained some measure of acceptance into the group. The translation of military insignia into jewellery for women, therefore, created equivocal objects, neither official uniform nor straightforward adornment, but a fusion of historical emblems with the sentimental jewels that incorporated Victorians' enjoyment of cryptic messages and visual wordplay.

The next three chapters focused on the significance of sweetheart brooches to different sectors of society. Chapter 2, *'Sweetheart Brooches and the Jewellers: Making and Selling the Brooches'*, described their importance to the wartime jewellery trade. Various methods of construction, developed by manufacturers that previously produced military insignia, were examined using contemporary documentation. I have consistently argued that while their monetary value varied widely and many were beautiful and costly jewels, the real value of these brooches lay in their significance to their owners through individuals' propensity to bestow meaning upon jewellery given as gifts. Women across all classes wore these brooches in circumstances when war and war-work inevitably disrupted society and contributed to some temporary redrawing of class boundaries. Brooches were invariably exchanged at times of heightened emotion even if, as later chapters demonstrated, they were not always given in the context of romantic relationships.

Chapter 3, *'Wartime Governments, Gendered Propaganda and the Sweetheart Brooch'*, argued that ubiquitous badges and, by extension jewels, materialise political concepts and conveyed messages that influenced the population. Propaganda images permeated everyday life: they formed a visual backdrop that helped to shape popular attitudes towards the conduct and progress of the conflicts. Gender demarcated propaganda, conflating masculinity with bravery and femininity with home and family. I argued here for the visual importance of uniforms and badges and brooches that drew attention to those who conformed to the actions society required of them. While other influential objects such as posters, songs and literature have been researched, these brooches have not, yet as shown throughout this chapter, they were closely linked to government campaigns to encourage recruitment in World War I. They revealed to others that, willingly or not, women had made the sacrifices required of them by persuading men to enlist. Emblems were persuasive: in the febrile atmosphere of disastrous casualty numbers some women employed them to denigrate men they perceived (often incorrectly) as 'shirkers'. When uniform provision, especially for civilian operations, was often haphazard, badges and brooches supplemented civilian clothing as identifiers across society, vital when to be 'out of uniform' meant to be vilified as unpatriotic or cowardly.

Chapter 4 *'Every Female Seemed to Wear One'*, considered why women wore the emblems that defined the career of another that was closed to them. What messages did wearing such a piece of jewellery convey? This section examined identity expressed through the medium of jewellery. Approaching jewellery as a narrative medium allowed for a wide-ranging discussion of women's engagement with the roles ascribed to them of 'recruiting sergeant', supportive wife or mother and often of mourner.

For Carol Thomas sweetheart brooches were love tokens worn to display that one of your loved ones was 'doing their bit'.⁸²⁶ Personal support for the fighting forces was certainly one reason why so many brooches were significant sentimental jewels. However, they also became fashionable items at a time when clothing design was

⁸²⁶ Thomas. Personal Communication, March 2011.

superficially linked to uniforms and it was expedient to demonstrate a connection to the forces. Through Mauss's theories of exchange and reciprocity regimental brooches were considered as bridal jewellery. A brooch articulated the bond between giver and recipient: if that failed then the brooch was no longer an inalienable object and ceased to reflect the relationship it originally celebrated. It brought the wearer within the protection of the unit represented and conveyed something of the giver's status. In the situation of total mechanised warfare, when for the first time bombing raids removed distinctions between the battlefield and the home front, superstitions were revived and regimental brooches, some combining good-luck images, were worn as amulets and talismans.

The final part of this chapter discussed the brooches' function as repositories of memory, looking at some of the reasons why many examples were kept secretly after the giver's death. In conflict art, mourning was generally personified as female, with the assumption of mourning culturally assigned, at least in public, to women. Yet women were required to suppress their grief in the interests of maintaining public morale. This section demonstrated that a brooch could convey messages in circumstances when outward expressions of grief were perceived as destabilising. Bringing the study to the end of the twentieth century was the consideration of Richard Machin's highly personal gift to his mother and the silent message of support it conveyed between her and the mother of a comrade killed in Afghanistan. This section also confirmed the complex concepts of patriotism. Airlie's brooch was a wedding gift to his bride at a time when patriotism was still related to ideas of empire, notions that were already changing by the end of WWI. Machin placed his love for his mother, and loyalty to his close comrades, above patriotism.

Finally Chapter 5 '*Brooches with Images, Images of Brooches*', concentrated on brooches to which photographs were added, exploring the enhanced intimacy of such a brooch. Comparisons with portrait miniatures and regimental brooches revealed similarities of function and appearance between these types of jewel, exemplified by Romney's portraits of Anna Maria Crouch and a brooch commissioned by Major Fleming Hartley in 1917. Analysis of early miniatures illuminated the way regimental brooches with images might be worn and handled by women within acts of concealing and revealing. Further, as in the Romney paintings, miniatures depicted within full-

scale paintings of women articulated relationships and close similarities could be seen in photographs of women in which brooches similarly featured. This chapter demonstrated the importance to families of retaining images of soldiers, sailors and airmen who might never return, through constructing memory shrines to the dead, showing how such photographs often included women whose brooches linked them to the uniforms of their men. These images were sometimes almost the only remnants of hastily conducted wartime marriages of such short duration that they might seem, without even a body for burial, never to have happened. As Saunders notes: ‘objects stand in for people, and the life of the object is a curious, often poignant reminder of a human life which otherwise has left no trace’.⁸²⁷

Throughout, case studies illustrated the changing histories of brooches that moved from commodity to gift and then to memorial, through the theories of Kopytoff and Appadurai, who argued that both people and things have biographies and these are intertwined. As Appadurai suggests, conflict is the catalyst for the altered trajectories of these objects from badge to jewel in both aesthetic and economic terms.

Today, regimental brooches are generally restricted to certain formal occasions: they are perceived as appropriate for specific memorial or commemorative occasions such as Armistice ceremonies or for funerals of relatives serving in or retired from military posts. Wives and female relatives of serving military personnel wear them on official occasions, for example, regimental dinners and parades. For instance, the gold and diamond brooch in fig.196 belongs to the wife of a retired career naval officer, who stated that most officers’ wives owned brooches and would wear them for any formal ceremonial occasion, for mess dinners and memorial services.⁸²⁸ His daughter, however, feels that when the brooch is eventually bequeathed to her, she will wear it in public only on specific occasions such as Remembrance Day services. She will treasure the brooch for its intrinsic history and its link to her father, but its narrative relates to his naval service and his marriage to her mother rather than to herself. As Stewart observed, an object’s history refers to its original owner; consequently those

⁸²⁷ Saunders, *Trench Art*, p.2.

⁸²⁸ Lydia Goodson. Personal Communication, 10.3.2015.

who inherit these brooches often feel they are not entitled to wear them, much as they would feel unable to wear medals.

Other considerations contribute to whether the brooches are worn publicly. Gary Skeels was formerly a Sergeant working as a cryptographer in the Royal Corps of Signals, based at various times in the 1980s and 1990s in Germany and Britain.⁸²⁹ He gave his wife Karen two sweetheart brooches, a modern version and an antique one with a King's cipher. At that period, troops were not allowed to wear their uniforms outside barracks for security reasons but instead were ordered to wear civilian clothing. Families were advised never to mention their army connections for fear of reprisals, so Karen Skeels could not wear her brooches outside the barracks. Today, they feel that despite current terrorism threats, this is unlikely to be a problem and she wears her brooches again.

Some regiments own brooches handed down for use on formal occasions by the current commanding officer's wife but not personally owned by her, such as the Airlie brooch. In addition, the Queen and other members of the royal family who act as Colonels-in-Chief are presented with the appropriate insignia brooch by the regiment and wear this whenever performing official duties. A brooch loaned by the Air Cadets to the Duchess of Cambridge for their 75th anniversary ceremony takes us back to the introduction's contention that women's jewellery need not be passive (fig.197). This piece, known as the Dacre brooch, was presented to the best female cadet of each annual intake and therefore signified the recipient's achievements as a professional active woman in the military.⁸³⁰

Further research might take this thesis as a starting point from which to engage with several themes. Women depicted in photographs are often unknown to us, their biographies lost without accompanying documentation; they can only be the subject of speculation. Is it possible, however, by scrutinising the information presented in such images, to restore to them something of their lost histories through the objects that

⁸²⁹ Karen and Gary Skeels. Personal communication, 7.7.2017, by telephone in response to British Legion editorial.

⁸³⁰ It was presented from 1982 when women were first admitted, until 2015, when it was agreed that women should receive a sword like their male counterparts.

surround them, not least the jewellery they wear? Badge brooches speak of the lives of their relatives who went to war, many of whom did not return. It is sometimes possible to trace their identities through the brooches' insignia, suggesting considerable avenues for further research. James Young draws attention to the distancing of memory from object and questions: 'what happens to the memory of history when it ceases to be testimony' and becomes instead recollection mediated through future generations.⁸³¹ Brooches given during WWII are now almost at the limit of living memory; as they pass from those for whom they had significance they become objects without first-hand histories and their stories will inevitably be different. Although it was necessary to restrict this thesis to brooches made in Britain, there is scope to develop the study in other countries. In addition, currently unavailable archives may be opened to researchers. For example, the Wolfson Centre for Archival Research at Birmingham Library holds quantities of uncatalogued documentation that could not be accessed for this study. If these include records of local jewellers, for instance, it might be possible in future to compile a more complete picture of such companies' trading practices. It is hoped that through displaying sweetheart brooches, possibly in local rather than military museum settings, it may be possible to access members of the public who own examples and would be interested in recording their histories.

In conclusion, though they are largely unknown today, sweetheart brooches were once worn by a majority of civilian woman in wartime; they would have been recognised as the symbolic jewellery they were. They were not necessities, yet there is evidence that even when wartime austerity and rationing required a 'make-do-and-mend' clothing culture, women treasured and wore them. Jewels, as Pointon observes, are artefacts with meanings that we may read as we would a written text.⁸³² They were evidence of significant social and personal relationships worn upon the body and their propensity to incorporate meaning allowed them to transcend their monetary value. Victorians were accustomed to conveying sentiment through the medium of jewellery, while military badges embedded memories of historic events that encouraged group cohesion and loyalty. These concepts were combined in military badge brooches

⁸³¹ J. E. Young, *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*, (Yale: Yale University Press, 2007), p.1.

⁸³² Pointon, *Brilliant Effects*, p.4.

given by men but worn by women, offering an insight into the way small, once ubiquitous but now largely forgotten and previously unresearched objects functioned to articulate and maintain relationships at times of danger, loss and separation.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archives

Airlie papers (relating to the Earl and Countess of Airlie) in the National Records of Scotland, Ref: GD16/1/1A-GD164/2069/ GB234/GD16. Online Catalogue: <http://catalogue.nrscotland.gov.uk/scancatalogue/details.aspx?reference=GB234%2F GD16&st=1&tc=y&tl=n&tn=y&tp=n&k=airlie&ko=o&r=&ro=s> [accessed 7.5.2014].

Airlie papers (relating to the Earl and Countess of Airlie) in the British Library:

- MS 52419 A: 1861-1956
- Vol. II A (ff. 122). Correspondence and papers of Lady Airlie; 1861-bef. 1956.
- MS 52419 B: 1900-before 1956
- Vol. II B (ff. 45). Letters, etc., relating to Lord Airlie's death; 1900-bef. 1956
- MS 82748-82919 : 1877-1955
- 82748-82919. Papers of Mabell Frances Elizabeth Ogilvy née Gore, Countess of Airlie (b.1866. d.1956); 1877-1955
- MS 82825 (Diary of Lt. Col. Earl of Airlie, 1899-1900); MS 82837 (Memoir of Lady Airlie's childhood); MS 82840 Vol. xcvi (Lady Airlie's birthday diaries 1880-1884); MS 82847 Vol C; MS 82854 Vol xcii 1886; MS 82853 (engagement diary 1883); MS 82863 (engagement diary 1899); MS 82825 (Diary of Lt. Col Earl of Airlie during Boer War); MS 82825 (Lady Airlie's poem after the Earl's death on active service).

Carrington & Co: accounts and original designs (c.1870-1930). National Art Library (GB), V&A Museum. Manuscript, L.1879-1980 to L.1891-1980.

Forces War Records, URL: <https://www.forces-war-records.co.uk/units/328/york-and-lancaster-regiment>.

National Army Museum, Chelsea, London. Document Archives.

National Army Museum, Temporary Collections Archive, Stevenage, Hertfordshire.

Mass Observation Archives, University of Sussex Special Collections, The Keep, Brighton.

SxMOA: Topic Collections (1937-1955):

- TC1/2.4: Shopping 1939-63 (1939-1963).
- TC1/2.18: Personal Appearance and Clothes 1938-54 (1938-1954).

- TC1/2.32: Women in Wartime 1939-45 (1939-1945).
- TC43: Propaganda.

Robinson, Peter to Dorothy Harris, letter, 19.3.1916, National Army Museum, London, Accession No.2013-01-1.

Smith & Pepper Order Books and Ledgers, Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, Library of Birmingham.

Treasure Roll of Richard II, National Archives, Kew, Ref:TNA:PRO.E.101/411/9.

Whylly, Col. H. C., C.B., *The History of the York and Lancaster Regiment, Vol. 1*, compiled c.1918, Regimental Archives, Clifton Park Museum, Rotherham.

Primary Sources: Published

Airlie, Mabell, *Thatched with Gold: The memoirs of Mabell, Countess of Airlie*, Jennifer Ellis, ed., (London: Hutchinson, 1962).

Alciato, Andrea, *Emblemata* [1550], Alciato at Glasgow: gla.ac.uk/alciato/emblem.php?id=A91a190

Anonymous, 'Gems and Superstition', Review of *The Magic of Jewels and Charms*, in *Nature*, 20.4.1916.

Anonymous, 'Clothes rationing in Great Britain', *Monthly Labor Review*, 07.1941; 53, 000001, p.73.

Army Dress Regulations (All Ranks), Part 13, Instructions for the Wearing of Insignia of Orders, Decorations and Medals, Ministry of Defence, PS12(A), January 2012. Section 2, 13.05, URL: <https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/185990/response/459552/attach/4/ADR%20Part%2013%20Wearing%20of%20Decorations%20etc.pdf> [accessed 5.5.2015].

Bacon, Francis, *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, and Lord High Chancellor of England in Five Volumes, Vol.I.* [16thC], (London: J. Rivington & Sons, 1778).

Baines, Andrew, Palmer, Joanna, eds., *Dearest Mother: First World War letters home from a young Sapper officer in France and Salonika* (Solihull: Helion, 2015).

Brierley, James, *Diary*, URL: <https://lieutenantjamesbrierley.wordpress.com/page/8/30> March 1916.

British Army Service Records, 1914-1920, URL: <https://www.ancestry.co.uk>.

Bryce, James, *Report by the Committee on Alleged German Outrages*, (H.M.S.O.:London, 1915). British Library, Shelfmark 18/28.

Church of England Baptisms, Marriages and Burials, Richmond-upon-Thames, St. Mary the Virgin, Twickenham. 'The Year 1785', p.4. No.13: Marriage Certificate of Rollings Edward Crouch and Anna Maria Phillips.

Civil Registration Death Index, England and Wales.

Carmen of Cockayne, 'Vogue's Vanities', *The Sketch*, 3.11.1915, p.104.

Charter of the Goldsmiths, Preamble, [1327], quoted in George Unwin, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, [1908] (Frank Cass: London, 4th edition, 1963).

Dawson, Jane, 'She's So Lonely Now', 'Jane Dawson's Advice', *Manchester Evening News*, 12.1.1940, p.4.

Dickers, Robin, *ARTY-BOYS: The History & War Diary of the 10th Medium Regiment (Royal Fusiliers)* (Lonsdale, 2010).

Dillon, Brian, 'Forget Me Not: An Interview with Geoffrey Batchen', *Cabinet*, Issue 14, Summer 2004.

Estienne, Henry, *The Art of Making Devises* [1645], trans., Thomas Blount, of the Inner Temple, London, to be sold at the Angell, Ivie Lane, <http://www.ebooksread.com/authors-eng/henry-estienne/the-art-of-making-devises>[accessed 11.3.2014].

Farington, Joseph, *The Farington Diary, Vol. I*, 3 July 1801, footnote to p.280, James Greig, ed., (London: Hutchinson, n.d.), Online, URL:<https://ia802705.us.archive.org/31/items/faringtondiary01fariuoft/faringtondiary01fariuoft.pdf>.

Feltham, John, *The Picture of London, for 1804* (London: Lewis & Roden, 1804).

Fraser, John Foster, 'Birmingham and its Jewellery', *The Windsor Magazine*, Vol.VI, June-November 1897, pp.463-473.

Froissart, Jean, *Chronicles of England, France and Spain*, [14C], trans. John Bouchier and Lord Berners; G. C. Macaulay, ed. (New York: MacMillan, 1904), Chap.XXI. Online edition: Internet Archive, URL:https://archive.org/stream/chroniclesoffroi00froiuoft/chroniclesoffroi00froiuoft_djvu.txt.

Fulton, Bill, 'A Life Rediscovered – 90 Years After', (Reprinted courtesy of *The Bulletin* Editor, The Western Front Association, 2007).

Hilliard, Nicholas, *A Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning* [c.1600] Robert Kelsey, Rought Thornton, Thomas Grant, Steven Cain, eds., (Mid Northumberland Arts, 1992).

Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi, George B. Stow, Nicholas Herford, eds., [1377-1390] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977).

Ince, Private Joe, letter to Pashler's family, in Fulton, Bill. 'A Life Rediscovered – 90 Years After: Charles William Pashler (1882-1917', (Reprinted courtesy of *The Bulletin* Editor, The Western Front Association, 2007).

Kelly's Directory of Birmingham, Staffordshire, Warwickshire and Worcestershire (Kelly's Directory's Ltd., 1897-1947).

Kennedy, Maev, 'MPs Call for 'Walter Mitty' Law to Prosecute Fake Military Heroes', *The Guardian*, 22.11.2016. www.theguardian.com/politics.

King James Bible [1604-1611].

Leland, John, *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543, Part V* [1538] Lucy Toulmin Smith, ed., (London: G. Bell, 1908).

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 9, August-December 1535, James Gairdner, ed., [London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1886], 195-218. *British History Online*, URL:<http://www.british-history.ac.uk>.

Lisle Honor, Lady, to Thomas Culpeper, 14.10.1535. RO.612. 'Henry VIII: October 1535, 11-20', *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 9, August-December 1535*, James Gairdner, ed., [London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1886], 195-218. *British History Online*, URL:<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol9/pp195-218>.

Mazzi, C., Due provisioni suntuarie fiorentine [1472], in Randolph, 'Performing the Bridal Body in Fifteenth-Century Florence', *Art History*, 21,2, June 1998, pp.182-200.

McDonald, Lynn, ed., *Florence Nightingale: The Collected Works* (Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2004).

Nightingale, Florence, to Queen Victoria, letter, 1.12.1855, Royal Collection, VIC/MAIN/F/4/15.b.

Page, Penelope, 'Wartime Wear', *Gloucester Journal*, 25.1.1941, p.15.

Padfield, Maureen, 'Out in the Trade: The Occupational Community of Birmingham's Jewellery Quarter', PhD. Thesis, Warwick University, 1990.

Peck's Circular Trade Directory and Detailed Buyers' Guide to the Manufactures of Birmingham and District, 1896-7 (Birmingham: W. E. Peck, 1896-7).

Plantagenet, Arthur, Viscount Lisle, *The Lisle Letters*, Vol.2, Muriel St. Clare Byrne, ed., (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1981).

Queen Victoria to Florence Nightingale, January 1855. *Letters of Queen Victoria*, Volume III, 1854-1861, by Queen of Great Britain Victoria, Arthur Christopher Benson and Viscount Reginald Baliol Brett Escher, eds., Project Gutenberg eBook, URL: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/28649/28649-h/28649-h.htm#pageiii.158>.

Smirke, R. S., *Jewellery: report on Birmingham trades, prepared for use in connexion with the Juvenile Employment Exchange* (London: GB Board of Trade, 1913), p.3.

St. Clare Byrne, Muriel, ed., Arthur Plantagenet, Viscount Lisle, *The Lisle Letters*, Vol.2, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1981).

Shakespeare, William, *Henry VI*, [c.1594].

Streeter, Edwin, *Hints to Purchasers of Jewellery on the Relative Value of the Relative Value of the Different Qualities of Gold, (Eighth Edition Part II)* (London: 1867).

Streeter, Edwin, *Precious Stones and Gems: their history and distinguishing characteristics* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1877).

Streeter, Edwin, *Something about Precious Stones* (London: Streeter, c.1900).

Stow, George B., Herford, Nicholas, eds., *Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi*, [1377-1390] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977).

Turner, John P., 'The Birmingham Button Trade', pp.432-451, in S. Timmins, ed., *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District* [London, 1866] (London, New York: Routledge, 2013).

Thornbury, Walter, 'Cheapside: Introduction ', in *Old and New London: Volume 1* (London, 1878), <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/old-new-london/vol1/pp304-315> [accessed 13.2015].

Timmins, Samuel, ed., *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District* [London, 1866] (London, New York: Routledge, 2013).

Ward, Robert, 'Gentleman and Commander', *Animadversions of Warre*, London, printed by John Dawson and are to be sold by Francis Eglesfield at the signe of the Marigold in Pauls Church-yard, 1639. Online: URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-122>.

Whitney, Geoffrey, *A Choice of Emblemes and Other Devises* [1586] Imprinted at Leyden, in the House of Christopher Plantyn, by Francis Raphelengius, Early English Books Online ID99855134.

Wither, George, *A Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Moderne*, (London: 1635).

Wright, J. S., 'The Jewellery and Gilt Toy Trades', pp.452-462, in S. Timmins, ed., *Birmingham and Midland Hardware District* [London, 1866] (London, New York: Routledge, 2013).

'Woman of Today', *The Globe*.

Primary Sources: Unpublished

Airlie, Mabell, *The Happy Warrior, An Account of the Life of Lord Airlie*, undated. British Library collection, MS 82845.

Padfield, Maureen, 'Out in the Trade: The Occupational Community of Birmingham's Jewellery Quarter', PhD. Thesis, Warwick University, 1990.

Roberts, Richenda, 'Art of a Second Order': The First World War from the British Home Front Perspective', Unpublished D.Phil. Thesis, Birmingham, 2012.

Newspapers, Periodicals, Magazines

(Where newspaper writers are named, they are individually listed in footnotes)

Aberdeen Evening Express

Aberdeen Weekly Journal

BBC News Online, URL:<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news>

Bedfordshire Times and Independent

Birmingham Daily Post

Birmingham Evening Despatch

British Jeweller

Cabinet

Colour

County Herald

Daily Herald

Daily Mail, 'Secrecy' Editorial,

Daily Mirror

Daily Record

Derbyshire Times

Dumfries and Galloway Standard

Flanders News BE, URL:<http://deredactie.be/cm/vrtnieuws.english/News/1.1865551>.

Gloucester Journal

Hull Daily Mail

Illustrated Times

Leeds Mercury

Legion
Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper
Mail Online: URL:<http://www.dailymail.co.uk>
Manchester Evening News
Middlesex Chronicle
Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser
Morning Herald
New York Times
Newcastle Evening Chronicle
Newcastle Journal and North Mail
North-Eastern Daily Gazette
Peck's Circular, Birmingham
Perfect passages of each dayes proceedings in Parliament
Sunday Post, Dundee
Telegraph Online
The Belfast Daily Mercury
The Bury Free Press
The Bystander
The Daily Mirror
The Devon and Exeter Gazette
The Dundee Courier & Argus and Northern Warder
The Edinburgh Gazette
The Globe
The Graphic
The Guardian Online
The Herald, (London)
The Illustrated London News
The Illustrated War News
The Jewellers, Goldsmiths and Watchmakers' Monthly Magazine
The Lady's Newspaper
The Ladies Treasury
The Lincolnshire Echo
The Liverpool Daily Post
The London Gazette
The London Standard
The Morning Post
The Northern Whig and Belfast Post
The Queen
The Sketch
The Standard
The Tatler
The Times, London
The Western Morning News
The Windsor Magazine
The Windsor Magazine: an illustrated monthly for men and women
The Yorkshire Evening Post
The Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer
Townsville Daily Bulletin (Australia)
Uhula, Manchester Grammar School Magazine
Woman and Beauty

Broadcasts, Sound Recordings

Beaghan, Doris M. A. BBC Interview, 1963. IWM Sound Recording No.4012.

Beaverbrook, Max, Lord, *Speech to Clydeside shop stewards*, June 1941, Pathe News, URL:<http://www.britishpathe.com/video/tanks-lord-beaverbrook>.

Jones, Irving, IWM Sound Recordings.
URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/podcasts/voices-of-the-first-world-war/podcast-3-joining-up>.

Lang, S. C. BBC Interview, 1963. IWM Sound Recording No.4154.

Lunt, Brigadier Walter Thomas, Interviewer David Lance, 1974, IWM Sound Recording No.300.

Rennles, Caroline, Interviewer Margaret A. Brooks, 19.2.1975. IWM Sound Recording No.00566.

Poetry

Allen, Marian, 'The Wind on the Downs', *Scars upon my Heart: Women's Poetry and Verse of the First World War*, Catherine Reilly, ed., (London: Virago, 1981).

Bedford, Madeline Ida, *Munition Wages*, c.1914, in Catherine Reilly, ed., *Scars Upon my Heart: Women's Poetry and Verse of the First World War* (London: Virago, 1981).

Begbie, Harold, *Fall In*, 1914.

Hamilton, Cicely, *Non-Combatant*, c. 1914-1915, in Reilly, *Scars Upon my Heart*.

Hamilton, Cicely, *The Jingo-Woman*, c. 1914-1915, in Reilly, *Scars Upon my Heart*.

Collins, Mary Gabrielle, *Women at Munitions Making*, c.1914-1918, in Reilly, *Scars Upon my Heart*.

Mitchell, Ruth Comfort, *He Went for a Soldier*, c.1914-1918, in Reilly, *Scars Upon my Heart*.

Reilly, Catherine, ed., (*Scars upon my Heart: Women's Poetry and Verse of the First World War*, London: Virago, 1981).

Film

Anderson, Michael, Director, *The Dam Busters* (1955).

Ministry of Information, *Jane Brown Changes her Job* (1941),
IWM:URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/1060006264>[accessed 1.12.2015].

G. Malins, J. B. McDowell, *The Battle of the Somme*, (1916). ©IWM.

Songs

Beck, Clara, singer, '*I'll Make a Man of You*', 1914. Music and lyrics, Arthur Wimperis, Herman Finck.

St. Clair, F. V., Music, lyrics, singer, '*Follow the Drum*' or '*Every Mother's Son is Ready to Carry a Gun*', 1914.

Tilley, Vesta, singer, '*Jolly good luck to the girl that loves a soldier*', 1906. Lyrics, Fred W. Leigh, Kenneth Lyle,

Tilley, Vesta, Unknown writer, *Six Days Home on Leave*, 1917.

Unknown, '*The Girl I Left Behind Me*', Traditional.

Wimperis, Arthur Finck, Herman, '*I'll Make a Man of You*', 1914.

Websites

Alciato at Glasgow: gla.ac.uk/alciato/emblem.php?id=A91a190

Ancestry.co.uk:database:<http://search.ancestry.co.uk>.

Army Register of Soldiers' Effects, 1901-1929, URL:http://search.ancestry.co.uk/cgi-bin/sse.dll?indiv=1&db=UKArmyRegistersEffects&h=347166&tid=&pid=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=Wcgl&_phstart=successSource&usePUBJs=true&rhSource=2706.

Birmingham Assay Office, URL:assayofficebirmingham.com.

British Army Service Records, 1914-1920, URL:<https://www.ancestry.co.uk>

British History Online, URL:<http://www.british-history.ac.uk>.

British Museum, URL: <http://www.britishmuseum.org>.

British Pathé, URL:<http://www.britishpathe.com/video/tanks-lord-beaverbrook>

Bruton, Elizabeth, British Army and RE Rates of Pay, 1914-1915,
URL:<http://blogs.mhs.ox.ac.uk/innovatingincombat/british-army-royal-engineers-rates-pay-1914-1915/>

Cheapside Hoard, Museum of London,
URL: <http://collections.museumoflondon.org.uk/Online/group.aspx?g=group-20978>

Cleveland Museum of Art, URL: <http://www.clevelandart.org>.

Derby Scheme 1915, URL:<http://www.1914-1918.net/derbyscheme.html>.

English Heritage, The Iveagh Bequest Collections, URL:
<http://www.englishheritageprints.com>.

Facebook.com/Sweetheart-Brooches-of-the-Great-War.

Firepower: Royal Artillery Museum, URL: <http://firepower.org.uk>.

Firminhouse, URL:<http://www.firminhouse.com/military/military.htm>.

Hansard, URL:www.parliament.uk: <https://hansard.parliament.uk>.

Horniman Museum, URL: <http://www.horniman.ac.uk>.

Internet Archive: Digital Library, URL:<https://archive.org>.

King's Royal Hussars, URL:<http://www.krh.org.uk/insignia.html>.

Leeds Art Gallery, URL:<http://www.leedsartgallery.co.uk>.

Mason, Amanda, *'The Incredible Story of the Dambusters Raid'*, IWM,
URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/the-incredible-story-of-the-dambusters-raid>.

Ministry of Defence, MOD, URL:<http://www.army.mod.uk/news/28632.aspx>.

Museum of London, URL:<http://collections.museumoflondon.org.uk>.

National Army Museum, URL:<http://www.nam.ac.uk>

National Maritime Royal Museums Greenwich, URL:<http://collections.rmg.co.uk>.

National Portrait Gallery, URL:<http://www.npg.org.uk>

Norfolk in World War One, URL:<https://norfolkinworldwar1.org>.

Office for National Statistics, 'Marriage Summary Statistics and Divorces in England and Wales 2012', URL:<http://visual.ons.gov.uk>.

Pennell, Catriona, *A Kingdom United: Popular Responses to the Outbreak of the First World War in Britain and Ireland*, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2012, Introduction, p.1.URL:<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com.ezproxy.sussex.ac.uk/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199590582.001.0001/acprof-9780199590582-chapter-1?print=pdf>].

Philadelphia Museum of Art, URL:<http://philamuseum.org>.

Project Gutenberg eBook, URL:<http://www.gutenberg.org>

Royal Collection Trust, URL:<https://www.royalcollection.org.uk>.

Royal Flying Corps 1914-1918, URL:<http://www.airwar1.org.uk>.

Science Museum, URL:<http://collection.sciencemuseum.org.uk/>

Smithsonian Art Museum, URL:<http://americanart.si.edu>.

South African Military History Society,
URL:<http://samilitaryhistory.org/vol136sw.html>.

Tate, URL:<http://www.tate.org.uk>.

Temple Digital Library,
URL:<http://gamma.library.temple.edu/exhibits/exhibits/show/george-tyler-wwi-poster-exhibi/page-5>.

The Peerage, URL:www.thepeerage.com.

UK Commonwealth War Graves Records,
URL:<https://www.google.co.uk/search?site=&source=hp&q=commonwealth+war+grave+commission>.

UK Parliament, URL:<http://www.parliament.uk>.

Victoria & Albert Museum, URL:<http://collections.vam.ac.uk>.

Victoria Cross History, URL:<http://www.victoriacross.org.uk/aahistor.htm>.

Victoria Cross Medals. East Sussex: Naval and Military Press,
Ancestry.co.uk:database:URL:<http://search.ancestry.co.uk>.

Wellcome Trust, URL:www.wellcomecollection.org.

Wikipedia, URL:<https://en.wikipedia.org>.

WWI Centenary, URL:<http://www1centenary.oucs.ox.ac.uk/?p=2446>.

WW2 People's War, URL:<http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar>.

Secondary Sources

Acton, Carol, *Grief in Wartime: Private Pain, Public Discourse* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

Albright, Madeline, *Read my Pins: Stories from a Diplomat's Jewel Box* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009).

Alec-Tweedie, Ethel, *Women and Soldiers* (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1918).

Andrews, Maggie, Gregson, Adrian, Peters, John, *Worcestershire's War: Voices of the First World War*, Ebook:
URL:<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=9CBVBQAAQBAJ&pg=PT5&lpg=PT5&dq=Worcestershire%27s+War:+Voices+of+the+First+World+War&source=bl&ots=TruEEVAqMB&sig=QZtvMwpCnQBgUGl59d73ocPt5JU&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUK EwihyeC77KLZA hVHJsAKHSxgAfAQ6AEIXjAI#v=snippet&q=badges&f=false>, p.23,[accessed 1.12.2017].

Anglo, Sydney, *Images of Tudor Kinship* (London: Seaby, 1992).

Anonymous, *Badges and Emblems of the Services* (London: N.A.G. Press Ltd., 1940).

Anonymous, 'Gems and Superstition', p.157, Review of *The Magic of Jewels and Charms*, in *Nature*, 20.4.1916.

Appadurai, Arjun, ed., *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Aronson, Julie, Wieseman, Marjorie, *Perfect Likeness: European and American Portrait Miniatures from the Cincinnati Art Museum* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

Arnold, Jean, *Victorian Jewelry, Identity and the Novel* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

Ash, J., 'Memory and Objects', pp.219-224, in Pat Kirkham, *The Gendered Object* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

Atterbury, Paul, *Antiques Roadshow: World War One in 100 Family Treasures* (London: BBC, 2014).

Aulich, James, 'Advertising and the Public in Britain during the First World War', in David Welch, Jo Fox, eds., *Justifying War: Propaganda, Politics and the Modern Age*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2012).

Barnes, R. M., *A History of the Regiments and Uniforms of the British Army* (London: Sphere, 1972).

Batchen, Geoffrey, *Forget me Not: Photography & Remembrance* (New York, Amsterdam: Princeton Architectural Press, 2004).

Barthes, Roland, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans., Richard Howard, (London: Cape, 1982).

Bate, Jonathan, Thornton, Dora, *Shakespeare: Staging the World* (London: British Museum Press, 2012).

Berg, Maxine, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Blunden, Edmund, *Undertones of War*, (New York: Doubleday, 1929).

Boff, Jonathan, 'Military Structures and Ranks', British Library, URL:<https://www.bl.uk/world-war-one/articles/military-structures-and-ranks>[accessed 3.4.2015].

Bostridge, Mark, Bishop, Alan, eds., *Letters from a Lost Generation: Roland Leighton, Edward Brittain, Victor Richardson, Geoffrey Thurlow* (London: Abacus, 1999).

Bown, Nicola, 'Tender Beauty: Victorian Painting and the Problem of Sentimentality', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, Vol.16.2, pp.214-215.

Braybon, Gail, ed., *Evidence, History and the Great War: Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2001).

Brian, John Patrick, *The Story of English Silver Brooches 1880-1918 In Peace and at War* (Bicester: Bound Biographies, 2007).

Brickhill, Paul, *The Dam Busters*, (London: Evans Brothers, 1951).

Bright, Janette, Gillian Clarke, *An Introduction to the Tokens at the Foundling Museum* (London: Foundling Museum, n.d.).

Brittain, Vera, *Testament of Youth: An Autobiographical Study of the Years 1900-1925*, [1933], (London: Virago, 2014).

Buck, Stephanie, 'Beauty and Virtue for Francis I: Iohannes Ambrosius Nucetus and the Early Portrait Miniature', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 71 (2008), 191-210.

Burdett, Carolyn, 'Victorian Sentimentality at Tate Britain', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, Vol.42, 1.3.2014, pp.141-165.

Bury, Shirley, *An Introduction to Sentimental Jewellery* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1985).

- Bury, Shirley, *Jewellery, 1789-1910: The International Era, Volumes I & II* (Woodbridge: Antique Collectors' Club, 1991).
- Bryant, Julius, 'Mrs. Crouch', *Kenwood: Paintings in the Iveagh Bequest*, (Swindon: English Heritage, 2012).
- Cannadine, David 'War and Death, Grief and Mourning in Modern Britain', pp.187-242, in *Mirrors of Mortality*, J. Whaley, ed., (London: Routledge, 2012).
- Carnevali, Francesca, 'Luxury for the Masses. Jewellery and Jewellers in London and Birmingham in the 19th Century', *Entreprises et Histoire*, 2007, No.46, pp.56-70.
- Carr, Gilly, 'Coins, Crests and Kings: Symbols of identity and resistance in the Occupied Channel Islands', *Journal of Material Culture*, 17(4), 2012, pp. 327-344.
- Carrington, Charles, *Rudyard Kipling: his life and work* (London: Macmillan, 1955).
- Carrington, Charles, *Soldier from the Wars Returning* (London: Hutchinson, 1965).
- Carruthers, Susan L., 'Manning the Factories': Propaganda and Policy on the Employment of Women, 1939-1947', *History*, 1990, Vol.75 (244), pp.232-256.
- Caunt, Pamela, *Military Sweethearts: A Guide for Collectors, 1-3*, (London: Friary Press, 1994).
- Cherry, John, 'Late Fourteenth-Century Jewellery: The Inventory of November 1399', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol.130, No.1019 (Feb.1988), pp.137-140.
- Choay, Françoise, *The Invention of the Historic Monument* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Clampin, David, *Advertising and Propaganda in World War II: Cultural Identity and the Blitz Spirit* (London, New York: I. B. Tauris & Co., 2014).
- Clark, Toby, *Art and Propaganda*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1999).
- Clephan, Robert Coltman, *The Medieval Tournament*, (New York, Dover, 1919).
- Collins, Ross F., 'Myth as Propaganda in World War 1: American Volunteers, Victor Chapman and French Journalism', *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 2015, Vol.92(3), pp.642-661.
- Conan Doyle, Arthur, *The History of Spiritualism*, Vol.2 (London: Cassell, 1926).
- Cork, Richard, 'Hyde Park Corner: Imperial Triumph and Tragedy', xv-xxiv, in Walsh, Michael, Varneva, Andrekos, eds., *The Great War and the British Empire: Culture and Society*, (London, New York: Routledge, 2017).
- Cormack, Andrew, *British Air Forces, 1914-18*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Osprey, 2000).

Crane, Susan, Editor, *Museums and Memory* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000).

Cropp, Glynnis M., Hanham, Alison, 'Richard II from Donkey to Royal Martyr: Perceptions of Eustache Deschamps and Contemporary French Writers', *Parergon*, Vol.24, No.1, 2007, pp.101-136.

Dobranski, Stephen B., *Milton's Visual Imagination: Imagery in Paradise Lost* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Dominiek Dendooven, 'The Journey Back', in Saunders, Cornish, *Contested Objects*, (London, New York: Routledge, 2014).

Donagan, Barbara, *War in England 1642-1649* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Druckman, Daniel, 'Nationalism, Patriotism and Group Loyalty: A Social Psychological Perspective', *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol.38 (April 1994), pp.43-68.

Eicher, Joanne B., 'The Anthropology of Dress', *The Journal of the Costume Society of America*, 27:1, 2000, pp.59-70.

Emden, Richard van, *Boy Soldiers of the Great War* (Bidford: Headline, 2005).

Evans, Joan, *Magical Jewels of the Renaissance Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Particularly in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922).

Falls, Cyril, Captain, *History of the Great War: Military Operation, Macedonia* (London: HM Stationery Office, 1935).

Fedden, Mary, 'Work Suspended', pp.51-61, in Nicholson, Mavis, ed., *What did you do in the war, Mummy?: Women in World War II*, (London: Pimlico, 1996).

Ferguson, Harry, *Operation Kronstadt* (London: Hutchinson, 2008).

Fletcher, Anthony, 'Patriotism, Identity and Commemoration: New Light on the Great War from the Papers of Major Reggie Chenevix Trench', *History*, 90, 4 (300) (October 2005), pp. 532-549.

Fletcher, Pamela, '“To wipe a manly tear”: The Aesthetics of Emotion in Victorian Narrative Painting', *Victorian Studies*, Vol.51.3, Spring 2009, pp.457-469.

Flower, Margaret, Langley-Levy Moore, Doris, *Victorian Jewellery* (London: Cassell, 1951).

Foskett, Daphne, *British Portrait Miniatures: A History* (London: Methuen, 1963).

Foss, Brian, *War paint: Art, War, State and Identity in Britain, 1939-1945*. (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Fox, Jo, 'Careless Talk: Tensions within British Domestic Propaganda during the Second World War', *Journal of British Studies*, 51, October 2012, pp.936-966.

Frantzen, Allen J., *Bloody Good: Chivalry, Sacrifice and the Great War* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

French, David, *The Regimental System, the British Army, and the British People c.1870-2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Freemantle, Michael, *The Chemists' War: 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Royal Society of Chemistry, 1915).

Fumerton, Patricia, ' "Secret" Arts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets', pp.93-133, in *Representing the English Renaissance*, Stephen Greenblatt, ed., (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

Fussell, Paul, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Gardner, Martin, *The Annotated Snark* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974).

Gell, Alfred, 'Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory', (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

Gere, Charlotte, *Love and Art: Queen Victoria's Personal Jewellery* (London: Royal Collection Trust, 2012), pp.1-19.

Gere, Charlotte, Rudoe, Judy, *Jewellery in the Age of Queen Victoria: A Mirror to the World* (London: British Museum Press, 2010).

Gibson, Guy, *Enemy Coast Ahead*, (London: Pan, 1946).

Gibson, Guy, *Enemy Coast Ahead: Uncensored: The Real Guy Gibson [1946]*, (Manchester: Crecy, 2003).

Gibson, Margaret, 'Melancholy Objects', *Mortality*, 9.4 (2004), pp.284-299.

Given-Wilson, Chris, 'Richard II and the Higher Nobility', pp.107-128 in Anthony Goodman, James Gillespie, eds, *Richard II: The Art of Kingship*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).

Gombrich, Ernst, *The Story of Art* (London: Phaedon, 16th Edition, 2006).

Goodman, Anthony, Gillespie, James, eds, *Richard II: The Art of Kingship*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).

Gordon, Dillian, 'A New Discovery in the Wilton Diptych', *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol.134, No.1075 (Oct.1992), pp.662-667.

Grace's Guide to British Industrial History: Ward Brothers Birmingham, URL: http://www.gracesguide.co.uk/Ward_Brothers_%28Birmingham%29.

Grant, Alistair, 'Elkington & Co. and the Rapture of Travel 1841-1961', *Journal of the Antique Metalware Society*, Vol.22, 2014, pp.2-31.

Graves, Robert, *Goodbye to All That* [1929], (London: Cassell, 1958).

Green-Lewis, Jennifer, *Framing the Victorians: Photography and the Culture of Realism* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1996).

Grootenboer, Hanneke, *Treasuring the Gaze: Intimate Vision in Late Eighteenth-Century Eye Miniatures* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

Gullace, Nicoletta F., *The Blood of Our Sons: Men, Women and the Renegotiation of British Citizenship During the Great War* (New York, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

Gullace, Nicoletta F., 'White Feathers and Wounded Men: Female Patriotism and the Memory of the Great War', *Journal of British Studies*, Vol.36, 2, Twentieth-Century British Studies, April 1997, pp.178-206.

Hallam, Elizabeth, Hockey, Jenny, *Death, Memory and Material Culture* (Oxford: Berg, 2001).

Harris, Barbara J., 'Women and Politics in Early Tudor England', *The Historical Journal*, 33.2.(1990), p.259-287.

Harris, Ronald, *Bengal Cavalry Regiments 1857-1914* (Oxford: London, 1979).

Harris, Carol, *Women at War 1914-1918* (Stroud: Pitkin, 2014).

Hayward, Maria, *Rich Apparel: Clothing and the Law in Henry VIII's England* (Ashgate: Farnham, Surrey 2009).

Hiley, Nicholas, 'Sir Hedley Le Bas and the Origins of Domestic Propaganda in Britain 1914-1917', *European Journal of Marketing*, 1987, Vol.21, 8, pp.30-46.

Holm, Christiane, 'Sentimental Cuts: Eighteenth-Century Mourning Jewelry with Hair', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol.38, 1, pp.139-143.

Horne, John, Kramer, Alan, *German Atrocities 1914: A History of Denial* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2009).

Hynes, Samuel, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (London: Pimlico, 1992).

Housley, Cliff, *Sweetheart Brooches (and other associated jewellery): the Sherwood Foresters* (Sawley: Miliquest, 2009).

Howard, Vicki, 'A "Real Man's Ring": Gender and the Invention of Tradition', *Journal of Social History*, Vol.36, 4, 2003, pp.837-856.

James, Susan, *Women's Voices in Tudor Wills, 1485-1603* (London, New York: Routledge, 2015).

Jarmin, Kenneth, *Military "Sweetheart" Brooches* (Boxford: Suffolk, 1981).

Jones, William, *Precious Stones: Their History and Mystery* (London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1880).

Jones, Ann Rosalind, Stallybrass, Peter, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Kernodle, George R., Kernodle, Portia, 'Dramatic aspects of the medieval tournament', *Speech Monographs*, 9:1, pp.161-172.

Kirkham, Pat, *The Gendered Object* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

Kopytoff, Igor, 'The Cultural Biography of Things', pp.64-91, in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, Ed. by Arjun Appadurai, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)

Langhamer, Claire, 'Everyday love and emotions in the 20th century', in Mark Hailwood, Brodie Waddell, eds, *The Future of History from Below: An Online Symposium* (2013) URL:<https://manyheadedmonster.wordpress.com/history-from-below/>.

Langhamer, Claire, *The English in Love: The Intimate Story of an Emotional Revolution*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Lewis-Stempel, John, *Six Weeks: The Short and Gallant Life of the British Officer in the First World War* (Orion: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2011).

Lichtenstein, Rachel, *Diamond Street: The Hidden World of Hatton Garden* (London: Penguin, 2013).

Liddle, Peter H., *Home Fires and Foreign Fields: British Social and Military Experience in the First World War* (London: Brassey's Defence Publishers, 1985).

Llewellyn, Nigel, *Art of Death: visual culture in the English death ritual c.1500-c.1800* (London: Reaktion, 2001).

David Lloyd George, 'An Appeal to the Nation', Speech delivered at the Queen's Hall, London, 19.9.1914. <https://www.bartleby.com/library/prose/2175.html>.

Lovett, Edward, *Magic in Modern London* [1925] (Boscastle: Red Thread Books, 2014).

Lutz, Deborah, *Relics of Death in Victorian Literature and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Maartens, Brendan John, *Recruitment for the British Armed Forces and Civil Defences: Organising and Producing "Advertising", 1913-63*, (PhD Thesis, University of Sussex, 2013).

Malvern, Sue, *Modern Art, Britain and the Great War* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2004).

Marshall, Richard, 'Stigmata: Military Insignia and the Recognition of Wounded Combatants during the Great War', *WWI Centenary*,
URL:<http://www1centenary.oucs.ox.ac.uk/?p=2446>[accessed 30.1.2017].

Marshall-Cornwall, General Sir James, *Wars and Rumours of Wars: A Memoir* (London: Leo Cooper, 1984).

Martin, Christopher, 'The Date and Authorship of the Letter from 'A Little Mother'', *Oxford Journals (Arts and Humanities)*, Notes and Queries, (2015) Vol.62, 3, pp.447-450.

Mauss, Marcel *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* [1925], trans. W. D. Halls (London: Routledge, 2002).

Mason, Amanda, 'The Incredible Story of the Dambusters Raid', IWM,
URL:<http://www.iwm.org.uk/history/the-incredible-story-of-the-dambusters-raid>.

Mason, Shena, *Jewellery Making in Birmingham 1750-1995* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1998).

Matt, Susan, 'Current Emotion Research in History: Or, Doing History from the Inside Out', *Emotion Review*, 3.1. (January 2011), pp.117-124.

McCrann, Grace-Ellen, 'Government Wartime Propaganda Posters: Communicators of Public Policy', *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, (2009), pp.53-73.

McNeil, Peter, Riello, Giorgio, *Luxury: A Rich History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Messinger, Gary, *British Propaganda and the State in the First World War* (Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, 1992).

Metcalf, Peter, *Remembered Again: Recalling Flint's Fallen Heroes of the First World War, Vol. I (A-H)* (Mold: Brown Cow, 2014).

Miller, Betty, ed., *Elizabeth Barrett to Miss Mitford*, (London: J. Murray, 1954).

Millman, Brock, *Pessimism and British War Policy, 1916-1918* (London: Routledge, 2001).

Montoya, Alicia C., Sophie van Romburgh, Wim van Anrooij, eds., *Early Modern Medievalisms: The Interplay between Scholarly Reflection and Artistic Production*. (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010).

Moriarty, Catherine, 'Remnants of Patriotism: the Commemorative representation of the greatcoat after the First World War', *Oxford Art Journal*, 27.3.2004, p.291-309.

Moriarty, Catherine, 'Though in a Picture Only': Photography and Commemoration', pp.30-47, in Gail Braybon, ed., *Evidence, History and the Great War: Historians and the Impact of 1914-18* (New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 2001).

Morris, Richard, *Guy Gibson*, (London: Viking, 1994).

Muir, Dorothy Erskine, *Florence Nightingale*, (London, Glasgow: Blackie & Son. Ltd., 1946).

Munn, Geoffrey C., *The Triumph of Love: Jewelry 1530-1930* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1993).

Nathanson, Stephen, 'Patriotism, War, and the Limits of Permissible Partiality', *Journal of Ethics*, No.13 (2009), pp.401-422.

Nash, Rosalind, *A Short Life of Florence Nightingale* [1923] (London: Forgotten Books, 2013).

Neher, Gabriele, Shepherd, Rupert, eds., *Revaluing Renaissance Art*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

Newman, Vivien, *We Also Served: The Forgotten Women of the First World War* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books, 2004).

Nicholson, Mavis, ed., *What did you do in the war, Mummy?: Women in World War II*, (London: Pimlico, 1996).

Nicklas, Charlotte, Pollen, Annebella, eds., *Dress history: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, (London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015).

Noakes, Lucy, 'Gender, Grief, and Bereavement in Second World War Britain', *Journal of War and Culture Studies*, Vol.8,1,2015, pp.72-85.

Noakes, Lucy, *Women in the British Army: war and the gentle sex, 1907-1948* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

Nora, Pierre, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoires', *Representations*, 26, Spring 1989, pp.7-24.

Nye, James, *A Long Time in the Making: The History of Smiths* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

O'Malley, Michelle, 'A Pair of Little Gilded Shoes: Commission, Cost and Meaning in Renaissance Footwear', *Renaissance Quarterly*, March 2010, 63.1, pp.45-83.

Orczy, Emmuska, *Links in the Chain of Life* (London: Hutchinson, 1947).

Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982).

Peniston-Bird Corinna, Vickers, Emma, eds., *Gender and the Second World War* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

Pennell, Catriona, *A Kingdom United: Popular Responses to the Outbreak of the First World War in Britain and Ireland*, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2012, Introduction, p.1.URL:<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com.ezproxy.sussex.ac.uk/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199590582.001.0001/acprof-9780199590582-chapter-1?print=pdf>.

Pollen, Annebella, *Mass Photography: Collective Histories of Everyday Life* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2016).

Pointon, Marcia, *Brilliant Effects: A Cultural History of Gemstones & Jewellery* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2009).

Pointon, Marcia, 'Intriguing Jewellery: Royal Bodies and Luxurious Consumption', *Textual Practice*, 11:3, pp.493-516.

Pointon, Marcia, '“Surrounded with Brilliants”: Miniature Portraits in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Art Bulletin*, Vol.83, No.1, March 2001, pp.48-71.

Pointon, Marcia, 'Valuing the Visual and Visualizing the Valuable: Jeweller and its Ambiguities', *Cultural Values*, 3, 1, 1999, pp.1-27.

Pope-Hennessy, John, *Design in Museums*, Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, Vol. 123, No. 5231 (October 1975), pp.717-727.

Powell Siddons, Michael, *Heraldic Badges in England and Wales* (Woodbridge: Published for The Society of Antiquaries of London by Boydell Press, 2009), Vols.1,2,3.

Radford, E., Radford, M. A., eds., *The Encyclopedia of Superstitions* (London: Rider, 1948).

Randolph, Adrian W. B., 'Performing the Bridal Body in Fifteenth-Century Florence', *Art History*, 21,2, June 1998, pp.182-200.

Randolph, Adrian, 'Unpacking Cassoni: Marriage, Ritual, Memory', in *The Triumph of Marriage: Painted Cassone of the Renaissance*, A. W. B. Randolph, J. M. Musacchio, A. Chong, eds., (Boston: Gutenberg Periscope, 2008).

Ramsay, Nigel, Blair, John, *English medieval industries: craftsmen, techniques, products* (London: Hambledon Press, 1991).

Reilly, Catherine, ed., *Scars Upon My Heart: Women's Poetry and Verse of the First World War* (London: Virago, 1981),

Richards, Frank, *Old Soldiers Never Die* [1933] (Sleaford: Philip Austen, 1994).

Richardson, Matthew, 'Medals, Memory and Meaning: Symbolism and cultural significance of Great War medals', in Saunders, Nicholas J., Cornish, Paul eds., *Contested Objects* (London, New York: Routledge, 2014).

Riello, Giorgio, 'Things That Shape History: Material Culture and Historical Narratives', in K. Harvey, ed., *History and Material Culture* (London: Routledge, 2009).

Riello, Giorgio, 'The object of fashion: methodological approaches to the history of fashion', *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture*, Vol.3, 2011, pp.1-9.

Robert, Krisztina, 'Gender, Class, and Patriotism: Women's Paramilitary Units in First World War Britain', *International History Review*, Vol.19, No.1 (Feb., 1997), pp.52-65.

Robertson, Emily, 'Propaganda and 'manufactured hatred': A reappraisal of the ethics of First World War British and Australian atrocity propaganda', *Public Relations Inquiry*, 2014, Vol.3(2), pp.245-266.

Rogers, Frances, Beard, Alice, *5000 Years of Gems and Jewelry* (New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1947).

Rolo, Charles J., *Radio Goes to War: The Fourth Front* (Putnam's: New York, 1942).

Roper, Michael, 'Slipping Out of View: Subjectivity and Emotion in Gender History', *History Workshop Journal*, 59, 2005, pp.57-72.

Rose, Gillian, *Doing Family Photography: The Domestic, The Public and the Politics of Sentiment* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

Russell, T., *Commercial Advertising* (London: Putnam, 1920).

Saunders, Nicholas J., Cornish, Paul eds., *Contested Objects* (London, New York: Routledge, 2014).

Saunders, Nicholas J., *Trench Art: Materialities and Memories of War*, (Oxford, New York: Berg, 2003).

Scarisbrick, Diana, *Rings, Jewelry of Power, Love and Loyalty* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2007).

Seymer, Lucy R., 'The Nightingale Jewel', *American Journal of Nursing*, Vol.55, 5., May 1955, pp.549-550.

Sheridan, Dorothy, 'Mass Observing the British', *History Today*, 1.7.1984, pp.41-46.

Shill, Ray, *Birmingham's Industrial Heritage 1900-2000* (Stroud: Sutton, 2002).

Simmel, Georg, *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, [1908], trans., Kurt H. Wolff (Glencoe: Free Press, 1950).

Simpson, Keith, 'The British Soldier on the Western Front', pp.135-158 in Peter H. Liddle, *Home Fires and Foreign Fields: British Social and Military Experience in the First World War* (London: Brassey's Defence Publishers, 1985).

Snider, Nick, *Sweetheart Jewelry and Collectibles* (Atglen: Schiffer, 1995).

Sontag, Susan, *On Photography* (London: Penguin, 1977).

Stephens, W. B. Pugh, R. B. eds., *The Victoria History of the County of Warwick: Vol. VII, The City of Birmingham* (Oxford: Oxford, 1964),

Stewart, Susan, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Durham, London: Duke University Press, 1993).

Stone, Tessa, 'Creating a (Gendered?) Military Identity: the Women's Auxiliary Air Force in Great Britain in the Second World War', *Women's History Review*, 8,4, 1999, pp.605-624.

Stow, John, *A Survey of London* [1604] (London: Chatto & Windus, 1876).

Streeter, Patrick, *Streeter of Bond Street: A Victorian Jeweller* (Harlow: The Matching Press, 1993).

Strong, Roy, *Artists of the Tudor Court: The Portrait Miniature Rediscovered 1520-1620* (London: V&A Museum, 1983).

Strong, Roy, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Pimlico, 2003).

Taylor, Lou, Wilson, Elizabeth, *Through the Looking Glass: A History of Dress from 1860 to the Present Day* (London: BBC, 1989).

Taylor, Lou, *The Study of Dress History*, (Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press, 2002).

Taylor, Philip M., *Munitions of the Mind: A History of Propaganda from the Ancient World to the Present Era* (Manchester, New York: Palgrave, 2003).

Taylor, Philip M., *Public Diplomacy, Propaganda and PSYOPS*,
<http://leeds.ac.uk/what-propaganda>.

Tillander, Herbert, *Diamond Cuts in Historic Jewellery 1381-1910* (London: Art Books International, 1995).

Tyas, Robert, *The Language of Flowers; or Floral Emblems of Thoughts, Feelings and Sentiments* (London, New York: George Routledge & Sons, 1869).

The Concise Oxford English Dictionary, 7th Edition, J. B. Sykes, ed., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

Unwin, George, *The Gilds and Companies of London*, [1908] (Frank Cass: London, 4th edition, 1963).

Veranneman, Jean-Michel, *Belgium in the Second World War* (South Yorkshire: Pen and Sword Military Books, 2014).

Vining, Margaret, Hacker, Barton C., 'From Camp Follower to Lady in Uniform: Women, Social Class and Military Institutions before 1920', *Contemporary European History*, 10.3 (2001), pp.353-373.

Wallace, Lt. Gen. Sir Christopher, Cassidy, Major Ron, *Focus on Courage: The 59 Victoria Crosses of the Royal Green Jackets* (Hampshire: RGJ Museum Trust, 2006).

Walsh, Michael, Varneva, Andrekos, eds., *The Great War and the British Empire: Culture and Society*, (London, New York: Routledge, 2017).

Ward, Gerald W. R., ed., *Grove Encyclopedia of Materials and Techniques in Art* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Welch, Evelyn, 'New, old and second-hand culture: the case of the Renaissance sleeve', pp.101-119, in *Revaluing Renaissance Art*, Neher, Gabriele, Shepherd, Rupert, eds., (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

Whaley, J., ed., *Mirrors of Mortality*, (London: Routledge, 2012).

Wilkinson-Latham, R. J., *Discovering British Military Badges and Buttons*, (Oxford: Shire, 2002).

Wing, Sandra Koa, ed., *Mass-Observation: Britain in the Second World War*, (London: The Folio Society, 2007).

Winter, Jay, M., *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Winter, Jay M., *The Great War and the British People* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Wise, M. J., 'Evolution of the Jewellery and Gun Quarters in Birmingham', *Transactions and Papers (Institute of British Geographers)*, 15, (1949), pp.59-72.

Young, J. E. *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*, (Yale: Yale University Press, 2007).

Young, Peter, Holmes, Richard, *The English Civil War: A Military History of the Three Civil Wars 1642-1651* (London: Purnell, 1974).

Zweiniger-Bargielowska, Ina, *Austerity in Britain: Rationing, Controls, and Consumption, 1939-1955* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Zybnek Zeman, 1973, *Nazi Propaganda*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1973).

Appendix 1

Methods of Research

It was originally intended to compile a quantitative survey of different kinds of sweetheart brooch in order to assess how and why they were purchased and worn. However, accessing objects owned by private individuals proved difficult. The methods detailed below were explored, though limited responses were received.

All those who responded to requests for information for this study were invited to provide family stories and/or photographs relating to sweetheart brooches. However, it proved impossible to provide a single questionnaire to send to everyone who responded. Most stated that they did not wish to complete such a questionnaire but would prefer to arrange a time to speak by phone, or to write an account in their own words by letter or in emails. They were all informed that the thesis would be stored as a hard copy and/or electronically by both the University of Sussex and the British Library in case they did not wish to continue. This information was confirmed to each of them either by email or letter. They were also given the option of remaining anonymous if they preferred (only one, the granddaughter of Charles Kearton, took this option. See p.203). They were also advised that any photographs they supplied could be removed from the copy archived at the British Library if they wished. (Only the Assistant Curator of the Argyll and Sutherlands Museum (Appendix 2) asked for this to be done. However, as it has not been possible to trace the origins of some of the images used here, since they have sometimes been posted across several internet websites without acknowledgements, it will be necessary to remove them all from the online versions of the thesis.

1. WW2 Talk: URL:<http://www.ww2talk.com>

A website forum that allows members to contact others to exchange information about any aspect of WW2 and to post photographs. In response to a request for information, the following contacted me with family stories and/or images, all via emails:

- Robin Dickers Figure 61: *Mr. and Mrs. Bishop.*
- Ron Goldstein See p.57 and
 Figures 10: *Lance-Bombadier Ron Goldstein, Royal Artillery, showing the RA cap badge.*
 Figure 11: *Royal Artillery Sweetheart Brooch belonging to Nita Goldstein.*
- Carol Thomas See pp.30, 32, 35, 108, 172, 252.
- Carol Thomas also contacted her local history group, of which she was then a member, but did not receive any relevant information.
 (NB An image was provided, but Thomas was unable to contact the descendents of the couple depicted for their permission to use the photograph, therefore the decision was made not to include it.)
- William Woodhouse See pp.49-50 and Figure 182, *Royal Navy sweetheart brooch with attached photo portrait.* Woodhouse and his partner are collectors of brooches, often found in house clearances.

2. The British Legion

The British Legion is a registered charity providing support to veterans and current members of the British armed forces and their families. It was hoped that it might be possible to contact women who owned sweetheart brooches through the Legion. Sue Sadler, Membership Support Officer Sussex, based in Brighton, wrote a short piece asking for information (written as though from me but based on information given to her), and published it in *The Legion*, the online and printed newsletter, in October 2015. (See below).

Six replies were received. Four related to objects that were not defined as sweetheart brooches: two were trench art, two were brooches with photographs but unrelated to regimental insignia. Two, however, are analysed here.

LETTERS

Frank Zarb had some success after Legion published this picture in the *Lost Trails* section of the April issue. The image shows the HQ Malta Sector from December 1956

DC at no charge to spend the day viewing the United States Air Force, Second World War, Korean and Vietnam memorials. The aircraft is laid on by the airline, the cabin crew donate their days off and the veterans pay for nothing except souvenirs they may want. Their flight cost is provided by a sponsor (family member or association they're a member of) and escorts/guardians (helpers for the veterans) pay \$400 for the privilege of escorting them! All meals are provided throughout the day, as are wheelchairs for those who need them. Flights happen in the spring and autumn, as even in Washington DC the summers can be very hot. This is one way we can give back to the greatest generation. **Keith "Dougie" Douglas (RN veteran), by email**

DEEP DIGGING

After reading the letter *Painting a picture* in the June *Legion*, and being a keen genealogist, I decided to do a bit of research with regards to L/Cpl Vernon Phizackerley. I was able to find an obituary for a sister of Vernon's, which was



posted in the *Leader Times* newspaper from Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada. The information in the obituary points to Vernon's other sister, Olga, being alive in 2013. After a bit more digging, I managed to obtain an address and telephone number for Olga W Phizackerley, who is now living in the Wirral! **Brian Warren, Coimbrão, Portugal, by email**

YES, THAT'S HIM!

Many thanks for publishing my 1956 photo in your *Lost Trails* feature in April. I am delighted to say that Derek Fowlds, who played Sir Bernard Woolley in *Yes, Minister* on television and appeared in my photo, made contact with me. It was a very pleasant surprise to hear from him

58 years after we were stationed together in Malta. **Frank Zarb, by email**

STORIES WANTED

Are you an owner of a sweetheart brooch, or do you know anyone who owns one? If so, I'd love to get in touch with you so I can add some personal stories to my research into these precious objects. I'm currently studying Art History at the University of Sussex, and became interested in the brooches – that are often kept as memorial objects after the death of the giver – when I came across references in the Mass Observation Archive here in Sussex. **Penny Streeter, PS.Streeter@sussex.ac.uk**



**THE ROYAL
BRITISH LEGION**
Haig House, 199 Borough High
Street, London SE1 1AA.
www.britishlegion.org.uk
Registered charity no. 219279

PATRON

HM The Queen
NATIONAL PRESIDENT
Vice Admiral Peter Wilkinson
NATIONAL CHAIRMAN
John Crisford
DIRECTOR GENERAL
Chris Simpkins

For queries relating to
The Royal British Legion,
call 0808 802 8080
[8am-8pm, seven days a
week. Calls are free from
UK landlines and main
mobile networks]

For change of address
queries, please email
memberships@britishlegion.org.uk
or call 0808 802 8080

For queries relating to the
content of the magazine,
write to Legion, 136-142
Bramley Road, London
W10 6SR or email
editorial@legion-magazine.co.uk

To advertise in Legion,
email sales@legion-magazine.co.uk

ABC 289,931
(Jan-Dec 2013)



Legion magazine is published on behalf of The Royal British Legion by John Brown, 136-142 Bramley Road, London W10 6SR. Tel: 020 7566 3000. The publishers declare that the publication of advertising does not carry their endorsement or sponsorship of the advertiser – or their products or services – unless so indicated. No responsibility can be taken for photographs, drawings or literary contributions during transmission, or while in the hands of the editorial team. Proof of receipt is no guarantee of appearance in the magazine. In the absence of an agreement, copyright of all contributions – literary, photographic or artistic – belongs to The Royal British Legion. The views expressed in this magazine do not necessarily reflect the views of The Royal British Legion.



Request for information in *Legion*, the British Legion Newsletter October 2015 and online version
<https://www.facebook.com/sussex.legion?ref=bookmarks>
Copy written by Sue Sadler, Membership Support Officer Sussex, (ssadler@britishlegion.org.uk).

John Keetley See pp.214-215, personal communication via emails (no image)

Karen and
Gary Skeels See pp.38, 255, via telephone calls (no image).

3. The Long, Long Trail: The British Army in the Great War of 1914-1918

URL:<https://www.longlongtrail.co.uk>

Forum for family and military historians. Members sent several images but as there was no associated information connected to the brooches these were not used.

4. David Ogilvy, Earl of Airlie,

Cortachy

By Kirriemuir

Angus

DD8 4LY

I contacted Lord Airlie by letter on 3 September 2015, to ask whether his grandmother's brooch was still in the family's possession and whether it would be possible to see and photograph it. He telephoned in response on 14 September 2015; the family no longer own the brooch and he did not know its whereabouts, although he thought it might have been given to his grandfather's regiment, the 10th Royal Hussars. (See p.80). This regiment no longer exists, but I was eventually able to trace the brooch to the garrison of the King's Royal Hussars, Tidworth, Wiltshire and to photograph it there.

5. Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers Museum, Chippenham, Wiltshire.

When contacted about sweetheart brooches in the museum's collection, Juliet Turk, Assistant Curator, offered to get in touch with the donors to ask whether they would be interested in including their family histories in this study. Two donors had since died, but two initially responded.

Terry Atkin

See p.50

Gertrude Kearton's granddaughter
(requested to remain anonymous)

See p.203 By letter,

Further information relating to the study

1. Norfolk in World War One URL:<https://norfolkinworldwar1.org>

This local association did not have specific information about brooches but kindly provided the diary of Lt. James Brierley from their collection. From Brierley's notes, it was possible to speculate about whether Major Fleming Hartley might have been able to travel to the UK in 1917 (Chapter 5.3).

Dr. Chris Upton, Reader in Public History, Newman University, Birmingham

Fiona Tait, Birmingham Library, passed details of my research to Chris Upton, who sent the newspaper account of Adolph Scott's 1915 prosecution under the Defence of the Realm Act. (p.114). This provided information about the way sweetheart brooches were marketed during WWI.

David Dickens, Queen's Royal (West Surrey) Museum, Clandon Park, Surrey

David Dickens was Chairman of Trustees at the museum, which owned a collection of brooches. The collection was studied and photographed for this thesis (though none of the brooches had any history or names attached to them), following which Dickens contacted me with photographs and information about two brooches he had bought for his wife. The regiment's collection was unfortunately lost in the fire which destroyed Clandon Park in 2015.

Appendix 2:

Museums and Archives

These tables show museums contacted for information regarding regimental sweetheart brooches in their collections. Each was visited in person or contacted by phone or email.

Table 1: Military Museums

All known military museums in the UK were approached or visited. Of a total of 61 museums, 45 replied, with varying amounts of information, often unrelated to their size and the number of their employees/volunteers but more to the enthusiasm of their staff. Those who did respond often took considerable trouble to take photographs or search their archives, often on their own time and I would like to thank them particularly for their help. Sixteen did not respond, though this may be because of recent closures or because recently some museums have been amalgamated or taken under the remit of local authorities. In some cases one curator, archivist or local authority covered more than one regiment. Many do not have the ability to put their collections online, though again this does not appear to be related to their size or finances but to the interests of curators or other staff members. Many could not associate their brooches with known individuals (notable exceptions were the King's Own Royal, Lancaster and the Manchester Regimental Museums, whose curators or trustees had taken a special interest in the subject). Where they did have named examples, only a few had followed up the histories of their owners. Wherever possible I have traced these further through military records, though this is often problematic post WWI because records are not always available to the public. Many did not distinguish between regimental badge brooches and handmade trench art objects (which are not included here except where clearly stated).

It is concluded that such badges are often included in regimental collections because they have been donated with other, more obviously military items such as uniforms and weapons and are often considered peripheral to the museum's narrative and only

displayed prominently if the curator (often ex-military personnel) deems them to be of interest. In addition, displays related to WWI and WWII anniversaries, for example in local museums and National Trust properties owned by families whose members had been involved, were visited.

RAF brooches are largely categorised by speciality rather than as the badges of individual units, so that they usually represent, for example, pilot's wings or navigators' or observers' insignia. Naval sweetheart brooches are less common than military ones and sometimes bear the name of an individual ship, frequently with the addition of an anchor. Some collectors (generally those who served within a specialist service) only collect the brooches relating to that service, for example, submarines.

Table 1: Military Museums

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Aldershot Military Museum, Aldershot, Hampshire	Gill Arnott Curator	10.4.2017.	0	-	-	-	■
Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders, The Castle, Stirling	Rod Mackenzie Curator	15.5.2017	3	0	0	1. Bandsman George Martin WWI, KIA 13.8.1916. (See Chapter 4 Memory and Mourning) 2. MacIntyre.	1. Sporran brooch + embroidered letter. 2. Sporran brooch. 3. Rifle brooch.
Beds and Herts Regiment, Wardown Museum, Luton, Beds.	Nigel Lutt, Museum Trustee.	15.3.2017	5	?	0	2 belonging to Capt. J. P. O'Brien Ledebor (Herts. Reg.) (WWII). 1 belonging to Lt. Mead (Beds. and Herts. Reg.) (N.d.)	Brooches are of silver and enamel in a pouch, with attached medal ribbon bar. 14ct. gold, Hamilton & Co. of Simla, India.
Black Watch, Balhousie Castle, Perth, Scotland.		Feb 2017	2	0	2 no image	0	1. Diamond brooch on loan to C.O. for his wife to wear. N.d. 2. Diamond encrusted, white gold brooch. N.d.
Buckinghamshire Military Museum Trust, Buckingham	Professor Ian Taylor, University of Kent	13.4.2017	2	0	0	0	1. Enamelled Royal Bucks Hussars Sweetheart Badge. BMMT 92. N.d. 2. Gold Bucks Battalion Sweetheart Badge. Purchased from Messrs. Dix, Noonan, Webb on 28 March 2002 (Lot 715). BMMT 505. N.d. Both held in store, Viney House, Oxford Road, Aylesbury
Carmarthen Militia, Abergwili, Carmarthen.	Curator.	March 2017	0	0	0	-	No response.

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Cornwall's Regimental Museum, Bodmin, Cornwall		6.4.2017			0		No response
Derbyshire Yeomanry (Sherwood Foresters) Derby.	Curator	March 2017			0		No response
Devon and Dorset Regiments, The Keep, Dorchester.	Helen Jones Deputy Curator	March 2015	'small display'	Percy-Jones brooch 'object of the month' Feb 2017	1	Several given as part of collections belonging to named individuals. Col. D. Percy-Jones to Mrs Molly Percy-Jones (n.d.)	These are believed to have been collected at sales or found in attics. No histories are known. Gold, diamonds, enamels. Victorian crown. Temporarily online as 'Object of the month', also on display at museum. Recent donation to museum.
Duke of Wellington's (West Riding), Halifax.	Military Keeper	March 2017	0	0	0		
Durham Light Infantry, Durham	Museum now closed (2016).						No access to collection.
Essex Regiment Museum, Chelmsford.	Nick Wickenden	30.3.2017	24	0	0	0	Museum currently has no curator. Brooches are boxed and kept in store.
Fusiliers Museum of Northumberland, Alnwick Castle, Northumberland.	Through website.	5.4.2017.			0		No response
Gordon Highlanders, Aberdeen.	General enquiries only through website.	17.4.2017.	2	0	3 no images	1. Related to Col. W. Drummond	1. Gold and silver brooch in case. N.d. 1. Brooch in form of cap badge? Or made from cap badge? N.d.

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Green Howards Richmond North Yorkshire	Steve Erskine Curator	March 2017	8	0	0	8	1. Made from cap badge. Victorian 1. Made from uniform button. WWI. 3. Souvenir battle brooches. WWI. 1. 'Died on Active Service'. WWI. 2. Regimental sweetheart brooches. WWI. 1. Diamond brooch, worn by C.O.'s wife till 2013.
Guards Museum, Wellington Barracks, London.	Curator.	8.3.2017.	0	0	0		
Hampshire Regiment, Hampshire Cultural Trust, Chilcomb House, Chilcomb Lane, Winchester, Hants.	Gill Arnott, Curator of Art.	April 2017	1	0	0	0	1 'Ypres' veteran's brooch. WWI. (See Memory and Mourning, Chapter 4)
Hereford Light Infantry Hereford	General enquiry	March 2017			0		No response.
Hertfordshire Regiment Hertford	Curator	8.3.2017					No response
Highlanders, (Seaforths, Gordons, Cameron's, Queen's Own), Fort George, Inverness.	General enquiries only through website.	17.4.2017.					No response
Jersey Militia, St. Helier Jersey	Jason Castledine Registrar	6.4.2017	1	0	0	0	Ref:JERSM/1985/00161/006. Referred to as sweetheart brooch but design is of Union Jack and French Flags crossed

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Kent Sharpshooters Yeomanry Museum, Hever Castle, Edenbridge, Kent.	General enquiries only through website.	March 2017.	1	0	1 no image.	0	1 gold 'tiepin/brooch', mounted on silver pinback sword of 1912 cavalry officer's pattern.
King's Own Royal Regiment, Lancaster.	Peter Donnelly, Curator.	April 2015.	58	?	58	<p>1. Brass lion with blue enamel from the collection of Private Albert Edward Corless, 1st/5th King's Own. KO1616/05 (WWI).</p> <p>2. Brass lion with blue enamel, from Sergeant Snape. KO2332/05 (WWII).</p> <p>3. "MIZPAH/reg. badge, given to his future wife by Private Albert McGuinness, 2nd, King's Own Royal Regiment. KO2592/11.(WWII).</p> <p>4. White metal, blue enamel. Relating to Private William Edward Sellars, 1st, King's Own. Died of wounds, 14.1.1946. KO2351/36. (WWII)</p> <p>5. Mother of pearl, one of three made (?) by Sergeant Richard Hamblett, 2nd, King's Own, for his wife and 2 daughters. Marked 'Bethlehem' where it was made in 1939. KO2467/02. (WWII). See Chapter 2</p> <p>6. Brass, blue enamel on plastic 'mother of pearl' backing, Royal Armoured Corps badge. 107th Reg. Royal Armoured Corps (King's Own) served in WWII with offices and men wearing King's Own cap badge. Collection of Corporal Len Davies of 107th. KO2483/23. (WWII).</p> <p>7. Silver and blue enamel Royal Armoured Corps badge. Collection of Captain Boulter, 107th Reg. KO1626/02. (WWII).</p> <p>8. Brass oval with blue enamel, collection WO2 (RQMS) Arthur Charles Bent, King's Own, who served in 1930s and 1940s. KO2549/05.</p> <p>9. Brass lion with blue enamel, collection of Private Daniel Rose, MM, served with 6th, King's Own.. KO2704/06. (WWI).</p> <p>10. Silver badge set with diamonds and red sapphires for the lion's eyes. Produced commercially late 1930s, purchased by Captain B D Armstrong and given to his sister.</p> <p>Former Loan to museum.</p>	<p>11. Photograph of an unknown man in civilian suit, by a Clitheroe photographer clearly shows that he is wearing a 'sweetheart' type badge. No further information. KO2873/24. (WWI?).</p> <p>This museum has the most detailed information regarding sweetheart brooches and associated items e.g. embroidered postcards, pincushions and other objects with regimental insignia made as personal gifts from serving personnel to their families.</p>

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
King's Own Scottish Borders, Berwick-on-Tweed.	General enquiries.	5.4.2017.					No response
King's Royal Hussars	See 'Other Organisations' table					Brooch given to Mabel Airlie by her husband, the Earl of Airlie (1886)	Visited. (See Chapter 1)
Leicestershire Yeomanry Carillon and Tower Museum Loughborough Leicestershire	Mel Gould Curator	7.3.2017	1	1	0		May have others at museum, but as they rely on volunteers, Curator believes some badges and brooches may have been catalogued incorrectly.
London Irish Rifles, Connaught House, London.	Alex Shooter, Curator.	March 2017.	-	-	0		Very small museum, not open to the public except for 4 days annually, run for members of the regiment.
London Scottish Regiment, London.	Archivist.	8.3.2017.					No response.
Manchester Regiment, Ashton Town Hall, Manchester.	Garry Smith, Curator, Collections.	8.3.2017.	Museum now closed (2015)	0	0	<p>Museum is currently closed, but Curator sent list of items previously displayed in an exhibition in their Forshaw Gallery entitled <i>A Token of my Affection</i>, from which these details are extracted.</p> <p>1. Brooch sent by Private John Newton (275385) to his sister, Marion, from Alexandria in 1915.</p> <p>2. Replica of the diamond brooch presented to the Queen Mother by Major General Moorhead on behalf of the Officers and other ranks on the occasion of her becoming the Colonel-in-Chief on December 27th 1947.</p>	<p>1. 96th Regiment of Foot lady's lapel badge (Astruc: 2005.11).</p> <p>2. Silver badge showing the Fleur de Lys and the Roman numerals for the 63rd Regiment of Foot, later the 1st Battalion of the Manchester Regiment.</p> <p>3. Mother of pearl lapel badge mounted with the Fleur de Lys, adopted as the Regimental cap badge from 1923.</p> <p>4. Lapel badge showing a wreath beneath a sphinx.</p> <p>5,6. Two Fleur de Lys lapel badges.</p> <p>Sweetheart brooch showing the Fleur de Lys.</p> <p>7. Sweetheart brooch showing the floriated Fleur de Lys particular to the 7th Battalion of the Manchester Regiment.</p> <p>8,9. Two sweetheart brooches designed around a heart motif</p> <p>+ 2 'On War Service' Badges</p>

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Manx Air Museum Ballasalla Isle of Man	Ivor Ramsden Director	March 2017	10	?	0	0	Mixed collection comprising brooches of Royal Naval Air Service Hampshire Regiment Royal Flying Corps Royal Air Force
Mercian Regiment (Worcester), Worcester.	Dr. John Paddock, Curator	17.3.2017	'Several'	0	0	2, 1 Officer's, 1 Other rank's.	None are photographed or catalogued.
Museum of Army Flying. Middle Wallop, Stockbridge, Hampshire./	Neil Martin, Curator	March 2017	0	0	0	-	No response.
Parachute Regiment Airborne Assault IWM Duxford Cambridge	Sam Stead Editor ParaData Parachute Regiment online history	8.3.2017	0	0	1 photo, no objects	1. Photograph of Private Christopher Pendegrass, 7 Battalion Parachute Regiment and his unnamed girlfriend wearing her sweetheart brooch.	(See Memory and Mourning, Chapter 4)
Prince of Wales Own, York Army Museum, York.	Hannah Rogers, Assistant Curator.	5.4.2017.	-	-	0		No response.
Queen's Own Royal West Kent, Maidstone Museum, Maidstone. Kent.	Giles Guthrie, Curator.	2011, 2016.	0	0	0	-	Giles Guthrie had a sweetheart brooch belonging to his own family. (See Chapter 2)
Queen's Royal Lancers, Grantham, Lincolnshire.	Curator	March 2017	-	0	0	-	No response All collections held in storage at Gloucester Barracks, Grantham.

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Queen's Royal Surrey, Princess of Wales Regiments, Surrey Infantry Museum, Clandon Park, Surrey. NB Destroyed by fire 2015	Dee Hutchison, Secretary, Friends of Surrey Infantry Museum.	March 2014.	22	22	0	0	Brooches show development of regimental insignia – otherwise undated and none associated with individuals. Many other related insignia items also in collection. NB This collection of brooches and associated objects studied for this thesis was lost in the fire that destroyed Clandon Park on 29 April 2015. David Dickins, Museum Managing Trustee, sent photos of his wife's 2 brooches.
Rifles (Berkshire and Wiltshire) Salisbury, Wiltshire	Unnamed	20.3.2015	16	10	10	10	1 is a 'Comrades of the Great War' badge. Remainder are regimental badge brooches in variety of styles.
Royal Air Force Museums, London, Hendon and Cosgrove (Shropshire)	Clare Paul, WWI Education Officer, London	March 2018	c.100	0 permanent	0	c.24 – names, but no histories attached to them	Some used in temporary display at RAF Cosgrove in 1990s. Some in annual Valentine exhibitions.
Royal Corps of Signals, Blandford Forum, Dorset	Paulina Gordon, Technical Curator	6.4.2017	25	25	0	0	Some WWI, mostly WWII. Known as 'Jimmy' Jewellery. Insignia referred to affectionately as 'Jimmy', probably from an RCS boxer, Jimmy Emblem, who was British Army Champion in the 1920s.
Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, REME Museum of Technology, Lyneham, Wiltshire	Juliet Turk Assistant Curator	11.2014	4	4	4	4	Assistant Curator contacted donors of 4 brooches in the collection. 2 agreed to speak about their relative's brooches (Terry Atkin and Delia Allfrey). Neither knew that their fathers had made these donations.
Royal Engineers, Gillingham, Kent.	Enquiries only through website.	March 2017.	1	?	1 no image.	?	Museum currently closed. Information taken from online database.

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Royal Guernsey Militia, Castle Cornet, Guernsey.	Lisa Burton, Registrar, Guernsey Museums.	18.5.2017.	1	?		Private Albert T. Falla, RGLI.	Probably picked up in trenches during WWI. Also several pieces of trench art, including 2 brooches and pincushions. See Chapter 4 'Medals'
Royal Green Jackets (Rifles), Winchester, Hampshire	Christine Pullen, Curator	8.3.2017	2	1	0	Lady Congreve's brooch. Brooch replicating the posthumous VC awarded to Sidney Woodroffe in 1915. Made for his mother.	See Chapter 4 'Medals'
Royal Hampshires, & Isle of Wight, Winchester, Hants.	Ian Taylor, Museum Volunteer	11 April 2017	7	2	0	3	2 on display in cabinet devoted to Western front in 1916, though they may not be dated to 1916.
- Royal Ulster Rifles Belfast N. Ireland.	Christine Begg Curator.	17.4.2017.	5	-	0	2	See Christine Begg's own photograph
Royal Leicestershire Regiment Leicester.	Associate Secretary	March 2017	-	-	0		No response.
Royal Military Police Museum, Fareham, Hampshire.	Richard Callaghan Curator	12.4.2017	5	3	2	-	
Royal Monmouthshire Royal Engineers (Militia) The Castle Monmouth Wales	Curator	March 2017	0	0	0		Museum holds only archives, not artefacts.

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Royal Scots Dragoon Guards, The Castle, Edinburgh	Paul Newnman, Assistant Curator.	March 2017.	1 + 'Hands Across the Sea' medals (see note)	2	0	1. Associated with Trooper T.A. Robertson (Greys, WWII). Silver (925) assayed Birmingham. 'X' (1922), enamel. William James Dingley (manuf.), Wilson & Sharpe, Edinburgh (retailers). Scroll at top also Silver (925) assayed Birmingham, 'X' (1922).	Also own 'Hands Across the Sea' Royal Scots Greys medals (unique to this regiment) 1915-WWII. Medals were presented to members of a ladies' working party who supplied comforts to members of regiment interned in Germany in WWI. Associated postcard was sold to raise funds for same cause. 1 of these is in WWI display, unattributed.
Royal Scots Dragoon Guards,						1. Sweetheart brooch, form of 25 th Dragoons cap badge. Curator believes to be rare, as 25 th Dragoons only existed between 1941-1947.	On permanent display WWII case.
Royal Sussex Regiment, The Redoubt, Eastbourne.	Katherine Buckland, Temporary Curator.	May 2014.	16	1	0	1.Regimental Sergeant Major J. W. Daniels, 11 Btn. Died at Ypres, 2 March 1917. May have belonged to his wife, Ada, though this is not known.	Brooch is not a regimental insignia but a Union flag. Poet Edmund Blunden (Lt. in Royal Sussex, described Daniels' death in <i>Undertones of War</i> [1928] (London: Penguin, 2000), p.147.
Royal Welsh Fusiliers, Caernarfon Castle, Gwynedd, North Wales.	Helen Butterworth, Visitor Services Officer.	March 2017	'Several'	0	0	1. L.Cpl. W.J. Hardy (d.12.7.1916), Mametz Wood. Student N. Wales University. (WW1). 2. Fusilier W. G. Evans. WWII.	Brooches kept in reserve collection in Wrexham.
Royal Welsh 'Firing Line' Museum Cardiff Castle Wales	Rachel Silverson Curator	17.3.2017	2	2	0	1	Brooches are not owned by this museum but are on loan from 1 st The Queen's Dragoon Guards.
Royal Welsh, The Watton, Brecon, Powys Wales	Richard Davies, Curator.	10/3/2017	30	'Several'	0	'Most'	Too small to afford to put collection online.

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	NO. ON DISPLAY	NO. ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Shropshire Regiment The Castle Shrewsbury	Christine Bernáth Curator	April 2017	-	-	0	-	They have sweetheart brooches for sale in museum shop.
Soldiers of Gloucestershire Museum, Gloucester	Unnamed	22.3.2015	11	10	10	0	1 is inscribed 'Gloster' on bar, 'Harry to Winnie' on hanging heart but cannot be identified. Probably WWI.
Somerset Regiments, Somerset Military Museum, Taunton Castle, Somerset	Sam Astill, Curator, Military Collections.	11.4.2017	10	0	0	3	1, belonging to Cpl. E.J. Welch, is a gold bar set with shrapnel extracted from his skull in 1918. Brooch was given to his wife on their wedding day and is inscribed. However this is a piece of trench art rather than a regimental badge brooch.
Staffordshire Yeomanry Stafford	Curator	March 2017	?	0	0	-	Currently closed for repairs.
Suffolk Regiment, The Keep, Bury St. Edmunds Suffolk.	Gwyn Thomas, Honorary Curator.	8.3.2017.	12	?	1	1. Brooch presented by the Regiment to Princess Margaret.	
Tank Museum, Bovington, Dorset	Curator	6.4.2017	0	0	0	-	This museum's collection focuses on army vehicles and has no small artefacts.
Welsh Guards, Oswestry, Shropshire.	Curator.	March 2017	0	0	0	-	No response.

<i>MUSEUM</i>	<i>CONTACT</i>	<i>DATE</i>	<i>NO. OWNED</i>	<i>NO. ON DISPLAY</i>	<i>NO. ONLINE</i>	<i>ASSOCIATED WITH NAMED INDIVIDUALS</i>	<i>FURTHER COMMENTS</i>
York and Lancaster Regiment, Clifton Park Museum, Rotherham.	Jenna Moughton, Assistant Collections Officer.	18.4.2017.	7	1	0	<p>1. Major Major Arthur James Willis – 3rd, 19th & 11th Battalions - YLRM : 1979.827A (WW1). On Display.</p> <p>2. 2nd Lieutenant Clifford Whiteley, 8th Battalion - WW1.</p> <p>3. Lieutenant F. E. Knowles – 19th Battalion – YLRM : 1979.826 – (WW1).</p> <p>4. Private H. Harlow – YLRM : 1979.827 (WW1).</p> <p>5. Corporal Ernest Dyson – 13th Battalion – YLRM : 1992.81 (WW1).</p> <p>6. Private Harry Foster – 6th Battalion – YLRM : 2003.4.8 (WW2).</p>	7. YLRM : 1988.267 – (no further information)

Table 2: Museums of Design and Social History

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	ON DISPLAY	ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER INFORMATION
British Museum, London.	Curator, Jewellery visited	2011/ March 2017	0	0	0	0	0
Imperial War Museum, London.	Alan Jeffreys Senior Curator, WWII and Mid 20 th C. collections Visited	January 2017	16	0	16, but images of only 3.	1. Brooch given by Major C.R.G. Barrington to his wife Dr. Kathleen Barrington, WWII	See Chapter 2.
Jewellery Quarter Museum, Vyse Street, Birmingham.	Barbara Nomikos Visited	Nov. 1914, June 2015 Visited	Number not supplied but a large selection included in <i>Adaptable Trade Ex.</i>	Number not supplied	0	1. Eric Smith's 'Bird & Crown' brooch given to Doris. 1918	See Chapter 4. 'Hope it will bring you luck'. This brooch was featured in the museum's temporary exhibition ' <i>An Adaptable Trade</i> ', June 2014-June 2015. The museum is situated in the premises of Smith & Pepper, jewellers who made sweetheart brooches in the early 20 th century. See Chapter 2
Museum of Liverpool	Curator	2015	1	1	1	0	King's Regiment Mizpah brooch
Museum of London, London.	Beatrice Behlen, Senior Curator, Fashion & Decorative Arts	2011/ March 2017	0	0	0	Museum has not been offered or collected any brooches, although Curator suggested they would be interested if offered any.	

MUSEUM	CONTACT	DATE	NO. OWNED	ON DISPLAY	ONLINE	ASSOCIATED WITH INDIVIDUALS	FURTHER INFORMATION
National Army Museum, Chelsea, London.	Sophie Anderton, Collections Care Curator. Visited (collection then at Stevenage) Visited redesigned museum 2017	September 2015.	102	1	9	<p>13</p> <p>1. Fleming Hartley Brooch (1917).</p> <p>2. RASC, owned by mother of Michael Handford, Oxford & Bucks. Infantry, 1941.</p> <p>3. Buffs Reg. 30 Corps, belonging to Capt. T. W. Manning.</p> <p>4. Silver Royal Engineers brooch, silver, hallmarked Birmingham, 1915. Associated with Lt Westwater, KIA 16 Mar 1943 near Bir Reir, south of Marché, Tunisia, aged 26; believed bought by or for his sister Margaret.</p> <p>5. Mother-of-pearl, brass, enamel brooch, The Buffs (Royal East Kent Regiment), c1943 (c); given by Pte C H Godwin to his sister Mrs Ethel Brown (nee Godwin).</p> <p>6. Glider Pilot Regiment, associated with Sgt Alan Newman, Army Air Corps. c1945, silver. Glider Pilot Regiment, associated with Sgt Alan Newman, Army Air Corps. c1945, silver.</p> <p>7. Coldstream Guards, 1939 (c); relating to Lt Harold Charles Spencer. Brass, enamel, c1939.</p> <p>8. Royal Corps of Signals, belonging to Sgt. Norman Harrison. Silver, enamel, c1940 (c); 9. Silver brooch with blue enamel belonging to Sgt Norman Harrison.</p> <p>10. Royal Artillery, 54th Division given by Maj George Drew Fanshawe, Royal Artillery, to his wife, metal, enamel, diamanté. 1939-1940.</p> <p>11. Royal Army Medical Corps, belonging to Miss M I Hammond, Queen Alexandra's Royal Army Nursing Service, c.1914.</p> <p>13. Royal Artillery, brass, associated with Nancy Lawton, 1941.</p> <p>+</p> <p>13. 'Bugle' brooch, owned by mother of Michael Handford, Oxford & Bucks Reg. 1941</p>	<p>(See Chapter 5. 'Public Image, Hidden Message')</p> <p>Remaining brooches are not associated with individuals.</p> <p>Of these, 1 is a 'Loos' battle brooch and 2 are trench art converted uniform brooches.</p>

<i>MUSEUM</i>	<i>CONTACT</i>	<i>DATE</i>	<i>NO. OWNED</i>	<i>ON DISPLAY</i>	<i>ONLINE</i>	<i>ASSOCIATED WITH INDIVIDUALS</i>	<i>FURTHER INFORMATION</i>
Royal Museums Greenwich, London.	Katy Barrett, Curator of Art, & Sue Prichard, Curator of Decorative Arts Visited	December 2016, January 2017	3	0	3	1. Brooch replicating Augustus Agar's Victoria Cross, given to his second wife. 1954-9155.	See Chapter 4 "Medals". No response to emails requesting further information about hallmark on this brooch.
Victoria & Albert Museum, London.	Richard Edgecumbe, (Head of Jewellery) (2011) Clare Phillips (Senior Curator 20C Jewellery), 2017	2011 & 2017	0	0	0		Only related object is an American brooch given to mothers who have lost sons in battle. The number of stars on the American flag indicate the number of sons lost. The museum has no suggestions as to why they have no British examples in their collection.

Table 3: Jewellers and Archives

ASSOCIATION	CONTACT	DATE	DETAILS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Antique Metalware Society.	Geoff Smaldon, Secretary	May 2015	Geoff Smaldon searched back issues of Society's journal for any mention of brooches.	Nothing found, Smaldon concluded this was not a subject they had covered.
Antiques Roadshow, BBC1 Television programme.	John Benjamin, Jewellery.	11 March 2011	John Benjamin stated he saw more regimental sweetheart brooches than other kinds of jewellery. Emailed him to ask for comments.	Stated that very few families who brought in brooches for valuation knew about the history of their brooches and knew of no books about them other than Pamela Caunt's small catalogues.
Asprey 167 New Bond Street London		March 2014	Request for information re archives	None available
Birmingham Assay Office, Newhall Street, Birmingham.	Craig O'Donnell. Research visit	Nov. 2014.	Information about hallmarks on jewellery.	
British Legion	Sue Sadler, Membership Support Sec., Sussex.	Nov. 2014.	Editorial published on British Legion Facebook site and in their online and printed monthly journal, early 2015.	6 responses from readers. Keetley Chapter 4.9 Skeels, Conclusion
British Jewellers' Association, Vyse Street, Birmingham.	Lyndsey Straughton, Marketing Manager. Research visit	Nov. 2014.	Archives, papers, documentation, trade publications. Information about historic and current working of the Birmingham jewellery industry.	
British Library, London.	Research visits	2014- 2017	Airlie family papers. Newspaper collections. Documentation.	

ASSOCIATION	CONTACT	DATE	DETAILS	FURTHER COMMENTS
Carrington & Co. Ltd. Jewellers and Silversmiths	National Art Library, V&A Research visit	2017	Archives: 5 volumes relating to jewellery and silverware NRA 38891 1870-1930 but 3 years missing	Airlie brooch Relevant documentation missing Order for conversion of button to brooch (See Chapter 2) Makers of regimental badge brooches
Garrard & Co. Ltd, Crown Jewellers	National Art Library, V&A Research visit	2016	Records, 1735-1949. AAD/1995/7, AAD/1999/6	
Goldsmith's Company, London	David Beasley, Librarian, Eleni Bide, Librarian.	2014, 2017	Information regarding any holdings in their archives relating to 19 th /20 th century goldsmiths' or silversmiths' records and costings.	
Kenwood House, (English Heritage) Hampstead, London.	Curator Research visit	2014	Portrait of Anna Maria Crouch Iveagh Bequest Catalogue	
King's Royal Hussars, Regimental Headquarters, Tidworth, Salisbury, Hampshire.	Capt. Thomas Kirkham, Unit Intelligence Office. Visited	6 Dec. 2016.	Visit to Regimental HQ to see and photograph Airlie brooch.	This is not a museum but the Regimental HQ. The brooch is part of the Regiment's own collection of art, silver and jewellery. The CO's wife wears the brooch regularly for regimental occasions.
Library of Birmingham Broad Street, Birmingham.	Fiona Tait, Librarian. 3 research visits	2014 - 15	Information on archives of local jewellery companies and manufacturers.	
Mappin & Webb 1 Old Bond Street London	Marketing Aurum Holdings Parent Company	March 2014	Request for information re archives	None available
Mass Observation Archives, The Keep, Falmer, Sussex	Research visits	2011, 2014 - 2017	Diaries, newspapers, documentation.	Documentation used throughout the thesis

<i>ASSOCIATION</i>	<i>CONTACT</i>	<i>DATE</i>	<i>DETAILS</i>	<i>FURTHER COMMENTS</i>
Norfolk in WWI Norfolkinww1.org.	Online website	2015	Archives relating to Norfolk during Great War, including the WW1 diaries of Lieutenant James Brierley.	Brierley's diary relates to Fleming Hartley's service in Salonika and servicemen's leave.