You must also improve my essay. Where have I missed out evidence to support a statement? How have I quoted historians or used a source. Can you do the same?

You will need to read the essay to see how I have done it; this is not the only way you can do it your own way.

**EXAMPLES**

**INTRODUCTION EXAMPLE.** In the 1830’s there was growing discontent among the working class male population in Britain. The electoral system was corrupt and they did not have the vote (enabling them to bring about changes to their pay and conditions). By 1867 the working class men had secured the vote after the Reform Act had been passed. A number of groups such as the Chartists were responsible for these changes. The Chartists were split into two main groups. The Moral Force Chartism (MFC) led by William Lovett wanted to achieve reform through Peaceful protest and presented petitions to Parliament. The other group, led by Feargus O’Connor, were known as the Physical Force Chartists (PFC) and felt that only a violent campaign would achieve the vote for all men. This answer will establish how each group may have been responsible for the Reform Act being passed.

**CONCLUSION EXAMPLE.** Clearly there are multiple causes for the Reform Act being passed. While the MFC and the PFC relied on different methods, their intention was the same, securing male suffrage. However there were multiple problems with the groups. They lacked single leadership, they were poorly coordinated and they were poorly funded. Neither group were solely responsible for the Reform Act. Over time the working class men had shown that they were capable of contributing to governing the country through education and peaceful demonstration.

**Question: How effective were the suffragists and the suffragettes in achieving the female enfranchisement (the vote)?**

**Introduction.**

* Include a brief overview of who the two groups campaigning for the vote were.
* Include a brief insight into their methods.
* Who were the NUWSS and the WSPU?
* Who were Fawcett and Pankhurst?
* Will make a judgement as to who was more successful.
* Introduces your argument.

**What the suffragists did to win the vote.**

This society was established in 1897 by Millicent Fawcett and its members were known as **Suffragists**. The NUWSS hoped to persuade politicians to give them the right to vote and undertook a peaceful campaign. Some of their tactics included petitions, distributing leaflets and organised meetings.

They were the first organised group of women to begin campaigning for female suffrage. They were responsible for persuading a number of MPs to back their cause. Fawcett believed that if the organisation was seen to be intelligent, polite and law-abiding then women would prove themselves responsible enough to participate fully in politics.

By 1900 there was already evidence that many Members of Parliament had been won over. Several Bills in favour of women's suffrage gained considerable support in Parliament, though not enough to pass. Some believed it was only a matter of time until women would gain the vote.

**What the suffragettes did to win the vote.**

Emmeline Pankhurst had been a member of the NUWSS, she grew impatient of the tactics used. In 1903 she established a separate group. The Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU) became known as the Suffragettes. The suffragette’s motto was "deeds not words", and in comparison to the Suffragists, their tactics were radical and militant. Some of the strategies included public marches, window smashing, chaining to railings, hunger strikes, arson attacks and interrupting political meetings. There are a number of arguments as to whether these tactics helped or hindered the cause.

Millicent Fawcett, the leader of the NUWSS herself, believed that the suffragettes were responsible for change, “In my opinion, far from having injured the movement, they have done more during the last 12 months to bring it within the region of practical politics than we have been able to accomplish”. Without the backing of the public, the pressure to change the law would never have increased.

While their actions brought publicity, historians such as John Ray argue that the “reaction of the public, was mixed. Some felt that women were justified, others believed that violence was totally wrong as a means of gaining the vote”. As the militancy became more extreme their influence becomes more doubtful. As Source C say’s “the public could hardly be expected to approve of arson”. Indeed the minister Lloyd George believed that the ‘actions of the militants is ruinous. The feeling amongst the sympathisers of the cause in the House of Commons is one of panic’.

**Other Causes**

It is debateable how much effect either movement had on bringing about changes in voting laws. Some believe their tactics made the Government more entrenched. Others say the 1918 Act was passed as a reward for women’s effort during the war.

**Conclusion. (Make a judgement)**

* Summarises the argument for who was more successful.
* Were the suffragettes more effective in securing the support of the public or the Government?
* Makes a judgement as to who was more successful.
* Might also include an overview of the two groups.

SOURCE A

To this day, many people equate the British women’s suffrage struggle and the final victory with the famous Pankhurst family and their militant supporters in the WSPU.   In its early years the WSPU was a bold, innovative, imaginative organisation, among the first to appreciate the value of publicity.   Not without justification, its members regarded themselves as the elite soldiers of the ‘Votes for Women’ campaign.   But for every suffragette there were always dozens of non-militant suffragists.   Some would argue – including me – that it was the moderates of the NUWSS, led by Millicent Fawcett, who actually won the vote.   In 1912, while the militants embarked on arson and bombing, the NUWSS made a successful working alliance with the growing Labour Party.   It was this group which successfully lobbied for the 1918 Franchise Act.

Newspapers at the time.

Does this support anything I’ve wrote?

Source D

Nothing could indicate more plainly their lack of fitness to be entrusted with the exercise of political power.

*Morning Post* ( 2 March 1912 )

At the height of the WSPU’s window-breaking campaign

Source C

After November 1911 the position is much more doubtful.  Militancy was becoming more extreme and strong antagonism was being aroused.  The public could hardly be expected to approve of arson.

Source B

The madness of the militants… the small body of misguided women who profess to represent the noble and serious cause of political enfranchisement of women, but in fact do their utmost to degrade and hinder it.

*Manchester Guardian* ( 2 March 1912 )

At the height of the WSPU’s window-breaking campaign