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Introduction: the construction of a national treasure

Octavia Hill is increasingly commemorated as a key figure of the heritage movement in Britain, and, indeed, is virtually the only nineteenth-century woman to be thus celebrated. Her enduring place in the collective consciousness owes much to the energetic efforts of friends and family to keep her memory alive after her death by publishing her letters and several biographies. They also put her centre stage in textual and visual accounts of the National Trust’s early years. A 1924 watercolour of the National Trust Executive Committee Meeting of 15 April 1912, the year of Hill’s death, is symptomatic of the creation of a founding narrative. Beneath a portrait of George Shaw-Lefevre, initiator of the Commons Preservation Society, an important headspring for the National Trust, the committee sits round a table listening to a paper read by the botanist Francis Oliver. Hill was too ill to attend the meeting, but the painter depicts her in her usual chair in a prominent position to the right of the other two founders, Canon Hardwicke Rawnsley and Sir Robert Hunter.²

Octavia Hill’s memory was also preserved more publically through the acquisition of land. Hydon Heath in Surrey was bought for the National Trust as a memorial to her, and 300 acres were added to Crockham Hill ‘to preserve the view so dear to Octavia Hill’.³ As the trust’s membership and influence grew between the world wars, Hill maintained her place as a venerated founder. The trust’s golden jubilee book edited by James Lees-Milne was dedicated to the memory of ‘Miss Octavia Hill, Canon Rawnsley and Sir Robert Hunter.’
Founders of the National Trust’. Her ideas, however, became progressively less important as guiding principles for the trust. The book noted that her ‘housing work had led her to a vivid appreciation of such places as Parliament Hill Fields to the urban working classes’, but said nothing else about her motivation.4 After the death of the founders the trust’s preoccupations shifted from improving the lives of the urban poor to preserving the great mansions of England. For the country house scheme, which developed during the interwar years and took off fully after the Second World War, Hill’s ideas offered little guidance. By 1994, when the trust’s centenary engendered the next round of official histories, Hill’s ‘moral tone’ with its biblical metaphors could even ‘seem unsympathetic’.5 Although later generations of scholars and practitioners never criticised her preservationist activities as they did her housing work, her language was perceived as ‘certainly unfashionable’.6

Yet, the National Trust’s centenary also provided an opportunity ‘for its past and future role to be assessed, for its achievements and ideals to be scrutinised’.7 The 1980s ‘heritage debate’ had led to widespread criticism of the commodification of the national past by the ‘heritage industry’, and some even mocked the trust as the ‘Society for the Preservation of the Aristocracy’.8 In light of this critique the trust’s ‘earlier values’ were perhaps ‘not to be despised’.9 Of all the Victorian founders Octavia Hill, with her idealistic yet practical approach, by now reappraised through scholarly works such as Gillian Darley’s biography and Robert Whelan’s editions of essays and letters, offered the best vision on how to make the trust a more diverse and participatory organisation.10 ‘I have felt the spirit of Octavia Hill sitting on my shoulder’, reflected Dame Fiona Reynolds about her time as Director-General of the National Trust:

When I joined the National Trust as Director-General, I concluded that while being proud of our many achievements, Octavia Hill might have questioned
whether we had sufficient focus on 'benefit for the nation'. We are world-class conservationist – and must always remains so. But we had drifted a little away from the ‘everlasting delight of the people’ that had been Octavia’s watchword. I felt we needed to become more ‘arms open’ if we were to meet her vision.\(^\text{11}\)

Hill was seen no longer as an interfering and dour if well-meaning Victorian spinster, but as a ‘focused, determined and passionate woman’. Talk of her old fashioned language, gave way to praise for her extraordinary foresight. Fiona Reynolds again:

> She was a visionary, ahead of her time in the links she made between access to fresh air and physical and spiritual wellbeing. This is a philosophy with which we are only now getting to grips. One hundred years after her death we are only beginning to develop ways of measuring national happiness as well as gross domestic product. In the age of capitalism’s birth, her views were truly revolutionary.\(^\text{12}\)

The commemorative events and media coverage of 2012 further popularised her contribution, but her rise to iconic status has led to her appearing as a lone visionary.\(^\text{13}\) She now outshines not only the two men commonly named with her as the ‘three founders’ of the National Trust, but arguably also most other Victorian preservationists.\(^\text{14}\) Yet to understand how Hill’s ideas became so powerful, it is necessary to remember that she did not act or develop her ideas about preservation in isolation. In her essay in this book Melanie Hall shows the need to examine her role in the trust more carefully by paying closer attention to the trust’s wider epistemic community.\(^\text{15}\) My contribution complements this approach, by looking beyond the institutional history of the National Trust to situate Hill within the broader national and international preservation movement.
Despite growing scholarly work on Hill and her prominence in institutional histories, she features little in the wider historiography on heritage which has developed over the last three decades. While Raphael Samuel drew attention to the relation between her social work and her preservation, later histories of the heritage movement in Britain, usually mention Hill only in passing as ‘founder of the National Trust’, and discuss neither her ideas nor her other contributions to the preservation movement.\textsuperscript{16} For reasons that will become apparent below, many histories of heritage preservation that are more internationally focused, and especially those in languages other than English, ignore Hill entirely and present John Ruskin’s and William Morris’s condemnation of restoration and their development of conservationist principles as the sole British contributions to nineteenth-century international preservationist thought.\textsuperscript{17} It is time to re-inscribe Hill in these histories, for only then can we appreciate what was unique about her contribution.

Examining her place in the national and international preservation movement can help explain the contradictions often observed in Hill’s work and personality, and draws attention to how she shaped and benefited from differences between British and continental European preservation movements. Focussing on Hill’s role of a ‘hub’ in the British movement, the first part of this essay compares her ideas with those of other preservationists. Tracing her national and international connections through personal networks and the reception of her publications in the second part of the paper, however, reveals communalities and differences between the British preservation movement and its European counterparts – differences that provided the structural framework for Hill’s contribution.\textsuperscript{18}

\textit{Octavia Hill’s place in the British preservation movement}
Octavia Hill’s route to preservation is well known, but it is useful to recall the main steps to frame the assessment of her place in national and international movements.\textsuperscript{19} It started with her housing work and her transforming cemeteries into gardens and playgrounds for the urban poor. She consulted Robert Hunter of the Commons Preservation Society (CPS) on how to save the Swiss Cottage Fields in relation to one of her projects in 1875 and thereafter joined the CPS and, with Hunter, helped to broaden its mission from the preservation of commons to the protection of the countryside more generally. In parallel, she became involved in locally focused preservation societies, including her sister Miranda’s Kyrle Society for the diffusion of beauty (discussed by Robert Whelan in this volume) and the Hampstead Heath Extension Committee, headed by the Duke of Westminster, who was later the National Trust’s first president, and she raised money by private subscriptions to safeguard numerous other locations. It was the failure of several such campaigns – a failure she and Hunter ascribed to the absence of a body that could acquire and care for land – that led to the foundation of the National Trust with its mission to hold property ‘for ever, for everyone’. While the land she saved and the institutions she created are arguably her biggest legacy, she also left a rich body of writings on preservation, spread across essays such as \textit{Our Common Land}, her letters to fellow-workers, and a plethora of articles in the national press.

Hill’s biographers have highlighted how her love for the open countryside was rooted in childhood experiences. She took refuge in nature after her father’s bankruptcy. Rather than a dolls’ house, a field ‘so large that I could run in it for ever’ was what she wished for most as a child.\textsuperscript{20} Some of the first places she fought to preserve were those she had roamed as a girl and the Hill sisters spent so much of their childhood outdoors that they became known locally as ‘the young ladies who are always up in the hedges’.\textsuperscript{21} The loss of the countryside...
plunged the fourteen-year-old Octavia into melancholy, but also fostered a determination to retain open spaces not only for herself but also for every man, woman, and child in England.

Hill’s housing work in places bereft of the country air, space, and greenery she valued make her emphasis on the preservation of nature rather than culture seem natural. Compared with the leaders of Victorian preservation bodies such as the Society of Antiquaries of London (SAL) and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), Hill’s focus was on the preservation of nature rather than culture, activism rather than antiquarianism, and, arguably, public access rather than the aesthetics of (anti)-restoration championed by William Morris.22

This does not mean, however, as is often argued, that historic, aesthetic, and artistic values meant less to her – not least because she, like Morris, and most other preservationists, took such inspiration from Ruskin. Ruskin’s influence on her thinking has long been highlighted, but his prediction that she would one day stop copying the great masters, which she had taken up under his supervision, with the words ‘Hang drawing!! I must go to help people’, has often been interpreted too literally.23 As William Whyte discusses in this book, Hill thought that the act of copying and the attention to artistic detail that it brought were crucial to her housing work.24 Other contributors also demonstrate the strong links between artistic creation and her social work. Elizabeth Baigent highlights how the secondary gifts of ‘music, colour, art, nature, space and quiet’ were second only to the primary blessings of entering ‘into divine and human love’.25

Thus, although Hill’s preservationist activities focused on open spaces, they were part of a broader fight to preserve and create beauty in all its forms. The integrative approach is reflected in the National Trust’s early acquisitions, which included many buildings alongside open space, and also in Hill’s role in creating links among organisations with different
concerns. Unlike in some continental European countries, where umbrella organisations tried to coordinate preservationist efforts, Britain’s national preservation societies had specific aims, with the CPS responsible for legal questions, the SPAB for restoration, and the National Trust for landscapes and acquisitions, while local societies championed research and particular sites. Yet the frequent collaborations among societies created an increasingly organised movement. In particular, lacking the money or power to hold buildings, the SPAB saw in the National Trust a source of help and often suggested buildings for acquisition. In turn, the trust often sought conservation advice from the SPAB.

Collaborations were facilitated by shared principles and overlapping membership, with a few individuals – notably Hill – acting as special connectors. She joined many local, as well as the three core national preservation societies. She was a member of the CPS for two decades before the inception of the trust, and was made honorary member of the SPAB in 1897 following a long collaboration with Morris in the Kyrle Society. Over several decades she brought societies together for numerous campaigns, formalised support by linking bodies through advisory functions, and enlisted contacts from her charitable work for preservationist efforts.

Like many other leading preservationists, Hill championed preservation not as an end in itself but as a means to change inequalities. Although she did not theorize her ideas in the same way as Ruskin or Morris did, and never produced a manifesto, her views expressed in Our Common Land were strongly critical of established privileges. She fervently defended ‘our common birthright to the soil’ against the ‘seven hundred and ten persons’ who owned a quarter of the English land. Her critique was in many ways no less radical than Morris’s, but was expressed in readily acceptable language: following Hugh Miller she pointed out ‘how intimately the right to roam over the land is connected with the love of it, and hence with patriotism’. While Morris alienated many of the SPAB’s supporters by contending that
preservation should pave the road to socialism, Hill steered clear of linking politics and preservation. Instead she successfully used the connections established through her charitable work to get backing for preservationist ventures from the most respectable and influential circles.

Yet, despite her ability to create support, Hill was criticised for how she put her preservation principles into practice, such that she can now appear rigid and even reactionary. However, she was very much a child of her time. How best to use sites that had lost their original purpose and who should have custodianship were new and contentious questions for the preservation movement, and have remained so ever since. Hill’s responses were sometimes contradictory, but so were those of the wider British (and continental) movement. A disagreement over the use of the Court House in Long Crendon between Hill and the Arts and Crafts designer Charles R. Ashbee, who was active in the SPAB and the National Trust, epitomises difficulties about the museification of the past. The Court House was among the vernacular buildings that Hill treasured for the ‘quaint picturesque out-of-the-world’ feelings they inspired, evoking ‘memories of England as our ancestors knew it’. Although ‘nothing very striking’, these buildings greeted ‘the eye with a sense of repose’. She also believed that such buildings should be used and so was initially keen for Ashbee to move in with his wife and make the house a holiday home for London boys connected with Ashbee’s art classes. Yet the boys’ boisterousness and Ashbee’s transformation of the house into a showcase for his Guild of Handicraft furniture was not quite what she had had in mind. She was not amused when Ashbee inscribed the guild’s emblem over a historic fireplace and, fearing that the occupants would damage the delicate old house, she did not renew Ashbee’s tenancy. He bitterly noted that the boys ‘would have given it such a soul as no dead museum in the Trust’s charge can…possibly have’. As Darley comments, ‘It was an early instance of a familiar criticism’.

In natural spaces too Octavia Hill struggled to reconcile increasing access with preventing destruction by ever increasing numbers of visitors. Publicly she expressed the belief that the trust’s properties belonged ‘to every landless man, woman and child in England’, but privately she said that the trust ‘by no means plans to give access to the tramp, the London rough, the noisy beanfeaster’. Instead the objective was to ‘preserve land in its natural beauty for the artist, the professional man, and such of the public as appreciate and respect natural beauty’. While she regularly organised excursions for the tenants of London’s East End, she was wary that ‘picnic parties carry London noise and vulgarity out into woods and fields, giving no sense of hush or rest’. The distinctions she drew between deserving and undeserving poor in her housing work also applied to her preservationism, and echo widely expressed anxieties about the ‘cocknification’ of travel, deplored for instance by Henry James. Many conservative preservationists used similar language to justify keeping cultural and natural heritage the preserve of the elite. Yet to ascribe fears about the potentially destructive impact of increasing visitor numbers to class snobbery is too easy. Such fears were also connected with a profound change in attitude towards ‘authenticity’, which sacralised the creations of the past and demanded that they be passed unaltered to future generations. Ruskin’s dictum that ‘[w]e have no right whatever to touch [old buildings]. They are not ours. They belong partly to those who built them, and partly to all the generations of mankind who are to follow us’, influenced conservationists of buildings and nature alike. Like most other reform minded preservationists of her generation, Hill did not really resolve the tensions between preservation and transformation through use and as a result appeared at times radical and at others reactionary. Similar contradictions run through Hill’s responses to decision-making in preservation, and the role of the aristocracy and the state in particular. Despite writing about the common
ownership of land by the people, she enlisted the mightiest aristocrats for the cause of the trust. Despite being known for her small scale, individualistic, communitarian method and her rejection of statist approaches in her housing work, she was not against a legislative framework when it came to preservation. Though she valued the leadership provided individuals of integrity, believing that the National Trust’s leadership should ‘consist of men and women who should be free from the tendency to sacrifice such treasures to mercenary considerations, or to vulgarizing them in accordance with popular cries’, she also embraced the need for a legislative framework to prevent the enclosure of commons and to safeguard the land acquired by the trust. As such, she was again in tune with prevailing sentiment in Britain and European as a whole.

Octavia Hill’s international networks and receptions

While Octavia Hill was creating new societies in Britain, a plethora of voluntary associations was being formed across the Channel and the Atlantic and working in tandem with state administrations. Some of these bodies, like the National Trust, still shape preservation today, while others, like the Kyrle Society, were more ephemeral. In some places, like Britain and the USA, the idea of a landholding trust gained lasting ground, while in others it did not. In Germany, for example, the Association for Protected Nature Parks purchased some land, but because of different property owning regimes and greater state involvement, there was less need for a private landholding body, and the National Trust model was imitated only in the late twentieth century when more value was put on private involvement in preservation.

Despite differences in organisation, there was wide agreement about the purpose of preservation. Activists everywhere saw the preservation of nature and culture as intertwined, and as part of a broader drive to reform art, land, and life in the face of a common challenge from modernisation. They also shared ideas and methods through
correspondence, publications, international exhibitions, congresses, and personal meetings.44

However, while Octavia Hill was connected to most preservation ventures in Britain, she remained on the edge of developments in continental Europe. Unlike some of her male preservationist colleagues, such as Canon Rawnsley, Charles R. Ashbee, or William Morris, Hill used her travels abroad to recover from exhaustion and not for promotional tours. She did however take inspiration from developments she saw on her travels. From Nuremberg, for instance, she wrote:

The town looks very comfortable and flourishing, as if the old things had been taken into use and would stay; – not like Italy or Constantinople as if every breath of purer or more living thought would sweep away some of the beauty, and substitute hideous Paris or London models. Trees grow among the houses; and children play round them, and clean industrious women knit at their doors; and comfortable little shops are opened in them; and you see “Bürger Schule” put up over their doors; and yet they aren’t all torn down and replaced with rows of houses, like Camden Town, and shops like Oxford Street; and still these gardens for the people everywhere look reproach on me, when I think of England, and every tree and creeper and space of green grass in the town reminds me of our unconsumed smoke, and how it poisons our plants, and dims the colour of all things for us. …We hope to make a few useful outlines here for windows &c. in possible future houses in London.45

Despite her interest in foreign practices, Hill’s main centre of operation always remained London, but by the mid 1880s visitors from across the world came to London to see her methods and be trained by her.46 The awe she inspired was such that some of her admirers
feared, ‘if ever, I have the pleasure of standing before you, all my courage will evaporate, and I will be utterly unable to express the feelings with which I look up to you, much as a raw recruit on the general who has led victory in many a good fight’. She took training seriously and in turn demanded serious commitment. When German visitors wished to study her schemes to implement them in Munich she wrote ‘I would gladly show and tell them all I could’, but ‘I am afraid that I should have to ask that whoever came should devote a minimum of three month to steady work. Nothing could be learnt under that time, and it is a great upsetting of work to arrange it for less’. Hill’s reputation abroad – across Europe, the USA, and the British empire – was facilitated by personal contacts, by her writings, and by others who discussed her work. Some of the earliest and most sustained interest came from the USA from the 1870s when her housing work was emulated in Boston by Henry Bowditch, chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Health, and by Ellen Collins and Alice Lincoln in New York and Boston. As the decade progressed, Hill’s ideas on charity, as well as on housing, became known in the USA, thanks to Louisa Lee Shuyler, founder of the State Charities Aid Association of New York. Shuyler published five of Hill’s articles as The Homes of the London Poor in 1875, before the book was republished in England. Our Common Land was re-published in 1880 for the Associated Charities of Boston, while reports by Bostonian Ellen Chase, after her return to Massachusetts, on her work for Hill in Deptford further increased interest in Hill. In 1896 the Octavia Hill Association of Philadelphia was set up by two other Americans who had worked for Hill in the 1880s.

While the common language facilitated exchanges with the USA and the British empire – resulting for instance in the implementation of some of her ideas in South Africa – correspondence also arrived from Europe, including Scandinavia and Russia.

Netherlands and Germany were perhaps ‘the most fertile ground for her ideas’, but they were also well received in catholic France, Italy, and Spain. As in the USA, in Europe personal visits and friendships made Hill’s ideas known. A ‘charming young lady, Mis Ter Meulen from Amsterdam’, whom Octavia Hill described to Ellen Chase as ‘full of power, brightness and sweet human sympathy’ spent a few months with Hill in England ‘to prepare for taking up houses in her own country’. In Germany Hill’s ideas were particularly influential because of her friendship with Princess Alice of Hesse-Darmstadt, Queen Victoria’s third child and a social reformer and organiser of the ‘Parliament of women’, which furthered topics of interest to women, including the education and employment of the poor. Hill’s sister Florence went to Darmstadt in the 1860s to help the princess’s housing work. Princess Alice had The Homes of the London Poor translated and, at Octavia’s request, wrote the introduction to the German edition. The translation was widely reviewed in the press and subsequent works on housing reform provided regular updates on developments in London.

Despite language differences, the broader reception of Octavia Hill’s work in Germany took off almost as early as in the USA, and peaked in the 1880s and 1890s. Hill was described enthusiastically as an ‘unusually gifted and hardworking lady’, and as ‘one of the noblest philanthropists in England’ in a turn of phrase that sounded particularly affectionate by Germanising and feminising ‘philanthropist’ as ‘Menschenfreundin’. As in the USA, in German her ideas were emulated by a society in Berlin, the Frauenverein Octavia Hill, and in Aachen and Dresden. Her ideas about housing reform were widely discussed in German publications on social reform, and in specialized economic, administrative, and theological publications, and reached the general reader via noted political periodicals such as the Preußische Jahrbücher and through Germany’s first successful mass-circulation newspaper, Die Gartenlaube, which aimed to address all members of the middle-class family.

The French, who translated Hill’s writings on housing reform partially in the periodical press in the 1880s and 1890s, were also full of praise for this ‘young girl who appears frail, pale, and weak’ but who is ‘great hearted’.62 The director of the Académie française called her the ‘personification of thoughtful charity’; and a historian of charity even claimed that: ‘All the governments of the world, with all their means of action, with all their enormous resources, have not accomplished what this woman has done alone, because her heart, her sympathy, her whole soul are in her work’.63 Hill’s housing work was initially discussed in books and journals on economics and sanitary reform, was then reviewed in works concerned with social reform, including catholic and socialist periodicals, and finally won wide praise in the main bourgeois newspapers, from the Figaro to the Petit Parisien, and the most prestigious intellectual magazines, such as the Revue des Deux Mondes.64 Following discussion by the Académie des Sciences morales et politiques, her work even featured in the Académie française’s annual public lecture, defused nationally in the organ of the Republic, the Journal Officiel.65

Similarly enthusiastic responses to Hill can be traced in other European countries, including Italy (where citations peaked in the 1890s and 1900s, mainly in economic and social reform publications) and Spain (where reception was strongest in municipal centres preoccupied with urban reform, such as Barcelona, and where feminists were particularly interested in her). From the late 1880s onwards international congresses for hygiene, housing reform, and female philanthropy took increasing notice. At the 1889 Paris Universal Exhibition, at least three international congresses discussed her work and helped to spread her ideas across the globe.66 Her international reputation was such, that when she died ‘although no formal invitation to the funeral had been sent, friends … gathered from far and near’, including ‘one of her Dutch friends coming from Amsterdam’. Tributes were paid to her in
newspapers ‘both English and foreign’,\(^6^7\) and her work was discussed in specialised and general publications in foreign countries during the twentieth century.

Throughout and beyond her lifetime, Hill’s work excited extraordinary interest among people as diverse as economists, doctors, lawyers, politicians, sanitation boards, Jesuits, and feminists and in fields including housing, sanitation, charity, child protection, and women’s work. Her reception across European countries complicates the question of whether Hill was reactionary or radical. Contemporaries certainly mobilised her for diverse political and social positions. German, French, Italian, and Spanish publications reveal that she inspired religious groups (protestant and catholic), socialists, and feminists alike. In France, for example, in the highly divided political climate between Dreyfus affair and separation of church and state, Hill inspired catholics and anti-clericals, conservatives and socialists.\(^6^8\) Her work was used equally to promote private charity and to prepare legislative drafts for more state regulation.\(^6^9\)

Yet what is striking about the reception of Hill’s work is that, in the European countries examined here, interest focused almost entirely on her housing projects, and references to Hill’s publications were largely limited to *Homes of the London Poor*. The only German citations I could find were the listing of her essay on ‘Colour, space and music for the people’ in the German Yearbook for National Economy and Statistics list of noteworthy foreign publications, and a brief commendation of her emphasis on fresh air and gardens by a local natural history society in the North German town of Emden.\(^7^0\) There was no mention of her work in preservationist periodicals such *Heimatschutz*, the organ of the National League for the Protection of the Homeland, Germany’s largest preservationist organisation, which, like Hill, championed the protection of nature and culture.
In countries outside Germany Hill’s preservationist work was discovered largely after the founding of the National Trust but was still little cited. In France for instance, the discussion of her work in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* coincided with the French discovery of Ruskin and the *Revue* picked up on their connection – but it was Ruskin’s help with her housing work rather than her own ideas about preservation that were reported in the late 1890s and early 1900s. As in Germany, French bibliographic works listed some of her preservationist essays, including ‘Space for the people’ and *Our Common Land*; but there was little discussion of them; and, when the National Trust was discussed, it was Rawnsley’s name that was mentioned, not hers.

How can this lack of notice be explained? Not by any anti British sentiment. The leaders of the German preservation movement were generally highly anglophile and well acquainted with British developments. The architect Herman Muthesius, an attaché to the German embassy in London, and collaborator of the SPAB, had done much to acquaint German audiences with English ideas about preservation, and especially Ruskin’s and Morris’s views on restoration. The conservator of the Prussian province of the Rhineland and arguably the most influential man in monument preservation, Professor Paul Clemen, published the first monograph on Ruskin and corresponded with Gerald Baldwin Brown, professor at Edinburgh and member of the National Trust council – each man wanting to make foreign preservationist practices known in his own community through publications and congress speeches. Interest in British developments was also strong among proponents of garden cities. Ernst Rudorff and Paul Schulze Naumburg, founders of the nation-wide *Heimatschutz* association (created in 1904), had since the 1880s promoted England’s ‘feeling for the charm of the landscape’ as an example which Germany should emulate. French preservationist periodicals and congresses were as cosmopolitan and anglophile as their German counterparts.
Hill’s refusal to allow her letters to fellow-workers, in which she outlined many of her preservationist practices, to be translated might have limited knowledge of her ideas on nature. Over many years she sent the letters to foreign ‘fellow-workers’ including Princess Alice, but she would not allow the princess to translate them into German:

I fear I feel just a little differently about my letters to my fellow-workers, and that slight difference of feeling makes all the difference in action. Though they are printed, and pretty widely circulated among certain circles of people, they have never been published. I have refused more than once to let them be published either in America or here. For this reason. They are meant for, and written to by fellow-workers and though they contain passages which are entirely public, there are other parts I could not write exactly as they stand if I felt I were writing to the world in general.  

As a result, many of her thoughts on preservation remained confined ‘to my own friends’.

But this explanation is unconvincing since the preservationists who shaped national and international movements were usually multilingual and highly mobile. They exchanged ideas through correspondence and personal encounters and read foreign language texts as is evident in their knowledge of English preservationism, and especially Ruskin and Morris.

It might have mattered that, unlike leading figures of the British preservation movement such as the National Trust’s Robert Hunter, Hardwicke Rawnley, Charles R. Ashbee, or Gerald Baldwin Brown, and leaders of the SAL and the SPAB, Hill did not go on promotional tours abroad or attend foreign congresses. Her travels abroad were for leisure and health. They might also provide inspiration, as shown in her comments above on Nuremberg and her letters from France, Italy, and Greece with their comments on developments in politics.
and art. She occasionally met well placed people abroad, the German head of excavations, Herr Kurzius, at Olympia for example, but she did not use her travels to connect with foreign campaigners or spread news about her work. Yet such reticence did not prevent her housing work’s becoming internationally known, and she was not the only preservationist who interacted with the outside world mainly through correspondence and publications.

Another reason for Hill’s striking poor links to continental preservationist circles was perhaps that legislation and restoration, which dominated the correspondences of her fellow trust leaders, were not at the forefront of her fight. While she did not correspond with continental preservationists interested in landscape preservation or land reform, she did discuss preservationist matters with American correspondents and used, for instance, her contact with Ellen Chase to find out whether the Trustees of Reservations, established in Boston in the early 1890s, could serve as a model for the National Trust.

A likely explanation for Hill’s lack of exchange on preservation with continental Europe might be the lack of women among the leadership of the preservationist movement in France and Germany, compared to the Anglo-Saxon countries. Hill’s foreign correspondents were mainly women, who, like the Russian correspondent who wrote on The Homes of the London Poor in the Journal of St Petersburg, took ‘pleasure and pride’ in the fact that achievements in housing reform were women’s. While women were prominent in housing reform across Britain, Europe, and America, only in Britain and the USA were they prominent in preservation. There were some women in German and French associations at the end of the nineteenth century, and some connections between the garden city movement and the women’s movement in Germany, but the founders and members of executive committees or councils of the large national preservation societies were exclusively male. Because of the earlier professionalization of preservation in France and Germany, state institutions and
private movements alike were dominated by civil servants, conservators, and architects. By the time preservation movements in Britain (and the USA) were institutionalised and professionalized, women who were already active in the feminised voluntary and religious spheres had achieved greater prominence in them. The lesser female presence in continental Europe meant that Hill’s ideas did not reach the preservation movement via her female correspondents who were neither as active nor as well placed as Hill across the two types of movements. Unlike housing reform which was largely seen as a domestic, ‘women’s affair’, continental European preservation was a professionalised, male world, and male preservationist leaders, who customarily picked up on interesting foreign developments, might have simply not considered it worthwhile to report Hill’s work in areas they considered masculine.

Conclusion

Situating Octavia Hill in the national and international heritage movement highlights that she was part of a broader current and yet exceptional. Her work appertained to a wider drive to preserve the heritage of the past and create a better, more equal future. She was one of many preservationists who never managed to reconcile access with protection, or belief in small scale private endeavours with the realisation that a long lasting framework for protection could be provided only by legislation. The same concerns animated debates within movements in all countries. Though favoured solutions might be unique, as for example the National Trust’s position as property holding trust, ideas about preservation were largely held in common.

A comparison of Octavia Hill’s international networks and those of other preservationists highlights her unique place in Britain and internationally. Hill, more than anyone else, married housing reform with preservation, practically and ideologically: but while she was
connected to virtually every important preservationist venture in Britain, and often acted as a nodal point, she was marginal to the international movement. Her network of (mostly female) correspondents extended from Boston to St Petersburg, but scarcely overlapped with those of international preservationists. While other leading figures of the National Trust, such as Hunter and Rawnsley, were in constant contact with preservationists from Europe, Hill was not. Although her housing work was internationally discussed and emulated, her preservationist work was not. A lack of promotional activity on her part might have been a contributing factor, but the different gendering of housing reform and preservation seems at least as important.

I have argued elsewhere that, at the turn of the century, similarities outweighed differences in the aims, structures, and numbers of British, French, and German preservation movements; but a close look at Octavia Hill and her international reception reveals some noteworthy distinctions. A properly gendered history of the European, including the British, preservation movement, is ‘yet to be written’. Octavia Hill’s biography certainly points to substantial differences in the public role of women. While the earlier professionalization of the heritage sector in continental Europe seems to have excluded of women from leadership, in British preservationism, with its slightly later drive towards institutionalisation, women known for their contribution to the arts, religion, and philanthropy were more prominent. The comparison of Octavia Hill’s networks with those of some leading male preservationists in Britain also suggests that, as a result of the lesser female presence, preservation and social housing reform were less close in continental Europe than in Britain, lacking a figure like Octavia Hill that acted as a connection – although more sustained research on this topic would be desirable. In all the countries discussed, ties existed among reform movements that focussed on housing standards, sanitation, open spaces, national monuments and even naturism and vegetarianism. The substantial literature on these ‘life
reform’ movements has long acknowledged how interconnected ideas and people were, but it seems worth exploring why ties between areas were closer in some countries than in others and how these thicker connections could be created.

Yet, while structural reasons help to explain why a woman could gain such influence and importance in the British preservation movement, it took the extraordinary woman that Octavia Hill was to establish a lasting link between the need for decent housing and for air, beauty, nature, and history. While she was not the only woman or indeed the only person whose contribution to the preservation movement should be more celebrated, Hill made a unique contribution. Her prominence as a housing reformer, her talent as a campaigner, her ability to find the right words (proposing for instance to call the National Trust a ‘trust’ rather than a ‘company’), and her connection in the highest circles enlisted support for radical ideas about natural and architectural property as common goods, even from conservative landowners who otherwise objected to seeing such properties as anything other than family heritage. Her emphasis on the right of access to beauty, nature, and history as an essential element for fulfilment and wellbeing for ‘every man, woman and child’ was indeed revolutionary and remains worth fighting for to ‘the utmost of our power’.
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