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**Abstract**

Ilford's rapid population growth during the 1890s and 1900s fuelled demand for the establishment of a local emergency hospital and, in order to finance this development, residents held an annual carnival every July from 1905 to 1914. The Carnival was a huge success, eventually attracting estimated crowds of around 250,000 people. This article uses the Ilford Carnival to examine the relationship between leisure and suburbanisation. It analyses the Carnival as a spectacle, considering the event's combination of tradition and modernity, the role of commerce and technology in the production and reproduction of its imagery, and the geographies of cultural dissemination involved. The article then evaluates the Carnival as a festival, examining how it both contributed to local identity formation and inverted suburban values, as well as how it helped bring meaning to suburban time and related to changes in the temporal organisation of work and leisure.

**Introduction**

This article examines suburban leisure through the prism of a carnival held in Ilford between 1905 and 1914 to raise funds for establishing a local hospital. It outlines the event's development within the context of Ilford's expansion, before considering the event both as spectacle and festival. As a visual cultural form, the Carnival borrowed from other leisure formats and recycled old themes, but also consciously embraced modernity; and was itself assimilated into other media, highlighting commercial influences on this charitable initiative. The article demonstrates the particularly suburban quality of the Carnival's juxtaposition of tradition and novelty, and its intricate geographies of cultural dissemination between suburbs and city centre.

In this respect, I take my lead from a recent special edition of *The* *International Journal of Cultural Studies* on 'Creative Suburbs', which challenged contemporary arguments equating creativity exclusively with inner cities, by showcasing creative suburban environments.[[2]](#endnote-2) This article does the same for Edwardian Ilford, highlighting how the rapidity of its social and physical change and its complex relationship with London fuelled its cultural dynamism. The article moreover builds on work by scholars like Roger Silverstone and Richard Dennis highlighting the fusion of old and new at the heart of the suburban dream.[[3]](#endnote-3)

There is also an extensive body of work on carnivals and other festivals across the span of history.[[4]](#endnote-4) Past debates surrounding this topic often characterised such occasions as either radical in their rejection of everyday norms, or as 'safety valves': temporary suspensions of those norms, licensed by authorities as a means of alleviating pent up tensions, that in the long term uphold the status quo. A further dominant historiographical narrative is the theme of social control, focusing on how, from the early modern period onwards, such events were curtailed or purged of unpalatable aspects, and replaced by an expanding range of alternative leisure forms as the Victorian era drew to a close.

While seeking to locate the Ilford Carnival within festivity's historical pantheon, my article avoids the above analytical strictures. Instead, it draws upon approaches laid out by historian Chris Humphrey in his analysis of English medieval misrule, particularly his arguments that each festival should be interpreted according to its own geographic and historic setting, and that symbolic inversion can have multiple purposes.[[5]](#endnote-5) Accordingly, the article interprets the Ilford Carnival within its suburban context, as a transitory opportunity for the values and routines of Ilford's largely lower middle class population to be simultaneously transgressed and reinforced, a ritual through which new inhabitants could familiarise themselves with the district, and an occasion compliant with the early twentieth century metropolitan economy's temporal organisation of work and leisure.

My research draws primarily upon material from local newspapers *The Ilford Guardian* and *The Ilford Recorder*, which covered the Carnivals in substantial depth, including printing full lists of procession items; given their scale, my research focuses on the programmes from four case study years: 1905, 1908, 1911 and 1914.[[6]](#endnote-6) These sources also provide valuable insight into discourse surrounding the Carnivals. Their editors held senior positions within the Carnival's administration, so the two publications' commentary would have been informed by discussions among committee members.[[7]](#endnote-7) Moreover, the newspapers published direct communications and comments from other leading organisers, and readers' correspondence regarding the Carnivals. While this analytical approach might appear to privilege some voices over others, this article shows local press narratives echoed ideas expressed in the processions.

**The Development of Ilford and Its Carnival, 1890-1918**

During the time period covered by this study, Ilford Urban District lay in Essex, beyond the County of London's administrative boundaries. Yet London was expanding beyond its official borders and this growth engulfed Ilford, its population rising from 10,922 in 1891 to 41,244 in 1901, and 78,188 in 1911.[[8]](#endnote-8) The extent of Ilford's built up area also increased rapidly during the Edwardian period, although most of the district remained rural. (See Fig. 1).[[9]](#endnote-9) It was therefore on the border of town and country, and the Carnival reflected this cultural liminality.

Against this backdrop, the Ilford Medical Society campaigned to establish a hospital to serve the district's growing population, and it was decided at a public meeting in May 1905 to hold a Hospital Saturday Carnival to raise funds for this purpose, an approach already taken up in other suburbs like Tottenham and Enfield. A General Committee was therefore set up, along with committees in Ilford's seven wards, headed by ward organisers.[[10]](#endnote-10) Each ward committee arranged a contingent of processionists, comprising individuals in fancy dress and decorated vehicles, which followed a set route within their ward, while costumed collectors sought contributions from the watching crowds; individual ward contingents then combined and marched through central Ilford into the recently opened Valentine's Park, where sporting entertainments and a concert were held.

This format was largely adhered to thereafter, with the Carnival held annually on the second Saturday of July.[[11]](#endnote-11) The event's scale generally increased year-on-year. The final procession was nearly three miles long in 1907, and four miles long in 1909, when it involved between three and four thousand participants.[[12]](#endnote-12) Crowds were also estimated at more than 100,000 for the 1910 Carnival and at 250,000 in 1912.[[13]](#endnote-13) And the amounts raised by the Carnivals escalated from £445 in 1905, to £828 in 1910, to £950 in 1913.[[14]](#endnote-14) Takings during the processions were increasingly supplemented with fundraising through auxiliary entertainments such as concerts, balls, fetes and sports, mostly held prior to Carnival day.

The Carnival procession was abandoned in 1915 as inappropriate in wartime, although Hospital Saturday continued to take place every July. The Valentine's Park concert survived and fetes were held elsewhere in the district; meanwhile, earlier house-to-house collections preceded street collections on the day itself. This proved a more lucrative method of fundraising than the Carnival had been, and the procession was not revived following the resumption of peace.[[15]](#endnote-15)

Crosschecking the 1905 and 1911 Carnival committees against census returns indicates their membership comprised a wide range of primarily lower middle class occupations, reflecting Ilford's broader social composition.[[16]](#endnote-16) Clerical workers were unsurprisingly the largest group in both years, for example. Yet while successfully attracting Ilford's commuting classes, the Carnival movement drew too on an assortment of groups employed more locally, who also accounted for a large minority of the district's residents.[[17]](#endnote-17) Teachers were particularly prominent in 1905, as were those working in construction. Other groups of small businessmen such as retailers, licensed victuallers and farmers also collectively composed a large proportion of Committee membership, while local doctors, council employees, postal workers and railway workers were present too. It is possible individuals who worked as well as lived in the district were particularly likely to be engaged in local affairs, and hence particularly important in establishing the Carnival. For example, Christopher P. Hosgood's research on shopkeepers during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century shows this group were firmly ensconced within their communities and saw themselves as fulfilling an important social role.[[18]](#endnote-18)

Increasingly large numbers of women were also involved in organising the Carnivals, accounting for 15% of ward committee membership in 1905, rising to 28% in 1911, which reflected their growing capacity to penetrate the embryonic suburban public sphere. Like the majority of lower middle class women in Ilford, most female committee members traceable via census were not in paid employment, and their daily routines were therefore far more likely to centre round Ilford, making them more prone to involvement in local initiatives too.[[19]](#endnote-19)

The Carnival organisers also successfully sought to recruit new residents.[[20]](#endnote-20) 22.3% of the first Ilford Carnival's committee members locatable by census had moved to Ilford since 1901, rising to 41.5% in 1911. The event enabled new settlers to become actively involved in Ilford's social life. Most of these newcomers belonged to the wider flow of people from city to suburban hinterland. At least half of traceable committee members for the 1905 and 1911 Carnivals had lived at some stage after 1871 in the area covered by the County of London. Many made their way to Ilford via nearby suburbs like East Ham, West Ham and Leyton. These pathways are illustrative of lower middle class suburbanites' tendency to continuously seek out newer, more select climes offering greater space and comfort, as older suburbs increasingly attracted skilled working class migrants and became more built up.[[21]](#endnote-21) They also highlighted Ilford's connections with surrounding districts, as did commuting patterns.[[22]](#endnote-22)

The Ilford Carnival's wider support base was inter-institutional in composition, and rooted in the district's administrative, social and economic infrastructure. The processions included items contributed by local businesses (and increasingly larger, metropolitan companies), local government, schools, and voluntary organisations like bands, political clubs, sports clubs, youth organisations, and friendly societies. Ilford UDC also allowed public venues to be used for Carnival-related events and affairs, most notably allocating Valentine's Park for the post-procession entertainments and allowing Executive Committee meetings to take place at the Town Hall. Ward committee meetings took place at a range of locations, such as schools, newspaper offices and club rooms.

**The Ilford Carnival as Spectacle: Modernity and Tradition, Commerce, and Geographies of Cultural Reproduction**

The Ilford Carnival's charitable rationale was central to its perpetuation, but its fundraising success depended on its popularity as a recreational form. The Carnival was a multisensory entertainment experience. Sonically, the crowd's cheers mingled with the playing of procession bands, followed later in the evening with the concert's musical offering. Then there was the physical feeling of belonging to the throng massed along Ilford's main roads. Nonetheless, the event was above all a spectacle, with thousands upon thousands gathering to *see* the procession, reflecting sight's primacy over other senses in the modern city; it is therefore on this aspect of the Carnival that this section will concentrate.[[23]](#endnote-23)

Responsibility for arranging Carnival contingents lay with individual ward committees, who could exclude items they deemed unsuitable. Yet ultimately, contributors to the procession and collectors created this spectacle. These multiple sources of cultural production help explain the Carnival's complexity and sometimes contradictory aspects. It also underlines the extent to which this was a grassroots, communal endeavour, even if capacity to arrest audience attention lay partly in the resources available to the contributing individual or institution.

The creative processes behind the Carnival, as with all popular cultural forms, involved appropriation and reworking as well as innovation. Thematically, procession items and collectors borrowed from a host of other cultural forms, such as nursery rhymes (via pantomime), children's and adult literature (See Fig. 2), stage musicals, operettas, Wild West shows, minstrelsy, circuses, and sports. This assimilatory tendency is crucial to understanding the three dimensions of the Carnival spectacle discussed below: its combination of tradition and modernity; its relationship with commercial forces; and the geographies of cultural production and dissemination it entailed.

Due to its adaptational composition, little visible in the Carnival was particularly *new*. As a format, the procession dates back to prehistoric societies, but enjoyed renewed popularity in modern Britain. Carnival themes likewise often possessed long histories. Many children's rhymes and stories represented originated in medieval and early modern oral cultures, for example. Nonetheless, the Carnival did embrace modernity, reflecting and referencing contemporary culture and current affairs. Like other fin de siècle popular cultural forms such as music hall and musical theatre, contributors to the procession and collectors often actively imparted an appearance of up-to-dateness. For example, the 1908 Carnival featured frequent references to the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale, while the 1914 Carnival contained a skit on ongoing industrial unrest. Other items exhibited fascination with modern and futuristic technologies. The *Ilford Guardian's* car in 1905 featured a working printing press distributing new copies of the newspaper en route, while the 1908 procession included a model airship offering 'trips to Mars' for 4d.[[24]](#endnote-24) Motorised transport, while substantially outnumbered by horse-drawn vehicles, was also increasingly present.

In other cases, however, Carnival contributors looked backwards for inspiration. The prehistoric, medieval, Tudor, Georgian and early Victorian eras were covered in numerous items featuring old monarchs, fictional characters, or representations of period dress, architecture and society more generally (See Fig. 3). Moreover, representations of nature comingled with those of technology. Picturesque depictions of rural life, such as country girls and boys, village scenes and rural workers like milkmaids and blacksmiths, featured heavily in the processions.

Floral motifs were even more plentiful. This reflected the countryside fantasy key to suburbia's appeal, but also illustrated how the suburb delivered a tailored version of that fantasy: the garden abstracted rurality from the countryside, tamed and prettified it, and relocated it within new residential developments. The Ilford Carnival entailed a further phase of relocation, as flowers now festooned costumes and vehicles, beautifying the procession and the suburban streets it paraded through (Fig. 4). It was almost universally women processionists and collectors who donned floral outfits, connecting female attractiveness with nature, and femininity with the domestic space of the garden.[[25]](#endnote-25)

The merging of the historic and contemporary was not unique to suburban culture. Bernhard Rieger and Martin Daunton have argued the British experience of modernity more generally during this period was often marked by efforts to construct lines of continuity between past and present.[[26]](#endnote-26) Indeed, combining old and new is central to cultural evolution regardless of location or period, though the balance between continuity and change may vary. Yet their particular configuration within the Ilford Carnival replicated the sights of suburbia. Rural and floral imagery temporarily renounced nineteenth century urban expansion, but the procession also reflected suburban modernity. The large quantity of decorated bicycles reflected their ubiquity in Ilford and neighbouring districts following the cycling boom of the 1890s. Meanwhile, in 1911 Ilford UDCs Electricity Department submitted two cars representing electrically lit homes, reflecting the combined forces of municipal expansion and technological proliferation at work locally.[[27]](#endnote-27)

Despite its philanthropic raison d'être, the production and dissemination of the Carnival spectacle was closely related to commercial source material and processes. Businesses contributed a sizeable proportion of the vehicles in each year's Carnival, usually for advertisement purposes. Sometimes this took the form of what would today be termed product placement; for instance, motor industry firms contributing motor cars. There were also vehicles featuring versions of consumer goods with exaggerated dimensions – for example, a monster gas cooker submitted by the Richmond Stove Company and Ilford Gas Company in 1908 (Fig. 5). The Carnival offered opportunities for ocular consumption, with the promise of possible future acquisition. Some bigger businesses, meanwhile, sent decorated cars capitalising on their brand names' familiarity and associated imagery (Fig. 6).[[28]](#endnote-28)

Furthermore, commercial motives drove reproduction of the Carnival's imagery. Local newspapers *The Ilford Guardian* and *The Ilford Recorder* carried in-depth Carnival reports, bolstering their sales and revealing demand for re-consumption of the Carnival experience. *The Ilford Recorder* also printed photographs of the Carnival, and as of 1908 the *Ilford Guardian* too accompanied its reports with supplements carrying photos from the processions, enabling the spectacle to be reproduced and re-viewed via a commercial medium.

These supplements carried advertisements, so the recreated spectacle of the Carnival was embellished with images of consumer goods and services. This included adverts from South Essex Sanitary Steam Laundry, featuring photographs of its Carnival cars accompanied by copy such as 'This was our show last Saturday in the procession...but our permanent show is in Roden Street, Ilford. Please come and see it', or inviting readers to 'inspect this up-to-date steam laundry' (Fig. 7).[[29]](#endnote-29) This advertising strategy used association with the Carnival to present a stylised image of the company's services, and relocate the spectacle from public to commercial space.

Local press usage of Carnival photos exhibited the relationship between spectacle, commerce and technology. These relatively young publications utilised advancements in photographic and printing processes to freshen up their product and bolster readership, and the Carnivals provided a valuable opportunity for doing this. In addition, they exploited growing enthusiasm for photography, with *The Ilford Recorder* encouraging readers to take pictures of the Carnival and send them in for inclusion in the newspaper.[[30]](#endnote-30) The procession was also filmed on more than one occasion – another case of an up-to-date spectacle gaining added novelty through replication via a rapidly advancing medium.[[31]](#endnote-31)

The imagery arranged for this charitable endeavour was therefore repeatedly commodified, exemplifying increasing commercialisation of contemporary popular culture. Yet the Ilford Carnival also highlighted this process's reciprocity, with imagery transferred back and forth between voluntary and private sectors, rather than simply from the former to the latter, with processionists and collectors imitating figures and motifs originally produced or popularised by various cultural industries, such as adverts, comic book characters, and popular musicals. Moreover, the event's organisers aped the monetisation of visual culture and urban space, using spectacle to encourage crowds to congregate in the streets where they could be solicited for contributions, as well as selling tickets for attending connected entertainments.

The geographies underpinning these processes of reproduction contradict simplistic notions of urban cultural dissemination as centrifugal. Certainly, the Carnival encompassed a myriad of cultural flows from city centre to suburb: advertising cars submitted by metropolitan businesses, for example; or the copying of imagery produced by Central London publishing houses and West End theatres. However, the Ilford Carnival received significant input from neighbouring suburbs too. Individuals and organisations from districts such as Barking, East Ham, West Ham, Leyton and Walthamstow all participated in the processions. Items from Ilford similarly took part in carnivals elsewhere.[[32]](#endnote-32) Given the aforementioned migratory and commuter pathways between Ilford and other suburbs on London's eastern fringe, it appears this complex mesh of social and economic connections supportned an equally intricate network of cultural flows.

Attendance at the Ilford Carnival also demonstrates that the suburb was culturally central rather than peripheral. Many spectators patently came from other areas, judging by reported crowd sizes.[[33]](#endnote-33) The Carnival caught the attention of the metropolitan-based national press too. *The* *Daily Chronicle* fulsomely praised the 1908 procession, concluding that 'Ilford seemed indeed to have transported itself from the fringe of London to the heart of fairyland' – exemplifying how the event transformed the district from being geographically marginal into a perceived idyllic destination.[[34]](#endnote-34) Furthermore, like Ilford's local newspapers, the illustrated London press on occasion capitalised on the Carnival's visual appeal by printing photographs of the event, assumedly helping to pique the interest of attendees from elsewhere in London.[[35]](#endnote-35)

Press coverage of the Ilford Carnival exemplifies London's elaborate geographies of cultural dissemination. According to Patricia Garside, the national press became increasingly London-centric in circulation and coverage from the late nineteenth century and often covered local affairs within the capital.[[36]](#endnote-36) Spectacles such as carnivals were therefore produced in suburbs, mediated via national media in the metropolitan centre, and distributed back to suburban readers. There were also more localised networks of mediation, with reports of the Ilford Carnival sometimes appearing in neighbouring districts' newspapers, and *The Ilford Guardian* and *The Ilford Recorder* similarly covering processions in other vicinities.[[37]](#endnote-37)

Visual recreations of the Carnival could be particularly convoluted. Photographs of the Ilford Carnival from *The Daily Sketch* and *The Daily Mirror* were sometimes printed in the *Ilford Guardian*, while *The Ilford Recorder* reprinted *The Sketch's* photo collages of the Carnival (Fig. 8).[[38]](#endnote-38) Imagery was copied, transmitted and recopied between suburb and city, and from suburb to suburb. In short, Ilford was not merely a cultural outpost of London, belatedly consuming what was produced in the city centre; it was also a frontier, a new space where up-to-date spectacles could be generated and exported from.

**The Ilford Carnival as Festival: Ritual, Inversion and Temporality in the Making and Unmaking of the Suburb**

As a festival, the Ilford Carnival embodied two cultural devices that are geographically and historically ubiquitous but whose underlying foundations and particular forms are contextually specific. The first of these was ritual. Street carnivals like that held in Ilford were in one sense kindred to ceremonies designed to legitimise ideas of 'order'. In Britain and elsewhere during the nineteenth century, processions offered a vision of structure counter to ontologically complicating developments like urbanisation, globalisation and technological advancement, as seen in municipal events, jubilees and pageantry, to name a few examples.[[39]](#endnote-39)

Yet the Ilford Carnival must also be interpreted within a framework of inversion, in which certain norms are temporarily defied. This was a common motif of festivals across medieval and early modern Europe and also evident in nineteenth century wakes, fairs and similar events, although as the century progressed many of these were halted or tamed through legislative action and middle and respectable working class opposition. Nonetheless, inversion remained a feature of festivals, as the Ilford Carnival demonstrates.

Festive amalgamations of ritual and inversion require nuanced interpretation. The Ilford Carnival made and unmade meaning. It combined a clear overall structure – a committee system, regular itineraries, separation of processionists from spectators – with scope for freedom of individual expression. Individual items and guises could communicate seemingly contradictory identities in themselves too. The following section accentuates the Carnival's suburban setting and charitable purpose in analysing its ritual and inversive dimensions, while also situating the event at the intersection of three temporal schemata: linear time, the year, and the week.

The expansion of Ilford's population and built environment yielded a fluid public sphere, to which the Ilford Carnival brought a semblance of coherence. Organisations participating in the procession could project synonymity with the locality. Friendly societies exhibited their place within the community by marching in their regalia, while Ilford Football Club often paraded its most recently won silverware. Patriotic and imperialist procession items meanwhile may have offered recognisable unifying symbols counterbalancing the potentially atomising and anonymising effects of residing in a growing suburb of a fast changing city.

The procession route also helped create suburban place. New streets were added to ward contingents' itineraries annually, such as the inclusion of the Seven Kings Estate in 1909 a year after construction had commenced on it.[[40]](#endnote-40) There was of course a pragmatic rationale for this – securing additional funds for the hospital – but in compiling these routes, ward committees composed linear narratives of their locality in the face of rapid changes to the built environment, continually integrating new suburban spaces into them. The final stretch of the Carnival route meanwhile demarcated the heart of Ilford, while the holding of its finale in Valentine's Park emphasised the cultural centrality of this recently established municipal green space.[[41]](#endnote-41)

The Ilford Carnival furthermore offered a significant source of pride for those seeking to define and celebrate Ilford as a district. *The Ilford Guardian*, for example, called the 1906 Carnival 'an essentially Ilfordian event, representative of Ilford's life, amusement, business and enthusiasm', and during the Carnival's early years asserted its supremacy to similar events held in neighbouring districts.[[42]](#endnote-42) Meanwhile, W. H. Ridgely – a former ward organiser himself – wrote in his column for *The Ilford Recorder* in 1906 that 'The Lord Mayor's Show was a travelling circus compared to the Hospital Procession last year', and that the Lord Mayor was rumoured to be sending representatives to watch that year's Carnival 'so that the greatest city in the world may not be behind an outlying although a flourishing, progressive suburb'.[[43]](#endnote-43) These expressions of local pride may have in part been retorts to the anti-suburban diatribes of some contemporary metropolitan writers, in which the suburb was characterised as backward-looking and soulless.[[44]](#endnote-44)

Yet the Carnival also ephemerally altered the suburb and overturned its values. Streets were turned from conduits of traffic into sites of congregation. Furthermore, a theme of enchantment ran through the processions, with their host of fictional and magical characters and displays; the potential implications of this for the spectator's sense of place were encapsulated by the *Ilford Guardian's* description of the 1909 procession: 'The drab suburban streets were metamorphosed into a veritable fairyland'.[[45]](#endnote-45)

Moreover, suburban institutions and practices celebrated in some procession items were parodied by others. The 1911 procession included the 'The Backbone of England' comic tableau, which sent up the scout movement, and 'Ye Olde Ilford Football Team', subtitled 'with apologies to the Ilford Football Club'. Moreover, while the Carnival and appended events offered sport as part of their programmes, they also incorporated comic variations that rejected the organisation and competitiveness of serious sporting encounters. Mayfield Cricket Club's 'Comical Clown's Cricket Match' was one such case, while a fete held in 1907 to augment Carnival funds included a pretend dash for a train, lampooning the suburbanite's daily commute.[[46]](#endnote-46)

Inversion was also inherent in the practice of dressing up, whereby everyday identity was concealed and another playfully projected. This included dressing as foreign nationals and sometimes wearing blackface; men dressing as women and (to a lesser extent) women dressing as men; and lower middle class men dressing as tramps. Such acts comprised temporary rejection of some of suburbia's guiding values: respectability; dress codes indicative of status and gender; Englishness. Yet the performance also relied on shared knowledge of its falseness, casting represented outgroups and the crossing of social, racial and gender boundaries as humorous, and thereby simultaneously reinforcing outwardly obscured identities.

Employment of inversion for conservative ends was particularly evident in the numerous instances of men dressing as suffragettes for the procession, in order to ridicule the campaign for women's votes and mock its supporters as lacking femininity (Fig. 9). This illustrates that transgression is not necessarily targeted at manifestations of authority, as power structures and struggles are generally more intricate than simply pitting elites against homogenous commonalties; on this occasion, it was the tool of males seeking to protect the status quo in gender relations against the incursions of a movement whose visibility and apparent militancy increased from the mid-1900s.[[47]](#endnote-47) Such behaviour echoed earlier ceremonies for censuring contravention of community rules, such as medieval and early modern charivari, and traditions of popular justice sustained in some nineteenth century fairs and Bonfire Night celebrations.[[48]](#endnote-48)

Other rivalries were also publically played out during the procession. In 1908, members of Ilford UDC's Tramways Department submitted 'The Ante-Vibrite and Dustless Motor Bus', spoofing the vehicle they would now be competing with for passengers, while Loxford Ward Ratepayers' Association's 'Justice' Car in the 1914 procession made jibes at various Council representatives (Fig. 10). Carnival day humour could be used to make light of and defuse tensions, but also to disparage rivals. The occasion's capacity for exacerbating rather than easing friction were illustrated in 1908 when a car championing the Liberal Government's Licensing Bill, which aimed to reduce public house numbers, appears to have been excluded to avoid offending Ilford's victuallers.[[49]](#endnote-49) Furthermore, while reference was often made to 'friendly rivalry' between wards stimulating fundraising efforts, this at times spilled over into acrimony arising from issues such as which contingents certain items should be included in.[[50]](#endnote-50)

For the most part, however, the Ilford Carnival was unsurprisingly far more genteel and less contentious an occasion than many of the earlier festivals discussed. While the urban middle class increasingly came to terms with leisure as the fin-de-siècle approached, they still disapproved of its misuse. This emphasis on respectability was reflected in crowd behaviour during the Ilford Carnival; there were, for example, very few arrests for drunkenness.[[51]](#endnote-51) Nor, with the occasional exception, does there appear to have been much criticism of the procession on moral grounds. Yet the Carnival's transgressive elements should not be downplayed. It allowed inversive behaviours derived from popular entertainments like music hall, pantomime and minstrelsy to be engaged in more widely, and within public sites. It also reflected a fluid relationship between individual suburbanites and the values they collectively attested to.

This ambiguity was mirrored in press discussion of the occasion. The *Ilford Guardian's* report on the 1906 procession claimed 'King Carnival "ran riot"', but insisted the event 'varied from any preconceived ideals of what the Carnival would be like in great Roman Catholic communities'.[[52]](#endnote-52) The following year, the same newspaper remarked that 'it must not be imagined by outsiders that this Carnival is a form of saturnalia, and that its real object is subjugated to its desire to riot and revel', but also acknowledged that 'in addition to the ebullition of the charitable spirit, the festival spirit is also outpoured in liberal quantity'.[[53]](#endnote-53) This narrative distinguished between Carnival day and normal life in the suburb, but avoided any connotations of breakdown in the social order. That the procession was later deemed inappropriate in wartime suggests its organisers too felt its levity and polysemy pushed at boundaries other forms of leisure did not.

Ultimately, the occasion's philanthropic purpose was crucial to its legitimisation. This was regularly referred to in local press coverage as a means of sanitising the event and justifying transgressive performances. For example, *The* *Ilford Guardian* wrote of A. G. Breens's turn during the 1910 Carnival as 'Miss Snooks': 'As "she" danced her way down the Ilford High Road, broad grins were everywhere followed by uproarious laughter, *and many a copper was thus won which would otherwise have been lost to the cause*' [My italics].[[54]](#endnote-54) When it became evident during the First World War that the procession was not essential to Hospital Saturday's financial success, it was consigned to history, reflecting charity's primacy over festivity for the event's organisers too.

The ritual and inversive aspects of the Carnival were intrinsically connected with its temporal dimensions. The occasion was for a start marked by efforts to connect Ilford's rural past and suburban present. Take, for example, the following verse from Ilford Liberal Club steward J. Wilson's poem 'Queen Carnival', submitted to the *Ilford Guardian* ahead of the 1913 procession:

'Still tower aloft the stately oaks

Linked with the days gone by

When children met and still do meet

And gambol merrily'

Wilson's ode used the rural to evoke a paradisiacal past and still portrayed contemporary Ilford in these terms, placing the Carnival within this context, as well as reflecting a broader celebration of the countryside as a reassuring site of continuity.[[55]](#endnote-55)

Similar conclusions can be drawn from the inclusion of the Fairlop Boat – a relic from the Fairlop Fair historically held in Hainault Forest – in the 1906 procession. The *Ilford Guardian* carried a short piece detailing the history of the boat and the fair, in which it noted that 'Ilfordians who were children in the Barking hamlet of "Great Ilford", who were youths in the village of Ilford, and have grown up with the great town of to-day, will remember the last efforts to retain the Fairlop Fair'.[[56]](#endnote-56) While like other nineteenth century fairs, the event had been marked by struggle between its organisers and working class patrons on the one hand and the authorities on the other, this was omitted from a bowdlerised narrative positing the Fair as the Carnival's predecessor.

It is likely this romantic image of Ilford and its past was intended to offer a sense of place that new residents could buy into, as well as a reassuring myth of perpetuity for longer standing residents in the face of rapid suburbanisation. The Carnival fitted in neatly within this vision, and discussions of the occasion shortly began to incorporate references to its own history, which was brief enough to assumedly resonate with relatively recent settlers. The *Ilford Recorder* stated as early as 1907 that 'the Carnival has now become a settled institution. It is three years old, which is quite a respectable age in a youthful community such as Ilford'.[[57]](#endnote-57)

The event negotiated modernity by emphasising within linear temporal progression its circular constituent part: the year. As Roland Hutton has argued, seasonal change retained its significance in Britain post-urbanisation because human relationships supplanted nature at the heart of the ritual year.[[58]](#endnote-58) In Ilford, the Carnival and its build up provided residents with an annual routine through which they could familiarise themselves with each other and the suburb, while making the host district's future more predictable through the promise of its repetition. This coloured local press coverage of the event: the *Ilford Recorder* stated in 1913 that 'Being always held on the second Saturday in July, [the Carnival] is coming to be regarded as fixed a festival as Easter, Whitsun, or even Christmas itself', while the *Ilford Guardian* similarly referred to recurring appended events as 'annuals'.[[59]](#endnote-59) The event therefore fitted Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger's model of 'invented traditions': 'practices which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with a suitably historic past'.[[60]](#endnote-60)

The Carnival's seasonality must be interpreted in the context of changes in the wider organisation of work and leisure time. Broadly speaking, these became more distinctly demarcated over the nineteenth century, while the length of the working day and week were scaled down to afford more time for recreation, creating demand for entertainment 'on tap' met by new cultural forms such as cinema. State-implemented bank holidays also began to supersede a more locally diverse holiday calendar.[[61]](#endnote-61)

Ilford's carnival both contrasted with and conformed to these changes. Its appeal lay partly in offering delayed rather than instant gratification – enhanced by accumulating anticipation – and greater freedoms in exchange for its ephemerality and relative rarity. Yet the fleeting excitement of Carnival day was followed by efforts to recreate and sustain it through newer media such as the press, photographs and films. Secondly, while the Carnival illustrated the continuing appeal of localised festive occasions, it also reflected their subordination to London's broader temporal regime. The Ilford Carnival was timed to occur at a certain time of year, best suited to an outdoor event, but also on a Saturday afternoon, in keeping with the work schedules of many of the district's earners, as well as visitors from elsewhere.[[62]](#endnote-62) In this respect it also contributed to the developing institution of the 'suburban weekend', as categorised by Gary Cross, whereby commuting suburbanites established their spatial and temporal autonomy from work and workplace.[[63]](#endnote-63)

**Conclusion**

This article has demonstrated that the Ilford Carnival's suburban setting was integral to how it functioned as a leisure occasion. Firstly, its popularity as a visual cultural mode belies the myth of the moribund suburb – propagated by writers of the time and subsequently by some historians – highlighting instead this burgeoning district's creativity and embrace of modernity; it also contradicts simplistic notions of city centres as sites of production and suburbs as sites of consumption, revealing the multidirectional nexuses of cultural transmission and connected commercial processes at work in London in the early twentieth century.[[64]](#endnote-64)

Secondly, the article has interpreted the Carnival's festive dimensions within its locational context, exhibiting how it reinforced suburban values and local identities, yet briefly permitted evasion of those values and altered senses of place. Furthermore, it has revealed connections between temporality and geography, with the Carnival filling Ilford's memorial vacuums by contributing to a local historical narrative and social calendar, but also cohering to a time-space relationship dictated by London's economy and regulated by the British state. To conclude, this local case study has offered some evidence as to how suburban expansion and accompanying socio-spatial reconfiguration shaped early twentieth century leisure practices and the roles they fulfilled. In doing so, it has hopefully highlighted potential future lines of enquiry for urban and leisure historians more generally, and illustrated the value of studying places and pastimes conjointly.
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