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Abstract: In Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own* the narrator clearly expresses her rage and resentment exposing the absence and exclusion of women through history and she also focuses on the unfair position of women in her contemporary society. The narrator encourages women to emancipate themselves and to be aware of the idiosyncratic nature of society that restricts them to the private sphere. The aim of this paper is to offer a different interpretation of *A Room of One’s Own* and demonstrate how Woolf excludes contemporary working-class women from partaking in her feminist message. In order to demonstrate the exclusion of working-class women three major perspectives have been integrated throughout the text: readings of *A Room of One’s Own*, a historical aspect including classism, and the significance of Woolf’s biographical background. My analysis highlights Woolf’s unintentional class bias, her ladylike manner, and the centrality of financial independence in *A Room of One’s Own* and displays how these features entail the exclusion of working-class women. The conclusion demonstrates that the amalgamation of the three perspectives mentioned above provides a nuanced and critical reading of *A Room of One’s Own*.
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Virginia Woolf (1882-1941) was an experimental novelist, short-story writer, essayist and critic. She particularly positioned herself as a critic of patriarchal society, stagnant views on homosexuality and women’s inferior position in society. Woolf’s contribution to the discussion of women’s position in society has been to constantly question norms, ideologies and gender division and shed light on these issues. Her work placed her as one of the most prominent writers of the twentieth century and especially earned her a well-renowned title among feminists, and she has had a major effect on feminist studies.

However, it is also important to mention that Woolf was a lady of high stature in Victorian society and fell into the category considered upper-middle-class. Due to her position as a middle-class woman of wealthy family Woolf had the privilege of being a lady of leisure and was not forced into domestic labour unlike many working-class women. Woolf had the unique privilege of being exposed to and being able to participate in debates where she had the time to discuss different topics social and political that were associated with the public sphere. Woolf developed her critical thinking through ventilating thoughts with her brother Thoby and his Cambridge friends in the Bloomsbury Group.

Woolf’s renowned work *A Room of One’s Own* was published in 1929. It consists of two papers based on two lectures given by Woolf at the Arts Society at Newnham and the Odtaa at Girton Cambridge (the only two colleges for women at the time) in October 1928. *A Room of One’s Own* is a direct critique that challenges the conventions of gender division through English history. Woolf uses her skillful language to dissect and question the many gendered norms of society in an ironic, subtle manner but with such underlying anger that a clear message appears: women are entitled to and must claim a room of their own in order to be able to create and obtain freedom just as their privileged husbands, fathers and brothers have done throughout history.
However, although Woolf’s polemical writing describes and addresses the inequalities between men and women in patriarchal society in general, in *A Room of One’s Own* she mainly focuses on women from her own social class (middle class). By doing so Woolf excludes, perhaps unintentionally, certain women from partaking in the discourse of equal status between men and women that she so passionately argues for. This paper will demonstrate that Woolf’s idea of the importance of economical independence and the necessity of having a room of one’s own to be able to gain intellectual freedom actually excludes many women; in particular women from the working class in Woolf’s contemporary English society. In order to investigate exactly how Woolf excludes working class women from participating in her quest for women’s liberation it is necessary to provide a brief description of the middle-class woman and the working-class woman of Victorian English society up until the publication of *A Room of One’s Own*.

Three perspectives will be integrated throughout the text: The first perspective consists of readings of *A Room of One’s Own*, where I will demonstrate how Woolf especially focuses on women from her own class, and how, by focusing on topics such as financial independence, she excludes many women in her contemporary society. The second perspective concerns classism during the Victorian era and also includes a definition of the working- and middle-class woman, especially focusing on the importance of domestic labour. The third perspective involves Woolf’s background and upbringing that influenced her writing. The biographical context is definitely of importance and an aspect to consider when discussing her class bias. It is impossible to disregard classism, which influenced Victorian society, and therefore leaving Woolf biased and blinded by her social stratum.

The Victorian middle class that Woolf was brought up in is usually associated with the economical development and urbanization of nineteenth-century England. The term generally describes the class below the aristocracy but above the working class. The middle
class can be viewed as a class that established the importance of merits instead of privilege by birth as opposed to the upper class. However, the definition of the middle class proves difficult to pin down due to the broad spectrum of actual people that the term represents. On the one hand economical development contributed to the emergence of numerous administrative occupations that could be representative of “typical” occupations connected to the middle class; on the other hand members of the working class could earn better salaries which indicates the difficulty of attempting to draw economical borders between the middle class and the working class (Loftus).

In *Working Class in Britain, 1850-1939* John Benson mentions that there are only small amounts of information recorded from the Victorian working class, and even less information that regard women of the working class. This is an important aspect when discussing the working class, the class that Woolf, perhaps unintentionally, tends to exclude from her feminist message. Benson describes two types of criteria that are often used when discussing the division of class. The two differentiating sets of criteria are: economic criteria (income and economic situation) and social/cultural criteria (behaviour, status, power, attitudes and relationships). Class determination can be a combination of the different groups and does not necessarily have to be determined by one of the criteria. However, the criteria utilized most often are economy or occupation when determining class (2-4). An important aspect in relation to class is the categorization of women and children. Benson enquires if it is possible to group women and children in the same category as men when discussing class (ibid). This aspect also further emphasizes the ambiguity of class determination. Therefore it is necessary to provide a brief but specific description of the situation of middle-class and working-class women.

In my analysis of *A Room of One’s Own*, I have included Woolf’s life as woman from the middle class and how her authorship is affected by this factor. In *Critical Theory Today: A
User-Friendly Guide Lois Tyson describes the term *authorial intention* as the author’s life having an effect on the text he/she has produced, and Tyson points out that in order to discover and understand the text better the author’s life should be taken into consideration (2). This is one way of viewing the text and is of importance to my analysis because it connects Woolf’s biographical aspect and its impact on my interpretation of *A Room of One’s Own*, without necessarily indicating that Woolf excluded working-class women “on purpose” or that she was even aware of it. Therefore it is important to state that Woolf was brought up in a typical Victorian household, surrounded by a domestic staff of seven or so that attended to her many needs; this was the case of many middle-upper-class households in Victorian England.

In *Mrs Woolf and the Servants: The Hidden Heart of Domestic Service* Alison Light discusses the significance of domestic service. Light even goes to the extent claiming that domestic service actually *is* the history of British women; women were either servants at some stage in their life or kept servants. Up until 1945 domestic service was the largest female occupation and in the typical middle-class household approximately 80% of the domestic staff were women (xv). There are numerous factors that contributed to the rigid position of women in society that restricted women to the private sphere – the sphere connected with household issues. Victorian England was directly affected by the established patterns of the eighteenth century, and the development of capitalist society during that period contributed to strengthening a division between the sexes that restricted women to domestic labour.

The women of the upper-middle class stressed the importance of being ladylike especially in terms of economic dependence; their major chore was attending to the household and matters that concerned the domestic staff. An important aspect is that women’s position in society alters only when the economy demands it, as seen during the two World Wars. It is not until women are needed in the public sphere of society that women’s role suddenly shifts
from the private sphere to the public sphere. The alterations clearly illustrate that women’s position in society is very much a cultural creation and not a coincidence (Hall 68). I believe the cultural creation mentioned above pinpoints gender roles in society and that the roles are very much a concept defined by the desires and needs of society. The two World Wars illustrate this in a very tangible manner; it is only when the nation’s economy demands the transformation that women are pushed into the public sphere. These were probably some of the reasons that drove Woolf to encourage women to take control of their position in society and be aware of the cultural creation imposed on them. It is also important to highlight and emphasize that this was a similarity shared by women, regardless of class; both middle-class and working-class women were restricted to the private sphere of society although chores and tasks differed. Women’s restriction to the private sphere is what Woolf mainly criticizes in *A Room of One’s Own*. The quotation below clearly indicates her critique of an explicit division of the sexes:

> He would open the door of the drawing-room or nursery, I thought and find her among her children perhaps, or with a piece of embroidery on her knee – at any rate, the centre of some different order and system of life, and the contrast between this world and his own, which might be law courts or the House of Commons, would at once refresh and invigorate; and there would follow, even in the simplest talk, such a natural difference of opinion that dried ideas in him would be fertilized anew; (86-87)

In this quote Woolf highlights the norms governed by society and the restriction of women to the private sphere. She clearly illustrates the distinct division between the sexes and addresses the issue by indicating that the ideals and norms practised by society are unacceptable and should not be maintained; the roles implemented by society must be challenged and questioned anew.

However correct and important Woolf’s statement is when she clarifies and illustrates the differences between the public and private sphere, there is another aspect (only
focusing on women) that should be addressed: Who were the women that Woolf primarily had in mind? For some women to thrive, gain the intellectual freedom, time and private space required to be able to develop and be creative, another group of women had to stand back. For example, a parallel could be drawn to Victorian society where men’s domination of the public sphere proved to be at the expense of women being restricted to the private sphere. Likewise, upper- and middle-class women’s participation in the intellectual liberation that Woolf presents is partly achieved at the expense of working-class women and in particular women serving as domestic staff.

Light also emphasizes the perspective of the working class or, more specifically, the perspective of the servant. Woolf was oblivious to the everyday drudgery of domestic work and chores that were instead attended to by the domestic staff (xvii). As Light puts it, “The independent life of the mind nonetheless needed someone to care for the body” (61) Here Light highlights the necessity of domestic staff for the kind of privileged intellectual “room” that Woolf envisioned, and it points out how the liberation of the mind also binds other individuals to attend to needs connected with domesticity. In the article *The Horror of Dirt: Virginia Woolf and Her Servants*, Elaine Blair also discusses the aspect of domestic staff and mentions that the necessary independence of the woman writer relies on the working class attending to her domestic needs:

Many male writers could rely on wives to keep house--as did Dylan Thomas and Robert Graves--even when they couldn't afford servants. For an ambitious female writer, the only hope was to be able to hire poorer, less educated women to take care of her and her family's household needs.

Thus, Woolf’s feminist message carries with it an implicit and perhaps an unintentional message that in order for one group to thrive another group is excluded from this opportunity and reduced to servitude. The perspective of Woolf’s class bias, as mentioned, by both Blair and Light, provides an aspect that illustrates how Woolf is clearly tainted by her background.
The perspective demonstrates how Woolf leaves out a large number of women from the working class, women who are invisible to her and thus not included in her feminist agenda of *A Room of One’s Own*.

Blair adds another perspective to a particular sequence in *A Room of One’s Own*. One of Woolf’s many strategic tools of persuasion used to evince the unfair position of women is the illustration of Shakespeare’s imaginary sister Judith. Woolf uses the Judith character to illustrate the obstacles women encounter although they possess an equal amount of genius as their male counterpart. Blair states that Judith could be exchanged with “Woolf’s maid” and enquires whether “Woolf’s maid”, a working-class woman, could actually partake in Woolf’s message or if it was indeed only a privilege meant for women from Woolf’s own social class (*The Horror of Dirt: Virginia Woolf and Her Servants*). In Alice Walker, Maria Lauret suggests another interpretation or perspective of Judith, one in particular presented by the author Alice Walker. Walker mentions her view that not all women share the same concerns associated with the white middle class. This displays Woolf’s limitation not only in terms of class but also in terms of different ethnicities (24). The discourse around the character Judith demonstrates that Woolf was oblivious to the domestic chores of everyday life that permitted her to have the time and comfort to write undisturbed. Although this was probably not a conscious part of Woolf’s agenda, Light’s argument illustrates the difficulty for some women to partake in her feminist thoughts of emancipation.

The concept of poverty is a central theme in *A Room of One’s Own* where Woolf discusses women’s poverty in comparison to the men of her own social class. Woolf raises a question: “Why did men drink wine and women water? Why was one sex so prosperous and the other so poor? What effect has poverty on fiction?” (25) This demonstrates a slightly paradoxical approach to the concept of poverty, or perhaps a one-way view on poverty.

---

1. Alice Walker criticizes Woolf for excluding African American women from partaking in her feminist message (Lauret 23).
Woolf’s main focus is on the relative poverty between men and women and in particular men and women within the same social stratum. For this reason Woolf seems to be oblivious of the situation of women from the working class and the effect of poverty on their situation.

Blair addresses this issue:

After all, Woolf’s famous formulation that a woman writer must have £500 a year and the solitude of her own room in which to write presumes implicitly that there will be servants to make the writer’s meals and clean her house.

Blair’s statement indicates that Woolf’s social status affects her writing and places Woolf in a position mainly focusing on women of her own social stratum. Since the definition of the middle class could be determined by economical criteria as mentioned earlier by Benson, it seems as if Woolf was clearly tainted by her class bias when she stressed the importance of financial independence in order to obtain liberation. This leaves a slightly paradoxical impression, since on the one hand Woolf expresses the importance of economical independence by mentioning an annual sum of five hundred pounds, and on the other hand she seems unaware of the fact that the majority of women in her contemporary society had difficulty to even fathom the sum.

Light’s claim that domestic labour actually is the history of British women indicates that Woolf only focused her message on a small number of privileged women of society – excluding the majority. In addition to Benson’s declaration that women and children could not be categorized like men when differentiating class due to economic criteria, Woolf’s mentioning of five hundred pounds acts as an instrument creating a clear financial boundary between the middle-class woman and the working-class woman. For domestic labourers the annual sum of five hundred pounds that Woolf mentions is an unrealistic goal and clearly demonstrates the exclusion of many women from being able to partake in her message.
An example from *A Room of One’s Own* coupled to Blair’s comment on the aspect of domestic staff carrying the workload can perhaps be Woolf’s glorification of and references to other female authors, such as Jane Austen, the Brontë sisters, Aphra Behn etc. The reference to Austen in *A Room of One’s Own* evidently illustrates how certain women are enabled to write at the expense of other women. Woolf uses an excerpt from Austen’s nephew’s memoirs where he states, “She was careful that her occupation should not be suspected by servants or visitors or persons beyond her own family party” (66-67). It seems as if Woolf’s intention is to demonstrate that Austen was forced to write in secrecy. Austen encountered difficulties to find the time to write due to the norms imbued by society that restricted women from engaging in such activities. However, as mentioned by Blair, an important detail is that Austen had domestic staff that attended to her needs, being a lady that belonged to the middle class.

Another factor mentioned in *A Room of One’s Own* further strengthening Blair’s comment, is Woolf’s repeated references to “the middle-class”, which leaves the impression that her thoughts apply to only or mainly this particular class.

Occasionally an individual woman is mentioned, an Elisabeth or a Mary; a queen or a great lady. But by no means could middle-class women with nothing but brains and character at their command have taken part in any one of the great movements which, brought together, constitute the historian’s view of the past (44-45).

The statement above could be connected to what was mentioned earlier regarding the differences between the middle class and the upper class. As stated earlier the middle class emphasized the importance of merits instead of privilege by birth, as opposed to the upper class. The quote clearly indicates that according to the narrator the plebeian middle-class woman with brains and character was excluded from history. If there is any individual woman mentioned at all she was of noble heritage – a queen or a great lady. The reference to the exclusion of the middle-class woman is of course primarily intended to enlighten the readers
of the absence of middle-class woman through history. However, when viewed from another perspective the word “middle class” pinpoints Woolf’s unintentional blindness caused by her social stratum leaving out the working-class woman.

There are other such instances where a passing remark signals the intended audience: “Mrs Behn was a middle-class woman with all the plebeian virtues of humour, vitality and courage; a woman forced by the death of her husband and some unfortunate adventures of her own to make her living by her wits” (63), “when the middle-class woman took to writing, she naturally wrote novels” (67) and “The middle-class women began to write” (65). These quotes also demonstrate Woolf’s continuous reference to the middle-class woman. By employing the word “middle-class” Woolf attempts to strengthen her message and inform the reader about the plebeian status of women compared to their male counterparts but she fails to mention the vast number of women from the working class, therefore indirectly excluding women from this particular class from her scope. It is interesting to note that Woolf, in my reading, becomes a victim of her own criticism; she accuses historians of excluding the middle-class women but she herself fails to mention the working-class women in her text therefore excluding these women from history. Woolf’s reference to the “middle-class” in the quotes above can easily be exchanged and replaced with “working-class” further demonstrating the exclusion and her unintentional blindness.

In “Radical Readers at the British Museum: Eleanor Marx, Clementine Black, Amy Levy”, Susan David Bernstein mentions the aspect that a solitary room that a woman from the middle class could call her own was a rarity, thus Woolf’s attempt to encourage women to claim a room of their own must have been an impossibility for many women from the working class. As mentioned earlier by Light, a large part of the working-class served as domestic labourers. The situation for domestic labourers in Victorian England is difficult to recreate due to the scarce information or data collected from this group. Domestic servants
had no union, and were not involved in discussions concerning politics or class struggle. They were also overlooked due to the fact that their services did not have any “exchange value” and therefore failed to appear in contemporary documentation. The women mostly considered their work as temporary in hope of marriage; although some stayed on even after marriage (Roberts 19). To estimate the working hours for domestic servants proves to be complex, but according to collected data a “typical” day for a housemaid extended from 6am to 10pm with a two-hour “break” spread out during the day, which included meals and needlework (20). An average wage for a domestic servant is also difficult to estimate. However, according to advertisements from The Times average annual wages for 1907 were 19£ 10s for general servants and 26£ 8s for parlour maids. It is also necessary to calculate the monetary value of lodging and clothing that was provided by the employer (22). An interesting insight is that domestic servants had a clear wage advantage compared to other female workers. Despite the fact that other female workers were paid even less, Woolf mentions: “I hope, that you will investigate when you have five hundred a year of your own – ” (37) clearly stating her wish for women to earn or be bequeathed five hundred pounds a year to write fiction. Yet, her desire only applies to her intended audience – the middle-class woman. Comparing Woolf’s statement above (of 500£ a year) to the reality of a domestic maid (earning 19£ 10s a year), evidently indicates that working-class women had an immensely difficult time to relate to the sum of five hundred pounds a year which Woolf mentions, compared to their annual wages as suggested by Roberts.

The fact that Woolf mentions five hundred pounds as a requirement for intellectual development elucidates and reveals her class bias very clearly; in reality such a sum of money was well beyond the reach of women from the working class. A Room of One’s Own discusses the importance of fiscal independence and its effect on creativity; however Robinson also emphasizes Woolf’s class bias in her feminist agenda. Robinson brings up
the term freedom and its complexity; she discusses this concept and the discourse between men and women. She suggests that Woolf comes close to defining a solution for women, albeit a biased one, “The only way to escape this and to bring this essay to a close is to speak in political terms. In *A Room of One’s Own*, Virginia Woolf comes very close to it, but the solutions she hints at are restricted by their idiosyncratic nature and their class bias.” (135) Woolf is profoundly committed to identifying and enlightening the concept of freedom between men and women, but is restricted to finding a complete resolution due to her class bias. I believe that the quote illustrates another perspective of Woolf’s polemic message of equality between men and women. The quote demonstrates that her message excludes many women from being included in concept of freedom because she focuses on her intended audience – the middle class. Thus the concept of freedom becomes problematic because it is primarily discussed within the boundaries of the middle class.

The fundamental insight of *A Room of One’s Own* is that the oppression of women both psychologically and culturally is the result of economic dependency (Robinson 136). This is illustrated by the following passage in *A Room of One’s Own*: “Of the two – the vote and the money – the money, I own, seemed infinitely the more important” (37). With this statement Woolf of course stresses the importance of economic independence in order for women to obtain intellectual independence and political emancipation. Her argument is of utmost importance in her struggle for women’s liberation when she claims that money is more important than the vote, implying that liberation can only start with economic independence. However, another way of viewing this statement is that Woolf places financial independence higher than political influence and this can perhaps be interpreted differently than how she primarily intended it to be. The statement provides the impression that Woolf’s attitude towards financial independence actually contributes to the division of the classes, by making monetary factors an obstacle for many poorer women. Robinson claims that, according to
Woolf, it is insignificant whether the five hundred pounds a year are bequeathed or earned, what is important is that “the money” as Woolf states is the crucial factor of intellectual freedom and creativity. The statement is somewhat contradictory; choosing the money over the vote indirectly advocates that only some women can partake in public discourse, women who are privileged and economically independent.

The women suffrage movement in Woolf’s contemporary society was a movement that brought together women (and some men) from different classes of society. Their struggle was based on the democratic idea that regardless of a person’s gender, position in society and financial status all citizens should have the ability to practise their right as citizens and affect society by voting. In contrast, Woolf’s choosing the money over the vote might exclude women without financial independence; also Woolf expresses a somewhat condescending approach to equal franchise and the suffrage movement that many women supported. Robinson provides an aspect connected to the topic: “Extending privilege without sex bias but within a small class also means giving a few women a stake in maintaining the system” (136). This furthers the connection between privilege and wealth, which only allowed a small group of women to thrive. Robinson also reveals another aspect of Woolf’s take on money and the suffrage movement, suggesting that Woolf believed that the suffrage was directly linked to the emancipation of women merely on a political level and not on an economic level.

It is important to clarify Woolf’s attitude towards economic independence and to state how seriously she addressed this issue. Woolf believed that the foundation of psychological and intellectual independence was primarily based on economic independence; it liberated women from being dependent on men to support them financially. To have a room of one’s own like the one that Woolf described demonstrates that a female writer obtained financial independence and provided herself with a protected space where she could be
creative (Bayuk 43-44). Although Woolf’s intentions were important for women and the suffrage movement, she tended to focus on financial status and placed material independence as one of the most important factors. By doing so Woolf disregarded the importance of the vote and the necessity for working class women to achieve emancipation even without wealth.

Another aspect of importance is Woolf’s ladylike manner in *A Room of One’s Own* which has also been criticized. This also strengthens her class bias excluding working-class women from her feminist message. In *A Room of One’s Own: Women Writers and the Politics of Creativity* Ellen Bayuk Rosenman mentions that Woolf’s ladylike manner infuriated many critics that claimed that she, especially in *A Room of One’s Own*, adhered to the stereotypical expectations of ladylike manner that she so desperately opposes: “Rather than inspire women, the essay perpetuates inhibitions against female self-expression, particularly against female anger” (20). The ladylike appearance demonstrates a direct connection to the “typical” Victorian woman from the upper and middle classes of society. A parallel could also be drawn to Benson’s suggestion earlier in the text regarding social criteria which acted as an instrument separating the middle class from the working class. This aspect could be directly linked to Bayuk’s claim regarding the infuriation caused by Woolf’s ladylike manner.

When Woolf fulfilled the social criteria that divided the middle class and the working class she also represented a typical middle-class woman who adhered to the conventions and expectations of her social stratum. Many women, particularly from the upper class, generally seemed to find the ladylike role appealing, partly due to the stature of Queen Victoria as an icon figure that epitomized the importance of motherhood. The Queen was also a reflection of status and power. Activities connected to the areas such as philanthropy might be considered one of the few areas where women were encouraged to participate; the area of philanthropy was merely an extension of the private sphere in the public sphere. Likewise to
be involved in charity was also perceived as a proper activity for a lady; the Anglican Church supported this “feminine activity”, and the image complemented or was well suited for the prototypical “Victorian Lady”. However charity work was only meant for women of the higher classes; women of lower status continued to serve the higher classes mainly as domestic staff.

The image of the ladylike Victorian woman also led to a clear division between male and female, which restricted women to the private sphere and men to the public sphere (Hall 88-89). Although Woolf wanted to encourage the liberation of women breaking free from the norms imposed on them by society, her writing reflects her class bias in terms of representing the stereotypical middle-class Victorian woman in certain aspects. Thus, in a paradoxical sense, Woolf can be said to have contributed to the rigid position of women in her contemporary society and acted according to what was expected of her in her social class. Light also addresses the issue and adds that class boundaries were something that was commonly upheld by the general public which was very defensive of their class privileges. Light especially suggests that behaviour associated with the working class was frowned upon (247-248).

In conclusion, I have focused on three different perspectives: readings of A Room of Ones Own, Woolf’s biography and the historical context, in order to illustrate the exclusion of working-class women from Woolf’s feminist message. The readings of A Room of One’s Own have been integrated throughout the entire paper to further demonstrate, in a tangible manner, how Woolf excludes the women from the working class. Other examples such as Woolf’s ladylike manner recognised as a quintessential trait connected to her social stratum demonstrating her class bias. Other arguments that also further demonstrate Woolf’s class bias and the exclusion of working class women is the reference to the term “middle class”, the sum of five hundred pounds and the historical middle-class authors. The arguments
connected to the authors also evince how Woolf is, perhaps, unaware that her message implies that only some women are able to write fiction, leaving other women to attend to their domestic needs, and are therefore unable to partake in the feminist message. The historical aspect which mainly focuses on the class system and in particular the situation for domestic labourers provides an understanding of the discourse and situation many women encountered in Woolf’s contemporary society. This clearly indicates that many women had great difficulty to relate to the message of emancipation in *A Room of One’s Own*. The amalgamation of the historical aspect, biographical aspect and the readings of the text *A Room of One’s Own* demonstrate Woolf’s blindness and class bias which cause her to exclude women from the working class. The analysis and the arguments given therefore provide a different approach to and another perspective of *A Room of One’s Own*. 
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