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Introduction

“To Live Correctly”:
Themes and the Significance of Character

In his 1927 book of essays, Notes on Democracy, newspaperman and social critic H. L. Mencken turned his sharp wit and pen against social purity and social hygiene reform groups such as the Committee of Fourteen, New York City’s longest-lived antivice society and the primary focus of this study.

Puritan legislation, especially in the field of public law, is a thing of many grandiose pretensions and a few simple and ignoble realities. The Puritan, discussing it voluptuously, always tries to convince himself (and the rest of us) that it is grounded upon altruistic and evangelical motives—that its aim is to work the other fellow’s benefit against the other fellow’s will. Such is the theory behind prohibition, comstockery, vice crusading and all of its other familiar devices of oppression. That theory, of course, is false. The Puritan’s actual motives are (a) to punish the other fellow for having a better time in the world, and (b) to bring the other fellow down to his own level.¹

Mencken could dismiss antivice crusaders as self-deceiving prudes but historians cannot. What follows is a history of a proposed criminal law reform of the 1920s to be achieved through statutory revision, known as “the customer amendment.” This 1924 proposal to prosecute the customers of prostitutes bound together unlikely allies in the campaign to secure a statutory amendment to New York State’s vagrancy statute. Two differing reform organizations found themselves united: the representative of traditional nineteenth-century purity reform—the Committee of Fourteen, and feminists interested in establishing new social relationships between the genders; in particular, the National Woman’s Party. As will be seen, not only did the
traditionalists and the feminists find themselves unexpectedly allied, but opposition to the criminal law proposal also arose from an unexpected source, from within the ranks of the purity reformers. New York City housing reformer Lawrence Veiller assisted in organizing the Committee of Fourteen in 1905, and he served on the committee’s board of directors when it voted in 1920 to launch the campaign for the customer amendment—over his opposition. As a result, Veiller separated himself from the Committee of Fourteen and used his position as secretary of the Committee on the Criminal Courts of the Charity Organization Society (COS) to direct the opposition to the customer amendment. He found support for his organization among other influential members of New York City’s governing elites such as key police department authorities and powerful members of New York City’s much-celebrated bench and bar. In time, and because of Veiller’s efforts, the opposition to the proposed criminal law amendment to New York’s vagrancy statute blocked the reform’s enactment.

Looking back at this social purity/social hygiene reform effort, it is not surprising that the proposal to prosecute men patronizing prostitutes did not become public policy in the 1920s. Intriguing, however, is the question of why proponents of this criminal law amendment believed the reform to be a viable public policy option at that time and why the opposition thought the proposed social and criminal law reform dangerous enough to work hard to defeat it. The answers come from understanding the motivations and goals of this group of social purity reformers and their associated allies.

In order to unpack the meaning and significance of this proposed purity reform, it is necessary to understand a series of overlapping issues. One such issue was the rifts (occasionally great) among the various organizations within the matrix of social purity/social hygiene and sexual reformers supporting and opposing the proposed customer amendment in the 1920s. Often in the history of early-twentieth-century reform movements the differences among reformers—progressives all—on the appropriateness or inappropriateness of any proposed reform has not been sufficiently stressed and interpreted. Historians have had a difficult time coming to grips with the 1920s as historian John Braeman details in his 1998 article reappraising the era. This episode in New York State legal and social history reveals the divisions among the strains of the “progressive” reformers who stayed the course of reform in the 1920s. While little scholarly debate continues on whether progressivism lasted into the 1920s, and no one any longer doubts it did, this story demonstrates that at least among the purity reformers in New York City, progressivism did not decline nor was it defunct; cultural reformers concerned about the sexual politics of their era pressed on and were taken seriously at the time.
With the exception of David Pivar in his 2002 book, *Purity and Hygiene: Women, Prostitution, and the “American Plan,” 1900–1930*, most modern historians have missed or underestimated the vibrant healthy quality to the domestic and international social purity/social hygiene reform movements in the 1920s. Perhaps this account will continue to rectify that shortcoming in the historical literature. Efforts for and against the customer amendment provide a unique opportunity to assess the divisions and disputes within the ranks of the purity reformers themselves. For example, the customer amendment reflected the values and visions of traditional mainstream cultural reformers such as the Committee of Fourteen as well as the values and vision of one branch of the feminist reformers like the National Women’s Party. Explaining how this proposed change to New York State’s criminal code embodied those values and visions provides the legal history to be examined here. Further, an examination of this alliance between the traditionalist and feminist reformers for what that alliance suggests about cultural conflict in New York City and by implication for the larger United States culture is also presented.

Another issue this study seeks to understand is one of focus and context. This admitted microstudy rather than a national macrostudy of one purity reform proposal in New York City in the 1920s offers an interpretation of the efficacy of legal reform. With a study of this nature, an appreciation of the interplay between criminal law reform and the social purity/social hygiene movement can be highlighted and interpreted. Additionally, part of the explanation of why the old (by the 1920s) antivice efforts at purity reform no longer appealed to large constituencies involves a description of the changing nature and composition of the sex work of prostitution in 1920s New York City. Purity and sexual reformers held certain assumptions about prostitution and the women in the trade that they had acquired in their earlier antiprostitution efforts in the 1910s, assumptions that failed to change as prostitution adapted to the changing world of the 1920s. As a result, reformers’ ideas and explanations about the prostitution trade, and the reality of the trade, drifted further and further apart. As time passed, reformers’ solutions for the social problem failed to address the real-world issues, thereby inadvertently making their solutions appear extreme, even wrongheaded.

Perhaps the most important issue dealt with by this study of the proposed customer amendment is the role and use of the criminal law in moral reform—a study in twentieth-century legal instrumentalism. Some social engineering and reform goals the law cannot affect, but that truism must be learned and relearned by the waves of reformers who have struggled with the plethora of perceived social problems in the course of US history. It was no different for this group of social purity reformers in New York City during the
1920s. Although the proponents of the customer amendment possessed great
faith—exactly the word—that the law could be used as the avenue to a new,
more moral urban world, the law's own standards and traditions ranging from
rarefied legal rules, doctrines, and conventions down to procedural customs of
the city's vice squad all proved resistant to reform. Further, because the cus-
tomer amendment meant modifying New York State's vagrancy statute, these
purity reformers faced the problem of the legislative process. They bore the
burden of convincing New York State legislators to make statutory changes;
therefore, the reformers had to overcome the legislators' reluctance to alter
established legal traditions in the criminal law for what appeared to the legis-
lators to be light and transient causes. Unless reformers demonstrated a unit-
ified front to the New York State senators and representatives and demonstrated
the political, legal, and social need for their reform of vagrancy law, they stood
little chance of legislative success. Supporters of the proposed amendment
failed to meet both of these standards. Yet in spite of the split among the tra-
ditionalists, the opposition from influential social hygiene groups, the grow-
ing gap between antiprostitution rhetoric and the reality of prostitution, and
the serious questions about the criminal law's ability to act as a catalyst for
social purity/social hygiene reform, the Committee of Fourteen and their allies
in the National Woman's Party pressed ahead with their reform campaign and
the defense of individual character. How these cultural reformers advanced
their efforts, the content and substance of their arguments regarding the vari-
ous policy options they considered, and the ultimate failure of this proposed
criminal law reform are the heart of this story.

Because of its unusually rich documentary heritage and its centrality to the
campaign for the customer amendment, New York City's longest-lived, pri-
vatly funded antivice committee, the Committee of Fourteen, stands at the
center of this narrative. As will be further described and analyzed in chapter 1,
a key institution for the Committee of Fourteen in its fight to repress the trade
of prostitution was New York City's Women's Court that met in the Jefferson
Market Court House, Greenwich Village. During the 1920s, most of the city's
prostitution cases came to the bar in that high Victorian building, now a
branch of the New York Public Library system. On the inside of the building's
turret, above the stairway which led to the main courtroom, is carved this epi-
gram: "The precepts of the law are these: to live correctly, to do injury to none,
and to render to everyone his own." To aid people "to live correctly," antipro-
stitution and social purity/social hygiene groups such as the Committee of
Fourteen relied on the state's criminal code to establish and enforce public
standards and to oversee the moral quality of cities like New York City.
Occasionally such groups decided that they needed better, more effective laws
to be more effective. This study analyzes one such social purity and criminal law reform campaign by the Committee of Fourteen and its allies to amend New York's vagrancy statute to better prosecute the customers of prostitutes.

Moral reformers matter whether they are the anticigarette or antihandgun activists of more modern times or the antiprostitution reformers of the 1920s. Their efforts are worthy of close scrutiny. As part of the complex social and urban tapestry of New York City during approximately the first third of the twentieth century, the Committee of Fourteen ought to be better appreciated in the general history of the city. By the 1920s New York City had long been the United States' most important cultural center for the arts, a manufacturing center as well as the center of finance, banking, and law; the nation's cosmopolitan center. A moral reform association operating in that environment as long-lived and influential as the Committee of Fourteen deserves appraisal. As the longest-lived of the antivice committees in the nation's most important city, the Committee of Fourteen's role in assisting the police monitor the moral health and quality of the city has not received enough attention. Taming the “immoral city” was a motivating factor for the Committee of Fourteen. To make the city a more moral and decent place (even if “moral” and “decent” are defined with the biases of the majority middle-class culture) formed an important goal of the committee and its proposed “customer amendment,” of the 1920s.

Just as social purity/social hygiene reform matters, so too does character. Through the customer amendment the committee sought not only to defend the individual character of the women and men involved in the sex trade of prostitution, but also to maintain the character of the city. Concerns about character motivated individuals and groups, like the earlier New York Society for the Suppression of Vice led by Anthony Comstock or the later Committee of Fourteen, to preserve and defend moral character against vice, corruption, and those persons without sufficient moral weight. Lastly, the committee and its values suggest the limits of moral reform and the use of criminal law to achieve social purity/social hygiene reform. Moral reformers of all stripes seek to set their reforms into social concrete of the law, to nudge public policy in a direction they believe socially desirable and then freeze that change into the black-letter law of statutes. This goal of legal reform can be demonstrated throughout US history and this microstudy demonstrates how strong that impulse was in the supposedly nonreformist era of the 1920s. These reformers had influence in 1920s New York City and their mentalité, goals, and visions for a better city have become a story of a road not taken, but also a story of a road perhaps wrongly taken.

Chapter 1 reviews the founding and purposes of the Committee of Fourteen.
Their proposed customer amendment of 1924 was just one of the committee’s many proposed legal actions over the course of its twenty-seven-year existence even though the customer amendment consumed the bulk of the committee’s energies in the 1920s. For example, the committee lobbied successfully for the passage of New York State’s 1910 Page Law, which strengthened the powers of the local Women’s Court. This statute required the fingerprinting of convicted prostitutes to trace recidivism and its Section 79 required their medical examination. If found infected, the statute allowed the state to detain women for up to one year; if certified as cured, a woman could be released earlier.7 Through such legal reform, the committee sought to raise the moral quality of New York City by identifying and detaining diseased prostitutes.

Of particular importance for the pro-customer amendment campaign was the action and beliefs of the committee’s long-serving general secretary, Frederick H. Whitin. Whitin’s personal commitment to and belief in the reform will be examined in depth as the best reflection of the committee’s hopes for the proposed social purity reform. If Frederick Whitin best represented those favoring the customer amendment, then New York housing reformer and Committee of Fourteen member Lawrence Veiller best represented its opposition. Chapter 2 provides a brief overview of the National Women’s Party and its members’ interest in the customer amendments, then assesses the changing sex trade of prostitution in New York City. From the 1910s through the 1920s the nature of the work, composition, and location of prostitution shifted because of demography, technology, and new structures of sex work. As a result, reformers’ rhetoric about the trade decreasingly reflected the reality of prostitution. Chapter 2 analyzes why this gap between reformers’ rhetoric and urban reality occurred and how it affected the reformers’ arguments for and against the 1924 amendment.

In chapter 3, vagrancy law and moral and social reformers’ perception that society’s betterment could be achieved through more efficient and effective vagrancy prosecutions are explained and analyzed. Also examined in the third chapter are police procedures regarding arrest and treatment of those accused of prostitution. In 1921, in order to test the effectiveness of New York State’s vagrancy statute (Code of Criminal Procedure, §887, subdivision 4) as applied against men who paid women for sexual contact, the Committee of Fourteen organized and aided the prosecution of a test case in the city’s Magistrates’ Court. In People v. Breitung (1921), the topic of the fourth chapter, the reformers’ hopes and expectations clashed with the law’s standards and traditions in a City Magistrates’ court opinion. What policy options to pursue in their quest to prosecute the customers of prostitutes forms the substance of chapter 5, while chapter 6 examines reformers’ expectations for and opposition to the
Committee of Fourteen’s proposed reform of New York State’s vagrancy statute. Frederick Whitin, the Committee of Fourteen, and their feminist allies in the National Women’s Party convinced several New York assemblymen and senators to sponsor their proposed “Customer Amendment.” Whitin, for the proposal, and Veiller, against the proposal, appeared before the appropriate legislative committee to debate this proposed step in the repression of sexual immorality. Chapter 7 analyzes what supporters and opponents of the customer amendment told the legislators and explains why the opposition not only prevailed in the first round of hearings and arguments—as discussed in chapter 8—but also continued to thwart successfully all further endeavors to secure statutory reform through the close of the decade. Some closing remarks and suggestions on the use of social purity reform through the criminal law and its meaning or the larger culture and society constitute the substance of the final chapter. That chapter also suggests that based on recent decisions by the US Supreme Court that the clash of traditionalists and sexual reformers has not disappeared, but rather is alive and well.

This story reaffirms the old lesson that, in assessing history, it is often as important to know what did not occur as it is to know what took place. Mencken’s scorn for and dismissal of vice crusaders may have earned him praise from the newspaper-reading population and sold newspapers and books, but the antiprostitution, social purity/social hygiene crusaders of the 1920s took themselves seriously, comported themselves seriously, and were treated seriously by others. In the 1910s purity reformers Frederick Whitin and the Committee of Fourteen articulated a reform program of repression of moral threats through the state’s criminal law that was largely achieved by 1919. Their work led to the closing of the red-light districts and the onset of national prohibition. By the twenties, such cultural reformers looked forward to continuing purity reform in the new world of postwar America. New York City police arrested thousands of women over the course of the committee’s life, and thousands went to jail because of evidence gathered and used against them in the Women’s Court by the Committee of Fourteen. When conservative moral crusaders such as the committee, defending traditional moral values, joined forces with sexual reform crusaders such as the National Women’s Party, their coalition formed a potentially powerful interest group. This alliance hoped to redraw the lines of appropriate and inappropriate relations between the sexes by limiting male sexuality either as the means of strengthening “character” which would lead to a moral New York City and urban environment for the committee or as the means to changing and to equalizing power in gender relations for the feminists. Not until the late twentieth century would this coalition of the moral right and the feminist left join together again in a public attack on
sexuality generally and male sexuality in particular. But this recent coalition against pornography had already been anticipated, seventy years earlier, in the efforts to secure the social purity/social hygiene reform of the customer amendment. When industrialist and millionaire Edward Breitung visited his mistress in July 1921, his behavior constituted the type of male behavior that traditionalist and feminist reformers sought to eliminate, or at the very least, to suppress. How to apply and alter New York State's statutory criminal law and legal traditions to affect, control, transform, and reform male behavior such as Breitung's forms the starting point of the legal history of the customer amendment and the Committee of Fourteen.

Primarily this study contributes to US legal history, but it also advances the scholarly reassessment of the decade of the 1920s. Previous historical interpretations of the era have suggested new manners of conceptualizing the era and assessing those interpretations allows this work's contribution to the field to be gauged. Americans experienced a major cultural shift in the 1920s. This cultural change was both noticed and not noticed in the 1920s to the point that the author of the most influential book on the era, Frederick Lewis Allen's Only Yesterday (1931), glanced back in exaggerated awe, fear, loathing, and bewilderment at the rush of events of the 1920s. Historians' explanations of the twenties as a disorganized jumble, a barely intelligible era, inherited from Allen's Only Yesterday, continues to the present day. George D. Moss, in his widely used textbook America in the Twentieth Century (1997), opens his chapter on the twenties:

The 1920s were a complex, vital, and divided decade, an era of conflict and contrast. Americans during the 1920s were forward-looking and reactionary, liberal and repressive, progressive and nostalgic. A majority of Americans enjoyed a life of unprecedented material abundance and leisure. But poverty plagued millions of small farmers, industrial workers, and nonwhite minorities. Prosperity eradicated neither poverty nor social injustice from the land.

Frederick Lewis Allen would be pleased with Moss's description of the 1920s; but Allen's shadow is unnecessarily long. Whereas Allen and Moss describe the period too simply as one of “conflict and contrast,” more recently and more accurately other historians, especially Warren I. Susman, Stanley Coben, and John Burnham, have reinterpreted the importance of the decade. In his 1984
book, *Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society*, cultural historian Susman devotes a chapter to the 1920s. Taking his cue from Willa Cather (“The world broke in two in 1922 or thereabouts, and the persons and prejudices recalled in these sketches slide back into yesterday’s seven thousand years.”), Susman rightly laments the image of the period inherited from Allen. “Too often,” he wrote, “historians see the decade all too simply as the consequences of involvement in World War I, or as a time of prosperity or of troubles leading to the Depression—or even as an era between two World Wars. They have been unable to present an overview that satisfactorily relates the period to the overall context of historical development.” The context Susman sought was not the 1920s as an anomaly between periods of “good” reforms, the Progressive Era and the New Deal, but rather the 1920s as the closing decade in a long period of US cultural reform begun with the 1860 Republican election victory and perhaps begun as early as the 1820s. The 1920s saw social purity/social hygiene reform in the defense of character as the latest variation of a long reform tradition. It was the New Deal with its liberal, “modern” values of huge direct federal government intervention in the economy and culture together with the clash of interest-group politics setting policy—the brokered state—that was new, different, and out of the longer US reform tradition.

Susman’s criticism of historians and of their current understanding of the twenties is convincing, but he does not try to explain why they have not done a better job of placing and analyzing the decade in “the overall context of historical development.” The answer lies within professional historians themselves. Too often historians of the 1920s have overlooked the continuity of the 1920s reform with reforms of earlier eras and too often historian have been too enamored with the federal government reforms of the 1930s. Additionally, Susman took insufficient account of the cultural value of “character.”

Two historians have answered Susman’s call for a reassessment and a better contextual interpretation of the 1920s. First, in his 1991 *Rebellion against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America*, Stanley Coben presented an intellectual history of the revolt against late-nineteenth-century convention and conception of “character.” This key cultural concept of character led Coben to examine the arguments of reformers and elite intellectuals of the 1920s—writers, feminist leaders, black leaders, and, with complete consistency, even the leaders of the Ku Klux Klan. What these reformers of the 1920s sought to change or to uphold was the nineteenth-century ideal of “character.” According to Coben, “the configuration of virtues” represented by character formed a “cult of character” that “went far toward defining an American Victorianism.” He provided a useful unpacking of the various meanings of “character”:
Dependably self-controlled, punctual, orderly, hardworking, conscientious, sober, respectful of other Victorians' property rights, ready to postpone immediate gratification for long-term goals, pious toward a usually friendly God, a believer in the truth of the Bible, oriented strongly toward home and family, honorable in relations with other Victorians, anxious for self-improvement in a fashion which might appear compulsive to modern observers, and patriotic.16

But not everyone who might demonstrate these values and attributes was “Victorian” or participated in the Victorian cult of “character.” These standards applied only to a particular social association, one described by Coben as “the British American ethnic group.” By identifying these traits with old-stock, white, male, Anglo-Saxon Protestants, other people, ethnic groups, and religious believers could be excluded from the culture of character and from serious consideration by that dominant culture. As Coben pointed out, character combined with Social Darwinism to form a power paradigm of social explanation that motivated waves of social and moral reformers in the early twentieth century either to defend this worldview or to struggle against it.17

United in an unspoken agreement about the importance of character, cultural reformers could and did disagree about the best means to support, advance, or check this paradigm. As will be seen, those purity reformers who opposed the customer amendment did so in the name of defending character while those reformers who supported the customer amendment did so as the best means to ensure that character could be protected and advanced by criminal law reform. At the same time, feminists, as reformers of the culture, supported the customer amendment as one device to level the playing field of character to include feminists as participants in the establishment of the social and sexual standards and politics of character.

Coben’s assessment and critique of Victorianism and its basis in “character” as seen through the lens of the intelligentsia of the United States aids in the understanding of what changed and what lasted in the cult of character in the society. As Coben concluded, much of Victorianism has weathered away in US culture under the weight of the liberal reforms of the 1930s and since; yet, deep attachment to family and home has remained in US life and culture.18 And while Coben reviewed the outsiders who struggled against Victorianism (and some who sought to uphold the ideal), he could have found exactly the tensions he describes within the social strata that sought to preserve and expand the cult of character. Although not an arbiter of elite culture, the Committee of Fourteen with its commitment to vice reform, social purity, and social
hygiene drew much of its strength and support from its defense of “character” against the multitude of large and small urban, social, and moral threats.

To social purity/social hygiene reformers small threats to character could, in time, be fatal to persons if not caught and checked because small moral flaws formed the edge of the wedge of larger, more dangerous social problems and individual failures. How small vices became socially acceptable over the course of the twentieth century provided the topic of historian John C. Burnham’s important 1993 book, Bad Habits: Drinking, Smoking, Taking Drugs, Gambling, Sexual Misbehavior, and Swearing in American History. In his reassessment of the 1920s, Burnham shoulders an ambitious and difficult task: to explain the “inversion of values” over the course of the twentieth century. Put another way, Burnham asked how and why it was that in 1910 what were considered major and minor vices were disdained and shunned by respectable people—vices such as drinking, smoking, taking drugs, gambling, sexual misbehavior, and swearing—would, by 1990, constitute the very standards by which the Americans judge themselves. By the late twentieth century, the lines between the respectable and unrespectable had blurred. For Burnham, the United States and its cultural values had “turned upside down”—vices became respectable and the previously respectable, the defenders of character like moral reformers, became shunned. For Burnham, like Susman and Cather, the key time frame for this shift in cultural values was the 1920s.

That this deep cultural shift occurred during the 1920s is particularly ironic because it was a time when two of the most important and long-sought-after reforms in all of US history took effect: women’s suffrage and national prohibition. It is ironic that American culture shifted in the twenties because while the reformers expected the society and culture to change (through a sober population and, particularly, through sober female ballots), the key cultural changes that did occur had little, if anything, to do with women or voting or with social drinking. Instead, change occurred as a reaction against both of these so-called progressive reforms. Burnham caught this shift in values in his study of the minor vices. “One of the results of the post–World War I changes in standards [of respectability] was,” he wrote, “the separation of moral reform from other kinds of social reform in the United States.” Burnham argued (and later chapters herein support), “prosocial ‘good’ people no longer presented a single front of both moral and social uplift. The ‘respectables’ often lost touch with other kinds of reformers and hence were vulnerable to arguments that they ignored social wrongs.” In particular, 1930s liberal reformers lambasted moral reformers for their alleged intolerance of the minor vices (a direct result of prohibition’s success): even “miserable workers and exploited people deserved some gratification, however flawed,”
Burnham summarized. Therefore, instead of targeting the minor vices of the lower classes of US society, too many reformers “jettison[ed] moral uplift and de-emphasize[d] respectability” as they focused their energies on “social justice,” not on maintaining respectability and social values.\(^{22}\) And therein lies the double irony; just as the battle against John Barleycorn was won, many of the moral reformers surrendered and thereby lost the war on setting the standards of appropriate and inappropriate behavior for the larger culture. As a result of that surrender, interest groups and corporations who profited from the minor vices stepped into the void of values and began to reestablish social and moral standards that blurred the limits and lines of respectability: cigarettes became glamorous, swearing commonplace, and gambling respectable.\(^{23}\)

Defenders of traditional moralism such as the Committee of Fourteen constituted just one organization among the interlocking matrices of social purity/social hygiene reform groups in the early twentieth century. Other similar groups existed that opposed a variety of ills or promoted a variety of social causes such as anti-child labor, anti-school consolidation, and antisuffragists. Such “anti’s” questioned the rise of modernity. Social critic Bill Kauffman in his 1998 book, *With Good Intentions? Reflections on the Myth of Progress in America*, interpreted these historical “losers” and examined what motivated such people. Questioning “progress,” such people and groups understood, claimed Kauffman, that progress came with social costs. Such groups, he argued, “people our forgotten history. Most have gotten a bad historiographical press—when they are mentioned at all.”\(^{24}\) Such anti’s had lost their social standing and social suasion in the culture even though they and their social impulses lasted into the twentieth century. These antimoderns held a vision of society more appropriate for the nineteenth century than for the twentieth. As Kauffman stated the issue, such people were “Faithful to the Old Republic, motivated by agrarian bias even when they lived in cities, their bedrocks were (1) family autonomy; (2) a minimal state; and (3) human-scale communities.”\(^{25}\) These values may have put them at odds with the emerging modern liberal US culture, but their values also motivated such groups to persevere in their quest for more moral communities. While Kauffman did not point to the antiprostitution moral reform work of New York City’s Committee of Fourteen, or the social purity/social hygiene work of the larger and better known American Social Hygiene Society, the Committee of Fourteen fits his pattern of values of concerned people with good intentions suspicious of the emerging modern world.

More recently still, other interpretations of law and the control of morals in the late nineteenth or the early twentieth century have come forward that examine both the US experience and the larger Western experience with
moral reform. In 1995, Mary E. Odem published *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885–1920*, arguing that both legal changes and social anxieties contributed to increased social awareness and concern about working-class female sexuality. Examining issues in the borderlands of legal and social history such as age-of-consent campaigns, statutory rape prosecutions, and the rise of juvenile courts, Odem argued, “social purity campaigns did little to address the sources of sexual exploitation.” For Odem, instead of providing young women the social and economic tools necessary to challenge and resist sexual exploitation (in other words, to strengthen their character), new “liberal” social reformers’ efforts instead sought “to protect adolescent girls by restricting their sexual expression.” Further, while middle-class reformers created new laws and institutions to deal with delinquent daughters, it was working-class parents who participated in these new institutions of control even if those parents lacked much power within these new legal institutions. As this study argues, Odem, too, understands that American culture shifted in the 1920s and while the culture shifted, the institutions (and bias of those institutions of moral reform) of delinquent daughters continued into the twentieth century. Odem might have argued that a nongovernmental organization such as the privately funded Committee of Fourteen persisted into the 1920s and affected the lives of thousands of young women through that decade. Odem concludes that the “double standard of morality” in the law and the culture that punished women more severely than men for the same moral offense lasted long after the reforms of female delinquents occurred. The Committee of Fourteen understood that this double standard existed, and that inequality between the genders motivated them to press on for the customer amendment in order to equalize the genders’ treatment before the law.

But was the drift of the criminal law running only against women? Research from Great Britain by historian Martin J. Wiener in his key 1998 article, “The Victorian Criminalization of Men,” suggests that “Victorianism” “culturally reconstructed” women and “subjected [them] to new gender-based disciplines in the nineteenth century.” Less well known or understood, these same cultural values and trends affected and disciplined men as well. While historians have started to examine how the expanding nineteenth-century criminal justice system affected women, often overlooked, pointed out Weiner, was how “the law increasingly stigmatized and proscribed long accepted modes of male behavior.” Social hostility to traditionally aggressive male behaviors such as heavy drinking, public fighting, and the rough handling of women emerged in the nineteenth century. A new hostility to male violence began to emerge in the black-letter law as well as in the administration of justice. As Wiener
argued, “The ‘masculinization’ of crime and punishment was one of the most notable, but least noticed, facts of nineteenth-century British (and, indeed, western) criminal justice history.” He postulated that “a long-term expansion and intensification of the legal disciplining of men relative to women” occurred over the course of the nineteenth century. His intriguing and suggestive argument has not been tested in the United States, but it certainly can be glimpsed in the goals and hopes that the Committee of Fourteen invested in its customer amendment. By equalizing the treatment of men and women in prostitution cases and prosecuting the men involved with prostitution, these proposed legal reforms placed previously unknown controls on male public power. As will be seen, the customer amendment demonstrates that Wiener’s arguments about Great Britain have an important and equally overlooked US parallel.

In the comparative context of Western European history, three works have interpreted the social purity/social hygiene impulse as a public policy issue on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. In 1990, Alain Corbin examined the French regulationists and neoregulationists struggles about the best policies regarding prostitution in his *Women for Hire: Prostitution and Sexuality in France after 1850*. Nancy Bristow examined the federal government’s efforts to protect the morality of World War I soldiers through the establishment of the Committee on Training Camp Activities in *Making Men Moral: Social Engineering during the Great War*, and, previously mentioned, David J. Pivar revealed the intricate webs of connections and arguments between and among the social purity and social hygiene “scientists” of the early twentieth century in both the United States and Great Britain. Working within these networks of traditional and sexual reformers was New York City’s Committee of Fourteen.

This present work provides a case study that helps to measure the strength of nineteenth-century criminal law social purity reform into the twentieth century’s third decade. It takes seriously Burnham’s argument that the moral reformers divided their ranks and conceded control of the minor vices to others in the culture and Wiener’s argument that a general criminalization of men occurred in the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. This fracturing among the purity reformers and their ultimate inability to sway policymakers provided an opportunity for other individuals and interest groups to seize cultural leadership and, in time, alter the meaning and diminish the importance of personal character. In pursuing this case study, the following chapter sets the context for the decade-long effort by the Committee of Fourteen on behalf of the customer amendment.
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2. For analysis of the problems and issues in fund-raising and supporting reform committees such as the Committee of Fourteen, see Thomas C. Mackey, “Anti-Vice Funding


4. See Mayor John F. Hylan’s outburst against the Anti-Saloon League and the Committee of Fourteen, New York Times, 10 July 1923, 21, under the headline, “Hylan Again Scores Anti-Saloon League.”


6. The topic of “professionalism” has begun to receive some important analysis and interpretation. For good places to start understanding the development of the near “cult” of professionalism in America, see the work of Thomas L. Haskell, The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977); The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984); Objectivity Is Not Neutrality: Explanatory Schemes in History (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).

For the twists and turns of “professionalization” in history see Peter Novick, That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

7. Arguing from within self-justifying worlds while remaining unchanged by other arguments or evidence reminds one of the controversy surrounding the National Endowment for the Humanities in the late 1980s and early 1990s. For a review of that Kulturkampf, see Richard Bolton, ed., Culture Wars: Documents from the Recent Controversies in the Arts (New York: New Press, 1992).


10. *The Book of Saints: A Dictionary of the Servants of God Canonized by the Catholic Church.* 4th ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1947), 60. Saint Anthony (251–356) came from a well-to-do family at Coma in Egypt, but at age twenty he gave away his wealth to the poor and became a hermit. Anthony is credited with starting the monastic religious life when, in 305, he gathered hermits together in one place to live alone together in the service of God. Exactly why erysipelas came to be identified with Anthony is not known but sufferers of the condition came to ask him to intercede on their behalf against the condition. Erysipelas causes the skin to turn red which probably accounts for the term “St. Anthony’s fire.”


Alice Paul, leader of the National Woman’s Party, included in her party’s “Declaration of Principles” “that a double moral standard shall no longer exist, but one code shall obtain for both men and women.” Her next “Principle” stated, “That exploitation of the sex of women shall no longer exist, but women shall have the same right to the control of their persons as have men.” Alice Paul, “Declaration of Principles,” *Equal Rights* (17 February 1922): 5.


16. For the New York experience in revising the state’s prostitution statute in the 1960s and 1970s, see Pamela Ann Roby, “Politics and Prostitution: A Case Study of the Formulation, Enforcement, and Judicial Administration of the New York State Penal Laws on Prostitution, 1870–1970” (PhD diss., New York University, 1971); Pamela A. Roby,

Empirical research on whether “john” laws have actually deterred men from seeking out women in prostitution suggest that staff problems and funding have not deterred men seeking sex in exchange for money and that recent “gender neutral” laws are not administratively neutral. My impression from newspapers and scholarship is that purchased heterosexual sex is alive and well. See Frances Bernat, “New York State’s Prostitution Statute: Case Study of the Discriminatory Application of a Gender Neutral Law,” *Women & Politics* 4 (Fall 1984): 103–20.


Much is still to be done. For example, the connection between the market and masculinity is not well understood as historical construct. For a sampling of the work on the subtle yet important ripple effects of the market economy, see Thomas L. Haskell and Richard F. Teichgraeber, eds., *The Culture of the Market: Historical Essays* (New York:
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Cambridge University Press, 1993) and the enormous scholarship on the rise and effects of the market economy.


> It is now technically possible to reproduce without the aid of males (or, for that matter, females) and to produce only females. We must begin immediately to do so. The male is a biological accident: the \( y \) (male) gene is an incomplete \( x \) (female) gene that has an incomplete set of chromosomes. In other words, the male is an incomplete female, a walking abortion, aborted at the gene stage. To be male is to be deficient, emotionally limited; maleness is a deficiency disease and males are emotional cripples. (201)
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