**Swearing Allegiance:**
**Street Language, War Propaganda, and the Declining Status of Women in Urban Nightlife, 1900-1920**

In September of 1917, in the midst of the U.S. mobilization for World War I, Baltimore journalist H.L. Mencken wrote an article satirizing the Commission on Training Camp Activities' campaign to keep the new military recruits morally pure. Mencken, the consummate master of "the American language," pointed out the contradictions in the War Department's campaign by juxtaposing the prewar white slavery narratives which portrayed prostitutes as innocent victims with the wartime discourse which depicted all sexually-active women, prostitutes or not, as diseased harpies. With the evocative phrase "predatory country girls," Mencken emphasized the incompatibility of the prewar and wartime representations of prostitutes.[1] In this article, I will, like Mencken, juxtapose the strikingly different prewar and wartime descriptions of sexually active women. I will not, however, primarily examine the language of reform. The wartime characterization of prostitutes as vipers, vultures, and disease-spreading votaries was a sharp shift from the white slaves, innocent country girls, and prodigal daughters of the Progressive-era white slavery scare, but it also corresponded with a marked difference in the way men talked about women when the two sexes met in the very vice resorts that reformers condemned. The influence of wartime programs and propaganda went well beyond the realm of "official" discourse and influenced, to the detriment of working-class women's status, the "street" vernacular that men and women used in saloons, dance halls, nightclubs, and other ambiguously reputable entertainment establishments.

Mencken correlated the shifting discourse of social reformers with a step back in the social dynamics between men, women, and the state, but, in general, historians and other cultural

commentators from Frederick Lewis Allen to Henry May, and more recently Kathy Peiss, David Nasaw, and Susan Cahn have portrayed World War I as a turning point for sexual manners and mores in America – a libratory loosening up of the sexual restrictions on women.[2] But as Susan Sontag warned in 1973, "Sex as such is not liberating for women. Neither is more sex."[3] Since 2000, more historians, notably Elizabeth Clement, Jennifer Fronc, and Courtney Shah, have recognized World War I's complicated legacy for women on the town, arguing that the war encouraged a sense of masculine entitlement among the troop.[4] In general, however, historians have focussed on the way the war department persecuted all sexually active women, while downplaying the way official misogyny sanctioned a street-level disregard of women's agency. In this article, I build on Clement, Fronc, and Shah's excellent work to show how women, for all their determination to participate in the new popular culture on their own terms, operated in settings that stimulated a sense of masculine privilege beyond that embedded in the old red light districts. More women could participate in the cleaned-up cabarets and dance halls without irrevocably damaging their individual reputations, but the virulence of the wartime campaigns against sexually active women encouraged an extreme misogyny that reduced aggressive sporting women to exploited charity girls.

In order to show the decline in women's sexual status during the First World War, this article analyses the most obscene conversations that undercover investigators recorded before the war in diverse vice-related venues and during the war in commercial dance halls, cabarets, and other establishments where men and women met socially. Drawn from the documents of New York anti-vice associations, mainly the Committee of Fourteen, these conversations came from reports written by working-class men who fit into the disreputable and quasi-reputable settings

they investigated. Anti-vice reports provide a rare insight into the sexual codes central to the commercial recreation of the urban working class.[5] Although the investigators' records are not transparent, they nevertheless expose a striking change in the way men and women used obscene language before and during the war. Like printed pornography, conversational crudities in saloons and dance halls reveal in bold strokes the prejudices that people muted in polite society, but unlike the often equally obscene verbal epithets recorded in defamation cases, these labels went unchallenged and rarely entered the public record. As an illustrative extreme, sexual swear words and their conversational context provide a key to understanding changes in gender hierarchies.[6] Shifting street vernacular shows that during World War I, men gained power to the detriment of women's self-determination.

**The Official Story**

During World War I, the dominant discourse of anti-vice reform changed. Reformers stopped describing prostitution as an institutional problem based on the economic exploitation of women, and started defining prostitution as a medical problem of diseased individuals, specifically disease-spreading women.[7] A dramatic discursive development, this shift evolved as a consequence of the wartime implementation of Progressive-era plans to reduce commercial vice. Since 1910, anti-vice reformers of all rhetorical persuasions had argued that if they could abolish the municipally tolerated red-light districts, and dismantle the marketplace of urban vice, prostitution would wither away to an "irreducible minimum."[8] Readily recruited into the War Department, some well-connected reformers saw World War I as their opportunity to realize their long-cherished goals. When the Law Enforcement Division of the Commission on Training

Camp Activities (CTCA), succeeded in closing down over a hundred red-light districts, including the entrenched tenderloins in Seattle, San Antonio, and New Orleans, urban reformers across the country celebrated.[9] But when prostitution did not disappear, and soldiers continued to have sex and contract venereal disease, reformers grew disillusioned and anti-vice discourse changed. The training camp commissioners stopped blaming the pimps and madams and started blaming the prostitutes themselves.[10] Their anger did not, however, end with prostitutes.

With the new emphasis on soldiers' venereal health, the training camp officials extended their wrath to include all sexually-active young women.[11] By ordering men to "keep away from prostitutes priced and private," the CTCA made money irrelevant to a woman's reputation as a "whore."[12] Indeed, reformers' abhorrence toward "charity girls" and "patriotic prostitutes" exceeded their disgust for "professional prostitutes." Reformers reluctantly rationalized the prostitute's desire for money, but they made no such allowances for the "uniform-crazed" girls who traded sex for a night on the town.[13] Despite these distinctions, the CTCA condemned all women who engaged in sex with soldiers. After all, as one wartime pamphlet explained, if a woman was "willing to 'give you a good time,'" she must "have either [the] clap or syphilis or both."[14] Thus, even though statistics showed that more women named soldiers as the source of their infection than the reverse, the CTCA insisted on classifying women as the "carriers of venereal disease" and soldiers as their target for contagion.[15] Through mandatory sex education lectures, a movie, and literally a million printed pamphlets, the Commission ensured that troops repeatedly heard this message.[16] Reducing women to disease vectors legitimated a extreme misogyny that allowed government authorities to persecute women with impunity.

Six months into the war, the CTCA closed the Committee on Protective Work for Girls, which aided young women who gave into the "lure of the uniform," and opened the Section of Women and Girls in the Commission's Law Enforcement Division.[17] The new section treated sexually active women with complete disregard for their civl rights. No longer satisfied with women leaving the immediate area around the camps, the Section could now arrest anyone behaving suspiciously and test her for venereal infection.[18] Bascom Johnson, director of the Law Enforcement Division, elided protection with detention in a blunt endorsement of imprisonment: "How can we protect young girls?...By providing detention houses….How can we make prostitutes hard to find? By internment in State reformatories, etc."[19] More than just rhetoric, the federal government initially allocated $250,000 from the president's war emergency fund to create centers for quarantining women, but ended up spending over $400,000 to accommodate the women detained.[20] In the push to acquire sufficient housing, Section workers found recently abandoned brothels served their purposes well. With large reception rooms and many small bedrooms, parlor houses required little renovation to hold the imprisoned women. Builders merely added high walls and topped them with barbed wire to make the conversion from brothel to detention center complete.[21] In a bitter irony barely recognized at the time, wartime reformers confined their "prodigal daughters" in the very houses from which, at the peak of the white slavery scare, they had once sworn to free them.

Historians do not know how many women suffered from these policies. The war department claimed to have "helped care for 30,000 delinquent women and girls," which Elizabeth Alice Clement interpreted as incarceration.[22] In contrast, Alan Brandt argued that more than 18,000 women were committed to federally funded institutions between 1918 and 1920.[23]

Government investigators Mary Dietzler and Thomas Storey concluded in their 1922 report on detention houses for quarantined women that the CTCA interned 15,520 women.[24] These divergent figures only hint at the full impact of the CTCA's repressive turn. Federal officials only counted federal detainees. They excluded women held in local in jails and in local hospitals when they quantified the impact of their policy.[25] In Bedford Hills, one of New York State's reformatories for women, authorities capped the total numbers of women admitted, but during this time they noted a dramatic increase in women imprisoned for sexually related offenses to include 75% of the population. Prior to 1918, Bedford's supervisors never specifically isolated women in this way either categorically or statistically.[26] The internment of "promiscuous" women represented the most extreme impact of the CTCA's antipathy toward women, directly altering the lives of thousands, but the Commission's policies also incited lasting cultural changes in the way men treated women.

During the war, in the cafes, cabarets, and commercial dance halls of popular recreation, men started to talk about women differently. By closing the districts and implementing new policing practices, the CTCA and its agents encouraged a new social distance between men and women where men determined the terms of exchange. Under the CTCA's new regulatory regime, men first talked to other men, labeling the women around them in the most reductive ways imaginable. Their categories overrode women's self-definitions. By contrast, in the entertainment venues of the pre-war vice district, women not only initiated sexual solicitations more often then men, they also set the place and price. To show how women's autonomy changed over this period, the next section circles back to the prewar years and examines the obscenities men and women used during their leisure hours in commercial resorts.

**Swearing in Saloons**

Often overlooked by historians of popular culture, the back rooms of saloons were central to the story of mixed-sex leisure in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While the stereotype of the pre-Prohibition saloon evokes a row of white working-class men with their belly up to the bar, this image represents an ideal, and a regulatory construction, rather than a naturally occurring reality.[27] In the less discussed, but still significant second room of saloons, women were present as patrons, bartenders, proprietors, and prostitutes. Indeed, the "family room" was a feature in most downtown saloons. Also known as "wine rooms," back rooms catered to both men and women and often had music for dancing.[28] Size and layout, not entertainment offered, distinguished "concert saloons" from dance halls. The simplest offerings involved a piano and a "professor" to play it, but it was not uncommon for concert saloons and black-and-tans, their mixed-race corollaries, to have multi-piece bands.[29] The back rooms were, however, heterosocial with a difference. In these settings, men and women did not go out together, nor did they date, but they did meet and mingle. Most people assumed that if a woman frequented saloon "wine" rooms, she was probably a prostitute. Indeed men were arguably the only consumers in these scenarios.[30] The "wine rooms" of turn-of-the-century saloons served both sexes, but women usually comprised part of the services offered, while men were the privileged patrons and proprietors. Although men spent the money, as the "producers" in commercial nightlife, sporting women were bold and aggressive figures with great determinative power.

In saloon back rooms, men and women both used "vile language." And the crudity of their conversations reflected the disreputability of the setting. In 1901, a Mr. Arthur Wilson reported that in a Seventh Avenue black-and-tan, a mixed-race saloon, a "colored woman had her dress to her knees. A Negro who was also sitting there said to her, 'Lizzie, put down your clothes or we will see your fire cracker [sic].' She says, 'That's all right, Jones, you don't get any of my firecracker.'"[31] As part of the vice districts' "vocabulary of abuse," men and women tossed around terms like "cocksucker," "son of a bitch," and "god damn bitches," with casual disregard.[32] For example, eleven years later in another Seventh Avenue venue, a woman declared, "There's nothing but a lot of C - suckers in this place." To which Mike, a male patron, quipped, "oh no, I am the only 'C sucker' in the place." Inspiring the woman to exclaim, "Why you S of [a] B, I'm going to leave...." [33] Although these particular exchanges were more obscene than most of the conversations that anti-vice investigators recorded, men and women typically conversed, and cursed, together in the back room of saloons.

The overt heterosociability in downtown saloons, and the interchangeability of insults, challenges the canonical characterization of turn-of-the-century commercial nightlife.[34] Following the argument of Jon Kingsdale's seminal 1973 article, "The 'Poor Man's Club'," even usually sophisticated scholars of popular culture have interpreted the presence of prostitution in working-class saloons as a confirmation that saloons were a male domain, but by definition, if prostitution was present, so were women.[35] Often drunk, frequently profane, and almost always disreputable, the sporting women who socialized and solicited in saloons were visible, vocal players integral to urban nightlife. Women in saloons commodified their sex, but they hardly deferred to men's whims. Their relative power came through in both the language used by them

and used to describe them. Men and women indiscriminately embroidered their conversation with epithets, applying them with equal derision to both sexes. In an article that compared insults in New France to those of "Old" France, but in an observation that holds as true for pre-war versus wartime New York City, historian Peter Moogk argued that "sexual and social roles were more loosely defined" in communities that used "sexually interchangeable insults" than in those where the "pattern of abuse" followed more gendered lines.[36] If nothing else, women within New York's sporting world defied respectable conventions which deemed modesty more feminine than assertiveness.

A grammatical analysis of sporting women's obscenities underscores their agency. Unlike later obscene exchanges during the First World War, sporting women were "bitches" and "bums," and only on rare occasion were they fetishized body parts. "Cocksucker," a common epithet, was obscene, but it was also active: it defined people, who were as often female as male, by what they did. As an insult it reviled agents not objects. In this setting, the metonymized individual, the "cock," was the patron, not the prostitute. Moreover, men were just as frequently the target of insults as women. Saloon prostitutes sometimes ridiculed their customers' penises, giving a running commentary about the size and hardness of a man's penis for the amusement of the room.[37] This commentary could even turn into a sale's pitch. In 1912, in a hotel barroom on Myrtle Street in Brooklyn, when a man was slow to accept a prostitute's terms, the woman groped him saying, "I don't believe you have a prick." The man, perhaps feeling the need to prove his masculinity, acquiesced to her sexual advances.[38] If, as feminists argue, women fear rape and men fear laughter, then saloon "wine" rooms were not for the faint of heart of either

sex. Little respect existed between prostitutes and their customers, but the sexual dynamics in the low-down dives indicate that women played an influential role in this heterosocial arena.[39]

Just as saloons were not invariably male domains, neither was "saloon" necessarily a straightforward designation. The line dividing cafes, dives, dance halls, and concert saloons was often ambiguous. All of these commercial venues, generically called "resorts" in underworld parlance, let in most anyone who chose to enter. And as the twentieth century progressed, they appealed to an increasingly varied group of consumers. Changing licensing laws, and the desire to serve liquor to a mixed-sex clientele, meant that proprietors turned "saloons" into "cafes" and "dance halls" into "clubs" or whatever other names allowed for the maximum latitude under the law.[40] Vice venues clustered together in commercial neighborhoods, but under "liberal" municipal administrations, district proprietors established shooting galleries, pool parlors, vaudeville theaters, and cheap restaurants alongside the more traditional brothels and saloons. Thus, during the Progressive era, through the diversity of entertainment offered, red-light districts gained an implicit institutional legitimacy that blurred the line between respectable and disreputable nightlife.[41] As the new commercial popular culture, especially movies, music, and dancing, attracted young men and women of increasingly heterogeneous social backgrounds, this problem was compounded. On the eve of the First World War, the range of activities and the variety of venues associated with commercial nightlife obscured the distinctions between "licit" and "illicit" entertainment.[42] New York City's ambiguous moral geography is the setting for the conversations discussed in the next section.

**Dishing in Dance Halls**

The institutional overlap between the sporting culture of the old vice districts and the youth culture of the new popular recreation confused previously predictable sexual conventions. During World War I, however, men and women participating in urban nightlife adopted new social scripts that shifted the power to initiate sexual negotiations from women to men. This shift was not, however, particular to working-class recreation. Beth Bailey argued in *From Front Porch to Back Seat*, a history of courtship during the twentieth century, that within the white middle class the First World War irrevocably solidified the move from a female-supervised system of suitors calling on women in their homes to a male-initiated practice of dating in public places. Bailey ascribed men's new control over courtship to the long-term masculinist conventions of commercial leisure. And yet a similar disabling of women's agency occurred in urban nightlife. Prior to World War I, in the differentially reputable venues of commercial entertainment, women approached men as frequently as men approached women. Furthermore, if the couple agreed to have sex, the woman, not the man, set the price and dictated the place to which they would adjourn. Unlike the shift in respectable society from calling to dating, the loss of women's power in the sporting world did not coincide with a change from a domestic to a commercial locale, but rather resulted from a new set of regulatory circumstances. During the war, with women prohibited from approaching unknown men, male "go-betweens," namely waiters, bartenders, doormen, bell boys, became integral to the sexual negotiations in black-and-tans, cabarets, nightclubs, dance halls, and other ambiguously reputable venues that survived the CTCA's assault on urban nightlife.[43] The closure of tolerated tenderloins, and the suppression of

saloons, reinforced a larger trend in twentieth-century sexual conventions that privileged men and disempowered women.

By 1918, five years of saloon reform, and almost a year of wartime measures, dramatically changed the pattern of heterosocial interaction. The social distance between men and women increased at the same time that the social distance between men decreased. For most of the first two decades of the twentieth century, anti-vice reformers had attempted, with only limited impact, to squelch direct sexual solicitation. In New York, the Committee of Fourteen pressured proprietors of saloons, dance halls, and cabarets not only to suppress direct sexual solicitation, but also to discourage any sort of social interaction between strangers of the opposite sex.[44] Yet, before the war, women still retained an important power in these settings: the power to set the terms of the sexual interaction. Proprietors, waiters, and bartenders supervised the socializing in their resorts, insuring that neither the patrons nor the prostitutes grew too obstreperous, but the management did not oversee the sexual negotiations between women and men.[45] During the war, however, anti-vice investigators stopped reporting women's voices with any regularity. The previously rote invocation, "she solicited me to prostitution," turned into an anachronism. Instead, investigators recorded their discussions with other men about the sexual availability of the women in the vicinity. Men now brokered the meetings between men looking for sex and the women willing to provide it. Where once women interacted directly with men, under recreation's new regulatory regime, men no longer talked first with women, but they did talk about them, categorizing them by their sexual availability, before they ever even approached them.

Perhaps the most important index of men's new power to set the tone and terms of sexual interaction was their uncontested right to label women. Before the war, through sartorial signifiers and conversational cues, sporting women clearly broadcast who they were and what they offered. Wartime repression, however, caused many prostitutes to mute their "professional" signifiers, making it more difficult for men to judge whether someone was, in their words, "out for the sugar" or just wanted a "good time."[46] As a result, men unfamiliar with the sexual codes of a particular dance hall turned to insiders – waiters, bartenders, and managers – to decipher the dance hall's sexual signifiers and to categorize the women around them. Since dance hall regulations forbade men from approaching women they did not know, men relied on the male management to inform them which women were sexually willing, and at what price.[47] Waiters quickly told their customers which women were "charity girls" and which ones were "money girls," and if the man seemed like a "good fellow," and a heavy tipper, the waiters would "stake" him to a woman.[48] Although not pimps, *per se*, waiters, bartenders, doormen, and managers facilitated other men's search for sex by labeling the women around them.

The insiders' role did not, however, end with the labeling of women, they also offered their customers tips on the social scripts that men needed to follow to obtain women's sexual favors. Besides telling their customers which women were sexually willing, waiters also coached their customers on how quickly they could push a woman for sex. For instance, Sam Kaplan, a doorman, told an investigator that Helen Davis "is a regular guy, is not out for the money but likes to go out for a good time and if you treat her right will go the limit." As the investigator concluded, "he told me he had been out with her and she is good."[49] Not rushing a woman or asking her directly how much she wanted was particularly important, because as one woman

explained, “she likes her Jazz but is not a streetwalker.”[50] These social distinctions mattered to women, but the economic distinctions held greater significance for men.[51] An evening with a charity girl was generally cheaper, especially since waiters made sure to warn their customers if the women who interested them were “bleeders,” a label that denoted women’s economic “exploitation” of men, even as it connoted their sexual unavailability because of menstruation.[52] To reassure their customers that a charity girl was a “regular fellow” who would “go the limit,” waiters would tell the investigator, as Sam Kaplan did with Helen Davis, that he, or someone else he knew, “had made her.”[53] Even when male waiters and their male customers colluded to preserve charity girls’ pretenses that they were better than prostitutes, men nevertheless saw women from a sexually reductive perspective.[54]

After the crackdown on prostitution during the war, men reduced all sexually willing women to their sex organs. For example, in March 1917, one waiter observed in an eighth avenue venue that “there aint one girl that remains here at this hour that aint ‘C--t’... they are all hall way rubs.”[55] While another declared “there is so much gash around that he is sick of it.”[56] Indeed, by 1919, waiters and their male patrons had reduced these exchanges to a kind of shorthand with “gash” or “cunt” as an umbrella term to describe all sexually willing women, and only then would they go on to qualify which women were prostitutes (“hustlers,” “whores,” or “gold diggers”) and which women were only out for a “good time” (“charity,” “charity bums,” or “charity gash”).[57] In these conversations, male waiters and their male customers verbally reduced women to their vaginas – the only real question was whether the man could get away with just paying for drinks, or would he have to pay the woman for her time and attention.

The changing use of obscenities raises important issues for evaluating the relative power of women in the "new popular culture." In the second decade of the twentieth century, more women from the respectable working and lower-middle classes could participate as consumers in commercial recreation; however, for all their self-defined respectability, men saw these women as they saw all women:  as sexual objects available for their exploitation. For a cheap night out, men humored charity girls' belief that they were better than sporting women, but the conversations between men showed that this consideration was pure hypocrisy. Amongst men all women were gash. The conflict between women's self-perceived status and men's reductive objectification might not have mattered, but by gaining the power to initiate sexual encounters, men also acquired the power to make the key, determinative categorization, and they did so to the diminishment of women. Men's umbrella definition of all women as cunts, overrode individual women's right to define themselves.

**The Conversational Context**

The grammatical construction and the conversational context of prewar and wartime profanity reveal the fraught gender dynamics in commercial recreation. At the beginning of this period, in the mixed-sex back rooms of saloons, women and men spoke to each other directly. Whether their conversations entailed solicitations or crude sexual put-downs, neither women nor men relied on intermediaries to negotiate the social terrain of vice district venues. The narrative strategies that anti-vice investigators adopted in their reports reflected the directness of sexual interactions in saloons. Because solicitations, not sexual representations, interested male

investigators, they rarely went into a saloon's main barroom to ask other men about the sexual availability of women. Instead, the investigators, like regular johns, headed straight to the back room where the conversations between the men and women present quickly revealed the sexual codes of the place. Throughout the prewar reports, investigators either acted as observers or interacted with women directly to assess a resort's relative reputability. This situation changed during the war. Investigators now needed to talk to other men to determine which women were sexually available. The conversational requisites of social mediation meant that any man wanting to have sex with a woman was automatically complicit in the verbal objectification of women. Where once women interacted directly with men, one subject to another, in the new heterosocial venues the enforced distance between men and women meant that men as subjects talked together about objects – women.[58] In saloons, women had commodified their sex, but in dance halls, men objectified women.

The grammatical differences between prewar and wartime profanity show how the combined impact of misogynistic propaganda and a campaign to increase the social distance between working-class men and women could have a significant, and negative, impact on women's status. In her essay, "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State," Catharine MacKinnon has observed, "Man fucks woman. Subject verb object."[59] MacKinnon wrote this statement as a truism, but the sharp shift in the way men and women employed profanity historicizes complicated sexual dynamics between men and women. Before the war, in their obscene conversations, saloon prostitutes objectified men as often as men objectified women. A prostitute impatient with her customer could tell him to "hurry up and get fucked," while another could ask a john if he thought she was going to "Fuck around here with you all night."[60] In

neither example did women defer to men. Women were agents who actively set the tone and the terms of the sexual exchange. In contrast, during the war, women would tell men, usually through an intermediary, if they would not "step the limit" (go all the way) or "had their flowers," (were menstruating), so men would not spend their money under false pretenses, and then "get sore at them."[61] Mostly, however, the investigators did not need to report their conversations with women because they had already found out if they were "gash." The male grapevine knew if a man had already "hosed" a woman, so whether she was out for the money or not, she was no longer the active "cockteaser," she was now the most reductive "object" – a "cunt."[62] Prewar obscenities acted as insults, not descriptions. Where "cocksucker" was an epithet that embroidered back room banter, "cunt" anchored the wartime conversations between men. Even the exchange about Lizzie's firecracker, the closest comparison to the wartime conversations was not a pure objectification. Lizzie was neither reduced to her genitalia, nor had she lost control over her sexuality.[63] Men's discursive diminishment of women during the First World War was not the first time men had called women "gash," but in the new sexual scripts, men labeled women (subject, verb, object), while women ceded their self-determination in sexual negotiations. In the commercial dance halls and other heterosocial venues of the new popular culture, charity girls were cunts because soldiers, sailors, and male civilians described all young women as such.

World War I served as the crucial lexical context for men's reduction of women in public to their privates. In wartime dance halls, amusement parks, and training camps, venereal distinctions superseded social distinctions. When men on the town lumped the women around them into the category of "cunt," they followed the lead of the Commission on Training Camp

Activities which reduced all sexually active women to a "dirty dose."[64] The Commission reinforced this symbolic diminishment of women through metaphors that compared sexually willing, *ergo* venereal diseased, women to any other object or animal that spread death and disease: German bullets, malarial mosquitoes, venomous vipers, and, in the most extreme version of women as a disposable object, other men's toothbrushes.[65] By so thoroughly vilifying women, wartime propaganda legitimated men's objectification of the women they met in dance halls and other commercial entertainment venues. The War Department's campaign against women lasted only a few years, but its extreme misogyny formalized men's reduction of women, whatever their social status, to conversational objects of exchange, barely capable of agency, valued only for their vagina at a critical time in the development of popular culture.

**Conclusion**

During World War I, one of the few extended conversations that an anti-vice investigator recorded with any woman was between David Oppenheim and two prostitutes in Newark, New Jersey: Kitty and Katz. Oppenheim had already met Kitty and Katz on a earlier trip to Newark two months before, so they felt comfortable talking with him. When he told them he "was out for charity," Katz laughed saying that Patsy Kline's "is a poor place to come for charity. Katz said she used to give it away but she found out she could sell it and is not giving it away any more." Oppenheim then turned to Kitty and "asked if she wasn't going to give it away." She said, "not me, I'm strictly business…." Oppenheim pushed her saying, "you told me last time you would," but Kitty replied, "that was different, if you would have phoned me...you might have got a little

charity but I am wiser now, I aint [sic] going to give any of it away any more, I was stung too often."[66] Historians of prostitution including Ruth Rosen have interpreted prostitutes' disdain for charity girls as a defensive rationalization of their own disreputable status, but Kitty and Katz offered a very different explanation. They were tired of men treating them like "gash" without getting any payback.[67]

The Commission on Training Camp Activities' reforms disrupted the long-term balance between men and women in urban recreation. Women like Kitty and Katz, however, saw only too well how the new order had hurt them. They realized that men had no more respect for women when they gave sex away, then when women charged men for it. Women consumers who ventured into dance halls retained their illusions of respectability, but their self-definitions mattered little to men. Prostitutes were liminal, disreputable, and unrepresentative figures, but unlike the more naive charity girls, they recognized men's disdain for women. No matter how women self-identified outside their direct interaction with men, the dialogic mandates of the new regulatory circumstances meant that women operated in an environment that favored men.

This argument challenges some basic historiographical conventions. Most historians consider the war a watershed for women's positive participation in the new popular culture. Kathy Peiss, the pre-eminent historian of working women's recreation, has warned that "women's embrace of mixed-sex fun could be a source of autonomy and pleasure, as well as a cause of their continuing oppression," but scholars have usually concluded that the social dynamics of dance halls, amusement parks, and movie theaters marked a positive step forward for women. According to this narrative, women entered into the new popular culture on their

own terms, expressing their agency in creative ways as they tested the boundaries defining respectability and sexual freedom.[68] Historians have based their conclusions on two fallacies.

First, they have assumed that men actively excluded women for saloons. By ignoring the presence of prostitutes and emphasizing the tradition of men treating other men to drinks, scholars have correlated the sexual exchange between charity girls, and the men who "dated them up," to the mutuality of treating in the main barroom, not the more appropriate analogy to the sexual exchange that occurred in the saloon's back room. But treating in the front barroom involved men buying other men rounds of drinks, or the purchase and exchange of equal commodities, while treating on dates entailed men buying commercial amusements for women with an expectation of sex at the end.[69] By comparing dating to barroom treating instead of to prostitution, historians have erased the more coercive side of mixed-sex amusement and, instead, described respectable women's entrance into commercial recreation as if they were just another "jolly good fellow." Yet "jolly good fellow" was a euphemism for "prostitute," and the accepted *quid pro quo* in dance halls was sex, not sociability. The gender dynamics of the saloon's mixed-sex back room, not the single-sex front room, prefigured the sexual scripts in dance halls, amusement parks, and other new sites of commercial recreation.

Second, charity girls for all their presumed agency did not operate independently. Interpreting women's participation in the new popular culture without taking into account the expectations of their male peers, has kept scholars from accurately analyzing the extent of women's success at redefining social scripts. Yes, women rebelled against their families and state-enforced middle-class morality, but men exploited that rebellion. Although most everyone placed the onus on women to determine the degree of their sexual involvement, more than a few

men forced women to keep up their presumed end of the bargain and deliver sex for a night out.[70] Men raped women not because they were psychopathic outliers with deviant desires, but because the norms of urban entertainment led them to expect intercourse at the end of an evening. Men believed that they deserved to get off whether they paid for sex directly or through the purchase of treats. Whether they knew it or not, when charity girls entered the venues of the new popular culture, they operated in an environment that still owed much to the mandates of commercial vice.

World War I encouraged a veneration of troops that translated into a diminishment of women's status. This decline engendered far reaching consequences for the development of popular entertainment in the new century. Although expectations shifted over the course of the twentieth century, men and women who dated continually revised a foundational script based on men's entitlement to women's sexual services. If scholars wish to contextualize today's "rape culture," they need to examine its origins in the conventions set out during the early days of men and women dating in the commercial venues of the new popular culture.

---

[1]H. L. . Mencken, "'Reformers' Oppose Sanitary Measures Against Disease," The Evening Mail, 18 September 1917; H.L. Mencken, The American Language: A Preliminary Inquiry into the Development of English in the United States (New York, Alfred. A. Knopf, 1919).

[2]Nancy K. Bristow, Making Men Moral: Social Engineering During the Great War (New York, 1996), 93-98, 134-135; Allan M. Brandt, No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States Since 1880, With a New Chapter on AIDS (New York, 1987), 92; Frederick Lewis Allen, Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the 1920's (New York, 1931); ; Henry F. May, "Shifting Perspectives on the 1920's," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 43 (December 1956): 405-427; Kathy Peiss, Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986); David Nasaw, Going Out: The Rise and Fall of Public Amusements (New York, 1993); Susan K. Cahn, Sexual Reckoning: Southern Girls in a Troubling Age (Cambridge, Mass., 2007).

[3]Susan Sontag, "The Third World of Women," Partisan Review, 40 (1973): 188.

[4] Elizabeth Alice Clement, Love For Sale: Courting, Treating, and Prostitution in New York City, 1900-1945 (Chapel Hill, 2006); Jennifer Fronc, New York Undercover: Private Surveillance in the Progressive Era (Chicago, 2009); Courtney Q. Shah, "'Against Their Own Weakness': Policing Sexuality and Women in San Antonio, Texas, during World War I," Journal of the History of Sexuality 19 (September 2010): 458-482.

[5]These investigators held their jobs for a long time and often the same investigators who recorded prewar banter in tenderloin dives also reported on the back-and-forth in wartime dance halls. On investigators' records, their usefulness, and problematic transparency, see George Chauncey, Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Gay Male World, 1890-1940 (New York, 1994), 130-132; Fronc, New York Undercover.

[6]Lynn Hunt, ed., The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500-1800 (New York, 1996); Karen Halttunen, "Humanitarianism and the Pornography of Pain in Anglo-American Culture," American Historical Review 100 (April 1995): 303-334; Christopher Waldrep, "The Making of a Border State Society: James McGready, the Great Revival, and the Prosecution of Profanity in Kentucky," American Historical Review 99 (June 1994), 767-784; Mary Beth Norton, "Gender and Defamation in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, 44 (January 1987): 3-39; ; Peter N. Moogk, "'Thieving Buggers' and 'Stupid Sluts': Insults and Popular Culture in New France," William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, 36 (October 1979): 524-547.

[7]Brandt, No Magic Bullet, 87; Barbara Meil Hobson, Uneasy Virtue: The Politics of Prostitution and the American Reform Tradition (1987; reprint, with new preface, Chicago, 1990); John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman, Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America (New York, 1988), 212.

[8]Francis E. Ward to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., 21 October 1910, file 59, box 8, series: boards, record group 2-OMR, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, New York; Jane Addams, A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil (New York, 1912), 9; Hartford Vice Commission, Report of the Hartford Vice Commission (Hartford, Conn., 1913), 14, 73-74; [Lancaster Vice Commission], A Report on Vice Conditions in the City of Lancaster, Pa. ([Lancaster], 1913), 76.

[9] "Standard Statistics of Prostitution, Gonorrhoea, Syphilis" (pamphlet), page 3, file 1, box 170, American Social Health Association Papers, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota (hereafter ASHA); Joseph Mayer, The Regulation of Commercialized Vice: An Analysis of the Transition from Segregation to Repression in the United States (New York, 1922), 9; Fosdick, Chronicle of a Generation, 147; Brandt, No Magic Bullet, 72-77.

[10]"Next Steps: One, Two, Three," (pamphlet), file 2, box 131, ASHA. See also Ruth Rosen, The Lost Sisterhood: Prostitution in America, 1900-1918 (Baltimore, 1982), 36; Bristow, Making Men Moral, 112; Shah, "'Against Their Own Weakness'," 459.

[11][Albert E. Webster], "Conference and Observations at Grant Park," 8 September 1917, file 380, box 24, ESDP; Brandt, No Magic Bullet, 80-82; Bristow, Making Men Moral, 118, 126.

[12] "Beware!" (poster), file 3, box 131, ASHA. See also Jane Deeter Rippin, "Social Hygiene and the War: Work with Women and Girls," Social Hygiene 5 (January 1919): 126; Hilton Howell Railey, "A Survey of Moral Conditions near Fort Logan H. Roots," 20 August 1917, file: Arkansas Little Rock, box 4, CTCA; Bascom Johnson, "Law Enforcement Against Prostitution from the Point of View of the Public Official, National Municipal Review 9 (July 1920): 428.

[13] Rippin, "Social Hygiene and the War," 126; Bascom Johnson, Preliminary Survey of Moral Conditions Surrounding Fort Riley, Near Junction City and Manhattan, Kansas," 31 May – 4 June 1917, file: Kansas, box 7, CTCA; Webster, "Conference and Observations at Grant Park," 8 September 1917, file 380, box 24, Ethel Sturges Dummer Papers Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College (hereafter ESDP); B.B. Howell and M. Abbey, "Record of Investigation at Rockford, Ill.," 22-24 September 1917, file 380, box 24, ESDP; Joseph R. Mayer to Raymond B. Fosdick, 29 September 1917, pages 7-8, file: Arizona 17, box 3, CTCA.

[14]"'Hello, Soldier Sport, want to have a Good Time?'" (pamphlet), file 6, box 131, ASHA. See also "Venereal Diseases: Facts for Every Man," American Social Hygiene Association Publication No. 98 (New York, 1917), file 6, box 170, ASHA.
[15] Maude E. Miner, "Report of the Committee on Protective Work for Girls: October 1, 1917 to April 1, 1918," 15 April 1918, file 381, box 24, ESDP.
[16]Walter Clarke, "Social Hygiene and the War," Social Hygiene IV (April 1918): 259-306, especially 269; "Method of Attack on Venereal Diseases: An Outline of Activities and Co-operating Agencies Planned to Reduce the Prevalence of Venereal Diseases in the United States Army," American Social Hygiene Association Publication No. 111 (New York, 1917), file 7, box 170, ASHA. In November 1917, the American Social Hygiene Association, which coordinated the work for the CTCA, proposed a budget allocating $10,000 for lecturers and $10,000 for producing and reproducing pamphlets, see Raymond B. Fosdick to Edwin R. Embree, 23 November 1917, file 739, box 79, Series 100, Record Group 1, Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Archive Center; "War Budget for activities to be carried on in cooperation with the War Department Commission on Training Camp Activities to October 1, 1918 enclosed in letter from William F. Snow to Raymond B. Fosdick, 22 November 1917, file 739, box 79, Series 100, Record Group 1, Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Archive Center.

[17] Raymond B. Fosdick to Ethel Sturges Dummer, 20 September 1917, file 377, box 24, ESDP; Ethel Sturges Dummer to Mrs. Gregory, 8 November 1917, file 377, box 24, ESDP; "Committee on Protective Work for Girls," (pamphlet), file 377, box 24, ESDP; "Miss Miner Discusses Plans of the Committee on Protective Work for Girls, Created by the C.T.C.A.," ASHA Bulletin 5 (March 1918): 3-4; Jane Deeter Rippin, "Outline of Organization and Methods: Section on Women and Girls, Law Enforcement Division, War and Navy Department Commissions on Training Camp Activities," 1 July 1918, file 381, box 24, ESDP; Henrietta S. Additon, "Work Among Delinquent Women and Girls," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 79 (September 1918): 155.

[18] Ethel Sturges Dummer to Paul Kellogg, 23 May 1919, page 13, file 235, box 16, ESDP; Rosen, The Lost Sisterhood, 35; Hobson, Uneasy Virtue, 165-168, 175-176.

[19] Bascom Johnson, "Next Steps: A Program of Activities Against Prostitution and Venereal Disease for Communities Which Have Closed Their 'Red Light' Districts," American Social Hygiene Association Publication No. 126, (Washington, DC, 1918), 10-11, file 2, box 131, ASHA.

[20] Miner, "Report on the Committee on Protective Work for Girls," 13-14; Martha P. Falconer, "The Part of the Reformatory Institution in the Elimination of Prostitution," Social Hygiene 5 (January 1919): 2-3; Brandt, No Magic Bullet, 88-89; Mary E. Odem, Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885-1920 (Chapel Hill, 1995), 125-126; Shah, "'Against Their Own Weakness'," 467-68.

[21] Mary Macey Dietzler, Detention Houses and Reformatories As Protective Social Agencies in the Campaign of the United States Government Against Venereal Diseases (Washington, D.C., 1922), 48, 89, 109-110, 113, 132-134,149-150; Falconer, "The Part of the Reformatory Institution," 4.

[22]Clement, Love for Sale, 125, 160.

[23]Brandt, No Magic Bullet, 89.
[24]Dietzler, Detention Houses and Reformatories, 5-6.
[25]For example, in Puerto Rico, where both federal and local statistics exist, the authorities arrested over a thousand women on vice-related charges from the beginning of July 1918 to the beginning of January 1919. Of these, they convicted and confined 809 women. In addition, the US District court found 58 women guilty of sex offenses and ordered them imprisoned in Puerto Rican jails. These arrests and convictions resulted directly from war department policy. In 1917-18, the Puerto Rican jails housed an average of 790 prisoners at any given time of which only 25 to 30 were women. [Howard L. Kern], Special Report of the Attorney General of Porto Rico to the Governor of Porto Rico Concerning the Suppression of Vice and Prostitution in Connection with the Mobilization of the National Army at Camp Las Casas (San Juan, 1917), 8-9, 14. See also Bristow, Making Men Moral, 129.
[26]Eighteenth Annual Report of the New York State Reformatory At Bedford Hills, N.Y. For the Year Ending June 30, 1918 (Albany, 1919), 13. See also Clement, Love for Sale, 142.
[27]Frederic H. Wines and John Koren, The Liquor Problem in its Legislative Aspects (Boston, 1897), 12, 317, 330; [Newark Vice Commission], Report on the Social Evil Conditions of Newark, New Jersey to the People of Newark ([Newark], [1914]), 21-22; Perry R. Duis, The Saloon: Public Drinking in Chicago and Boston, 1880-1920 (Urbana, Ill., 1983), 2-3; Mara L. Keire, "The Committee of Fourteen and Saloon in New York City, 1905-1920," Business and Economic History 26 (Winter 1998): 573-583.
[28]Norman H. Clark, Deliver Us from Evil: An Interpretation of American Prohibition (New York, 1976), 57; Rosen, The Lost Sisterhood, 84.

[29]Louise de Koven Bowen, "Dance Halls," The Survey 26 (3 June 1911): 383-387; Report on the Social Evil Conditions of Newark, New Jersey, 69-71; James Weldon Johnson, The Autobiography of an Ex-Coloured Man (1912; New York, 1960), 115; George Foster, Pops Foster: The Autobiography of a New Orleans Jazzman, as told to Tom Stoddard (Berkeley, 1971), 26-37; Burton W. Peretti, The Creation of Jazz: Music, Race, and Culture in Urban America (Urbana, 1994), 22-38; Kathy Ogren, The Jazz Revolution: Twenties America and the Meaning of Jazz (New York, 1989), 57-59; Duis, The Saloon, 238; Timothy J. Gilfoyle, City of Eros: New York City, Prostitution, and the Commercialization of Sex, 1790-1920 (New York, 1992), 224-225; 231-232. Black-and-tans were probably named for a faction opposed to the "lily-whites" in the Republican Party, see "Black and Tans Predict Shake Up," New Orleans *Item*, 2 August 1908, 4.

[30]Jon M. Kingsdale, "The 'Poor Man's Club': Social Functions of the Urban Working Class Saloon," American Quarterly 25 (October 1973): 485; Roy Rosenzweig, Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920 (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), 45; Peiss, Cheap Amusements, 21; Chauncey, Gay New York, 83.

[31]"Arthur E. Wilson states," 2 March 1901, 305 7th Avenue, New York Committee of Fifteen Papers, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library (hereafter NYC15). For a similar example, see Fronc, New York Undercover, 63.

[32]"Statement of Arthur E. Wilson," 9 February 1901; Investigation Report, 128th Street and 2nd Avenue, 21 January 1912, file: 1912, box 1, Committee of Fourteen Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts, New York Public Library (hereafter C14); Investigative Report, 300 Seventh Avenue, 21 January 1912, file: 1912, box 1, C14. Peter Moogk coined the phrase "vocabulary of abuse," see Moogk, "'Thieving Buggers' and 'Stupid Sluts,'" 528.

[33]Investigative Report, 300 Seventh Avenue, 21 January 1912, file: 1912, box 1, C14.

[34]On the significance of interchangeable insults, see Moogk, "'Thieving Buggers' and 'Stupid Sluts,'" 534, 546.
[35]Kingsdale, "The 'Poor Man's Club'," 472-489; Howard P. Chudacoff, The Age of the Bachelor: Creating an American Subculture (Princeton, 1999), 107-115; Richard Stott, Jolly Fellows: Male Milieus in Nineteenth-Century America (Baltimore, 2009), 101, 228-230;
[36]Moogk, "'Thieving Buggers' and 'Stupid Sluts,'" 534.
[37]Deposition of Lawrence J. Beine, [July] 1912, page 3, People of the State of New York vs. Jim Proprietor, box 29, C14.
[38]Deposition of Lawrence J. Beine, [July] 1912, page 2, People of the State of New York vs. Jim Proprietor, box 29, C14. For a more complimentary sales pitch, see Fronc, New York Undercover, 70.
[39]Kingsdale, "'The 'Poor Man's Club,'" 485; Rosenzweig, Eight Hours For What We Will, 57-64; Peiss, Cheap Amusements, 17, 20-21.
[40] Wisconsin Vice Committee, Report and Recommendations of the Wisconsin Legislative Committee to Investigate the White Slave Traffic and Kindred Subjects ([Madison], 1914), 59; [Hartford Vice Commission], Report of the Hartford Vice Commission: Hartford, Conn. (Hartford, Connecticut, [1913]), 27; Vice Commission of Chicago, *S*ocial Evil in Chicago: A Study of Existing Conditions, With Recommendations (Chicago, 1911), 83; H. Gordon Frost, The Gentlemen's Club: The Story of Prostitution in El Paso (El Paso, 1983), 148, 154-155.
[41]Herbert Asbury, The Barbary Coast, (New York, 1933), 270-271; Kenneth L. Kusmer, A Ghetto Takes Shape: Black Cleveland, 1870-1930 (Urbana, 1976), 48; Robert F. Selcer, "Fort Worth and the Fraternity of Strange Women," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 96 (July 1992): 63; James R. McGovern, "'Sporting Life on the Line': Prostitution in Progressive Era Pensacola," The Florida Historical Quarterly 54 (October 1975): 134; Mark Thomas Connelly, The Response to Prostitution in the Progressive Era (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1980), 93; Duis, The Saloon, 237-238; Gilfoyle, City of Eros, 204-208.

[42]Story #21, "Hairdressing Parlor," 3 September 1912, New York Kehillah Papers, Judah L. Magnes Archives, Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People, Jerusalem, Israel (hereafter Kehillah); St. #601, "Penny Arcade – 143 Park Row," 12 May 1913, Kehillah; St. #602, "City Hall Theatre – 93 Park Row," 12 May 1913, Kehillah; St. #623, "Manhattan Moving Picture House – 10-12 Forsythe St.," 20 May 1913, Kehillah; St. #624, "Dancing at 106 Forsythe Street," 21 May 1913, Kehillah; St. #780, "The Majestic Moving Picture Theatre – 9-17 2nd Ave.," 21 October 1913, Kehillah; Bowen, "Dance Halls," 383-387; Report on the Social Evil Conditions of Newark, New Jersey, 47; Rosen, The Lost Sisterhood, 43-44; Paul S. Boyer, Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, *1820-1920* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), 207; Connelly, The Response to Prostitution in the Progressive Era, 95-96.

[43]American Social Hygiene Association, "Atlanta Social Hygiene Survey," (typescript), 1926, file 10, box 98, ASHA; "Detroit, Michigan: General Summary, Under-Cover Investigation of Prostitution, January 4 to February 4, 1926 and March 4 to June 4, 1926," (typescript), file 9, box 99, ASHA; American Social Hygiene Association, "Saint Louis Social Hygiene Survey," (typescript), March 1923, file 2, box 100, ASHA.

[44]Keire, "The Committee of Fourteen and Saloon Reform," 573-583.

[45]"N.E. Cor. 132 St and 5th Ave.," page 2, file 1913, box 28, C14; "Special Report Club Inspection," file 1914, box 28, C14; Deposition of Lawrence J. Beine, [July] 1912, People of the State of New York vs. Jim Proprietor, box 29, C14. .

[46]Before the war, vice investigators found it much easier to read the sexual signifiers and determine whether a woman was a prostitute, promiscuous, or prim, see Investigation Report, 30 January 1914, Gilligan's Cafe, file: 1913-1914, box 28, C14. For typical categorizing phrases, see Investigation Report, 19 January 1917, 216 West 46th Street, box 31, C14; "Investigation Report, D.O.," 4 June 1918, Paterson, N.J., page 14, file "Paterson, N.J.," box 24, C14; "Grand Central Palace," 4 May 1918, file: 1918, box 4, C14.

[47]Investigation Report, 19 January 1917, 216 West 46th Street, box 31, C14; Investigation Report, 8 March 1917, 153/155 West 47th Street, box 31, C14.

[48]"General Conditions and Conversations," 31 August 1917, Trenton, N.J., page 2, file: Trenton, N.J., box 24, C14; 12 February 1917, 2137/2139 Boston Road, box 32, C14; "Investigation Report, D.O.," 16 November to 20 November 1918, Providence, R.I., page 8, file: "Special New Eng. towns," box 24, C14; "Investigation Report," 16 April 1918, Philadelphia, P.A., page 12, file: Philadelphia, box 24, C14.

[49]" Report of D.O.," 28 November to 5 December 1919, New Haven, Conn., page 33, file: "Special New Eng. towns," box 24, C14. See also Investigation Report, 19 January 1917, 216 West 46th Street, box 31, C14; "Disorderly Houses, Manhattan, Bronx and Bklyn.," 26 February 1918, file: 1916, box 30, C14.

[50]"Report of D.O.," 28 November to 5 December 1919, New Haven, Conn., page 34, file: "Special New Eng. towns," box 24, C14.

[51]"Report of D.O.," 28 November to 5 December 1919, New Haven, Conn., pages 6,10, file: "Special New Eng. towns," box 24, C14; "Investigation Report, D.O.," 11 May 1918, Paterson, N.J., page 4, file: Paterson, N.J., box 24, C14. The venereal health of a woman was also both a consideration and a point of conversation, although secondary to the economic distinctions, see "Report of D.O., 28 November to 5 December 1919, New Haven, Conn., page 35, file: "Special New Eng. towns," box 24, C14.

[52]In addition to being called “bleeders,” these women were also known as “cockteasers,” and “leg pullers,” see “Central Casino,” 8 July 1916, file: 1916, box 31, C14; “Investigation Report, D.O.,” 21 November to 23 November [1918], Fall River, Mass., page 16, file: “Special New Eng. towns,” box 24, C14. See also, “Niagara Falls, N.Y.,” 12 August 1917, file: Ft. Niagara, box 25, C14.

[53]Investigation Report, D.O.,” 21 November to 23 November [1918], Fall River, Mass., page 9, file: “Special New Eng. towns,” box 24, C14. See also Investigation Report, 4 June 1917, Old Homestead, box 32, C14.

[54]“Investigation Report, D.O.,” 21 November to 23 November [1918], Fall River, Mass., page 16, file: “Special New Eng. towns,” box 24, C14; “Report of D.O.,” 28 November to 5 December 1919, New Haven, Conn., file: “Special New Eng. towns,” box 24, C14.

[55]Investigation Report, 19 March 1917, 2926 Eighth Ave., box 32, C14. See also, “Investigation Report, D.O.,” 21 November to 23 November 1918, Fall River Mass., page 5, file: “Special New Eng. towns,” box 24, C14.

[56]Investigation Report, 17 February 1917, 2926 Eighth Ave., box 32, C14. See also, Investigation Report, 19 January 1917, 216 West 46th Street, box 31, C14.

[57]Investigation Report, 29 March 1919, 57/67 Smith St. Brooklyn, file: “Bklyn. - Investig. Reports,” box 32; “Report of D.O.,” 28 November to 5 December 1919, New Haven, Conn., pages 7, 9, file: “Special New Eng. towns,” box 24; 16 December 1916, 2137/2139 Boston Road, SW, box 32; “H.K. June 28th 1919,” file: “Bklyn. – Investig. Reports,” box 32; “Grand Central Palace,” 4 May 1918, file: 1918, box 4; all C14.

[58]Eve Sedgwick described this phenomenon as sexual displacement that reinforced the patriarchy, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire (New York, 1985), 26. See also Jane M. Ussher, Fantasies of Femininity: Reforming the Boundaries of Sex (New Brunswick, NJ, 1997), 103; Lucienne Frappier-Mazur, "Truth and the Obscene Word in Eighteenth-Century French Pornography" in The Invention of Pornography, 206.

[59]Catharine A. MacKinnon, "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 7 (Spring 1982): 541.

[60]"Report of A. Whitehouse and J.W. Brewster," 2 May 1905, file: "Inv. Rep. 1905," box 28, C14; Deposition of Lawrence J. Beine, [July] 1912, p. 5, People of the State of New York vs. Jim Proprietor, box 29, C14.

[61]"Vicinity of 63rd + Halsted Sts.," 1 April 1918, page 344, volume 10, Chicago Committee of Fifteen, Mss. 1028, Department of Special Collections, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois; Report of D.O.," 28 November to 5 December 1919, New Haven, Conn., page 10, file: "Special New Eng. towns," box 24, C14. The women's concerns about men getting "sore at them," were relayed to the investigator by the dance hall manager.

[62]"Investigation Report, D.O.," 16 November to 20 November 1918, Providence, R.I., page 5, file: "Special New Eng. towns," box 24, C14; "Central Casino," 8 July 1916, file: 1916, box 31, C14. Andrea Dworkin calls cunt "the most reductive word," see Andrea Dworkin, Pornography: Men Possessing Women (1979; reprint New York, 1989), 204.

[63] "Arthur E. Wilson states," 2 March 1901, 305 7th Avenue, NYC15.

[64]"V.D.: Putting it up to the Men," (pamphlet), page 8, file 5, box 131, ASHA. See also, "Standard Statistics of Prostitution, Gonorrhea, Syphilis," (pamphlet), page 3, file 1, box 170, ASHA.

[65]"'Hello, Soldier Sport, want to have a Good Time?'" (pamphlet), file 6, box 131, ASHA; John H. Stokes, Today's World Problem in Disease Prevention (Washington, 1919), 105 cited in Brandt, No Magic Bullet, 72; "V.D. : Putting it up to the Men," (pamphlet), page 8, file 5, box 131, ASHA.

[66]"Investigation Report, D.O.," 30 October 1918, Newark, N.J., pages 9-10, file: New Jersey, box 24, C14. For the report on Oppenheim's earlier visit, see "Investigation Report, D.O.," 29 August 1918, Newark, N.J., file: New Jersey, box 24, C14.

[67]Rosen, The Lost Sisterhood, 102.

[68]Peiss, Cheap Amusements, 6; John Kasson, Amusing the Million: Coney Island at the Turn of the Century (New York, 1978); Lewis A. Erenberg, *S*teppin' Out: New York Nightlife and the Transformation of American Culture, 1890-1930 (Westport, Conn., 1981); Rosenzweig, Eight Hours For What We Will; Odem, Delinquent Daughters; Ruth M. Alexander, The "Girl Problem": Female Sexual Delinquency in New York, 1900-1930 (Ithaca, 1995); Joan Jacobs Brumberg, The Body Project: An Intimate History of American Girls (New York, 1997); Cahn, Sexual Reckonings; Clement, Love For Sale.

[69]Peiss, Cheap Amusements, 113; D'Emilio and Freedman, Intimate Matters, 197. For a discussion of barroom "treating," see Rosenzweig, Eight Hours For What We Will, 59-63. For treating on dates, see Clement, Love For Sale, 1-9, 45-75.

[70]Alexander, The "Girl Problem", 29, 48; Odem, Delinquent Daughters, 58; Clement, Love for Sale, 153-154; Fronc, New York Undercover, 85-87, 203 n 53; Estelle B. Freedman, Redefining Rape: Sexual Violence in the Era of Suffrage and Segregation (Cambridge, Mass., 2013), 156.