

THE CURE  
OF THE  
GREAT SOCIAL EVIL,  
WITH  
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RECENT LAWS  
DELUSIVELY CALLED  
CONTAGIOUS DISEASES' ACTS,

BY  
FRANCIS W. NEWMAN,

*Emeritus Professor of University College, London.*

A. P.



LONDON:  
TRÜBNER & CO., 60 PATERNOSTER ROW.

BRISTOL:  
ARROWSMITH, 11 QUAY STREET.

1869.

PRICE ONE SHILLING

Acland. P. 37(20)

Digitized by Google

# THE CURE

OF

## THE GREAT SOCIAL EVIL.

---

### PART I.—THE MATERIALIST TREATMENT.

UNDER the name of the Great Social Evil our newspapers have for years alluded to an awful vice, too evidently of wide prevalence. Private effort is powerless to prevent: it can but, too late, rescue a few frail victims. Charitable persons, though well aware how much better it is to tear up roots of evil than to lop twigs, yet have no other form of action, but to slave at a task which is comparable to mopping out the ocean.

But at length the State itself has been forced out of its apathy; the State, which can not only punish those primarily guilty, but act through institutions upon men's habits, morals and circumstances. Being largely *able* to prevent, and being itself vitally dependent on the public morality, it is *bound* to prevent; and is still more solemnly bound not to facilitate, to occasion, to sanction vice, or intensify depravity. Dr. GOURLY, a veteran physician, long acquainted with the army, was peculiarly shocked at the "rottenness" (such is the word) of our most splendid regiments in the Crimean war; and for a series of years made energetic representations concerning the unsound health of English soldiers. Sir ALEXANDER TULLOCH and other distinguished persons entirely agreed in Dr. GOURLY's judgment, which declared the evil to have removable causes. In a paper read at Bradford to the Social Science Association Dr. GOURLY recited the leading facts. 1. The soldier is

entrapped into the army by making him drunk : 2. he is kept in artificial idleness, as a pampered male animal, in wretched ennui for 8 hours a day : 3. he has the drinkshop near to him. Dr. GOURLEY was too tender to add, what is now loudly asserted, that superior military authorities regard it as a natural right of the soldiers to have loose women hanging about the barracks or camp. Be this as it may, Parliament in 1866 took the matter up with silent unanimity, and passed a vigorous Act, entitled, The Contagious Diseases' Act.—Diseases, in the plural ! Who could guess that this meant, *one* shameful disease ? The public, both then and later, supposed it to refer to the Cattle Murrain.

And of what sort was the Act ? It had not a scrap of *prevention* in it. It did not remove one of the incentives to vice, nor one of the facilities. It dealt with effects, not causes. It did not regard the vice as an evil, but only the disease engendered by it. It is evidently based upon the axiom, enunciated deliberately by an eminent Colonial Governor, "Prostitution is a public necessity ;" which is practically interpreted, that the trade is a fixed quantity, against which it is vain to struggle : that, on the contrary, we must acquiesce in it, *accept it as an English institution*, and try to make it as safe to health and as decorous as may be.

This is the main point, upon which England will be called to judge. I am unwilling too much to fill my pages with details : for others are sure now to dwell on these abundantly, and if even the worst injustices be removable and were removed, the deadly principle would remain. Elated by easy Parliamentary success in 1866, a Society was formed to promote the Extension of this Act. An amended Act, which added new towns to its reach, and multiplied by *nine* the area attached to each town, passed through Parliament last session in its last moments, and became law, in spite of the protest of philanthropists to the Government and in the total silence (as is alleged) of the newspapers. There is great danger, lest by such stealthy extensions, they gradually get into their grasp the women of the whole country. The evidence printed in the blue book clearly shows, that the police can totally dispense with the magistrate and do actually terrify chaste women into signing their names. The public, on seeing the title of the Act, could not guess at its nature. Now that the secret has been revealed, (though very few public prints seem willing to aid in informing the nation

of the facts,) amazement and indignation are stirring up many bosoms. Ladies, young and old, are filled with horror at the outrages offered to their sex, and lay aside reticence. I have not heard the name of a woman who is not intense in aversion. A second Society has arisen to oppose the intended Bill. Disgusting and ghastly as is the subject, noble hearted ladies are coming to the conviction, that the inevitable debate of it over the breadth of the land is a painful but salutary medicine. If, through the conspiracy of the press to suppress information, the party of resistance be crippled; if, in consequence, the Bill become law; it is safe to predict, that it will be to the classes now ruling a most funereal victory. All that part of the nation which has faith in family sanctities, in constitutional law and in sacred personal rights, as paramount over all materialistic arguments,—will be thrown, as never yet in England, into the scale of democracy. It will be said truly: “No plebeian Parliament would ever have passed so disgraceful a law.”

The Act of 1866 introduced a new, an unheard of *punishment*. A harlot had never before lost rights over her own person. To violate her was as criminal as to violate a chaste woman. But now, if the chief policeman swear that he “has *good cause*\* to believe” that a woman is a harlot, the law forthwith commands that the woman’s person shall be forcibly violated by a way of its own. We thought that torture was disused as a punishment: here is torture of mind, and for aught we can tell, of body, imposed by summary conviction, which may rest on secret irresponsible whispers.—But in the opinion of its defenders, it would seem that the Act has only introduced a new *crime*, Olandestine Prostitution. If a woman will but write on her brow the horrid word Prostitute, if she will not try to hide her shame, if she will enrol herself in the forlorn hope; they interpret her to be an honest creature, who is not ashamed of her trade, is

\* In Section 40, it is enacted that if any one exhibits a document “*purporting to be signed* by a Justice ..... or by *any Person* in her Majesty’s service or in that of the Admiralty, IN ANY PROCEEDING UNDER THIS ACT, it shall on production be received in Evidence, and *shall be presumed to be duly signed*, UNTIL THE CONTRARY IS SHOWN.” If I understand this, the Justice, without seeing or hearing the woman, may give to the Chief Policeman a heap of papers *ready signed*, to use at his discretion: and the woman is not permitted to plead, that they are not *duly* signed. I desire rather to distrust my interpretation, than to believe any thing so atrocious.

not troubled with modesty, and of course can have no objection to being "examined" by male surgeons 26 times a year:—to call *that* a punishment, or a torture, they regard to be simply absurd. Yet the examination is (what one may well blush to write) a compulsory instrumental introspection of her person. It merely aims to ascertain, whether she may possibly impart contagion *to* a soldier. If not, then she is instantly free to receive contagion *from* him. If, on the contrary, she is judged to be unclean, she is carried into hospital, and cleansed *first*. Dismissed then anew on her mission, she is bound to come for re-examination in a fortnight. Such is the clever and delicious routine, which Justices of the Peace and honourable Surgeons are reputed to conduct. Last year, we are told, there were 18,000 examinations: how many there will be, and with what speed the wheels of the machine must turn, if the whole kingdom be overspread by it, no mind can conjecture, nor how vast will be the expense. A single Hospital in Devonport has cost recently above £20,000; and new Hospitals for this one shameful disease will have to overspread the land. What a proclamation to the world that we are become a Sodom and Gomorrha!

But if a woman whom the chief of the police tells the Justice he "has good cause to believe" is a Prostitute, refuse to submit, or to reappear statedly, she is liable to prison with hard labour, first for a month, then for three months, and so on for her whole life, if she be obstinate. The accusation against her is comparable to that of the Spanish inquisition. She has no jury, no counsel; she cannot cross-examine the chief of the police and force him to tell *what* is his "good cause;" and on what knowledge, or whose tattle, it rests. It is acknowledged by the defenders of the Act, that most regrettable injustices have been inflicted under it on wholly chaste women. But that to which they are blind, is, the cruelty, nay, the unpardonable iniquity, of driving women into a shamelessness which they are themselves trying to avoid. The law insists, that if a girl who has been wickedly seduced is driven by starvation and misery to sell her person, she shall *not* hide her shame, she shall *not* cherish any remains of modesty, she shall *not* nourish the hope of getting back into honourable ranks; but she shall professedly enlist in a trade which she abhors,—thing and name; she shall abandon all power to blush, and cheerfully lay herself out, as often as required, like a carcass for dissection. "Oh!" cry the

supporters of the Act, "she soon becomes accustomed to it." *Accustomed!* But if you once accustom her to it, do you expect her ever to recover modesty? And if the law deliberately deprave her,—a thing which *nothing* can justify,—will this tend to make soldiers or society at large, more moral? or, (if we must meet Materialists on their own ground, and think nothing of sin and vice, much of physical discomfort,) can it possibly do anything but *extend disease?*

The violent punishment here enacted on disobedient women proves that the framers of the Act well knew how intensely the women abhor the process,—how truly it is a mental *torture*. Altogether, both the violent unconstitutional proceeding, and the blind disregard of the universal corruption which such proceedings must cause, show, that the object was, to get at any cost the completest possible register of loose women and the most frequent possible examination. Paris gave the pattern to which it aspires. The narrative of what goes on in Paris is truly repulsive. Dr. ACORN\* states that about *a hundred and fifty women* pass through the hands of the medical man [men?] in *two hours!* The women are brought in vans to a central point;—and of course all the little boys ask what it is for. The women become so very abandoned (says Dr. ACORN), that a guard of soldiers is always at hand, to preserve order.—I do not pretend myself to know hideous details; but some one has sent to me the *Medical Times and Gazette* of September 25th last, where, (among other things spoken more plainly than is pleasant to repeat,) their Surgical Correspondent from Paris declares that the police cannot suppress "the worst class" of women, namely, the "clandestine" traders, whose "clients come from the *wealthier* portion of the community;" and from these proceed "by far the largest amount of disease." The physical scourge, says he, *is increasing* in Paris: the "examinations" of the "public girls" do not answer their end. Inspections, he adds, ought to be made "twice a week, and rigorously, instead of once in two weeks, *which is merely absurd.*" Lists cannot be made complete; not only because the women who have richer customers get beyond the reach of the spies, but also because "it is hard to say where libertinism ceases and prostitution begins."—Such is the necessary result of brute materialism. Such is the encouragement which Paris gives to her imitators.

\* I quote from Mr. THOMAS WORTH, Surgeon, of Nottingham.

As regards the depravity which the Parisian system causes in the women, the London Rescue Society gives the following terrible testimony:—

“The English fallen women who frequent the Haymarket and other similar resorts, speak with the utmost abhorrence of the bestiality of the foreign women perambulating the same neighbourhoods. The Committee have known more than one instance where the loathing produced by the habits of the women has led English girls to a desire to escape the abominations incident to a continuance in a career of sin.”

It is not amiss to add, that a private International Society of ladies is rising on the Continent, to put down the heart-breaking and disgusting enormities of the system, which amiable materialists are straining every nerve to impose upon England.

At the recent Congress of Social Science in Bristol, a gentleman who may speak with some authority, made, in defence of the Act and Bill, a remarkable and very painful statement, which has been printed. He is the medical officer of Health for the place: and he said, that in all Clifton almost every youth became infected with a shameful disease before puberty. Most of us will cry out, that this is incredible; that the specialist is sure to find his favourite disease *everywhere*, and that his statement is a virtual slander. Yet, after making all allowance for possible bias, it would seem that the case must at least be very bad, if a sincere and clever official inquirer can possibly commit himself to so awful and offensive a declaration. What then follows?—Clifton is not likely to be worse than other places. It contains numbers of wealthy families, with much zeal for religion in various forms. If this is a specimen of England, what else is she, in the upper ranks at least, but a whited sepulchre? It becomes us to give up self-righteous airs; to remember that in Catholic Ireland the women cannot be bought, and that even in Mohammedan Turkey there is no class of harlots, although (forsooth!) in England we are told that they are a necessary of life. It is thus made out, that of the two influences which alone keep men chaste, viz., 1. moral principle, 2. fear of disease, the former has almost wholly vanished from a great mass of our richer classes. Undeniably therefore, if any Law of this nature effect, or rather *seem* to effect, its object,—that of enabling vice to indulge itself with impunity,—the vice will be greatly extended. If then we are a quarter as bad as we are told, it is QUITE CERTAIN that the law must *fail* of its

object. For if any truth of physiology is sure, it is sure that no medical art can counteract the natural punishments of vice. When men by the thousand are set loose, with confidence of impunity, they will spread contamination more widely than ever, polluting also the whole moral atmosphere. Family life, already much shaken in the fashionable world, will be deeply undermined. Ancient Greece, imperial Rome, modern Paris, all warn us into what abyss England will plunge. Art will assuredly pander to lust, not only by advertising impunity to vice, but by overthrowing Lord CAMPBELL's Act, and in ways on which I am reluctant to write without necessity. The decree will have issued against us, "Let the unclean become more unclean still."

Indeed another foul principle in this Act cannot fail to multiply shameless and cruel horrors. It pretends, *not* to repeal the penalties against brothel-keepers; but it has practically abolished them wherever the Act is applied. Yes! the brothel-keeper, the avaricious accomplice of the rich seducer, is already brought into official relations with the authorities, and is avowed to be "a valuable source of information." We need not press, how easily a spiteful whisper from her against a girl who has scornfully refused her seductions may be caught up by a zealous spy, and reported to the chief policeman as "valuable." The advocates of the Act have been made aware of such contingencies, and will now try to improve in detail its worst aspects towards wholly chaste women. But if the brothels be honestly suppressed, how can the soldiers be served? No such attempt has been made, or will be made, while the law stands. The execrable trade, in comparison with which mere harlotry is virtue, is now on pleasant relations with official persons, and receives their compliments for improved cleanliness and decorum. One solemn duty is laid upon the brothel-keepers—to inform against *unsound* harlots. If this most hateful of all trades obtain impunity, *no other trade in vice can long be punishable*. Thus, while the nation was profoundly ignorant, and Parliament (we must charitably believe) so overworked as to be practically in torpor, military men and medical specialists have introduced a deadly and revolutionary principle, fatal to national morality. Our specialists are now offended if one call this legislation *insidious*; although its promoters have distinctly avowed the necessity of great caution, lest the religious and moral part of the nation become aware of its details.—But we have nothing to do with.

persons, only with facts and with principles; and where vital interests are at stake, to mince words would be folly and cowardice.

Regard for the health of the *army* is the plea which introduced on the statute-book the Acts of 1864-6-9. Astonishing indeed has been the course of legislation concerning soldiers. Parliament deliberately winks at men being entrapped into drinkshops, and while drunk, cajoled to enlist. Thenceforward the kidnapped men forfeit every vestige of English liberty; have no appeal to a civil court, are liable to insult and cruelty, and if they complain, find their tyrant to be their judge. Down to the miserable minutiae of beard, hair, cravat and tight trowsers, they are stript of controul over their bodies and their dress. Only a few years back, young soldiers fell down in suffocation and died, in marching from Windsor, because their cravats were too tight. They are kept in constrained idleness, and are turned into toys and puppets, or into pawns on a chess-board. Drinkshops are brought close to them. Many stupify by drink their grief at leaving home and parents. Ennui eats them up. On some occasions, allowances of rum are served out to them. Few of them are allowed to marry. Harlots are regarded by many commanding officers as the natural and necessary complement to the camp and barrack. A few years ago it was attested, that the nuptial privacy of married soldiers was—the common dormitory! The soldiers in the Regent's Park barrack sickened and died of foul air, because they *did not dare* to complain to the colonel. When, with such a mass of tyranny, crushing men's souls and bodies, it is discovered that the soldiers are "invalided" by vice, and cannot go through their drill; then at last the collective wisdom of parliament,—credulous to statistics and specialists, incredulous to moral principle,—instead of putting away drink and idleness and harlotry and slavery, nails these down upon the unhappy slaves, and only thinks how, by medical cleverness,—at the cost of all which remains of female modesty, throwing overboard the most sacred principles of English law,—only thinks how soldiers may be enabled to practise, under the influence of drink, vice worse than brutal, without being incapacitated for parade or battle.

There is at the same time a peculiarity in the system, while it is purely Military, which vanishes when it is applied to Civil life. So intense is the army-despotism, such a prostrate slave is

the soldier, that his commanding officer can, by his own mere will, bid the man to strip himself naked, and exhibit every thing naturally secret: not for any offence which the soldier has committed, but barely because it is *safest* to do so, before letting him "go freely about." (What that means, we know.) This military power has been used. At least this is a little, a partial protection to the women, and may be said to make things *fair* between the sexes. The soldiers are subjected as well as the women, to periodical examinations, though not impartially: for, first class petty officers, and all above them, are exempted,—as if contagion did homage to rank and station! Moreover it is attested by a high military officer, that in some regiments even the common soldiers have been set free from it, because it hurt their feelings, and disgusted the surgeon! Of the women's feelings no account is taken; and the surgeon, it seems, has no disgust from operating on *them*. However, the great mass of the men in the ranks, here and on foreign stations, are periodically examined. But male civilians are not under such despotism; and the Act is quite silent about them. This may not be marvellous, yet it is infamous. No epithet of scorn and hatred can be too strong for this dastardly favouritism of the male sex. Who are the original seducers of women? Men. Who cause disease in women, though you heal them fifty times? Men. Now to a man the examination is only disagreeable and humiliating; it is not depraving. No surgical operation is required. To *him* there is no danger (which to the unhappy woman is great) of contagion from an unclean instrument, nor of cruel disease from the repetition of a hideously unnatural process. As a cumulus of iniquity,—while it is universally agreed that the dreaded mischief is unmistakable in a man, first-rate medical authorities assert that in the case of women the most skilful and laborious surgeon may be wholly deceived,—may condemn the healthy, and fail to detect the unhealthy. What chance then has the surgeon, if women are shovelled-in upon him at the rate of one per minute? And what armies of surgeons will suffice, what array of huge hospitals, if this system is to overspread the whole United Kingdom? But in fact, if the principles of the Act are to be accepted;—if spies, tattling, and affidavits of what one who has listened to spies and tattle *thinks* he has "good cause to believe," justify summary conviction and violating of personal secrecies; there is obviously a much speedier and surer way to

“stamp out the murrain.” Set the spies on *men*; take evidence from the harlots themselves, (and from the brothel-keeper too, if you will obstinately tolerate her) against *men*. Harlots would quickly point out grey-haired fathers of families, surgeons, or, now and then, a clergyman, who frequent brothels and seek their company. If a soldier’s evidence is accepted as to the woman who contaminated him when he was tipsy, why not take the woman’s evidence as to the rich man who previously afflicted her? The only reply that can be given is, that legislators are tender over their own sex, and especially over very respectable people. Nay, we must add, we should need female magistrates, to hinder so just a law from being a dead letter.

There are times and places when Despotism is beneficial and necessary. Compulsion is sometimes eminently right; at other times infamously wrong. In the face of a public enemy, or in warlike operations, or while masses of men are handling deadly weapons, an energetic rule, which requires instant obedience without appeal, is most rightful. So in time of pestilence we need a dictatorial authority. But besides an adequate necessity for despotism, two conditions are essential to prevent cruel abuse: first, the despotism must be impartial; next, measures equally energetic must be used to annihilate the CAUSES of evil, and thus limit the despotism to the shortest time. In both respects this despotic Act utterly, undeniably, indefensibly breaks down.

I must not pass by one very singular argument, which is pressed in conversation by the supporters of their Bill, in proof that it is urgently necessary. They assert, (and alas! it is too well attested to deny,) that brothels are largely frequented by married men. “Well!” say they: “are we to endure that a husband shall frequent evil houses, consort with unsound women, bring back disease on his unhappy wife, and transmit it to his innocent children? Think of the poor dear children! Malignant virus is being introduced into respectable families. We must by any severity stop this contagion. You cannot stop it by the ordinary process of law. This sharp malady needs sharp remedies.” So far, we might agree. One might expect them to add: “Therefore, we must spy out these respectable family-men, arrest them, cleanse them, and break up the brothels.” But instead of this, they reason: “Therefore, by operating on the *women*, whether they like it or no, we must bring about,

that respectable husbands shall find none but sound harlots in the brothels." For my part, I find this to be a very masculine argument: but I would rather, ten times over, sanction a limited Turkish polygamy at once.

Finally, let us learn from the elaborate Report of Mr. JOHN SIMON, medical officer to the Privy Council, to call this Bill by its correct disgraceful name,—“A Bill for warranting a woman clean to those who wish to use her.”

NOTE on page 4, line 4 from bottom :—

Mr. E. K. PARSONS, Visiting Surgeon of the Portsmouth Lock Hospital, was examined by the Committee; and was asked (398) whether, if the police *by error* bring up a really modest woman to the surgeon, mistaking her for a harlot, the woman signs a voluntary paper before the surgeon examines her. He replies: “Yes, they all sign a voluntary submission, *unless sent by order of a magistrate.*” The questioner continues (399), “But a modest woman would *decline* to sign that paper, would she not?” *Reply*: “No: for this reason. The police, believing the correctness of their own *impression (!)*, say: Very well: if you do not sign that, you go to the Bench.—And then the woman says in order to avoid that: Well, I do not mind going into a private room, and *speaking to Mr. PARSONS.*—And she will sign the voluntary submission.” (400.) *Question*: “Therefore they [really modest women?] sign a voluntary submission, under the *fear* of being taken before the magistrate?” *Reply*: “Unquestionably.”

That modest women should be brought up by the police *without cognizance of the magistrate*, is a phenomenon so familiar to the surgeon, that he knows exactly what is sure to happen. The woman is sure to be terrified into signing her name, and losing controul of her person for a whole year. The surgeon makes the dry sharp statement without betraying whether he approves or abhors. Is he afraid to offend his superiors?

We here see how little the magistrate need concern himself about it.

Mr. PARSONS also says (370) that the Police are very apt to jump to the conclusion that a woman is a prostitute if they see her out at night.

## PART II.—THE MORAL TREATMENT.

But a challenge has been thrown out to those who reject this Bill, not to be mere *obstructives*, but to suggest some cure for the frightful evil. To that task I now address myself.

No man of sense can imagine that immorality pervading a nation can be quickly cured: nevertheless, measures can be taken which will at once reduce and limit the mischief. We can leave off to do evil, while we learn to do good. We may pass laws to punish those whose guilt is primary, and we may suppress the obvious and most effective incentives or facilities. Beyond this, public institutions have to be improved and social errors set right. Further yet, (what it would be vain even to touch on in these pages,) where isolation, poverty, misery and the crushing of population into pigsties, are the overpowering causes of women's self-debasement, all improvement in the laws of Land, in Building, in restricting the size of Towns, are of course among the preventives of this most pernicious evil. In general also, whatever abets roguery, ignorance and brutality, abets also cruel unchastity.

(1.) The first head of Cure, is, obviously, to punish those whose guilt is foremost and most fruitful: these are, the Seducer and his Accomplices. Hitherto, there is no pretence in England of punishing the Seducer, as such. Men, who alone make the laws, make them with little account of women. One might fancy that legislators either fear to be legislating against their own sons, or are conscious of personal guilt: else why, for 600 years, have they been so very lax? As to the seduction of *their own* daughters, they have no fear; though they would shoot through the heart the man who perpetrated such a thing. But if it be only a poor girl,—how much does either House of Parliament care?

Women who are seduced are generally minors, who have no legal power to give themselves away *into* marriage. Surely then they have no legal power to give themselves away *without* marriage. Nor yet have their parents a legal right to sell their virtue, which is morally the worst form of being accessory to

seduction. Those who have looked closely into these dreadful matters, report that children of tender age are bought of a wicked parent, or, if orphans, of some uncle or aunt, by a brothel-keeper : she sells them in turn for a large price to some rich customer, who is too delicate to risk infection : hence comes a perpetual supply to the market. The law must defend young girls' virtue, at least as sternly as it defends their property, alike from strangers and from base kinsfolk. If a man run away with an heiress, a ward of Chancery, though each party may love the other and desire marriage, the man is imprisoned for contempt of Court, and cannot escape punishment either by claiming to marry the lady, or by pleading that he never promised to marry her. So tender is English law of the rich, and so reckless of the daughters of the poor. It surely is time to change all this fundamentally.

The seducer of a minor girl must not be allowed to plead against her her own consent ;—she has no right to give consent : his act therefore has the nature of a RAPE. Nor, that he did not know her age : it was his duty to find out her age accurately. Nor thirdly, should the man be allowed to recriminate, by saying that the young woman had previously been unchaste. It is always easy to impute such a thing, and difficult or odious to refute it ; and the dread of such a defence holds back women and their near kin from having recourse to law. If indeed the man assert that the woman definitely makes a trade of herself to those who do not profess love ; that she was the soliciter, the seducer, and he was the seduced ; this is quite to the purpose. If he can prove it, he must be acquitted ; but anything short of this is irrelevant, and the judge should forbid the man's counsel from aspersing the woman. If she have fallen once, that does not justify him in seducing her to a second offence. While she tries to conceal her shame, the law must presume that she is struggling to keep in an honourable course ; therefore to draw her out of it, is, SEDUCTION.

A man who cajoles a silly person to give away a valuable estate or sign his name to a large cheque, for no substantial consideration, will not be allowed by the law to keep his prize. He must have known that he was cheating, not fairly buying. The same is true of the seducer, who robs a woman of that which he cannot replace. At present, not seduction at all, but only breach of promise of marriage, is an offence. The law

throws on the woman the burden of *proving* the promise : but a cunning man can generally secure that no legal proof of this shall be possible. Also by promising that he will yet marry her, provided that she hold her peace, or otherwise playing on her hopes or her love, he wholly evades punishment and generally even public knowledge. It is more important that those who are near of kin to the woman, than that the woman herself, should have a right of action against the seducer : but if, before long, we get a Public Prosecutor, it were better still that on the affidavit of one or more of the woman's kinsfolk, and with necessary precautions against fraud, it should be his duty to bring the offender to justice ; who, if convicted, must be pronounced a felon. The enactment of such a law, even before any prosecution took place under it, would strike terror into profligates of the upper classes, and save numbers of weak-minded inexperienced girls, who are dazzled by flatteries, attentions, finery and the hope of raising themselves in society ; girls who cannot be saved by any public instruction, and have no wise teacher at home. When full majority is attained, it seems necessary to leave a woman who can give herself away in marriage to define at her own will what she chooses to call marriage. But if once the seduction of those under age is severely punished, a different sentiment will soon pervade society. *Public law is the great teacher of morals.* At the age of 21 a young woman is far wiser than at 18 ; and the infamy of seduction will be so much increased as to be a new protection to her.

It is needless here to define carefully what should be the seducer's punishment. If his act be pronounced felony, fathers will never wink at such transgression in sons. But it seems to be a sound principle, that one who offends from avarice, as a seducer's accomplice, should (besides other infliction) be heavily fined ; while one who offends through animal passion, should suffer at least corporal chastisement with public disgrace. A younger man, guilty of seducing a minor, should (in my opinion) be scourged, and put to hard labour ; scourged, not so severely as to cause compassion for his animal suffering, but severely enough to mark the disgrace. But what is to be said of elder men thus guilty ? I have been informed that it is well known to a London Society formed for the protection of women, that men of 50 and 60 years are great corruptors of children aged 14 or 15,—one after another ; whom they entice by gifts of con-

fectionery, and other small trifles. This is firmly believed; but to get legal proof is most difficult, as the law now stands. Such execrable conduct seems to deserve hard labour for life. The older the man and the younger the girl, the fiercer ought punishment to be; especially where it is clear that marriage between them would be preposterous, and no love can have existed.

A grave question will have to be discussed, how to punish the seducer who is himself a married man; who therefore cannot offer to his victim the reparation of marriage, such as it is. Guilt is piled upon guilt, in the very common case of a married man corrupting his female servant. In these as in other cases, mercy towards an innocent wife distracts the deliberations of justice. It suffices now to say, that human destiny and divine wisdom force each heart to bleed through the crime of one near and dear, and that the legislator must not be more tender over the wife of the seducing adulterer than over the wife of the poacher or swindler. But long deliberation and combined advice are needful for fixing penalties.

Another question will arise, concerning tribunals. In every case of alleged seduction, if there be an ordinary tribunal, it appears to me obvious, that half of the jury should be *women*. But if the seducer confess his guilt, and desire to marry the woman, this ought not to supersede further law-proceedings, but (as I think) the judge should summon, and preside in, a secret *family*-tribunal or rather parliament, formed by him from kinsfolk of both parties, with free leave to all to speak in their turn. Two complications have to be considered. The kinsfolk may say, that one or both families disapproved the marriage, and that the pair have committed their offence, expressly in order to extort consent. It will have to be considered, whether the judge should have discretion to inflict in that case some disagreeable corporal punishment on the seducer, even though marriage follow. Next, the woman may have been so shocked at the man's baseness, (of which nobody can know all that she would know,) that she recoils with horror at the idea of being his partner for life. This would be extremely rare. A weak woman would seldom indeed show such spirit. But if she did, it implies peculiar malignity of baseness in him: apparently his offer of marriage should go for nothing, and he should be punished as if he had not made it: especially if he may have

made the offer, from foreseeing that it would be refused.—But all these matters also would need mature consideration. Once more. The woman ought never to be brought into public court, but her evidence, when needed, should be taken in private by the judge or his deputy.

There is another aggravated form of seduction, which calls for intense severity of punishment; viz., when the criminal has gained his end by administering a potion to his victim. With our omnipresent drink-shops, this is in many towns the commonest way in which vile plebeians corrupt girls of their own order. If the public sale of intoxicating drink be ever so decidedly put down, it might not wholly extinguish this atrocity. A change in drinking habits would aid: yet, since opiates of one sort or other may always be had, the crime will be possible. Whatever the woman's age, the man should be liable to the full severity of law, if it be ostensible that he induced her to drink, as an aid to his plot against her virtue. The fatal cup equalizes all ages, so that the woman of 30 becomes as defenceless as the child of 14. Perhaps the crime should be simply called Rape.

In the First Part, I alluded to another abomination, which may seem richly to deserve the title of felony; viz. the frequenting of brothels by a married man. Yet it is not clear how to punish this singularly wicked conduct, (singularly wicked, in its first aspect,) without too much cruelty to the woman who is aggrieved, viz. the wife. But as soon as houses of illfame are broken up, in accordance with the purpose and spirit of our ancient law, which is still unrepealed, society will be relieved of these awful impurities, so hideously cruel to wives. But surely, without awaiting the slow process of a Divorce Court,—without any necessity of absolute divorce or legal separation,—a woman who even *suspects* such a crime in her husband ought to have immediate defence, by retaining full legal rights over her own person, alike against her husband, as against a total stranger. Both sexes must be on an equality. Here, as usual, our law is infamously unjust to women. I cannot believe that such iniquities will be much longer endured. On many grounds, wives must retain woman's indefeasible right. The horrible enormity now so freely unveiled, gives this a foremost place among Women's Wrongs.

Not to be too hard upon any class of offenders, a conjecture may be thrown out concerning the "greyheaded gentlemanly

men," who, in so great numbers, visit courtezans in their private apartments, to the surprize and scandal of the women themselves. First, it may be merely the women's fancy, that they are married men. They may be widowers, or old bachelors. Next, they may be men, whom marriage without love has sensualized, not purified; as happens with Oriental princes: and when they have as many children as they desire, they may persuade themselves that they are doing just the kindest thing to their wives in transferring their outward demonstrations of affection to others whom they love neither less nor more than they love their wives; having indeed an easy goodnatured friendliness all round. There are many men, whose whole creed is materialistic; whose morality has no back-bone; who, if they think at all, think general principles of morals to be a weakness; who are kindly enough, glad to do services, liberal with money, and really amiable; who would be shocked at the thought of *injuring* a woman, and fancy that by judicious liberality they do *kindness* to a respectable courtezan, and also buy immunity for their wives. Such men are likely to be most found among the elderly and the rich; which may explain the disproportionate number of them, which shocks and puzzles the simple women. Younger husbands will not come to them, and poorer ones cannot. In all such cases no "*dear children*" are injured. (Alas! where are the harlots' children? oh, gross and hideous violation of Nature's laws, which are God's!) But these gentlemanly old men, though they may not cause physical mischief to their wives or children, not the less are guilty against the community. Men, however healthy, who, without even any mutual compact, share a woman among them, are by so unnatural a practice liable to create in her foul disease, with incalculable result.

What is now the legal punishment of being *accessory* to seduction, I am not aware; but when gain is its object, not only must the offence be criminal, but the pecuniary penalty needs to be of the severest kind. For the ordinary trade of the brothel-keeper heavy fines are evidently the appropriate punishment; but they must increase rapidly on every conviction, so as to become ruinous. Moreover stringent precautions are needed, that the fines be not paid by rich customers. A philanthropic lady who struggles to rescue fallen women, and hereby sees and knows much which is behind the scenes, writes to me: "The

well-to-do brothels here are chiefly maintained by *rich merchants of middle and venerable age*. One was about to be closed, but was endowed speedily by a rich man to keep it going." Evidently the pecuniary penalties ought to increase on such a scale, as to break down even colossal fortunes. But that is not all. To make any pecuniary gift,—beyond what may be called common charity,—for no substantial return, to one who has been fined for brothel-keeping; or to pay the fine; should be made felony, punishable with prison and hard labour. Whether any but a plebeian Parliament, or a Parliament in which *Women* hold numerous seats, will ever enact penalties of adequate severity; many will doubt. But now that these horrible movements towards contented national impurity force chaste and modest persons (and not least, those women who are our chief pride,) to look at the enormous evil with steady eyes; I cannot yet believe that the existing Parliament will fail to admit sound *principle*, however timidly and weakly they may apply it.

(2.) The second great measure,—needful for many other reasons, but equally needful against the Great Social Evil,—is, the suppressing of drinkshops,—of tippie houses, as our old law calls them. I have already observed, that they are dens of seduction. A woman is first poisoned, then ruined; while the potion bedims her understanding, and impairs her self-controul. Chaste feeling is benumbed, before the victim herself is at all aware. Next, the unhappy harlots often avow, that except under the stupor of gin, they could not ply their hateful trade. We may try to imagine what sort of men come into their bosom; with what foulness of breath, with what coarse sensuality, and what not beside! It is shocking to suggest such things; but one may well believe that to a sober harlot many a tippy smoker is inexpressibly disgusting. Who can be accosted in the street by young girls, with tender and refined features, and not be ready to sink into the earth at our national iniquity! Who can avoid the intense conviction, that thousands of poor girls loathe their trade, and can only carry it on at all by benumbing their perceptions? These are sufficient reasons for striking at the "tippie-shops:" but in the cause of young men, hitherto outwardly chaste, the argument reaches wider, to a general abstinence from all intoxicating drink in their private homes,—a topic which will come up under my next head. Here I will only add, that the drinkshops are fatal chiefly by debauching *young people under age*.

Careful parents cannot save boys above 15 from their influence. Few probably who attain their majority without *a taste* for such liquor are afterwards corrupted by it. The shops hinder parents from duly educating their children; which suffices to make them indefensible.

It is not to my immediate argument, yet it is of prime importance, that the same drink is from day to day cause or means of foul murder. Among the conditions for *preventing* both violent crime and the great Social Evil, the foremost rank must be given to a prohibition of the open drink-trade. The liquor is strictly a narcotic poison. Chemists class alcohol with opium. Physiologists pronounce it to spoil the gastric juice, harden food in the stomach, mar the purity of the blood, chill the body, and lower vitality. To be tender over the trade in alcoholic drinking is more unreasonable than to be tender over a trade in opium-eating: for opium does not produce crime, immodesty, impurity and pestilence.

(3.) But further: several of our public institutions need to be fundamentally reorganized, primarily our Churches. Both sexes in common need frank instruction in detail, concerning matters to them of prime importance; which instruction they never get. These institutions pretend to teach Morals; but they do not. They are chiefly concerned with lofty doctrines, which, whatever their value to elder hearers, shoot over young people's heads. The Churches, by their pretensions, and by the inordinate reverence paid to them, so preoccupy the field, that other moral teachers would have no chance of an audience. Nearly all women who are seduced by men, are seduced at a tender age, at which they cannot have the faintest prospect of the dreadful future which awaits them. It must be imputed (I suppose) to the faithful warnings given by Catholic priests, that Irish Catholic women are so chaste: let this be some set-off against our Protestant horror of the confessional. Nevertheless, the experience of at least all Latin Europe, besides the natural instinct of every pure heart, tells us, that Priestesses, not Priests, ought to instruct girls as to the morality of the sex, and the cruel results of its violation. Let boys be taught under a man, girls under a woman, perhaps a matron; so as to secure that on this subject, which is of all the most vital to young people, they shall not have to learn from their own bitter experience. It is now wholly omitted. Girls are not even warned, what an odious

hypocrisy every mercenary marriage is liable to become: how great is the evil and the danger from marriage without love, and how unnatural is the legal relation thus superimposed. Much less are they taught, not to be lenient to those men who have debased themselves before marriage, or urged to exact from men a high standard of chastity. Much more might be hinted here; but Priestesses will find plenty to say, without hints from men. A clergyman also will be able to speak more simply and instructively to youths in the absence of women; and *spiritual* instruction will be only the more effective, when built upon a broad foundation of faithful and detailed *moral* teaching.

There is one important matter, which young men need especially to be taught, *viz.*, that at no time of life is any man, married or unmarried, exempt from the essential duty of curbing animal impulses. In the struggles of a young man against unchaste surroundings and raw passions, nothing so paralyses his will, as to be told, that some men have from God the "gift" of continence, and others *have not*; and that to those who have it not, marriage is the rightful *vent*. This doctrine is disastrously prominent in the Anglican marriage-service, and is borrowed from St. Paul. But that great and deep-hearted apostle was unmarried, and had no personal experience. He writes, not as one revealing supernatural communications, but as imparting his best wisdom; indeed desiring charitably to *apologize* for those who had less self-controul than himself. It is not the less certain, that the lewd are encouraged in their lewdness, and the weak struggler is made weaker still, by each saying to himself, or indeed publishing one to the other,—Ah! you see I have no "gift" of continence.—The malady is in the mind, in the base imagination; and one condition of cure, is, that the false doctrine be cast out. Marriage is not (what I once heard a Catholic Professor bitterly declare was Protestant doctrine) "a legal mode of giving loose rein to the lust of the flesh." A married man is bound sternly to act the celibate during long months; and in some cases totally, through the weak health of his wife. (Not but that even here our law most cruelly treats a wife; who is stript of that self-defence against a brutal sensual husband, which every female dog and cat retains and exercises.) Notoriously, a moderated polygamy brings no physical evil to any of the parties: it follows, that monogamy cannot exhaust a man's physical passion. It is also notorious, that the unbridled

polygamy of some Oriental princes, which aims to satiate animal desire, enervates both mind and body. It follows again, that a firm self-restraint is necessary and salutary for every man. Equally certain is it, that a ship-crew of young men, chiefly under the age of five-and-twenty, and picked for masculine vigour, may go to the Arctic regions for a year or two, and return in splendid condition, without seeing a woman's face. It is therefore a pernicious falsehood, that violation of woman's chastity can be needed for man's health.

I too well know, that some physicians will flatly contradict me. I once received from a medical man (I believe, in reply to some papers which I had written on Chastity) a book entitled *Physical Religion*, which enforced, that a young man is bound, in duty to his body, to consort with harlots. Forsooth, this is the way to health! The same book treated as a dangerous disease,—for which the remedy is to be unchastity,—*that* phenomenon, which every chaste young man knows to be the mode by which God in Nature provides that he shall have no unhealth through chastity. A medical man must know, that it is but the counterpart to a like provision in women.—Now if a more plausible physician, teaching less monstrous doctrine, tell me that there are exceptional men, of abnormal passions, who do (in plain words) “really need” that a woman shall be sacrificed to them; I wish to know, whether the other sex has never a like excuse, and whether he ever recommends a woman to be unchaste. Men expect such abnormal women to die in preference. How loose would young women become, if they opened their ears to such doctrine as is poured in upon young men! A woman who hesitates, (it is said) is lost. Young men also need to spurn with horror such doctrines. To confute them, it would suffice to reply that physical and moral law are in harmony; that the practices which are stigmatized as vice because they lead to disease as well as to injustice, cannot be the appointed remedies for unhealth; that what debases the soul, is no fit cure for the body. And yet, for young people, to abhor is better than to confute. Moreover, a young woman by unchastity sacrifices herself; a young man injures another more than himself: which is much worse.—But as regards this medical lore, it is permissible to ask, whence the physician got it? I frankly say that I regard such “authorities” as *dupes* of their own patients, who,

to cover the offences which they have to confess, throw upon physical causes the weakness or depravity of their will.

The ordinary preachings of the clergy, I believe, laboriously miss the mark. One illustration may perhaps suffice for many. In a certain Oxford College the authorities were distressed to believe that immoralities had crept in, though the outward aspect of the young men was decorous. The clerical Fellow who had to preach in the college chapel determined to speak *faithfully* and *plainly*. He took for his text the Seventh Commandment. The larger part of his discourse was against Adultery. He then explained that the Hebrew word was not limited so much as this English term, but it included other fleshly sin, especially Seduction of women, on the wickedness of which he further dilated. He concluded by touching in the most bashful way on a word, which (apparently) he dared to take into his lips only by quoting a text from St. Paul, viz. the ugly\* word "Fornication"; and earnestly implored his hearers to remember that they were called to be Saints and were dedicated to God from their baptism, that it behoved them to be soldiers and servants of Christ, that it was an awful thing to pollute "the temples of the Holy Spirit,"—and more to this effect,—without one hint that the unchastity of man is an inevitable and frightful *crudelty* to woman.

I heard free comments upon this from young gentlemen who were on good terms with their own consciences. Adultery and Seduction, they avowed, were utter scoundrelism. It was needless to say a word more about them. At least, (said one,) if a gentleman *did* seduce a poor girl, at any rate he ought not to abandon her; but to make her an allowance, to look after her now and then, to maintain her child, if he had one by her: in short, he must honourably take the consequences of his own act. Nevertheless, on the whole, they did not approve of Seduction. A man could not exactly put the woman back where she had been. It was really a shame to spoil a woman's after-chances. But as to Fornication, that was quite another thing. A man found a woman already spoiled: he did not do her any harm, poor creature! As to the talk about being Saints, the preacher must know that very few people are Saints; many of the best and most honourable men are not; in fact many of them are, not a little, *better* than sanctimonious persons; and it was want of

\* It strictly means, Frequenting of *Vaults*.

common sense not to know that they (the young men) did not make any such profession, though they were forced to go to chapel.

On this occasion, the preacher had the disadvantage of being unmarried and on the youthful side of manhood; but he had the advantage of speaking in the entire absence of women. If, instead of directing the young men's eyes into books, he had turned them to the real facts of the world, they were not so hard-hearted or dead of sentiment as to be proof against pointed words. They were quite able to understand, that if a woman were buried alive by each soldier of an army flinging one handful of dust on her while she lay tied on a plank, no soldier could free himself from the guilt of cruel murder, by saying, "It was not *my* handful that suffocated her." The murder is not the less horrible for being a collective act. So is it with the wretched harlot. Nor could her destructive trade exist at all, or be dreamed of, if men were chaste. And to her it is a loathsome misery. Would young men with a spark of good feeling, *if they realized this, if this were pressed upon their conscience*, take the matter so gaily? But precisely these cardinal points seem to be omitted in church-routine. If instead of the Seventh Commandment the preacher had taken a text from Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH, "A licentious age is parent of a cruel age," he might have hit their consciences harder. And as regards personal considerations, he might have asked, whether they make up their minds to live all their lives with harlots: whether even now, they could bear mother or sisters to know their unchastity: whether a man does not become a hypocrite, even a liar, inwardly humiliated and self-despising, timid and anxious, who has always a dread lest the women whom he respects should learn his secret: whether, if hereafter he seek a lady as a life-companion, when ~~his~~ his bride clung to his bosom, he would not wish it to be from fervent self-abandoning love: whether he would not be inexpressibly shocked to learn, that she had no love for him at all, and was only seeking for a fleshly gratification: whether she would not, as certainly, be disgusted to know that this was exactly the thing which he had habitually and deliberately done himself: whether it is just in a man to expect in a wife antenuptial chastity, if he do not himself come chaste to her: whether he must not condemn himself as self-degraded by that which he would regard as self-degradation in her: whether finally,—knowing as we do the delicacy and

complexity of our bodies, and, when once we plunge into unnatural vice, the tenacity of disease,—whether a man who in youth is profligate, can ever be *quite sure* that he does not carry with him afterwards into marriage some seeds of disease which may ruin the health and happiness of an innocent, loving and trusting woman. How then would he detest his own past, how would he condemn his fraudulent concealment of it,—if he found wife and children to suffer from it!—Few young men, in my belief, are so hardened, as not to shudder when such things are pressed home. But alas! preachers preach things transcendental to those who have not climbed up the first stairs. But, to go back to a former point. The effect of happy marriage is often grossly misrepresented to young men. A true love-marriage purifies the debased imagination: that is the first gain. It teaches practically, how empty is carnal, and how solid is spiritual delight. It reveals to a man the heart of woman, through his intimate knowledge of the one heart which is his own. It gives him, not only one wife, but a hundred frank-hearted and pleasant sisters. If young men knew, what is the constant joy of a simple loving wife, they would not be such fools as to defer or sacrifice it for frivolous luxury, much less for hired embraces.

At the same time, to fortify young women, more is needed than *moral* instruction. They need to gain such *industrial* knowledge or skill, as will fetch a price in the market. They must not be driven to the pit of ruin by destitution threatening them. We must not endure an unjust depreciation of work, merely because done by female hands, nor their exclusion from business for which they have aptitude. Nor yet should *high* education (so called) be allowed, even among the gentry, to supersede *industrial* training. Many a pitiable tale is whispered concerning daughters of clergymen, and of young women reared in every luxury, but ruined by calamities unforeseen. The Society\* which struggles to find work for women needs and deserves help a hundredfold. It is a matter of national concern.

Handsome young women who are poor, are allured by flattery, by love of finery and of passing as “ladies,” as well as by indolence;—indeed, by the great gap which separates the

\* “Society for Promoting the Employment of Women :” Secretary, Miss Crewe: Office, 19 Langham Place, London (W)..

continuous toil of a virtuous girl, from the easy life of her who listens to a man's base proposals. Such young women might in great numbers be saved, by the faithful warnings of a Woman-teacher in their tenderer years; nevertheless, with a sadly large fraction of them such moral instruction might be insufficient in their frivolous girlhood, until seducers are dealt with as felons.

To fortify chastity in young men, the first point is, not to break down that modesty and sensitiveness which they naturally have, in common with girls. I have read an energetic letter from an American mother, who insists that the natural mysteries of the sexes must be taught, as mothers know how, to little boys as well as little girls, at an age when such mysteries can move only amazement and keen interest, without any possible admixture of passion. She had so taught her little boys. The matter deserves mature thought. Such a method effectually hinders evil curiosity and the impure talk of boys one to another; at least insofar as it is a boasting of superior knowledge, and a taunting of younger boys with ignorance or modesty.—But to cleanse our schools, if they inherit any traditions of the past, is truly to cleanse an Augean stable. For myself, I am firmly convinced that many things in the school-classics perniciously inflame passion in boys and young men: so do many approved English poems, plays, sculptures and paintings. All such things are a great *cruelty* to a boy who struggles to keep his imagination undefiled. Let us not hear the reply, "To the *pure* all things are pure;" "A nice man is a man with nasty ideas;" nor other such folly as anonymous writers pour forth on those whom they call *prudes*. The glaring fact is, that we are *not* pure. With 8,000 street harlots in London alone, what utter nonsense is such talk! It is clear that a gravely large fraction of us is early and profoundly corrupted: no one can tell how small a spark may cause explosion. And as a reclaimed drunkard cannot safely take even a little sip of the once fatal liquor, so who of us can tell how dangerous, to him who has hardly escaped the pollutions of the world, are even reminiscences of his ancient plague? Will you scold at him as a prude, because, cherishing inward purity, remembering his past with hatred, he chastens his eyes and his ears, and dreads every voluptuous suggestion? And has any man,—artist or poet,—in an apartment full of straw and gunpowder, any *right* to scatter

sparks abroad?—But, if we start with children, hitherto innocent, why do we treat boys so differently from girls? No one imagines that a girl will be made purer by plunging her through impure reading or any thing that excites voluptuous thought: how then can any person of common sense think that this method is desirable for boys, who are so much more inflammable? Manifestly the fact is, that people desire chastity in their daughters *greatly*, and in their sons *very feebly*: that is the true key to the whole. Boys are to be brave; and if they are (what is gently called) “irregular,” it does not much matter. But when this “irregularity” is sport to the one sex, at the cost of death to the other, the nation that permits such crime cannot evade the judgments of God. In the very same proportion that individuals are profligate, the State needs to be severe. So it is when high robbery and incendiarism are rife: so should it be when tender girls are execrably abused.

Nevertheless, even when the frightful ordeal of school has deeply polluted a young man’s mind, yet while he retains tenderness and refinement and outward modesty, it is impossible for him not to start with horror from the touch of a common woman. There is something surpassingly disgusting in the idea of bestowing fond kisses, the symbol and pledge of warm and faithful love, on one who not only is not loved, but to-morrow is cast away: one, whom we may deeply pity, and yet must loathe, while she touts for custom. The lie, the hypocrisy, the unnatural monstrosity of intimately embracing a person whom we do not love, might seem too hateful for any man of ordinary sensitiveness to endure: and from this point of view man’s guilt in coarse impurity is a hundredfold that of a woman in her first fall. For the woman is generally courted under pretence of love, and easily persuades herself that her suitor loves her, and she can trust her own darling: others may be faithless, but *he* will not. But a man, in casting himself to a harlot, neither loves her, nor imagines that she loves him. It is but a brutal bargain, with an absolute minimum of enjoyment. A kiss of real love may be ecstatic in delight, as it is a pledge of life-long union: but what can be more empty or contemptible, than to kiss lips which we do not love?—Why do I dwell on this? Because I cannot but believe, that scarcely any young man, hitherto outwardly pure, (whatever his inward corruption through a calamitous history,) could so degrade himself as to rush into a

harlot's embrace, unless he had first taken off the edge of his good sense, his delicacy, and his self-controul, by certain glasses of wine, or other intoxicating drink. *Primâ facie*, the same thing is to be believed concerning soldiers and sailors. To stop the bar and the tap, might almost in itself suffice to save for the Government the health of the two services, and spare to the nation the intolerable humiliation and misery of this ill-omened "Contagious Diseases' Act." Orgies of impurity to young men at Oxford, in my undergraduate days, could only go on as sequel of a wine-party. Apparently, without the wine preceding, no freshman could be corrupted. Wine does certainly precipitate even elder men into talk of which they would be thoroughly ashamed in their normal state; a phenomenon which reveals how easily it may disarm young men of their usual delicacy. If then individuals, society or the State, desire to arrest debasing vice, most cruel to women, ruinous to family life, to industry, to public health and to the nobler virtues; very severe restriction must be put on *strong drink* by influence, by custom and by law. So far as minors are concerned, perhaps no measure of prohibition can be too strong. It is the first thing needed, it is absolutely needed, and the effect on public morality and public health will be prodigious.

(4) Another institution which needs fundamental reform, in the cause of public purity and modesty, is, the treatment of female maladies by male surgeons and physicians. A poor fallen woman told her story frankly, to a lady who told me of it; that the base man who first seduced and abandoned her, communicated to her a vile disease; that she went into hospital for it, and was there tended by a young surgeon, who took so many liberties with her under plea of medical necessity, that he gained an overpowering familiarity, and corrupted her a second time. After this she was unable to recover herself, and fell into the rank and file of that most pitiable female army. The simple tale seems to lift up a curtain and disclose unimagined abuses. —I have seen in the handwriting of a purehearted Catholic dignitary the statement, that Catholic priests often hear in the confessional the distress of married women, who do not know how to behave towards surgeons who attend them as man-midwives, and indulge in "impure handling." To be told such things even in isolated cases is enough to make one shudder at existing practices. Allow that old men and married men

(though age, which naturally destroys bashfulness, is not always favourable to that modesty and chastity, to which at every age man is as solemnly bound as woman,—of which moreover the destruction is more hateful in the old man and far more inexcusable,) yet allowing that elder men must *sometimes* be called in, as a last resort, to advise in *some* female ailments, nevertheless in a well-ordered community this would be the exception, not the rule. It would be confined to the case of extreme suffering, which of itself overpowers female bashfulness, and, by the compassion which it excites, thoroughly chastens a physician's heart. But it is at least as improper for young medical students to explore the anatomy of the female, or treat any of the diseases of women, as for women to treat the diseases peculiar to men. Nay, it is far worse. For, whatever is peculiar to the male sex can only be hideous and repulsive to a woman: therefore nothing of the kind, in painted anatomy or in real life, can ever deprave a female practitioner. But that which is hidden of the woman is alluring to the man, and, in so far, undoubtedly *tends* to corrupt him. As just said, when a woman is in acute pain, compassion purifies the surgeon's heart; but this does not apply to the study of paintings, to the anatomy of a female corpse, or to that horrible introspection of scores of women turned in a heap out of vans. It is a belief too general to be safely slighted, that young medical students are more licentious than other young men; and an ancient commonplace may here apply: "those are more likely to commit crime, who can more easily hide their guilt." He who has medical knowledge thinks that if by trespass he contract infection, he can heal himself in privacy: another youth would need to reveal it to a physician. The young surgeon, with more to inflame him, has also less to frighten him. Surgeons are men, and their chastity is not always firm. Another lady who has opened herself frankly to me, states, that at a certain Penitentiary, when a surgeon was called in to treat a case of severe accident, several of the girls told the matron that they knew him well, as a constant frequenter of brothels. It is difficult to imagine how any medical man can retain delicacy, who has to go through such a business-like operation as inspecting a long string of women in the shortest possible time; even if we have not attained the almost miraculous rapidity of the French surgeons, whom the women seem to obey more promptly than Chasseurs could

manceuvre at the word of command. If all England be scourged by the Bill of Extension, we might well apprehend that the whole tribe of surgeons would become as immodest as the women. But surely the whole principle is a fundamental error. If we could look at the matter with fresh eyes, I believe we should call our present practices a mischievous and intolerable indecency. We need to return to the sentiment of all antiquity and of all Eastern people, which *was* also that of all Europe. But, when modern science arose, men kept it to themselves, and thereby expelled women from their natural rightful place of physicians and surgeons to women. Let the study of female diseases and female anatomy be withheld from young men in the public hospitals and medical schools, at least as soon as enough women have been made competent. A few years will suffice, if there is but force of will in the *women* of the nation. The £20,000 already spent on one hospital in Devonport, erected for the base object of supplying the sailors with "safe and sound" companions, would probably have sufficed to raise up the female practitioners needful for their own sex. Not only would they minister in child-birth and in general female illnesses, but they would be invaluable in rescuing the unhappy harlots. To women-physicians the poor lost ones would come willingly, whenever it was necessary. No compulsion would be needed, no agonizing shame would be incurred, none of them would be hardened in depravity. Priestesses and female surgeons combined, would carry out a truly great work. Women are not only the natural purifiers of men; they are also the natural rescuers of their own sex, to whom no good man can come very near. They would kindly and pitifully withdraw the harlot from her dreadful course, would cherish her modesty, aid her to conceal her shame, throw a veil over the past; and instead of branding "Prostitute" on her forehead, would strive to mix her in the crowd of unspotted women. Many of those uncounted thousands might be thus rescued by the tender intervention of ministering angels, if Parliament would but assign proper funds, so as to equip women for the task. Do you set male surgeons to a compulsory introspection of these pitiable outcasts? Oh, how *can* men be so cruel on the one hand, or so unconscious of cruelty on the other! It is women's work: men have no business to touch it, or to study it. Greek, Turk and Indian cry out shame upon them.

I cannot here avoid to add, that a Female Medical College already exists in Fitzroy Square, London. It has excellent Professors, ardent in the cause. The teacher in Midwifery is the eminent Dr. MURPHY, Professor of that branch in University College, London. The Earl of SHAFTESBURY is President. It has also energetic pupils, who quickly get practice as midwives. It only needs funds, but needs them urgently, to enlarge the course of instruction and secure its permanence. Ultimately, of course, the Professors in most branches ought to be women.— Here, alas! we encounter a grievous and most surprizing phenomenon, that some women whom every one would expect to be zealous friends of this institution, are not merely cold and disdainful to it, but seem to have a pleasure in vilifying it. The ground of their attack is, that the curriculum is not sufficiently extended, and it ought to have a Hospital of its own. But I read, that wholly uneducated midwives have better success with women in childbirth than the most accomplished male physicians: and it is certainly rash to make so light of Professor MURPHY's diligent instructions, to say nothing of the other distinguished Professors. But, as soon as money comes in, the curriculum *will be* extended. The Hospital, which those ladies so dictatorially claim, will need many thousands a year. If they would aid this Infant institution, instead of assailing it, its funds might soon be enlarged.

(5.) It is time to pass to another topic. A standing army, with barrack life, and martial law in time of peace, is too immoral and too tyrannical an institution for a wise people to endure. Thousands, I am persuaded, have this conviction deep in their hearts; but they think change so hopeless, that they hold their peace. Mr. JOHN STUART MILL, during his brilliant but unhappily short Parliamentary career, excellently laid down, that our armaments ought to be *strong for defence, and weak for offence*. Such a principle does not suit a pugnacious minister, and will be resisted to the utmost by routine, by military officers and by very powerful secret influence. Nevertheless the times are propitious for a fundamental change. Not only of Mr. GLADSTONE and his most eminent colleagues is the policy most heartily pacific: but the same is equally true of the present Earl of DERBY, known to us in office as Lord STANLEY. Next, the urgent effort for economy, and the just claim that the National Debt shall be paid off, press in the direction of re-

stricting our armaments to the utmost, and cutting down their expense.

The force which is most offensive to foreigners is our immense war-fleet. They remember our bombardment of Copenhagen without even prior warning and declaration of war. To defend our arsenals, such heavily armoured hulks or monitors as cannot bear rough seas, are efficient beyond every other device, and can never alarm foreign countries. Our fleet on the coast of West Africa was proved by Sir FOWELL BUXTON, more than 30 years ago, to make the slave trade more cruel to negroes, without checking it. All reason for that fleet has come to an end. Our Mediterranean fleet is equally an anachronism. To suppress piracy, both in that sea and on the Oceans, we need a *joint action* of all maritime powers; of which each should contribute its quota of ships to an International Board,—if not rather to *two* Boards, one for the Mediterranean, one for the Oceans. The Board and its ships would in fact be Extra-National and essentially neutral in every possible war. Russia, Prussia, Austria and Italy, would rejoice to be recognized as maritime. We have no right whatever to a fleet in the Mediterranean except for common benefit. We should finally get rid of that hatred and suspicion, which from nearly all nations rest upon us because of the greatness of our marine and our arrogance in the past. By such coöperation on the sea, we might plant a germ of European Federation, in a *Mediterranean Board* from which Russia probably would be excluded; we might also provide a high tribunal for international arbitration. At any rate, we should immensely lessen, on the one hand, the expense of our fleet; on the other, the number of those who follow the *unnatural* life of sailors.\*

\* Although it does not belong to my subject, I cannot refrain from adding,—especially since the general movement is towards early liberation of colonies,—that the danger of renewed slave-trade is great, if petty powers, with small population and land to spare, are admitted into diplomatic equality with the greater. Now is the crisis for the powers of Europe and of the two Americas to establish, as laws of the Ocean, great principles, which shall for ever make a slave-trade impossible. Such a development could not be, until Russia and America had liberated their slaves. An *Oceanic board* is now perhaps a timely growth, and would soon take this important work in hand. On the East Coast of Africa, the slave-trade through Zanzibar is become of late awfully destructive.

To reconcile moral with commercial and imperial interests in the case of sailors is to me the hardest part of my subject. I do not pretend to solve the problem; I merely point at it, and insist that the smaller our fleets, the smaller the evils. Also, the greater our fleets, and the longer the men have been abroad, so much the greater is the cruelty of allowing sailors, as soon as they land, to be inveigled into taverns where they spend in drink and vice the earnings of months or years; carrying also back with them abroad that tendency to drunkenness and frays, which makes our nation infamous and has even involved us in war.

But, for a standing army there is no necessity, no valid reason. Martial law in time of peace, especially such martial law as exists, is a gratuitous mischief, as immoral in its results as it is tyrannical. It is only enacted for one year; such is the traditional and just jealousy of Parliament. This is a solemn annual protest that it is no accepted system. The ancient institutions of England down to the Revolution did not allow of a standing army, but were much more like those of Switzerland; which enable a State, very small in population and poor for its numbers, to keep a formidable defence against invasion from even great Powers; and this, at a minimum of cost, while eminently sustaining patriotic feeling. We want no other army, but such a skeleton as may be a normal school to the nation, to organize and drill us, *if ever* the occasion arise. The only thing needed to be taught beforehand and taught to all, because the art cannot be acquired in a moment, is, the use of the rifle. The less we spend in peace, the stronger we are in war. Old armaments are a positive weakness. In the late American civil war, the South, with all its deficiencies in workshops, workmen, materials and wealth, so armed the *Merrimac* that no ship in the whole English navy could have withstood her; and the *Pingal* (or *Atalanta*) was perhaps still more formidable. The North, beginning with some half dozen ships, blockaded in a few months a coastline of between 2 and 3 thousand miles; and built, first the *Monitor* which repelled the *Merrimac*, next the *Weehauken* which knocked to pieces the *Atalanta*. Contrast the English Admiralty. Being accustomed to huge ships, they were unwilling to put on the stocks what was really needed for the war in the Baltic, namely, gun-boats: and built them so late, that the war was over before they were complete. In America, the North and South alike,

with unheard-of speed, organized out of civil population in country and town armies on a scale utterly unknown to us.—To keep up in peace armaments fit for war, is an insanity which we ought to leave to despotic powers.

But, it is said, we are then to be defenceless. No such thing. England under HENRY VIII. and ELIZABETH was not defenceless. Switzerland is not defenceless. Every young man in the kingdom, within certain ages, should be *compelled* to learn the use of the rifle, or whatever is the most effective arm. A compulsion which is universal, would not be felt as any hardship. It would not have any immoral tendencies, as it has when soldiers are merely the riffraff and scum of society. It would not encourage frivolity or a taste for war: moreover, young men naturally like to be taught a skill of this kind. The public holidays necessary for it would be highly convenient for local political action: but details are not here in place. If ability to shoot preëxist, an army, greater than we ever yet had, could be raised at the shortest notice. We want no regimenting, no "volunteers," (an evil institution on several grounds,) no military movements, no uniforms, no martial law, no martinet-tyrannies, but only a temporary dictatorship, limited to secure the community against the misuse of weapons. As soon as it is known abroad that every Englishman can use the rifle, French colonels will for ever leave off to bluster about invasion. On a really great crisis, armies would, as it were, spring out of the soil. Remember the Hungary of 1848-9: or rather, the new generation may need to learn the facts. Austria, resolved to crush the liberties of Hungary, (which are as ancient and continuous as those of England,) had carefully put away nearly all the Hungarian army into Italy, Bohemia and elsewhere: so that only 4000 trained troops remained in Hungary, which had few workshops for arms, and was very backward in all mechanical developments. The Austrian ministry perfidiously stimulated insurrection in Transylvania, Serbia and Croatia, and secretly furnished the insurgents with arms and officers, while publicly disowning and denouncing them. The Russians occupied Transylvania—the very citadel of Hungary,—with 20,000 men, and the Austrians with 150,000 invaded Hungary from three sides. Yet Hungary, thus taken by surprise, beat down her insurgents, drove out the Russians, and defeated the Austrians in seven great battles on the open field in the single month of March,

1849. She wanted nothing but *arms*,—which she could not manufacture fast enough,—to defeat the host of nearly 200,000 men which Russia proceeded to pour in upon her. But all the European Cabinets conspired, *not* to acknowledge her “belligerence,” (even after she had defeated Austria,) and thereby enable her to purchase arms. In consequence, her chief general was driven to unpatriotic despair: his perfidy, and that alone, caused her final defeat. Every European Cabinet knows perfectly what England, once taught to use arms, could and would do, if invaded. No defence of the coast by a fleet will be needful. We shall have no more disgraceful panics, such as that of Russian invasion in 1838, and of French invasion both in 1852 and in the close of 1859.

Parliamentary hatred of standing armies became intense, after CHARLES I. had attempted to overthrow the laws, and CROMWELL had succeeded in usurping a despotism by his Ironsides. The guard of CHARLES II. (I think) were called *blackguards*, and the meaning which the word assumed attests the general sentiment. Vainglorious delight in MARLBOROUGH’S victories may have lessened English hatred of a centralized and armed landforce; yet the hatred lived in Parliament into the reign of GEORGE II. Perhaps it perished in the blazing military successes of the elder PITT’S administration. Happily at last no Statesmen now dream of entering European conflicts. We fought against Russia our last war, and by its success the freedom of Italy and the union of Germany became possible. Spain, Italy, Hungary, Germany, can now all take care of themselves; and in our conduct to Denmark and Poland the nation and Parliament jointly have uttered the verdict, that we are not mighty enough to rescue little States from great ones. Whatever our sympathies and judgments, it is no task for us; and we ought now to be able to go back to old English principles, as under the Tudors. Let a powerful minister announce it, and, I believe, a tumult of applause will ring through all three kingdoms.

Yet undoubtedly there is a huge mountain of difficulty in the way, in respect to India (to say nothing of Ireland). We have recently conquered India by force, and we keep it undisguisedly by the strong hand. We no longer trust native troops, nor hold Indian loyalty by delegation from the Great Mogul, whom we treated as a felon for remembering that he was our

*suzerain*. We now lift aloft upon our tiara the historical badge of "tyranny," by occupying India with a foreign army; and in case of new insurrection, all the Cabinets in the world, and all the Garibaldians in the world, will sympathize with the insurgents. If moral principle cannot make us tremble, the fate of Austria while clinging to retain Venice and Lombardy may warn us. But that is a glance forward into the future. As our immediate punishment, we use up, we strictly *sacrifice on the altar* of Imperialism, some thousands of young men in every year of peace, (ten thousand, it has been said,) to maintain our vast Indian army. Every soldier who reaches Indian soil has cost to the Government, it is said, £100. India is taxed for our military expenses, and pays yearly for her own subjugation: not a very soothing fact for patriots unreconciled to our rule. As for our soldiers, they most reasonably abhor the idea of being shipped off to such a distance, and to a climate where barrack-life under martial law is simply pestilential; while the fostered vices of the troops make bad worse. Desertion from the army increased prodigiously in 1858, when the soldiers found that they were liable to be sent to India. The difficulty of inducing men to enlist is intensified, at the very time when the Government wants more of them: and, awful to say! powerful persons regard this as a justification of entrapping them into the service by making them drunk. The drain on our military population is too great, and makes the idea perfectly ridiculous of depending on a standing army for home defence. Yet, so insane are men of routine, that forgetting the Martello towers built against the first Napoleon, which, it was presently found, could not be garrisoned, the stupidity has been repeated in new fortifications, which are already confessed to be useless. We cannot be safe, until we rest on a *righteous* basis; that is, until Indians learn to be proud of the English dynasty, and cast their patriotism into it. Their high admiration of our mechanical developments, their sense how many benefits we can impart by constitutional procedures, by fixed legality and social freedom, give us noble opportunity. It must be confessed, that our introduction of *spirit-shops* for the sake of revenue has shocked the most intelligent classes, who are our most valuable and loyal supporters. How they will be revolted, how they will despise and abhor us, if we adopt a warranted harlotry as a universal English institution, we can but speculate. At this moment England may win

the loyalty of India quickly by one way, and by one only: that is, by faithfully carrying out the Charter of 1833, and the Queen's proclamation made when she assumed the empire. The one assures absolute evenhanded justice and equality between Hindoo and Englishman as regards official appointments; the other guarantees security to the Princes and neutrality in religion. No one would more rejoice to give to Indians their fullest rights, than the present Prime Minister, who spoke nobly for the Ionian Isles, long before any other official person; who wrote concerning Naples letters of historical fame, casting diplomacy to the winds, when sacred morality was concerned; who also showed his conscientious sense of the solemnity of national pledges, in his very brave and unexpected utterance concerning the extension of the Parliamentary suffrage. But alas! he is not immortal: his health may fail, as did that of other laborious "Peelites," his near friends. Against the intense resistance of officials, men of routine, men scornful of Asiatics, men clinging to narrow interests, who have hitherto made our high pledges well nigh empty,—the ablest Prime Minister can do nothing signal, until there is a loud cry from the nation. Very few of our middle classes know the facts concerning India and Indian policy; perhaps not many even of the upper classes; but when once it is clearly understood that the standing army is kept up only for India, plain men will say plainly: "*England is not to be sacrificed for India: our brethren, our sons, are not to rot by thousands in time of peace.*" The moral hatreds of a people, simply uttered, are not ineffective, especially of a people which exercises political suffrage; and the intense difficulties of our position both in India and in Ireland will weigh with men who measure justice and morality by what they call Expediency.

For some years we have been running hard in the direction of the French army-system. It cannot possibly be complete, without *conscription*. The miserable mean substitute of cheating poor men by drunkenness to "take the Queen's shilling," must soon break down. Conscription certainly never will be endured. To transplant the system into England so as to obtain French *efficiency*, is quite impossible: meanwhile, tottering steps in that direction lead us into French *immorality*; and now, a bold hand has suddenly opened to us a clear vista of the future,—French licensed prostitution, French social despotism, women turned into shameless animals, and marriage-ties dissolving. Do the ruling classes sup-

pose that the nation is as yet willing to renounce the decencies and sanctities of family life, to replace wives by "sound harlots," or wholly to strip off modesty and legal rights from the women who have been ruined by the wicked heartlessness of men ?

A topic on which Mr. SIMON touches in his valuable report, cannot quite be omitted here. *Early marriage* would be conducive to general welfare. Most true. MALTHUS himself would heartily recommend it, under the stipulation that the State should not relieve parents of parental duty, or support able-bodied paupers. But the chief thing that we have to say of a practical kind here, is, that the State must not allow whole classes of people to be artificially kept unmarried, which is injurious to public morals, and also weakens the country. To the State the first matter of importance is to have *good* citizens ; next, if they are good, to have *as many as possible*. An able, industrious, self-denying man or woman is always worth having as a citizen, and is a source of national wealth, unless institutions are infamously bad ; and then, the institutions must be mended ; the population must not be shovelled out. To one class of us, the great discouragements of marriage are, silly Fashion and Luxury, injudicious and expensive Food, false principles of Economy, the enormous expense of educating children ; also the expense of House Rent, rising out of the system of huge towns. To another class, the prohibition of building cottages, and the stagnation of rural industry ; which increases with the increased area of grazing land. Improvement in these matters is *general* improvement, and cannot be treated as specific to the present subject. Not so the enforced celibacy of a hundred thousand men, in the army and navy : is not this as bad as a celibate clergy ? But the cure cannot be had by any other method than the natural one of trusting the public defence to the brave hands and hearts of the entire people.

I have long believed that we need legal processes, to be publicly performed with religious solemnity, for Adoption and Clientship. They would aim primarily at securing children from destitution, and *especially girls*. Orphan Houses and Foundling Establishments are, to the thing really needed, like what SOLOMON'S Polygamy is to Marriage. But as with Marriage, so here, the strictest and wisest precautions are needed, lest wicked persons abuse the legal power entrusted to them. Hence the subject is too complex and difficult to treat in these pages, and can only be alluded to.

Parliament is too often stupified by overwork and by piles of figures. Statistics have been called the *raw materials* of Science. They are not always even that: yet medical men, who ought to know better, are constantly mistaking them for Science itself. They present to one a tabulated view, and then beg that it may be confuted, if possible: as if a table were, in and by itself, a scientific argument. Figures often usefully refute, or suggest defect in some theory. Again, where principles are clear and acknowledged, where we know what are the relations of cause and effect, and what are *all* the causes at work, Statistics are of value to show the *magnitude* of the *known* elements,—as so often in Politics: and if tables are copious enough, they may show how far a change in one element changes another. If we are able to make *experiments*, where causes are few, are known, and are in our own controul, the Statistics may develop an orderly law; yet even here, they denote a weak and obscure science, to which they are but a supplement; as in experiments on the resistance of fluids. But when we can only *observe*,—where causes are numerous, many of them unappreciable, many perhaps unsuspected; and much more, where we are absolutely ignorant, *a priori*, of any relations at all between the phenomena tabulated, Statistics are generally an ignis fatuus, and the reasoner who thinks he is acting the scientific man, is apt merely to show his excessive folly. The late eminent Professor Dr. WHEWELL declared that the weak point in the English mind is, *distrust of broad truths*: to this defect he thought Mathematics to be a corrective. The defect shows itself preëminently in the direful exploding of Moral Faith: without which a legislator gropes in the darkness, and falls into calamitous errors, which a youth morally wise would reject.

[END.]