
Hauling Down the Double Standard: Feminism, Social Purity and Sexual Science in Late Nineteenth-Century Britain

Lesley Hall

Introduction

There is often assumed to have been a vast dichotomy in the late nineteenth century between an emergent scientific discourse of 'sexology' on the one hand, and feminism and the related social purity movement on the other. Work on the rise of a sexual science in the late nineteenth century has for the most part depicted this as engendered within the fields of medicine and science, at that time largely closed to women. The emphasis has been on the development of medicalised discourses around homosexuality and 'perversions' more generally.¹ Studies of the social purity movement have taken different perspectives towards this complex phenomenon. The foundational study by Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance* (1977), focussed on its moral policing and regulatory activities, which have also been the subject of more recent monographs by Petrow and Hunt.² Taking a contrary view, Sheila Jeffreys and Margaret Jackson posited social purity as advancing a morally radical feminist agenda.³ Subsequent studies, in particular Lucy Bland's *Banishing the Beast*, and the essays in Bland and Doan's *Sexology in Culture*, have added considerable nuance to this picture, including the important fact that feminism and social purity were far from coterminous, though they had strong common grounds of interest.⁴ The extremely ambivalent nature of social purity in practice, with its tension between policing and punishment on the one hand, and rescue and support on the other, has become increasingly apparent.⁵

The relationship between these two movements may superficially appear to have been antagonistic: sexology rejecting the moral policing (and the

definitions of morality) of social purity, social purity regarding sexology as simply another manifestation of the obscenity it was campaigning against. However, social purity and sex reform not only had common roots as responses to the phenomena of urbanisation and modernisation, they were also both in profound opposition to the miasmatically widespread 'classic moralism' (defined by Michael Mason, in *The Making of Victorian Sexual Attitudes*),⁶ which assumed that the double moral standard was an embodiment of 'natural' transhistorical law based in unalterable differences between the sexes. Thus they were fighting, on somewhat different fronts, a common enemy that privileged the (white, upper-/middle-class heterosexual) male in both actual law and in social practice, and by the early twentieth century significant links can be discerned between the two movements.

A number of studies have already demonstrated that feminism and social purity were engaging with the emerging scientific literature on sexuality in the early twentieth century in ways rather more nuanced and less oppositional than originally assumed.⁷ However, on the whole these accounts retain a largely gendered dichotomy between the political and moral movement on the one hand, and the scientific investigations on the other, well into the twentieth century.

This article argues that the complicated relationship between these two movements, neither of them in themselves monolithic, went back much earlier, and that the role of feminist and social purity debates and activism as an aetiological factor in the emergence of attempts to investigate sexual phenomena in an (ideally, if not always actually) dispassionate manner, using the tools of rationality and drawing on the findings of a wide range of scholarly disciplines, has been neglected if not wholly overlooked or misinterpreted by subsequent historians.

The emergence of sexology

Something that for the sake of brevity might be described as 'sexology' was discernibly emerging in Britain (influenced by contemporaneous developments on the Continent and in North America) by the late 1880s and the 1890s. Unlike feminism and social purity it was by no means a mass movement, and could be represented as a withdrawal from the field of immediate campaigning action in order to ascertain the basis on which matters might proceed (as with the British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology, founded in 1913).⁸

Nonetheless, the handful of individuals in Britain who were associated with the endeavour to apply rational analysis to the phenomena of sex had strong links to social movements of the day. Karl Pearson was a socialist, though of somewhat authoritarian cast, as well as a follower of Sir Francis Galton's recently adumbrated eugenic theories.⁹ The Scottish biologists

Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson, Geddes in particular, were involved in a range of causes.¹⁰ Edward Carpenter was not a scientist: he was a socialist, pacifist, anti-imperialist, feminist, vegetarian, simple-lifer, early 'green' environmentalist and, for the period, a relatively 'out' homosexual and spokesman for homosexual rights. However, the arguments he advanced, in a form directed towards a popular rather than a specialist or elite audience, fused ethical themes with developments in modern science.¹¹ The major figure in English sexology, Henry Havelock Ellis, was medically qualified, though he had only undertaken this training in order as a basis for his life's work of investigating the mysteries of sex. His profound involvement in a world of progressive thought and societies has been brilliantly delineated by Chris Nottingham in *The Pursuit of Serenity: Havelock Ellis and the New Politics*.¹²

The traditional way of looking at the rise of sexology around the 1890s was as the beginning of a movement of reaction against what was assumed to be a monolithic system of 'Victorian repression'.¹³ This Whiggish vision of a mission of enlightenment, which can still be discerned in Vern Bullough's *Science in the Bedroom* (1994), parallels the stories of the Wonderful Onward March of Medical Progress in traditional versions of the history of medicine, and like those stories, tends to be implicitly gendered as a story about heroic males working for the benefit of society as a whole. A later perception of sexology (already being argued before Foucault made his mark on the scene) was that it was attempting to control by definition, with an emphasis on its role in creating 'pervert' identities.¹⁴ This has been substantially nuanced, for example by Oosterhuis' analysis of the two-way interaction between Richard von Krafft-Ebing and the 'male inverts' who consulted him.¹⁵

However sexology has been depicted, when its genealogy has been constructed, it has been delineated, as pedigrees so often are, on patrilineal lines. The accepted lineage has encompassed medical texts; legal judgements, legislative acts and codes; scientific works (in particular Darwin's *Origin of Species*, his work on sexual selection and other works on the doctrine of evolution); emerging new disciplines such as criminology; and the observations of anthropologists and explorers such as Sir Richard Burton. These, all activities or fields of endeavour coded as masculine, have been cited as influencing the emergence of a scientific study of the phenomena of sex in society by the final decades of the nineteenth century.¹⁶

Women protest

Missing from this genealogy, however, is the impact of preceding feminist campaigns and debates over questions of sexuality in society. Criticism and analysis of existing assumptions had been generated in large part by

the multi-strand attack on the Contagious Diseases (CD) Acts of the 1860s.¹⁷ These withdrew civil liberties – enjoyed by the rest of the population – from prostitutes in the ‘designated districts’. Women who had committed no crime in law were being incarcerated.¹⁸ The right to refuse medical examination on the grounds of the possibility of self-incrimination – women suspected of infanticide or men accused of sodomy could only be physically inspected for proof if they consented¹⁹ – had been removed from a group of women who were not doing anything illegal.

Seldom explicitly articulated assumptions about masculinity underlay the Acts. Men from the rougher strata of the lower classes who joined the army and navy, in particular, were regarded as having uncontrolled and probably uncontrollable sexual urges.²⁰ Preconceptions about the male necessity for sexual release and ‘fallen’ women as being outside the rights accorded to the rest of society were clearly articulated in the report of the 1870 Royal Commission on the working of the Acts:

There is no comparison to be made between prostitutes and the men who consort with them. With the one the offence is committed as a matter of gain; with the other it is the irregular indulgence of a natural impulse.²¹

This openly stated, within the formal framework of an official Government ‘Blue Book’, a pervasive, but seldom so explicit, attitude towards the differing needs of men and women.

The double moral standard had also been embodied in the Divorce Act of 1857, which made a single act of adultery by the wife sufficient grounds for dissolving the marriage, while the husband’s adultery was so minor a peccadillo that it had to be combined with cruelty, desertion or some other matrimonial offence to provide grounds for the wife to obtain a decree. This assumption was not uncontested, and the CD Acts burst upon a society already thinking about, and begin to campaign around, a number of issues to do with the male/female relationship, in and out of marriage,²² including domestic violence and rape within marriage. While the latter did not perhaps generate campaigns as broadly based as those for married women’s property rights and against the CD Acts, they were promoted by vigorous and determined campaigners, Elizabeth Wolstenholme Elmy even endeavouring to get a Parliamentary act passed abolishing the presumption that a husband could not rape his wife.²³

Early historical studies of the social purity movement that evolved out of the campaign against the CD Acts were not particularly kind to it or the strand within feminist thought that it represented. Constance Rover in *Love, Morals and the Feminists* (1970) argued that the ‘obviously respectable and worthy’ leaders of the nineteenth-century women’s movement ‘subscribed to conventional morality’, whereas they might have been better advised to make ‘a more concerted effort to restructure society, including

its moral basis'.²⁴ Judith Walkowitz in her classic study of the campaign against the CD Acts, *Prostitution and Victorian Society* (1980), deplored the outcome of proliferating 'clubs and armies to train the young and innocent in sexual repression' and the 'voluntary and propagandist efforts ... complemented by repressive public measures against unrespectable sexual activity'.²⁵ She also argued that the 'prurient' emotions fed by white-slavery scandals 'assuage[d] middle class guilt' by implicating 'sinister forces ... outside society' rather than its 'basic social and economic arrangements',²⁶ a theme she developed in more detail in her account of W. T. Stead's 'Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon' articles in her *City of Dreadful Delight* (1992).²⁷

The view that feminists had basically colluded with something defined as 'conventional morality' was inverted by Sheila Jeffreys in her influential *The Spinster and her Enemies* (1985). In this she made a case that the social purity movement was a strong attack on the privileging of 'male lust' by the double moral standard. She claimed that the movement was associated with the rise of a radical and subversive model of female autonomy and independence, deliberately undermined by male sexologists. Jeffreys usefully drew attention to the potential feminist subversion of contemporary moral assumptions by social purity, but her account was somewhat oversimplified.²⁸ A more complex and nuanced picture of the intricate relationship between feminism and social purity was drawn by Lucy Bland in *Banishing the Beast: English Feminism and Sexual Morality 1885–1914* (1995). Bland explored social purity as one among a variety of sources and discourses drawn on by women in the later nineteenth century, in order to articulate ideas about sexuality.²⁹ Anne Summers has pointed out that on the one hand there was undeniably a 'rush to prurience, censorious and gender-biased responses to sexual irregularity' by social purity bodies such as the National Vigilance Association (NVA) in the late nineteenth century, expressed in triumphs over petty victories such as suppressing the trade in 'indecent match boxes'. Nonetheless women were working with the NVA and similar bodies 'to prevent or prosecute offences of sexual exploitation of women and girls', drawing inspiration from Josephine Butler, and achieving some successes, though often on the level of individual cases rather than structural reform.³⁰ Alan Hunt has commented that 'neat classificatory grids simply do not mesh with the diverse projects' in which the late nineteenth-century social purity movement was engaged.³¹

The common enemy

Feminism/social purity and sexology have thus tended to be positioned as gendered female and male respectively and as opposing camps, or at least as distinct and separate movements with different aims and ideologies.

It has already been suggested that both trends were based on critique of existing moral conventions. Both considered sex to be a serious matter, and in this they were opposing a tacit, but nonetheless pervasive and influential conventional view of sex based on traditional assumptions which served the interests of privileged males. Michael Mason, in *The Making of Victorian Sexual Attitudes* (1994) described this 'classic moralism' as assuming that sex was not something for serious discussion, though on appropriate occasions it might a subject for jokes.³² Ethilda Budgett Meakin Herford, who qualified in medicine in the late nineteenth century, bore out this contention with her comment that 'subjects and conditions causing the profoundest misery in married life' were ignored in the medical curriculum and textbooks. However 'on attending congresses where women were not usually present [she] was astounded at the prominent place given to these matters as a subject of laughter and jest'.³³

'Classic moralism' relied on un-interrogated and never systematically formulated beliefs, seldom articulated in full explicit detail. Nonetheless these had a powerful influence on institutions, legislation and social attitudes, emerging from oral tradition and implication during Parliamentary debates on prostitution and the raising of the age of consent, in judicial pronouncements, and in some sections of the press.³⁴ This vague yet omnipresent element in nineteenth-century British attitudes towards sexuality was analogous to a planet invisible to the naked eye influencing the orbits of other celestial bodies. It was only beginning to be somewhat shaken in the period after 1870, the year in which the Royal Commission on the CD Acts, with its already cited statement about men's use of prostitutes being 'the irregular indulgence of a natural impulse' was in preparation.³⁵ It is arguable that 'classic moralism' was becoming more articulate around this time, as it came under siege, and was more visible to various 'outgroups'.

Common ground

Both social purity and sexology were grappling with this amorphous yet omnipresent enemy, and there were common sympathies, even alliances. For example, the feminist social-purity activist Jane Ellice Hopkins and the pioneer sexologist Havelock Ellis both drew inspiration from the works and theories of James Hinton.³⁶

The enlightenment of children with clean, 'natural' information about sex was one of the main planks in the social purity platform. The rise of the 'birds and bees' rhetoric in sex-education literature during the 1890s,³⁷ which made this so much easier for parents and teachers than talking about human bodies, was surely one outcome of the publication of Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson's 1889 volume, *The Evolution of Sex* by

Havelock Ellis in his *Contemporary Science* series. This took a Darwinian angle, deploying ideas of evolution to trace the development of sex in the living organism from the amoeba to the human, via plants, insects, reptiles and mammals. It provided many useful examples well removed from humanity towards which young minds might be directed.

Geddes and Thomson themselves are probably best remembered for their apparently anti-feminist statement 'What was decided among the primeval Protozoa cannot be annulled by Act of Parliament'.³⁸ In fact, Geddes, in particular, assigned to women a crucial role in shaping evolution, and saw their nurturing tendencies as essential to creating higher levels of civilisation, though he was somewhat dubious about the campaign for political representation. He was, however, prepared to advocate control over reproduction within marriage, something which increased his notoriety in publishing a book on sex.³⁹ Both men were sympathetic to the single moral standard, and Thomson later became active in the social hygiene movement that emerged from social purity in the early twentieth century.⁴⁰ Their theories of sexual differentiation could be deployed to support the contention that given the complementary but different natures of the sexes, men could not pretend to represent women. Certainly by the time that limited female suffrage was granted, Geddes himself expressed opinions 'about the futility of politics without women actively involved', and on the social problems due to the 'separation of the sexes, without their normal cooperation'.⁴¹

Far from spurning sexologists, the extreme social purity feminist and theosophist Mrs Frances Swiney (a significant figure in Jeffreys' arguments⁴²) paid tribute to the scientists (among whom she specifically named Havelock Ellis, and Geddes and Thomson) who were 'laying bare the foundations of the eternal temple' and 'in a measure elucidat[ing] the mysteries of sex'.⁴³ She believed that their investigations were 'doing their part in enlightenment as to the cesspool of sexual vice underlying society at the present time'. In the works of Iwan Bloch and Havelock Ellis, she claimed, 'the cold, impartial phraseology of science disclose[d] the depths of perversion in which man ... has polluted the sacred mysteries of generation'.⁴⁴ Recent studies have indicated that even the apparently extreme misogynist theories of Otto Weininger had complex origins and could serve purposes very different from those he intended.⁴⁵

Similarly complex relationships between these two strands can be discerned in the early years of the British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology (BSSSP). Founded in 1913, this is often assumed to have been a predominantly homophile organisation furthering the ideas of Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis. However, its stated objects foregrounded 'The Evils of Prostitution' among the problems it proposed to 'consider ... from their medical, juridical and sociological aspects'. Also high on its

agenda were 'Sexual Ignorance' and 'Disease', long-term concerns of feminism and social purity. The BSSSP's list of suggested reading included texts by stalwarts of social purity, and the leading social purity campaigner, Dr Mary Scharlieb, was approached to join the committee.⁴⁶ So there was very clearly a quite wide zone of overlap between these two movements, social purity and sex reform, even before the 1920s when this became much more marked.⁴⁷

It is possible to extend the connection between the two phenomena even further and to suggest that sexology in fact owed a major debt to the feminist and social purity debates which had preceded the development of a 'sexual science' by several decades. There were various elements to this debt. The campaigns by and on behalf of women on various aspects of sexual and moral behaviour had opened up public debate in areas formerly regarded as not fit for public discussion. The men who were endeavouring to create a science of sex were in close contact with women of feminist sympathies, at least some of them actively involved in campaigns against the CD Acts, for women's rights in marriage, etc. The critique of the double moral standard and the ways in which existing institutions encoded assumptions about normal male and female sexuality had destabilised accepted concepts of the normal and the natural.

Overtuning the conventions

Josephine Butler, the leading figure in the women's campaign against the CD Acts, spoke extensively and wrote a great deal on what she perceived as problems of the morality of society even when these approached the conventionally unmentionable. She argued against

the false and misleading idea that the essence of right and wrong is in some way dependent on sex. We never hear it carelessly or complacently asserted of a young woman that '*she* is only sowing her wild oats'

yet 'numbers even of moral and religious people have permitted themselves to accept and condone in man what is fiercely condemned in woman'. As a result

a large section of female society has to be told off – set aside, so to speak, to minister to the irregularities of the excusable man. That section is doomed to death, hurled to despair; while another section of womanhood is kept strictly and almost forcibly guarded in domestic purity.⁴⁸

This may, superficially, look like subscribing to conventional morality. Butler was actually pointing out that the lip-service given to a creed of Christian morality which claimed that sexual chastity was the highest good was only being applied to one gender. '[T]he irregularities of the excusable man' received a good deal of leeway from conventional morality,

at the cost of designating a specific class of women with which they could indulge these, while strictly enforcing purity on other women. Butler was critiquing both the hypocrisy of gender-specific moral codes, and the artificiality of the good/bad woman distinction. If she was recommending 'conventional morality', this was very much along the lines of the remark attributed to Mahatma Gandhi about Western civilisation – 'I think it would be a good idea'.

The response aroused by Butler and the Ladies National Association for the Repeal of the CD Acts suggests how much their arguments ran counter to conventional assumptions and how far from acceptable or respectable they were found. Butler suffered social ostracism and was assailed by 'violent and cruel criticism'. Her husband felt obliged to make a public statement denying that personal marital unhappiness had led her to take up the cause. The *Saturday Review* gave her 'nicknames ... of the most offensive kind'. In the House of Commons, George Cavendish-Bentinck MP referred to her as 'a woman who calls herself a lady', while Sir James Elphinstone MP declared that '*I look upon these women who have taken up this matter as worse than the prostitutes*'.⁴⁹

Butler was writing polemics in emotive and religiously coloured prose. Anne Summers has pointed out that the 'tremendous intensity' of Butler's attack on the CD Acts was 'embarrassing in its outspokenness, not only to contemporaries, but also to later historians'.⁵⁰ This may suggest one reason why the debt of sexual science to the contemporary climate of social agitation around moral issues has largely been overlooked. Nonetheless these campaigns formed the contextual matrix within which the ideas of sexologists were generated. The ferment of protest against ingrained societal assumptions could hardly have been unknown to the thoughtful men in Britain who were developing theories about sex, particularly given their involvement with socialist and other radical groups among which there was intense awareness of these issues.

One of the earliest efforts to bring about 'objective' debate on sexual matters and their bearing on society, the Men and Women's Club established by Karl Pearson in 1885, was very much embedded within this context of contemporary moral agitation. The Club has been extensively analysed by Judith Walkowitz in *City of Dreadful Delight* and by Lucy Bland in *Banishing the Beast*. Its establishment in the year 1885 was hardly a coincidence. The CD Acts had been suspended in 1883 and a Criminal Law Amendment Bill was making its contested way through Parliament to bring into law several demands of the social purity movement, most particularly the raising of the age of female consent to sixteen from thirteen. Immediately prior to the Club's first meeting, W. T. Stead had published his sensational articles on 'The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon' in *The Pall Mall Gazette*.⁵¹

Women's contribution

Pearson appears to have agreed with certain concerns of the social purity movement, but found the emotionalism and religious emphasis of the campaigns personally antipathetic. He also feared that it would not be fully recognised that 'the majority of men are as guiltless as the women'.⁵² His opening paper to the club on 'The Woman Question' aroused considerable feeling, though expressed mostly in private correspondence rather than open debate. The South African novelist, Olive Schreiner objected that he had entirely left out Man. Henrietta Muller's rejoinder at the following meeting argued that men were 'slaves to sex instinct' and thus morally inferior to women. Lucy Bland has persuasively contended that the decision that the club should undertake to 'assess the comparative strength of this instinct between the sexes' was driven by a hidden agenda to respond to Muller's open, and the others' more covert, accusations.⁵³ Walkowitz plausibly suggested that one of the many 'secrets' of the club was the unacknowledged debt the men owed to their female colleagues. The most flagrant example of this was Pearson's incorporation of substantial portions of a letter from his correspondent, the Fabian and anarchist Charlotte Wilson, critiquing 'The Woman Question', into his paper 'Sex and Socialism', without acknowledgement.⁵⁴

This kind of debt was pervasive in the development of a science of sex. Other male writers on sexual phenomena, such as Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis, also drew upon the experiences of female associates within the progressive circles within which they moved, and indeed there were significant overlaps. Olive Schreiner, for example, was a close friend of both Ellis and Carpenter, as well as of Pearson. However, malign intent should not necessarily be attributed to all use of evidence from their female friends and colleagues by male sexological writers: in many cases it was a conscious and voluntary gift. It was still very difficult for women in particular to speak openly, let alone publish, about sexual matters, except in ways that aligned them, if not entirely with conventional morality, at least with moral assumptions about female purity, and carefully positioned them as distinct from immoral men (and 'fallen' women).

In his preface to *Studies in the Psychology of Sex: Volume III: Analysis of the Sexual Impulse; Love and Pain; The Sexual Impulse in Women* (first published in 1903), Ellis commented that he was indebted to 'many correspondents ... for much valuable assistance' and when permitted had mentioned their names in his text. However, he added

This has not been possible in the case of many women friends and correspondents, to whom, however, my debt is very great ... Many circumstances ... conspire to make it difficult for women to assert publicly the wisdom and knowledge which, in matters of love, the experiences of life have brought to them ... I can therefore but express

again ... my deep gratitude to these anonymous contributors who have aided me in throwing light on a field of human life which is of such primary social importance and is yet so dimly visible.⁵⁵

His wife, Edith Lees Ellis, also commented on the problems that 'many clean-minded people' (undifferentiated by gender) had in disclosing their '[e]xperiments in legal marriage and outside it' – 'as fearful ... as if they were to do with theft or murder'.⁵⁶ She also alluded to the fears of public opinion and its condemnation, which led 'those of us who have found out some of Love's newer meanings by daring to live them' to 'hide the beauties of the new expression and experiment'.⁵⁷ This surely refers to the unusual nature of her own marriage to Ellis: following the crisis caused by the revelation of her lesbianism, they both developed outside emotional and sexual attachments while remaining committed to their union.⁵⁸ There were serious constraints on the extent to which women could openly participate in the development of a sexual science.

Personal contacts, conversation and correspondence played a significant role in the development of ideas. Meller has indicated that many young women were active participants in Geddes' numerous projects, administering student halls, working in civic betterment schemes and undertaking social work,⁵⁹ and that the roots of arguments addressed in *The Evolution of Sex* may be found in debates in these progressive circles.⁶⁰ The informal interplay of ideas and theories is one of the hardest things for the historian to reconstruct. However, the vast amount of surviving correspondence between Olive Schreiner and Havelock Ellis does reveal extensive interchange of ideas. While clearly strongly inflected by their own idiosyncratic characters, their discussions may be taken as reflecting of the kinds of issues that were concerning earnest young people of the day.

Responding to Ellis' enthusiasm for James Hinton, Schreiner queried whether, in the matter of 'spiritual spouses' Hinton 'appl[ied] the same measure to man & to woman?'⁶¹ She expressed the opinion that the 'best kind of union between a man & a woman is a sort of camaraderie (temporary or permanent) between two people who care about the same things'.⁶² She described her own sensations during the monthly period and also that of other women with whom she had discussed this.⁶³ Following her reading of Lecky's *History of European Morals*,⁶⁴ she asked Ellis to recommend books on prostitution, and how much it might cost to purchase the report of the Royal Commission on the CD Acts.⁶⁵ Reading this made her 'blood boil'. She was against the Acts 'but they are a small thing, it is the whole thing', and she declared that 'if it is necessary to pull down the whole structure of society to get out that stone that lies at the foundation of it, it must be pulled down & built up again better'.⁶⁶

Schreiner herself 'in early youth ... began a book on Woman'. It traced 'the differences of sex function' in 'different branches of non-human life', to demonstrate that 'those differences which we, conventionally, are apt to suppose are inherent in the paternal or the maternal sex form, are not inherent'. It also dealt with 'woman's condition in the most primitive, in the savage and the semi-savage states', and made various speculations based on 'a physiological study of woman's structure'. However, after she had laboured over the manuscript for years, it was destroyed by fire at her Johannesburg home during the Boer War. Nonetheless, many of her thoughts on the subject, for example her theories on 'sex-parasitism' found their way into her influential text, *Woman and Labour*, published in 1911. '[T]his little book' was drawn, she claimed, 'from one chapter of the larger book' and thus was far from the 'general view of the whole vast body of phenomena' which she had hoped to produce.⁶⁷

In particular, *Women and Labour* did not include the last, longest and in her mind the most important chapter in the original, dealing with the 'problems connected with marriage and the personal relations of men and women in the modern world'. This combined a fierce idealism about a deep mutual monogamous relationship, with an equally idealistic and celebratory vision of sexual possibilities. She had 'tried to give expression to ... a great truth', that 'the direction in which the endeavour of woman to readjust herself to the new conditions of life is leading' was not to sexual laxity or promiscuous indulgence but 'toward a higher appreciation of the sacredness of all sex relations'. Within the 'closer, more permanent, more emotionally and intellectually complete and intimate relation' between the sexes, sexual union would be far more than an act 'producing and sending onward the physical stream of life'. It would manifest its 'latent, other and even higher forms, of creative energy and life-dispensing power', assuming 'a hundred forms of joy and beauty'. In this 'higher development of sexual life', woman was 'bound to lead the way, and man to follow'.⁶⁸ During the long evolution of this work, colleagues such as Ellis and Carpenter must have been aware of her research and conclusions.

The history of the development of a science of sexology is one which so far has tended to privilege the published scientific treatise and articles in medical and scientific journals, even when, as in Oosterhuis' study of Krafft-Ebing, the important and actively contributing role of 'inverted' male patients is acknowledged.⁶⁹ The role of history (e.g. Lecky's influential *History of Morals*) as a contributory discipline, providing evidence that contemporary mores had not been universal even in Western Europe, has largely been overlooked. Even Edward Carpenter, although male and closely associated with Havelock Ellis, as Judy Greenway has remarked, 'holds an uneasy place in the pantheon of sexology, and is often omitted altogether'.⁷⁰ Indeed, in Bullough's *Science in the Bedroom* he figures

merely as an associate and informant of Ellis,⁷¹ in spite of his important role in disseminating similar ideas. He wrote in an accessible style for a general audience, and was quite explicitly motivated by an agenda that was ethical and political, rather than 'purely' scientific, and indeed he pre-figured modern critiques of science.⁷² Therefore it is not entirely remarkable that a whole range of other forms of writing and communication in which women in particular were more likely to be making their ideas known tend to be excluded or ignored, as at best popularisation of ideas being generated in this 'high' field of knowledge. These included unpublished lectures, polemic pamphlets, articles in feminist and social purity periodicals such as Margaret Shurmer Sibthorp's *Shafts* or *The Shield*, the journal of the Ladies' National Association for the Repeal of the CD Acts, letters to these journals, the debates in the popular press on marriage, sex education pamphlets and 'New Woman' novels.

Issues of genre and discursive field are significant here: early studies of the continuing neglect of women's thinking and women's writing still provide useful examples and explanations.⁷³ Sexology is no unique case of the overlooking, if not the denigration, of women's contributions to a field of endeavour. Studies of women in the sciences have drawn attention to the significance of women working in 'borderline disciplines' and 'developing fields', most of whom failed to gain recognition and professional rewards when these fields became established.⁷⁴ Analogous gendered neglect can be seen in other cases, like sexology, related to the emergence of twentieth-century modernity. It is only recently that the standard patriarchal narrative of the history of psychoanalysis in Britain (positioning Ernest Jones as founding father in 1913) has been expanded to include the role of politically activist women, such as May Sinclair and Jessie Murray, and the Brunswick Square Clinic they established, and others, in disseminating the ideas of Freud and other proponents of 'the new psychology'.⁷⁵ The role of women in the development of literary and cultural modernism has similarly been obscured until relatively recently. Ann Ardis has suggested a source for the modernist aesthetic in the experimentations of the 'New Woman' writers of the late nineteenth century, and Jo-Ann Wallace has drawn attention to the often-occluded figure of Edith Lees Ellis as 'an almost uncanny trace' of the hidden roots of modernism.⁷⁶

Sexology has had a long history of problems with establishing itself as a serious field of endeavour based on objective scientific and scholarly research.⁷⁷ It may therefore have had a particular investment in presenting its genealogy as impeccably patrilineal, excluding the matrilineal inheritance, not to mention the numerous eccentric maiden aunts, or the 'confirmed bachelor' uncles such as Edward Carpenter, in its family tree.⁷⁸

Sexology and 'the normal'

Much writing about sexology has tended to concentrate on what it was saying about 'deviance' and 'perversion'. Any implication for 'normality' has been assumed to be about the policing of the boundaries of the acceptable.⁷⁶ The involvement of the developing science of sex in contemporary debates over issues such as prostitution (except as these related to the construction of the prostitute as a degenerate type of criminal)⁷⁷ and the place of sexuality within society has been less analysed.⁷⁸ Yet Ellis and Carpenter, Geddes and Thomson, were definitely opposed to the double moral standard and struck notes not dissimilar from those struck by Butler or Schreiner. 'From the modern moral standpoint', Havelock Ellis averred,

not only is the cruelty involved in the dishonour of the prostitute absurd, but not less absurd, and often not less cruel, seems the honour bestowed on the respectable women on the other side of the social gulf.⁷⁹

But quite apart from their commitment to moral egalitarianism, what occurred in the works of writers such as Ellis and Carpenter, was an interesting switch in what got assigned to the categories of 'natural' and 'unnatural'. Issues of heterosexual relations, both marriage and prostitution, were problematised, and existing arrangements seen as a product of imbalanced forces within society rather than expressing a natural state of affairs. Ellis defined these arrangements as follows:

The husband had the right and the duty to perform sexual intercourse with his wife, whatever her wishes in the matters might be, while the wife had the duty and the right ... to submit to such intercourse, which she was frequently taught to regard as something low and merely physical.

It was 'not surprising that such an attitude ... has been highly favourable to conjugal unhappiness, more especially that of the wife'.⁸⁰

Almost uniquely among works which have set out to analyse male and female sexual differences, Ellis' early volume *Man and Woman* (1894), which preceded and was in some sense a prologue to his *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, came to a resounding 'don't know' conclusion: 'we have not succeeded in determining the radical and essential characters of men and women uninfluenced by external modifying conditions'.⁸¹ Both he and Carpenter argued that while there was a basis of biological difference between the sexes, the relationship between them had been grossly distorted and the differences exaggerated by a male-dominated society: as Carpenter put it

These distinctions have ... been strangely accentuated and exaggerated during the historic period – till at last a point of maximum divergence and absolute misunderstanding has been reached.⁸²

Man had 'tended to become arrogant and callous and egotistic' and woman 'slavish, crafty and unreal': the understandable outcome of the imbalance of power between them.⁸³

The idea that the existing systems of heterosexuality were natural and normal and unquestionable had been destabilised well before Carpenter and Ellis started to write. When Ellis wrote that it seemed unnecessary to deal extensively with the nature of the male sexual impulse, his argument was that 'since the constitution of society has largely been in the hands of men, the nature of the sexual impulse in men has largely been expressed in the written and unwritten codes of social law',⁸⁴ a central tenet of feminist social purity theories. This destabilisation enabled a productive problematisation of the nature of sex and sexual relations, for example, the possibility of suggesting that satisfactory heterosexual intercourse was 'not a mere physical act to be executed by force of muscles',⁸⁵ but was an art to be learnt. It also, by deconstructing accepted categories of 'normal' and 'natural', opened up a space for the consideration of categories that previously had been constituted 'abnormal' and 'unnatural'.

There was therefore a complex, if largely unacknowledged, debt, owed by sexologists to feminism and social purity. In making it clear that sex and gender relations were a problematic area, by providing individual evidence, by destabilising accepted categories, feminism and social purity had created a context within which existing sexual conventions could be interrogated, laying foundations upon which a science of sex might be erected.

Conclusion

Neither feminism and social purity nor sexual science was entirely successful in actually eradicating the double standard. The social purity movement (an umbrella which included a number of different parties and attitudes) spent a good deal of energy on persecutory campaigns of censorship and even harrying prostitutes (much to Josephine Butler's distress).⁸⁶ Male sexologists often took an overly romantic view of maternity and its place in women's lives and identities, and sometimes failed thoroughly to critique their own gender preconceptions⁸⁷ (Schreiner had accused Ellis of 'speaking about women as if they had only one brain & heart':⁸⁸ though they had exchanged ideas, not all of hers got acted upon). But there were some manifestations of wider influence.

The First World War is often depicted as the major post-Victorian moral watershed in British sexual attitudes and behaviour. The drama of this upheaval has tended to occlude the ferment of radical ideas before 1914, strongly influenced by the intersection between feminist visions of reformed relations between the sexes and the development of scientific

investigations into the mysteries of sexuality. The struggle for the relaxation of theatrical censorship to enable the production of plays on themes of social relevance;⁸⁹ the campaign for divorce law reform which culminated in the appointment of a Royal Commission which advocated the equalising of grounds for dissolution;⁹⁰ the appointment of a Royal Commission on Venereal Disease after two decades of demands for official investigation by an assortment of interests in which feminism and social purity were strongly represented;⁹¹ these reveal that ideas of reform had extended well beyond small radical circles to be debated much more widely, even if practical outcomes were slower in arriving. Already, by the time of Victoria's death, as a result of the combined efforts of social purity and an emerging sexual science as well as general changes in society, 'classic sexual moralism' was on the defensive, and the double standard, if it had not been completely hauled down, no longer fluttered quite so proudly over British social institutions or in the minds and hearts of men and women.

The transnational development of sexology has already begun to be explored.⁹² Studies of changing medical and public health ideas about the prevention and control of venereal disease in a number of European countries have demonstrated that the abolitionist, anti-regulationist ideas associated with feminism and social purity were widely known and had a significant impact on policies in other nations besides Britain.⁹³ The recent biography of Josephine Butler indicates the international extent of her activities and Anne Summers has drawn attention to the internationalism of the late nineteenth-century women's movement.⁹⁴ Was sexual science elsewhere in Europe and in North America similarly influenced by these concerns? To take one example, Magnus Hirschfeld in Berlin was involved with the radical wing of the German feminist movement as well as socialist circles.⁹⁵ While he is best known for his advocacy of the rights of the 'Third Sex', in an obituary the British feminist sex reformer Stella Browne commented that his 'statesmanlike vision included *all* the aspects of a sane and tolerable treatment of sex'.⁹⁶ This suggests that there are still other stories to be explored of the interaction between moral indignation at sexual injustice and the development of scientific discussions of sex, and that critiquing accepted assumptions about 'normality', as encoded in the sexual double standard, was a central factor.

Notes

1. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, tr. Robert Hurley (London: Allen Lane, 1978); Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich (eds), *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: the History of Attitudes to Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Vern L. Bullough, *Science in the Bedroom: A History of Sex Research* (New York: BasicBooks, 1994); Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urla (eds), *Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Difference in Science and Popular Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); Vernon A.

- Rosario (ed.), *Science and Homosexualities* (London: Routledge, 1997); Lucy Bland and Laura Doan (eds), *Sexology in Culture: Labelling Bodies and Desires* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1998); Harry Oosterhuis, 'Medical Science and the Modernisation of Sexuality', in Franz Eder, Lesley Hall and Gert Hekma (eds), *Sexual Cultures in Europe: National Histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp. 221–41 and *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Ivan Crozier, 'Havelock Ellis, Eonism and the Patient's Discourse: Or, Writing a Book about Sex', *History of Psychiatry* 11 (2000), pp. 125–54, 'Taking Prisoners: Havelock Ellis, Sigmund Freud, and the Construction of Homosexuality, 1897–1951', *Social History of Medicine* 13 (2000), pp. 447–66, 'The Medical Construction of Homosexuality and its Relation to the Law in Nineteenth-Century England', *Medical History* 45 (2001), pp. 61–82.
2. Edward Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain since 1700* (Dublin: Gee and Macmillan, 1977); Stefan Petrow, *Policing Morals: The Metropolitan Police and the Home Office, 1870–1914* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); Alan Hunt, *Governing Morals: A Social History of Moral Regulation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
 3. Sheila Jeffreys, *The Spinster and Her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality 1880–1930* (London: Pandora Press, 1985); Margaret Jackson, *The Real Facts of Life: Feminism and the Politics of Sexuality, c. 1850–1940* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1994).
 4. Lucy Bland, *Banishing the Beast: English Feminism and Sexual Morality, 1885–1914* (London: Penguin, 1995); Bland and Doan, *Sexology in Culture*.
 5. Anne Summers, *Female Lives, Moral States: Women, Religion and Public Life, 1800–1930* (Newbury: Threshold Press, 2000), pp. 127–9 comments on this. It is an experience that is familiar to anyone who has looked at the archives of the National Vigilance Association.
 6. Michael Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexual Attitudes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 49–63.
 7. This engagement is addressed in several of the essays in Bland and Doan, *Sexology in Culture*; see also Lesley A. Hall, 'Suffrage, Sex and Science', in Maroula Joannou and June Purvis (eds), *The Women's Suffrage Movement: New Feminist Perspectives* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), pp. 188–200.
 8. Lesley A. Hall, "'Disinterested Enthusiasm for Sexual Misconduct": The British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology, 1913–47', *Journal of Contemporary History* 30 (1995), pp. 665–86.
 9. Judith R. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late Victorian London* (London: Virago, 1992), pp. 135–70; Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, pp. 3–47.
 10. Paddy Kitchen, *A Most Unsettling Person: An Introduction to the Ideas and Life of Patrick Geddes* (London: Gollancz, 1975); Philip Boardman, *The Worlds of Patrick Geddes, Biologist, Town Planner, Re-Educator, Peace-Warrior* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978); Helen Meller, *Patrick Geddes: Social Evolutionist and City Planner* (London: Routledge, 1990).
 11. Sheila Rowbotham and Jeffrey Weeks, *Socialism and the New Life: The Personal and Sexual Politics of Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis* (London: Pluto Press, 1977); Tony Brown (ed.), *Edward Carpenter and Late Victorian Radicalism* (London: Frank Cass, 1990).
 12. Chris Nottingham, *The Pursuit of Serenity: Havelock Ellis and the New Politics* (Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press, 1999); see also Rowbotham and Weeks, *Socialism and the New Life* and Phyllis Grosskurth, *Havelock Ellis: A Biography* (London: Allen Lane, 1980).
 13. Edward M. Brecher, *The Sex Researchers* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1970) and Paul Robinson, *The Modernization of Sex: Havelock Ellis, Alfred Kinsey, William Masters and Virginia Johnson* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976) both made this case in a wider Anglo-American context, and it can be seen as implicit in a number of studies of Victorian sexual mores published in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The notion still pervades popular works such as Cate Haste, *The Rules of Desire: Sex in Britain, World War I to the Present* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1992).
 14. See, for example, Jeffrey Weeks, *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain from the Nineteenth Century to the Present* (London: Quartet, 1977) and *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800* (London: Longman, 1981).

15. Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature*, especially Part III, 'Articulate Sufferers: Perversion and Autobiography', pp. 127–208.
16. Vern Bullough, *Science in the Bedroom*, works with this genealogy; see also Carolyn Burdett, 'The Hidden Romance of Sexual Science: Eugenics, the Nation and the Making of Modern Feminism', Siobhan B. Somerville, 'Scientific Racism and the Invention of the Homosexual Body' and Jane Caplan, "'Educating the eye": The Tattooed Prostitute', in Bland and Doan, *Sexology in Culture*, pp. 44–59, 60–76, 100–15, for the variety of sources 'sexual science' was drawing upon.
17. There have been numerous historical analyses of the Acts and the campaigns against them: Paul McHugh, *Prostitution and Victorian Social Reform* (London: Croom Helm, 1980); Frank Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-Moral Politics in Britain since 1830* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), pp. 174–6; Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society*; F. B. Smith, 'The Contagious Diseases Acts Reconsidered', *Social History of Medicine* 3 (1990), pp. 197–215; Deborah Dunsford, 'Principle Versus Expediency: A Rejoinder to F. B. Smith', *Social History of Medicine* 5 (1992), pp. 503–13; F. B. Smith, "'Unprincipled Expediency": A Comment on Deborah Dunsford's paper', *Social History of Medicine* 5 (1992), pp. 515–16.
18. Anne Summers, *Female Lives, Moral States*, pp. 52–4.
19. Thomas Stevenson (ed.), *The Principles and Practice of Medical Jurisprudence by the Late Alfred Swaine Taylor* (3rd edn, London: J. & A. Churchill, 1883), pp. 458–61.
20. Ideas about the male body implicit in discussions around venereal diseases (and their changes over time) are addressed in Lesley A. Hall, "'War always brings it on": War, STDs, the Military, and the Civilian population in Britain, 1850–1950', in Roger Cooter, Mark Harrison, and Steve Sturdy (eds), *Medicine and Modern Warfare* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999), pp. 205–23.
21. *Royal Commission upon the Administration and Operation of the Contagious Diseases Acts: Volume 1: The Report C.408* (London: HMSO, 1871), §60.
22. Lee Holcombe, *Wives and Property: Reform of the Married Women's Property Law in Nineteenth-Century England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983); Mary Lyndon Shanley, *Feminism, Marriage, and the Law in Victorian England, 1850–1895* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989); Maeve E. Doggett, *Marriage, Wife-Beating and the Law in Victorian England* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1993); Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, pp. 124–85.
23. Angus McLaren, in *Twentieth-Century Sexuality: A History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), p. 205 and Alan Hunt, in *Governing Morals*, p. 205, have both claimed that these topics were ignored by nineteenth-century feminists, in spite of the accounts by Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight*, p. 224, Shanley, *Feminism, Marriage, and the Law in Victorian England*, pp. 164–74; Doggett, *Marriage, Wife-Beating and the Law*, pp. 126–33; Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, pp. 130–39.
24. Constance Rover, *Love, Morals and the Feminists* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), p. 48.
25. Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society*, p. 246.
26. Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society*, pp. 250–1.
27. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight*, pp. 81–134.
28. Jeffreys, *The Spinster and her Enemies*.
29. Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, pp. 189–249.
30. Anne Summers, *Female Lives, Moral States*, pp. 127–9.
31. Hunt, *Governing Morals*, p. 169.
32. Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexual Attitudes*, pp. 49–63.
33. E. B. Meakin Herford to the Medical Women's Federation, 23 March 1923, in 'Co-Education' file, Medical Women's Federation archives in the Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine, London, SA/MWF/D.9/2.
34. Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexual Attitudes*, pp. 49–63.
35. *Royal Commission upon ... the Contagious Diseases Acts*, §60.

36. Sue Morgan, *A Passion for Purity* (Bristol: University of Bristol, Department of Theology & Religious Studies, 1999) is an excellent study of Hopkins; on Hinton's influence on the development of Ellis' thought, see Grosskurth, *Havelock Ellis*, pp. 51–77.
37. Lesley A. Hall, 'Birds, Bees and General Embarrassment: Sex Education in Britain from social purity to Section 28', in Richard Aldrich (ed.), *Private and Public: Studies in the History of Knowledge and Education* (London: Woburn Press, in press).
38. Patrick Geddes and J. Arthur Thomson, *The Evolution of Sex* (London: Walter Scott, 1889), p. 267.
39. Meller, *Patrick Geddes*, pp. 82–3.
40. Kitchen, *A Most Unsettling Person* and Boardman, *The Worlds of Patrick Geddes* include further discussions of both men's attitudes towards women, gender and sexual relations and how these evolved over time.
41. Boardman, *The Worlds of Patrick Geddes*, p. 298, quoting a 1919 letter of self-review from Geddes to Victor Branford.
42. Jeffreys, *The Spinster and Her Enemies*, pp. 35–9.
43. Frances Swiney, *The Cosmic Procession, or the Feminine Principle in Evolution: Essays of Illumination* (London: Ernest Bell, 1906), p. 71n.
44. Frances Swiney, 'The Unrazed Bastille', in *The Sons of Belial and Other Essays on the Social Evil* (London: C. W. Daniel, n.d.), p. 48.
45. See for example Judy Greenway, "'It's what you do with it that counts": Interpretations of Otto Weininger', in Bland and Doan, *Sexology in Culture*, pp. 27–43. Chandak Sengoopta, *Otto Weininger: Sex, Science, and Self in Imperial Vienna* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000) is also illuminating on the diversity of the roots and influence of Weininger's notorious *Sex and Character*.
46. Hall, "'Disinterested Enthusiasm for Sexual Misconduct'".
47. The well-known works of Marie Stopes on marriage and birth control blended ideas about women and marriage generated in the ferment of the suffrage movement with the ideas being advanced by sexologists. Similar interweaving of the two trends can also be discerned in the writings on sex and marriage of the Reverend A. Herbert Gray (founder of the Marriage Guidance Council) during the inter-war years.
48. Josephine Butler, *Social Purity* (London: Morgan & Scott, 1879), pp. 7–8.
49. Jane Jordan, *Josephine Butler* (London: John Murray, 2001), pp. 109–10. Emphasis in original.
50. Summers, *Female Lives, Moral States*, p. 60.
51. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight*, pp. 135–70, Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, pp. 3–47.
52. Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, p. 8, citing Pearson's own correspondence.
53. Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, p. 15.
54. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight*, p. 151.
55. Havelock Ellis, 'Preface', *Studies in the Psychology of Sex Volume III: Analysis of the Sexual Impulse, Love and Pain, The Sexual Impulse in Women* (London: privately printed for the Society of Psychological Research, 1904), pp. vii–viii.
56. Mrs Havelock Ellis, 'A Noviciate for Marriage', in *The New Horizon in Love and Life* (London: A. and C. Black, 1921), p. 11. Posthumous publication of an essay of 1892.
57. Mrs Havelock Ellis, 'Marriage and Divorce', *The New Horizon*, p. 87.
58. Grosskurth, *Havelock Ellis*, pp. 154–9.
59. Meller, *Patrick Geddes*, pp. 79–80.
60. Meller, *Patrick Geddes*, pp. 79–80.
61. Yaffa Claire Draznin (ed.), *My Other Self: The Letters of Olive Schreiner and Havelock Ellis, 1884–1920* (New York: Peter Lang, 1992), no. 9, pp. 44–5.
62. Draznin (ed.), *My Other Self*, no. 23, p. 60.
63. Draznin (ed.), *My Other Self*, no. 63, p. 101.
64. Draznin (ed.), *My Other Self*, no. 67, p. 108.
65. Draznin (ed.), *My Other Self*, no. 133, p. 163.
66. Draznin (ed.), *My Other Self*, no. 148, pp. 176–7.

67. Olive Schreiner, *Woman and Labour* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1911), pp. 11–21; Ruth First and Ann Scott, *Olive Schreiner: A Biography* (London: André Deutsch, 1980), pp. 265–82.
68. Olive Schreiner, *Woman and Labour*, pp. 25–7.
69. Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature*, especially Part III, 'Articulate Sufferers: Perversion and Autobiography', pp. 127–208.
70. Greenway, 'It's what you do with it that counts', p. 34.
71. Bullough, *Science in the Bedroom*, pp. 78, 80, 137.
72. Greenway, 'It's what you do with it that counts', p. 34.
73. E.g. Dale Spender, *Women of Ideas and what Men have done to them from Aphra Behn to Adrienne Rich* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982) and Joanna Russ, *How to Suppress Women's Writing* (London: Women's Press, 1984) for discussions about the processes by which women's writing becomes marginalised.
74. Julian, 'Women in Crystallography', in G. Kass-Simon and P. Farnes (eds), *Women of Science: Righting the Record* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), pp. 335–83; Mary Creese, 'British women of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries who contributed to research in the Chemical Sciences', *British Journal for the History of Science* 24 (1991), pp. 275–305; Pnina Abir-Am and Dorinda Outram (eds), *Uneasy Careers and Intimate Lives: Women in Science 1789–1979* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987); Lesley A. Hall, 'Chloe, Olivia, Isabel, Letitia, Harriette, Honor and many more: Women in Medicine and Biomedical Science, 1914–1945', in Sybil Oldfield (ed.), *This Working-Day World: Women's Lives and Cultures in Britain, 1914–1945* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1994), pp. 192–202.
75. Dean Rapp, 'The Early Discovery of Freud by the British General Educated Public, 1912–1919', *Social History of Medicine* 3 (1990), pp. 217–43; R. D. Hinshelwood, 'The Organizing of Psychoanalysis in Britain', *Psychoanalysis and History* 1 (1998), pp. 87–102; Sally Alexander, 'Psychoanalysis in Britain in the Early Twentieth Century: An Introductory Note', *History Workshop Journal* 45 (1998), pp. 135–43.
76. Ann Ardis, *New Women, New Novels: Feminism and Early Modernism* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press), 1990, p. 5; Jo-Ann Wallace, 'The Case of Edith Ellis', in Hugh Stevens and Caroline Howlett (eds), *Modernist Sexualities* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 13–40.
77. Lesley A. Hall, "'The English Have Hot-Water Bottles": The Morganatic Marriage between Sexology and Medicine in Britain since William Acton', in Porter and Teich, *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science*, pp. 350–66.
75. This was very noticeable in the session, 'The emergence of medical sexology and its impact on modern sexualities', at the Anglo-Dutch Wellcome Symposium, 'Sex and Madness', Huizinga Institute, Amsterdam, 13–14 December 2001, at which a preliminary version of this paper was presented.
76. Angus McLaren, in *The Trials of Masculinity: Policing Sexual Boundaries, 1870–1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), has delineated the use of discourses of deviance and perversion to inscribe the bounds of what constituted normality.
77. Caplan, 'Educating the Eye'.
78. However, the essays in Bland and Doan, *Sexology in Culture*, and the edited readings in the companion volume, *Sexology Uncensored: The Documents of Sexual Science* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1998) make a beginning towards redressing the balance.
79. Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex: Volume VI: Sex in Relation to Society* (Philadelphia: F. A. Davies and Co., 1910), p. 312.
80. Ellis, *Sex in Relation to Society*, p. 538.
81. Havelock Ellis, *Man and Woman: A Study of Human Secondary Sexual Characters* (London: Walter Scott Ltd, 1894), pp. 385–6.
82. E. Carpenter, *Love's Coming of Age: A Series of Papers on the Relations of the Sexes* (1896; repr. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1930), p. 75.
83. Carpenter, *Love's Coming of Age*, p. 72.

84. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex Volume III*, p. 217.
85. Ellis, *Sex in Relation to Society*, p. 546.
86. Walkowitz, *Prostitution and Victorian Society*, pp. 246–56; Bland, *Banishing the Beast*, pp. 95–123.
87. Rather more the case with, for example, Ellis than with Carpenter. Ellis's *Sex in Relation to Society* begins with a chapter on 'The Mother and her Child', and the chapter on sexual morality includes a good deal on the sacred character of motherhood. Ellis believed that 'the act of the bringing a child into the world ... is for women the most massively gratifying of all sexual acts', p. 418.
88. Draznin (ed.), *My Other Self*, no. 23, p. 60.
89. Samuel Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (1968; repr. London: Pimlico, 1991), pp. 212–37.
90. Janice Hubbard Harris, *Edwardian Stories of Divorce* (New Brunswick: F. Rutgers University Press, 1996).
91. Lesley A. Hall, 'Venereal diseases and Society in Britain, from the Contagious Diseases Acts to the National Health Service', in Roger Davidson and Lesley A. Hall, *Sex, Sin and Suffering: Venereal Disease and European Society since 1870* (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 120–36.
92. Oosterhuis, 'Medical science and the Modernisation of Sexuality'; Bullough, *Science in the Bedroom* (at least in the earlier chapters); and, for a somewhat later period, Ralf Dose, 'The World League for Sexual Reform: Some possible approaches', in Eder, Hall and Hekma, *Sexual Cultures in Europe: National Histories*, pp. 242–59.
93. Davidson and Hall, *Sex, Sin and Suffering*.
94. Jordan, *Josephine Butler*, especially pp. 146–66, 262–81 on her European activities and connections; Anne Summers, 'Critique: Gaps in the Record: Hidden Internationalisms', *History Workshop Journal* 52 (2001), pp. 217–27.
95. This is touched on very much in passing by Bullough in *Science in the Bedroom*, p. 68, and by James Steakley in 'Per Scientiam ad Justitiam: Magnus Hirschfeld and the Sexual Politics of Innate Homosexuality', in Rosario, *Science and Homosexualities*, pp. 133–54; although Charlotte Wolff in her biography, *Magnus Hirschfeld: Portrait of a Pioneer in Sexology* (London: Quartet Books, 1986), includes a chapter on 'Hirschfeld and the Women's Movement', pp. 86–99, this represents the connection more as a strategic alliance between two campaigns already up and running.
96. F. W. Stella Browne, 'Magnus Hirschfeld, Scientist and Humanitarian', *Plan: For World Order and Progress*, 2/7 (July 1935), p. 15.