Going Public: Shopping, Street Harassment, and Streetwalking in Late Victorian London
Author(s): Judith R. Walkowitz
Source: *Representations*, No. 62, (Spring, 1998), pp. 1-30
Published by: University of California Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2902937
Accessed: 27/05/2008 09:56

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucal.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We enable the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org

JUDITH R. WALKOWITZ

Going Public: Shopping, Street Harassment, and Streetwalking in Late Victorian London

My mother had said that I could not go into town alone, because I might be "spoken to" by some man. I replied that I had already been "spoken to" and had been very angry with the fool, but I could not see that it had done me any harm. She then said a girl as young as I would be taken for a "bad woman" if she went about Piccadilly or Oxford Street unaccompanied. She didn't explain what she meant by a "bad woman" and I had not the least idea, but I can remember hotly saying that if more well-behaved girls went about Piccadilly on their business, alone, it would improve the state of Piccadilly.[1]

I thought I had no fear of the darker moods of men. When they came across my way . . . they could be terrible to me. . . . When I was helped over a dangerous crossing by two gentlemen . . . they seemed gentlemen till they reached the other side. . . . They said things that frightened me. With difficulty they were shaken off. I had learned, well before to be afraid in broad daylight of being followed.[2]

THESE STORIES ARE MEMOIRS OF LONDON LIFE in the 1880s, written in the 1930s by the feminists Helena Swanwick and Elizabeth Robins. Both authors introduce the discussion of street harassment strategically to document their personal struggle against the constraints imposed on women in the past—whether by controlling mothers or by anonymous male pests. Swanwick and Robins link that early moment of personal struggle to a collective history of gender conflict that culminated in their participation in the Edwardian women's movement, a movement that staged its feminist spectacles in the public spaces of London's center.[3]

In this essay, I consider why the West End of London, the city center, came to be imagined in the late Victorian period as a notorious site for street harassment of respectable women by so-called gentlemen.[4] I also explore how and why strong-minded women such as Swanwick and Robins came to mark their relation to public space in terms of these "annoyances" and to memorialize their ability to speak out against them. To understand why and how the West End came to be a notorious site for "street impertinences," we need to look at the transformations of London as a real and imagined environment in the second half of the nineteenth century.[5] To explore how women came to speak out against these annoyances in public, we need to examine the new journalistic practices and political culture that incited a range of social actors, including women, to speak their minds about sexual matters.

Anthropologist Micaela di Leonardo offers a definition of street harassment

that closely approximates the meanings attached to "street annoyances" and "street impertinences" in the Victorian period:

> Street harassment occurs when one or more strange men accost one or more women . . . in a public place which is not the women's worksite. Through looks, words, or gestures, the man asserts his right to intrude on the woman's attention, defining her as a sexual object, and forcing her to interact with him.[6]

This form of street harassment is not a universal social practice, nor is it simply an objective set of circumstances: it has a history specific to the history of gender, social spaces, and the popular media. In Victorian England, street harassment emerged as a "social problem" and "social issue" when the city center and the national newspaper expanded to create publics that were both heterogeneous and conflictual. In particular, it emerged as a subject of concern when unaccompanied middle-class women and the new class fractions of clerks and "smartly-dressed" shop assistants became a massed presence in the center, thus entering the privileged spaces of politics and commerce and, especially, consumption. Street harassment surfaced as a subject of concern when some women were empowered to articulate it publicly as a violation of their bodily integrity.[7]

Three features of the late Victorian discourse on "street impertinences" are worth highlighting: the use of popular cultural forms to narrate personal experience; the imbrication of gender with other social terms, particularly those of class and nationality; and the prominence of middle-class women, including feminists, as public interlocutors. Victorian print media not only provided middle-class women with a forum in which to speak out against street impertinences; it also supplied the cultural forms to articulate their experience. To defend their practices, women and men selectively combined the conventions of guidebooks, music hall routines, urban exploration, comic magazines, and melodrama, while also invoking political and nationalist discourses of freedoms and liberties. In the pages of the national press, strong-minded women relied on novelistic scenarios to legitimate the right of "decent" women to move through public space unimpeded—but they were immediately confronted with a counternarrative that accused them of class prejudice and discredited their authority to speak for all women. In these public debates, the same cultural forms that mediated Victorians' subjective experiences of the street came under scrutiny as contestable truths.[8]

When Helena Swanwick's mother forbade her to go into "town" alone, she was acting on a longstanding view of the West End as a negative environment for women: an urban setting of clubs and political institutions that had traditionally been considered male territory, an eroticized zone of commercialized sex, yet also a fashionable shopping area for ladies. Yet, in the late nineteenth century, London's West End underwent significant transformations that attracted many more women into the area. From a wealthy residential area, the West End of Mayfair and St. James, particularly its main thoroughfares, had been transformed and diversified

into the bureaucratic center of empire, the hub of communications, transportation, commercial display, and entertainment.[9] Thanks to speculative builders, enterprising merchants, and government-sponsored street improvements, a modern urban environment began to take shape—of government office buildings, shops, department stores, theaters, restaurants, hotels—to service not only the upper class of Mayfair but also a new middle class of civil servants and clerks.[10] New figures appeared in this urban landscape—protesting workers, "Glorified Spinsters," "platform women," Salvation Army lasses, and shopping ladies. From lower-middle-class suburbs also arrived "girls in business," as well as "counterfeit swells and gents" decked out in ready-to-wear attire.[11] In late Victorian London, the West End no longer signified the home and fixed reference of the privileged urban flaneur; it became known as a "pleasure capital" and second business district used by men and women of different classes.[12]

I want to emphasize a series of shifts and ironies here. First, pleasure. Pleasure was not a term generally associated with early and mid-Victorian London. Unlike Paris, London was not a "city of pleasure" where "elegant trifles form the staple of its products," declared one City of London alderman in 1867; instead, his imagined city was, by implication, "a robust free-trader in rough, indelicate masculine commodities."[13] By the 1870s, however, newspaper commentators frequently noted, with some degree of astonishment, that London had indeed become a "pleasure capital," a "pleasure lounge for the idlers of the world"—a direct reference to increased international tourism and to the increasing appearance in the West End of Continental-Parisian style urban amenities.[14] Throughout the Victorian period, Nash's Regent Street, with its "sham-stuccoed" fronts, its imperial monumentality, and its aristocratic ambience, was regarded as the most "Parisian" of London streets.[15] Reinforcing this Continental impression was the presence on Regent Street of foreign "loungers" and bohemians—particularly the crowds of mustachioed Frenchmen and their "showy," disreputable female companions.[16] When the Café Royal opened in 1865, it was heralded as the only authentic café in town; with its mixture of high and low life, it "brought the boulevards to London," and allowed Englishmen to enjoy "the luxury of forgetting that they must always behave like Englishmen."[17]

The West End not only brought the "boulevards to London" by catering to dubious male pleasures. Regent Street shopkeepers actively cultivated a Parisian impression to attract female custom; milliners and dressmakers often adopted French names and stressed the quality and exclusivity of their products by emphasizing their non-British origins. In keeping with this trope of foreignness and Frenchness, the Victorian press regularly identified new customer services provided by department stores, such as a lunchroom for ladies, as a "Paris import."[18]

Superimposed upon this Parisian tableau was another imaginary landscape, this one drawn from another, even more exotic setting—the Orient. In this imaginary landscape, the West End shopping district became a Turkish bazaar or harem.

Exoticization, aestheticization, and feminization produced this Orientalist fantasy. In an article for the *Daily Telegraph,* G. A. Sala transformed Whiteley's Department Store in Bayswater into a "Bezehstahn" for the "Sultana Valides" of Lancaster Gate.[19] The *Saturday Review* also conjured up a highly gendered Orientalist dream when it began to speculate on the "mysterious" depth of pleasure that shopping aroused in women: ladies who were unable to control even their servants and children at home hastened to the shops where they "luxuriate in a sense of power" approaching that of an Oriental "potentate," waited on by young men whose "peculiar privilege it is" to serve these "exalted personages."[20] Aiding and abetting this fantastic narrative were the elaborate displays of material objects from Japan, India, China, and Persia in West End emporia like Liberty's. On the one hand, these displays linked the commercial power of empire to the purveyance of Oriental luxuries in the metropolis. On the other hand, they served as a material backdrop for a new world of female shopping that could be identified as a distinctly un-English practice associated with the unrestrained license and sensuous pleasures of the East.[21]

Even as the West End was constructed as an illuminated site of pleasure, a "fairyland" of lights and window displays, its habitués had to contend imaginatively and materially with the "dark" social and sexual labyrinth that lay at its doorstep.[22] The new thoroughfares that helped to construct the spectacular landscape of the West End also served as opportunities for slum clearance and increased residential segregation.[23] This segregation may have erased the most notorious local signs of economic exploitation and social unease. As John Tagg has observed, it could not obscure the fact that the metropolis, besides being a city of consumption and display, was also a city of production, service, and exchange. It was dependent on immigrants and large masses of working people whose very proximity to the core posed real and imagined threats.[24] In the most immediate sense, these real and imagined threats were epitomized by an area like Soho, with its foreign vice, foreign restaurants, foreign radicals, and foreign artisans (who made possible the fairyland of lights and display). As Tracy Davis has noted, Soho (along with the Haymarket, Covent Garden, and the Strand) functioned as a nighttime erotic backstage to the decorous daytime front of Mayfair and the shopping zones of St. James.[25] At the more sensational level, the dangers of the street in the mid-1880s were also represented by a series of Fenian bombings. In 1886 and 1887 socialist-led demonstrations of the East End unemployed in the wealthy West End exacerbated respectable fears of "Outcast London." This class polarization, coupled with the increasing sensitivity of public officials to any form of disorder in the center as a threat to the empire, made the policing of the center an anxious priority.[26]

If King Mob (and the Fenians) threatened public order in the center, so did the varied street styles of the new class fractions—those counterfeit swells and girls in business—who entered the center for work and pleasure. As we shall see, the new social mix challenged the conventions of surveillance and disrupted the prevailing

codifications of identity and desire.[27] In particular, it led to territorial conflicts, complex social negotiations and confusions, and to a notorious case of "mistaken identity" and false arrest of a shop girl in 1887.[28]

Helena Swanwick did not mention what her intended "business" was in Piccadilly and Oxford Street, but we can safely presume that she was propelled by the desire to visit the fashion emporia organized there for female pleasure. Shopping emerged as a newly elaborated female activity in the 1870s, but it reinforced a public role traditionally performed by ladies as a visible sign of a ranked social system.[29] The expansion of the retail revolution in the second half of the century extended this decorative role to a larger segment of middle-class women, who increasingly played a more visible and central role as consumers and managers of household expenses.[30]

Signs of commercial transformation of the West End were in evidence in the 1860s and 1870s, when Oxford Street drapers began to expand into multistory department stores, complete with plate glass windows that heralded a constantly changing exhibition of goods. To attract respectable middle-class women into the center, the expanded fashion emporia offered a series of services and comforts that would recreate a homelike atmosphere: restaurants, restrooms, and writing rooms, and elegantly attired shop girls who were quick to "understand" what other women "want" and to enter into the "little troubles" of their customers.[31] In the late Victorian period, department stores developed alongside a network of commercial entertainments and services—inexpensive tea shops, public lavatories, ladies clubs, cheap public transport, and theater matinees. These facilities allowed female consumers to enter the city center and to enjoy a "shopping day" while still maintaining their respectability.[32]

Despite the development of Oxford Street as a middle-class marketplace, the emporia of Bond Street and Regent Street retained their small scale and aristocratic tone; their architecture, interior design, sales technique, and advertising, notes historian Erika Rappaport, "reflected a notion of a fixed and class-specific . . . market."[33] Entering the luxury shops of these streets might have presented a social challenge even to middle-class women, but they and their more humble sisters could still catch the bus into town, walk down Regent Street and gaze in shop windows, and thus partake in the "Londoner's ability to enjoy things without buying them."[34]

If shopping fulfilled women's social obligations as status symbols of their families' wealth, it simultaneously exposed them to new dangers. For many Victorian observers, immersion in the sensuous world of consumption rendered women suspect—subject to the seduction of men and sales promotion and to their own uncontrollable impulses.[35] This ambivalence is readily evident in the print culture of the period, from comic magazines for men to medical treatises on kleptomania as a peculiarly female form of insanity. It may be found in the *Draper's Record*'s denuncia-

tion of the female "shop rover" as a ransacker of stock who often "evolves" into that other "plague" of the draper, the shoplifter.[36] Ambivalence about the female shopper also extended to the women's press, whose columns tried to prepare female readers for their urban adventure as consumers of visual display, while condemning some female peripatetics for their excessive display and appetite. The fashion pages of the *Queen* and *Girl's Own Paper* constantly stoked the flames of female consumer appetite by informing readers of the styles, colors, and fabrics that had gone out or come back in.[37] Yet other columns tried to rein in that desire by instructing readers how to be rational or ethical shoppers. Readers were told to acquire "business habits" for shopping, to avoid being "wandering and fruitless" shoppers, who "finger" things unnecessarily and "give no thought to the loss of time and trouble" inflicted on shop assistants.[38] By constructing women as rational consumers, magazines emulated the male ideal of the consumer as "rational subject, calculating, and efficient, aware of his aims and wants."[39] This was set against the negative example of the shop rovers who meander through large establishments where they "deposit the burden of their formless desire."[40]

Jokes of the period also interpreted female shopping as morally dubious: a practice that rendered them ridiculous, because it incited acquisitive and autoerotic desires and transformed women into erotic objects for men. These jokes played on the fact that when ladies went fashion shopping in the West End, they often went into stores to undress and dress.[41] Male jokes called attention to the embodied existence of female shoppers, particularly to the underclothes and "dress improvers" that structured the female body of the "ladies" and "women" who perambulated the West End. One such joke tells of a well-known actress who is observed on her way to the Empire Theater, carrying a bundle that she drops. Out fall her wings and tights. A swell picks up the tights and offers them to her with a bow, but the lady is so embarrassed that she hesitates before snatching them up and stuffing them away. All the surrounding observers but the lady herself smile at the scene.[42] In another story, a fashionably dressed young lady is walking her clipped poodle in Birdcage Walk in nearby St. James Park: her iron bustle shaped like a birdcage comes rattling down from her "voluminous skirts." The gallant narrator runs after her with the contraption: she disowns the possession with a curt, "Not mine."[43]

This play of dress and undress, of artifice and eroticism, provoked the following observation by the distinguished anatomist E. Ray Lankester in a private letter to Karl Pearson: like the teller of a dirty joke, Lankester finds the "women who object to be spoken to in the street" to be "comic." What can women who "dress themselves up" with "false bottoms and stays—and other erotic adornments" expect? If women "really do wish to be left alone," they should dress to be "plain and unappetizing and avoid the haunts of men."[44]

Lankester's comment stripped women of social distinctions, exposing them as all the same underneath. This collapsing of women into a general sexual category remained in tension with other representational codes of the era that continued to

polarize womanhood into two categories, the fallen and the virtuous.[45] We might also say that these opposing categories were always ambiguous and that they demanded a regulatory force of observers to police the boundaries. In the mid- and late Victorian period, police provided the most official form of surveillance, as they endeavored to clear the streets and theaters of prostitutes to make room for respectable women. Yet police activities simply provoked further instabilities on the street. In the elegant shopping districts around Regent Street, prostitutes, dressed in "meretricious finery," could and did pass as respectable, while virtuous ladies wandering through the streets, "window gazing at their leisure," often found themselves accosted as streetwalkers.[46]

Cases of mistaken identity were frequent enough that they became the stuff of jokes. In one lithograph of 1865, a well-dressed woman in the street is approached by an evangelical clergyman, who offers her a reforming tract. She rejects his attempt to rescue her and assures him, "You're mistaken. I am not a social evil, I am only waiting for a bus."[47] This confusion was frequently blamed on the "fast" daughters of the upper middle class who imitated the sumptuary habits of the demimonde. Apparently seduced by the values of the market, these inveterate consumers seem to have repudiated the self-sacrifice of traditional reproductive womanhood in favor of the selfish pursuit of pleasure and self-display.[48] In the 1880s, professional and literary men like Lankester and Pearson continued to condemn female consumers as "shopping dolls," as embodiments of a Philistine market culture (while assuming that their own intellectual capital elevated themselves above the operations of the market).[49]

This association of shopping with a marketable, sexualized femininity seemed to entitle male pests to "annoy" respectable women who tried to experience the freedom of the city and to enter the palaces of consumption organized for them. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the culprits tended not to be errand boys or tradesmen who could be ignored. They were clerks and civil servants, like the "young bloods" from Tooting Bec, Acton, and Tufnell Park, who congregated at the Piccadilly entrance of the Burlington Arcade in the late afternoon, dressed in frock coats, polished hats, and lavender gloves.[50]

The women's press lost no time in offering "decent women" a series of strategies to deal with male pests. Just as they had advised shopping ladies how to negotiate the poles of rational free choice and involuntary seduction in the shops, women's magazines instructed ladies how to navigate and manage heterosexual relations on the street.[51] Early in her adolescence, a girl had to learn to free herself of unwanted admirers. In her gestures, movements, and pace (always dignified and purposeful), she had to show that she was not available prey.[52] Conduct books and magazines frequently admonished their female readers not to window-shop or in any other way exhibit "lounging behavior" on the street. While deploring the conduct of male pests, magazines such as the *Girl's Own Paper* nonetheless insisted that it was generally a girl's fault if she was "spoken to."[53]

Indignation over "street impertinences" periodically surfaced in the publications of the period, but it was left to W. T. Stead of the *Pall Mall Gazette* to elevate street harassment to a national scandal in 1887.[54] Stead was the éminence grise behind the media production of sexual scandals that rocked England and its empire in the 1880s. His newspaper exposé of child prostitution in 1885, the "Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon," was a milestone in the history of the mass media, selling over a million and a half unauthorized copies and establishing Stead as a "controlling force in English life."[55]

In lurid and prurient detail, the "Maiden Tribute" documented the sale of young virgins in the West End for the sum of five pounds to aristocratic old rakes.[56] Stead showed how a dark labyrinth of illicit and violent sex existed behind the facades of respectable West End villas. Public furor over the "Maiden Tribute" forced the passage of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, which not only raised the age of consent for girls from thirteen to sixteen but also gave police far greater power to prosecute streetwalkers and brothel keepers.[57]

"Maiden Tribute" forcefully contributed to an emerging feminist social purity politics, dedicated to eradicating vice and upholding a single standard of chastity for men and women: it both amplified the fear of sexual danger and gave women a public platform from which to speak out against men's double lives. Feminists credited Stead with bringing into the open the ominous "shadows," "spectres," and "haunting fears" that darkened women's views of heterosexual relations.[58] "Maiden Tribute" stimulated new "possibilities of thought" among middle-class women, driving them by "fear" into [public] "speech."[59] On the whole, middle-class women articulated their sense of sexual vulnerability through the narrative conventions of melodrama, a popular form that allowed the weak to speak out and gain agency in their own defense. The sexual scandals of the 1880s helped to precipitate the political and cultural conditions that would later find subjective expression in the memoirs of women such as Helena Swanwick and Elizabeth Robins.

In the immediate aftermath of the "Maiden Tribute," Stead continued to manufacture thunderbolts and publicity escapades focused on the West End, with varied political effects. By constantly shifting targets and inventing new categories of sexual danger, he persisted in elaborating sexual danger as national news. These subsequent media campaigns included exposés of the pornography trade in the West End, a vast expansion of sex-crime reporting, attacks on politically prominent men such as Charles Dilke as sexually dangerous, and, ultimately, attacks on the metropolitan police for making the streets of the city center unsafe for women. In these campaigns, Stead both charged the state to protect women and then repudiated its representatives as sexually dangerous.[60]

In January 1886, Stead reprinted a letter from a "lady" published earlier in the *Standard* and the *Daily News* under the heading "Police Outrage on a Lady." The anonymous writer complained of being accosted by a policeman when a friend, "a well-known physician," had escorted her home one night. The policeman told her

friend, " 'I've nothing to do with you, Sir; I don't want to interfere with you. It's her I want.' " He also made it clear that he "wanted some money." The letter writer was the novelist Olive Schreiner, whose spiritual identification with fallen women had found poignant expression, thanks to the police constable: she had "merely experienced for once a very little of what her forlorn sisters have to put up with always."[61] By 1887, the semiannual index of the *Pall Mall Gazette* (*PMG*) had established police attacks on women as a new category of sex crime: to its general listing for "assaults on women," it appended "assaults on women (involving the police)."[62]

This proliferation of sexual scandal and debate set the scene for the cause célèbre involving Miss Elizabeth Cass, a respectable milliner, newly arrived from the North of England, who was falsely arrested for streetwalking on Regent Street one Saturday night in June 1887. Accompanied by her stalwart and protective employer, Miss Cass protested her innocence at Marlborough Street police court. She claimed that she had merely been on her way to buy gloves. The testimony of her employer, Mrs. Borman, was crucial: she adamantly claimed that this was the first time Miss Cass had stepped out in the evening since she had arrived in London six weeks earlier, thus contradicting Police Constable Endacott's testimony that he had seen her soliciting on Regent Street on two previous occasions. The magistrate, Mr. Newton, dismissed the charge, but he also cautioned Miss Cass that no respectable woman would be found on Regent Street at nine in the evening. Indignant M. P.s from the North immediately raised questions about the magistrate's handling of the Cass case in Parliament. They demanded that Miss Cass receive an official apology and achieved the virtual censure of the government and the Home Secretary (who had defended Newton) by successfully moving a motion to adjourn. This uproar forced Sir Charles Warren, the police commissioner, to undertake an official inquiry into police conduct in the case. He also issued new orders, prohibiting arrests of streetwalkers without a citizen's complaint.[63]

The daily press took up Miss Cass's cause, using the pretext of wounded female honor to defend the "liberty of the subject," to condemn a Continental-style police, and to demand the public suppression of "foreign" vice.[64] On Regent Street, that frenchified "avenue of superfluities," "spy police" colluded with foreign prostitutes while threatening a pure English girl from the North, untainted and innocent of the ways of London. One correspondent in the *Daily Telegraph* expressed patriotic outrage that "foreign women" and their foreign bullies were allowed to "infest" the area at will, while an "innocent and most respectable English girl is pounced on."[65] Another "Father of Daughters" worried that his own daughter, who was employed in business in the Regent Street area and sometimes had to work well past 9:00 P.M., could suffer the same fate as Miss Cass—thus bringing into relief the massed presence of respectable girls in business in the center.[66]

As the crusading editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Stead immediately added his voice to the chorus of protests and condemned Mr. Newton's action as "simply abominable."[67] Despite his considerable indignation, Stead had helped to provoke

the conditions that led to the "police outrage in Regent street." His campaign against child prostitution had pressured the police to renew their crackdown on West End streetwalking, thus precipitating the occasion of Miss Cass's false arrest. Yet, his subsequent campaign against "police attacks on women" had also prepared the discursive and political ground for a public outrage against such an action.

Stead's reformist project was generally both controlling and inciting, inclusive and restrictive, unifying and fragmenting, and these features can be seen specifically in the publicist role he played during the Cass case, when he extended the public debate further by opening the columns of the *PMG* to female correspondents, whose letters were excerpted in a column headed "How Ladies Are Annoyed in London Streets."[68]

The lady correspondents shift the discussion away from the "police outrage in Regent street" to focus on respectable women's vulnerability to well-dressed civilian "male pests." They go to great lengths to identify themselves as innocent victims of street annoyances: "respectably dressed," walking or traveling in "broad daylight," minding their own business, never attempting in any way to attract notice. Nevertheless, they complain of annoyance by "so-called gentlemen," who stare at them and speak to them "in a most hateful manner," following them and impeding their way.

Some offer remedies for the problem. In "Going to the Root of the Matter," a female correspondent insists that the "remedy for the state of things in Regent street and other streets is for respectable women to make a point of walking there and anywhere else they like, and at any hour they like."[69] To ladies who complain that they have been accosted in the middle of the day even when "wearing sober black or blue dresses," one female correspondent recommends "an infallible specific": "a Salvation Army bonnet!"[70]

When male pests persisted in following them, correspondents were often driven from passive, if resisting, silence—the method recommended by conduct books and advice literature—to active speech and verbal retaliation. One correspondent offers a first-person account of a successful resistance of this sort. "I am 'middle-aged,' homely and a plain dresser," she declares; yet she was persistently followed from Chalk Farm Station to Adelaide Road, by a man who begged her, "Won't you speak to me?" When she "turned round upon him sharply" and said, "Yes, I will. If you think I'm like yourself, you are very much mistaken, and if you call yourself a gentleman you're still more mistaken; and that is all I have to say to you," at which point he "took to his heels, and ran up College-road."[71] The lady intended her story of adventure to demonstrate that the danger evaporated when a woman spoke out, becoming a speaking subject rather than the mute object of the gaze.

Other correspondents were less sanguine about self-defense or even the protection accorded by the law, particularly when well-dressed gentlemen were the offenders. "On one occasion," reported a "married lady," "I applied to the police [about a man annoying her], but the rude manner in which I was told—'it will be

all right—I am sure you can look after yourself'—has made me very chary of seeking further aid in this quarter." After her maidservant had been repeatedly annoyed when she ventured out at night on the "smallest errand," one "lady householder" in Kensington complained to a policeman, asking him, " 'Why don't you clear these men away who prowl about the streets and squares?' 'Ma'am,' replied the policeman, 'these are the gentlemen who live in the big houses about here: what do you think my place would be worth if I interfered with them.' "[72]

Only one lady correspondent insists that she has "no disagreeable adventures" on the streets to recount.[73] To the contrary, the streets of London afford her total privacy and freedom: she feels as "safe in Regent-street as in my own drawing room." To drive the point home, she enumerates the many public spaces that she has frequented (alone or with another lady) without meeting with a "single rudeness or interference." She has "been out early and late alone"; "done Regent-street and Bond-street shop windows slowly"; "been to the pit of every theatre in London"; "had coffee afterwards in some Strand restaurant and taken the last 'bus or train back." "There is no place like London," she concludes. Having lived recently in two small towns, she is always thankful to return "once more to the metropolis," "where one really lives in peace, freedom and safety, annoyed by no gossip, bothered by no officious neighbours, and free to act as independently as in a desert."

Most lady correspondents remain anonymous, simply signing themselves "Indignation" or a "Lady of Forty," but they do include the well-known feminist and social purity activist Laura Ormiston Chant, who uses the occasion to laud female agency and to link street harassment to women's civil disabilities.[74] As a professional journalist and platform woman, Chant is able to pick up the narrative of sexual danger and elaborate it as a fully developed feminist political melodrama, complete with rapid action, role reversals, and impersonation and disguise. In her revised melodrama, Chant also introduces a set of stereotyped characters, that is, privileged villains, passive female victims, and a crusading heroine—in the person of herself.

To counter the impression "that it is only young women of somewhat doubtful steadiness of conduct" who are "annoyed" in "public places," Chant offers her own "experiences" with "male pests of the street."[75] She begins with one account of herself, a middle-aged and "well-known personage," as a target of unwanted attention. Returning home "dressed in white" from a temperance address, she was accosted and followed across London on the Underground by a man dressed as a gentleman, whom she kept eluding by shifting train compartments. Finally, when this "perverse parody of manhood" alighted at Marlborough Road Station, accompanied by a "poor, gaudily-dressed, painted woman," he leered into her compartment where she was the only woman, "nodding his head, and saying insolently, 'Oh, there she is.' " Chant invokes a different scenario in her second example of this "disgraceful evil," in which she casts herself as crusading "all-seeing" heroine, able to frustrate the plans of a privileged villain to ruin a young girl, while still

running the risk of being confounded with a "fallen woman." While returning home with her husband from an evening's entertainment at Wild Bill Cody's "Wild West Show," she observed a little girl, accompanied by a blind father; the little girl stared with a "curious frightened look" in Chant's direction. Following the little girl's gaze, Chant observed a "well-dressed man of middle age" "making eyes" at the little girl. "He followed her and her father. So did I." After warning the father, who did not at all appreciate her intervention, Chant took "the liberty of following the coward . . . whose white face and quick trot showed he had 'a turn.'" She concludes her narrative by noting that in pursuing the villain she placed herself in danger: if the man complained to a policeman, she could have been "marched off to the police-station as a well-known prostitute."

Female correspondents defend the "right" of "respectable women," "young married women," to move about the city, particularly the city center, unimpeded. That is, they extend the right of privacy, the right to be private in public, to all "decent women"—those who dress "quietly," who never engage in communications with strange men, who go out at reasonable hours. These women, they insist, should not be treated like prostitutes, like public women, when they enter public space. They should feel as "safe in Regent-street as in their own drawing room," as "free to act as in a desert."

Although these correspondents extend the right and privileges of privacy to all decent women—including "daily governesses and maid servants" out on errands—there are limits to their democratic sentiments. Chant's account of her experiences with male harassers is a case in point. In her second narrative, where she figures herself as an all-seeing heroine empowered to act in defense of a poor, innocent girl, Chant establishes herself as a privileged observer and actor, who inverts the victim-aggressor relationship; it was she who assumed the "manly" detective role, superseding the father as the girl's protector and transforming the villain into a feminized "white-faced coward." No other female is empowered in the story: not the imperiled girl, who mutely and passively beseeches Chant with her "curiously frightened look," and not the fallen women of the streets. On the contrary, in her first story, Chant expresses considerable indignation at being treated as fair game by the leering man on the train, as if she were a reasonable substitute for the "gaudily-dressed, painted" woman who later accompanied him; she concludes her second tale of female detection on the same note of vulnerability and fear of being libeled and arrested as a "well-known prostitute," instead of the "well-known personage" she was.

Female correspondents sustain the division between "decent women" and "disorderly women of the streets" as enunciated by Chant, with one important exception. Remember the woman who advises wearing a Salvation Army bonnet as an "infallible specific" against male pests. So equipped, a shopping lady would be presumably marked off visually from the dangerous fallen women of Piccadilly. Yet the "Quaker-like" bonnet of the Salvation Army also evoked equivocal, and

transgressive, associations.[76] The "Salvation Army lasses" who sported this bonnet were overwhelmingly working-class women doubly renowned as "public women." They were simultaneously embodiments of a gracious national womanhood, drilled and disciplined and "singularly free of affectation," and disorderly women of the streets, noted for their spontaneity, physical courage, and pluck.[77] The "boisterous high spirits" of these "bonneted Amazons," matched by their red jersey uniform, contrasted sharply with the discreet body language and neutral tones adopted by middle-class women, intent on speeding through London without incident.[78] Although the Salvation Army bonnet might have served as an "infallible specific" against male pests, it also implicated middle-class women in a complicated cultural exchange with a new style of independent working womanhood, whose collective street manners violated the canons of public decorum. Sporting a Salvation Army bonnet went well beyond women's desire to protect themselves and their respectability. On the one hand, it was a "magical bonnet," a cap of liberty, that focused attention on a woman's head rather than on her nether regions and thus allowed her to enjoy the freedom of the highway by transcending her body.[79] On the other hand, it revealed a fascination with and emulation of down-to-earth, embodied working-class women, with their energy of the street and easy relation to street culture.[80]

Female correspondents insist on the stability of their own respectable identity, but they call into question the stable identity of men. They describe well-dressed male offenders as "so-called gentlemen," "male pests," and "profligate parod[ies] of manhood"—that is, as verminous, irritating, social impostors. Their intention is to challenge these men's status as gentlemen: in their view, a "manly man," the true gentleman, is one who restrains his sexuality outside of marriage and acts chivalrously to women on the streets. Such a man marks himself off from the sexual bestiality of the lower orders and the libertinism of the decadent upper classes.[81]

A number of male correspondents concur with this assessment.[82] Reverend H. R. Haweis, a noted liberal reformer, commends Stead for opening his "columns to the poor hunted ladies of London."[83] Speaking as a paterfamilias and patriot, he offers ways to deal with a national disgrace so notorious that it has allowed "the astonished foreigner whom we regard as the corrupter of our morals to point to his boulevards and Elysian Fields as chaste and spotless compared with our Oxford-street or Piccadilly."

> The growing misery of the situation has at last overcome the reticence of modest women; they have told us now—are telling us with an anguish we ought to pity, and with blushes that every father, husband and brother should respect—what the state of the streets is for them, not after dark, but in broad daylight; yes, while we are at our desks or on 'change—too busy mayhap to think about them and their shopping and their enforced strolls. . . .
>
> At present it is clear the police will not act promptly against a well-dressed man: they have received no instructions, they have not been encouraged by public opinion, and they fear, in view of brother Endacott, the consequences of a mistake. But these obstacles are very

superable. . . . The only formidable mistake which might be dreaded is the black mailing of gentlemen by prostitutes who might pose as unprotected females; but such an attempt would be utterly abortive, the essence of the case turning on the demonstrated respectability of the woman who promotes the arrest.

For Rev. Haweis, the scandalous condition of Regent Street has become a matter of national, familial, and class honor. In his defense of the "poor hunted ladies of London," he exonerates shopping ladies from any imputation of frivolous self-display and self-indulgence. Their "enforced strolls" sustain the bourgeois sexual division of labor that accorded women a public and mobile role as embodiments of their family's wealth, even as their menfolk remain immobilized, laboring away at their desks, "or on 'change." Nevertheless, the imagined contrast between perambulating ladies and sedentary men of business seems to have generated some unease. Haweis displaces this anxiety onto the ominous figure of the blackmailing prostitute, whose attempts at social masquerade, he hastens to reassure readers of the *PMG*, would be "utterly abortive," lacking as she does "the *sine qua non* for success"—"demonstrated respectability."

Other male correspondents vigorously resist the efforts of strong-minded women like Mrs. Chant and "sympathising parsons" like Rev. Haweis to ennoble female victims and to curtail male sexual prerogatives. In keeping with his policy of the "universal interview," W. T. Stead allowed men of the world to respond in a column entitled "What the 'Male Pests' Have to Say for Themselves."[84]

Careful to distinguish themselves from "ruffians" whom no decent woman would endure, they defend their practice of "following after and speaking to respectable women" as both harmless and consistent with English principles of liberty. Unless one wants to follow the policy of "locking women up as they do in the East," asserts one correspondent, "there is nothing [left] but to leave men perfectly free to gaze at and even follow women as they please."[85] Male correspondents go further and maintain their right to address women, quite aware that they are violating the injunctions of conduct books not to speak to women without an introduction. That is to say, they defend their right to draw women into "conversation," into a discursive practice distinct from sexual commerce, yet still ambiguously attached to the sexual marketplace.

While defending their own right of conversation, male correspondents simultaneously challenge the legitimacy of female verbal protest over their actions. They do so in two ways. First, they call attention to the appearance of "outraged females" in their "tailor-made dresses" that attract male notice (thus refuting the women's insistence that they were dressed in sober blue and black dresses). "It would be very interesting to have the pictures of all the modest and refined-looking ladies who complain of molestation published in your columns," wrote an "Observer in Mayfair." This comment builds on longstanding and gendered "ways of seeing" deeply embedded in modern Western culture.[86] It also refers specifically to the mass marketing of visual representations of female faces and female bodies in the mid- and

late Victorian period, thanks to photography and poster art. I am thinking here of the immensely popular "beauties of England," *cartes de visite* that sold in the hundreds of thousands, and their less decorous pornographic variations.[87] I am also thinking of the effect of the new hand cameras, the so-called "detective cameras," that appeared in the 1880s. These cameras, commentators complained, stimulated a new mania in the form of "snap shot fiends," mostly men, who took candid photographs of unsuspecting citizens, often vulnerable women.[88]

Not only do "Men of the World" put women back in their objectified place in the field of vision, they also attack the ignorance, class prejudice, and misguided assumptions of "outraged females" and their supporters. "Like most people who know nothing about the matter," "outraged females" and "sympathising parsons" seem "to divide women into two classes—the strictly virtuous and the strictly the other way," declares "Le Monsieur qui a suivi les dames."[89] Yet, "There are hundreds of girls, without being vicious, who will enter into conversation." Other "Men of the World" concur. Some insist that it is not only "girls" or "silly," "half-educated middle-class women" who allow men to address them but also "ladies who ought to and do know better."

"Men of the World" invoke the "middle ground" of open yet licit sexuality—what historian Peter Bailey has called parasexuality—that had been constructed by the consumer culture of the nineteenth century as an ensemble of sites, practices, and occasions that "mediate across the frontiers of the putative public/private divide."[90] In this "middle ground," the objects of desire were mostly women of liminal status, neither ladies nor prostitutes, but working girls in the tertiary sector of the economy, like barmaids, actresses, and milliners "who are not vicious, but will enter into conversation." Male correspondents endow these women with a sexual "knowingness," in sharp contrast to the sexual prudery of middle-class feminists like Chant, who would deprive the people of their pleasures and gentlemen of access to female companions who "hold their evening parties in the streets."[91]

Like the Salvation Army bonnet, the correspondence of male pests highlights the complexity of social description related to gender: male pests assert the stability of their own authoritative gender and class identity—never bothering to document how they *looked* when addressing women.[92] But they call into question the social and moral status of women on the streets. As they grapple with the moral terminology associated with feminine identity, they variously describe the objects of desire as girls, women, ladies, or females. Sometimes male correspondents distinguish between "women" and "ladies" to demarcate middle- and upper-class status; more frequently they invoke these categories to undermine the credibility and moral authority of female correspondents purporting to be "ladies." As long as ladies retain a privileged class distinction, they enjoy the positive connotations of "true" womanhood; however, when linguistically stripped of that respectable identity and reduced to being "females" or "girls," even "ladies" become vulnerable to all the misogynist associations ascribed to women in general, to women-as-the-sex. So

stripped, even ladies become vulnerable to male harassment as women of the streets, open to public view and to public access.[93]

In their letters, male correspondents often invoke a populist discourse that defends the pleasures of the people and attacks privilege by denying the class differentiation of women. The complex rhetorical moves produced by the correspondent who signed himself "Socialist" is a case in point. His account of social encounters on the street parodies and inverts Chant's narrative of sexual danger and feminist heroism. Unlike Chant, whose personal narrative places her in the middle of the action, "Socialist" positions himself on the outside, as an impartial observer, outside of the class and sexual politics intrinsic to "street conversations." Yet, as we shall see, his position as ethnographer was far from disinterested or dispassionate.

"Socialist" establishes his authority over the meaning of "street conversations" by placing them in the context of working-class courtship practices and, most particularly, of female desire. "There is nothing which tens, hundreds of thousands of girls more desire than to be addressed by unknown men in the street." "At work all day, . . . with no parties in the evening," they hold their "evening parties in the street." To "secure a 'young man' or add to their 'young men,' tens, hundreds of thousands only too gladly dispense with formal introductions, and require only a certain respectfulness of self-introduction." This "respectfulness," he explains, often takes the form of a young man's "hesitation in addressing the young girl" and of "following" her for "some distance." This delay, he further observes, has the added benefit of "showing oneself off at the same time to the best advantage before venturing to address her." To the "uninitiated observer," this practice could appear to be "persecution." As an example of this social misreading, "Socialist" introduces the case of a "Woman's Right" acquaintance, who, "full of holy rage, came to the 'rescue' of the 'victim.' Speechless was her astonishment when the 'victim' rounded upon her, in very strong language, for her officious interference in other people's affairs."

"Socialist" not only appropriates the voice and viewpoint of his popular female protagonists to challenge the credibility of ladies as reliable social observers and narrators. He also unmasks the outraged protests of these same "ladies" as essentially self-serving and defensive of their own class prerogatives: "The girls who really feel insulted by strangers addressing them in the streets are, in general, only ladies, and the 'insult' often consists, not so much in what is said, as in being taken to belong to a lower class of girls, who welcome such self-introduction."[94]

It is not surprising that the Cass case and its ensuing correspondence exposed late Victorian distinctions of class and gender to be slippery and emotionally charged. Turning as it did on many cases of "mistaken identity" and multiple readings of social encounters, the Cass episode epitomized the confusions and conflicts provoked by the material and imaginative transformations of the West End. In light of these changes, the occupational identity of our victimized heroine, Miss Cass, is telling: she was a milliner, employed to assist the large numbers of shopping

ladies attracted to the feminized world of shopping created for them at the center. An independent working woman like Miss Cass was, in her words, "not afraid to go out alone . . . because I can take care of myself."[95] Some urban observers made efforts to accommodate and acknowledge these new social actors—the shop girl, with her different patterns of heterosociability and street style, and also the shopping lady, with her penchant for window-gazing, who now claimed the right to engage in lounging behavior on the street that would have traditionally marked her as the "other" kind of woman. Despite their efforts, the fin de siècle West End continued to function as a territory of commercialized sex, where traditional forms of predatory male behavior were tolerated and condoned.

As we have seen, the very multiplicity of these meanings and practices complicated both policing and social encounters in the center. As a social and physical site, the West End may have accrued new meanings, but it did not shed older ones. This is readily evidenced by the varied and conflicting responses of politicians and publicists, of outraged females and patresfamilias, as well as of "Men of the World" and ladies corresponding about the Cass episode. From their perspectives, the West End was a political and commercial center; its thoroughfares served as the local high street for a fashionable neighborhood and a metropolitan hub; its streets were Continental and Oriental; they were the path of revolution and empire; they purveyed respectable pleasures and notorious vice; they were centers of masculine privilege and feminine consumption. For these respondents, streetwalking in the West End presented a test case of English urban freedom and the right to privacy in public.

The Cass case correspondence also highlighted the new discursive spaces opening for a heterogeneous public, particularly the new forms of mass market fantasies and desires consolidated and circulated by Stead's New Journalism. Through the techniques of the New Journalism, particularly the practice of the "universal interview," Stead tried to transform the newspaper into a public forum for an expanded public.[96] This expanded public would be the place, as critic Simon Watney puts it, where "modern society and individuals made sense of themselves," where symbols, images, and words circulated that provided "the basic raw materials from which human subjectivity is constructed."[97] Stead hoped to harness these structures of feeling to fashion a new political formation under his own editorial direction, to construct a "Government by Journalism."[98]

Although he opened the columns of the newspaper to an expanded heterogeneous public, Stead tried to forge a single moral majority under his own editorial direction. To a certain extent, he succeeded. We have seen how Stead and the entire daily press embraced the cause of the chaste and innocent working girl from the North as a nationalist defense of the "liberty of the subject" against the threat of "foreign vice" and a "Continental-style" police. As a pure English girl, Miss Cass was elevated above class and politics, much like Queen Victoria, who was carted around Regent Street in celebration of her Golden Jubilee during the same

month that Miss Cass was arrested there.[99] Members of the daily press represented both women, the modern-day (and English) Joan of Arc and the Imperial Mother, as embodiments of the abstract virtues of race and nation.[100] As classical female bodies emblematic of a closed, regulated, homogeneous social order, Miss Cass and Queen Victoria stood in stark contrast to the female grotesques of the street, those "foreign" prostitutes, who with "glaring colors" and "wicked glances" endeavored to arrest the attention of passersby.[101]

This national unity was immediately disrupted, however, when the *PMG* opened its correspondence columns to "male pests" and "outraged females." By so doing, it extended the meanings of the Cass case well beyond the "police outrage" in Regent Street to elaborate many subject positions and forms of heterosexuality. Despite his efforts to control the "moral" of his story, Stead had to contend with struggles over meaning partially activated by his own journalistic practices. In the midst of media scandals of sexual danger in the London labyrinth, Stead allowed shopping ladies to voice their anger against male pests and to express their desire for free access to the street, symbolized by the transformative power of the Salvation Army bonnet. Stead also enabled the "Men of the World" to extol a diffuse, healthy sexuality—the middle ground—associated with the new spaces of consumer culture and with girls who were neither "strictly virtuous" nor "strictly the other way."

In their correspondence, male pests document and acclaim a distinctive street style—of verbal chaffing, of carefully managed eroticism—that working women may have carried with them into the center. There is no doubt that the emerging consumer culture of the period capitalized on this kind of sexual exchange and beamed its attractions to working-class women, praising the independent working woman who was well dressed, who could move beyond the confines of her neighborhood (and the constraints imposed by "local matriarchs"), and who could navigate the class distinctions of the West End.[102] Mass circulation periodicals of the turn of the century like *Girl's Friend* emphasized the importance of a beauty culture for the business girl "who earns her living and would pay due regard to her personal appearance"; they circulated "romances" that glamorized the workgirl's life, insisting that "there is much to wonder at even in the life of a mere tea waitress."[103] However, the advice columns of these periodicals stopped short of advocating the kinds of cross-class sexual encounters celebrated by the musical comedies and comic magazines of the late Victorian era.[104]

Like the male pests of the Cass correspondence, musical comedies and comic magazines interpreted these cross-class sexual encounters through a certain class and sexual politics: the *true* friends of the attractive barmaid, the counter girl, and the actress they insist, are gentlemen, who both flirt with the working girl and commiserate with her over her labors. These "true friends" stand in contrast to the "ladies of rank who could buy up the bank," but who exploit and condescend to

the working girl, or the feminist "prudes on the prowl" such as Mrs. Chant, who try to restrict her pleasure. We need to know more about how working-class women received this message, and how *they* interpreted the cultural negotiations between gentlemen and "girls who hold their evening parties in the street."

We do know that many working-class courtship rituals—"skylarking" or "clicking" with the "birds" in the "populous highways" surrounding working-class districts—resembled the coded behavior noted by "Socialist."[105] A young man would "sign on," that is, show his preference, by "glad-eyeing" a young woman. Their eyes would meet; both would walk on and look backwards. The young woman might slow down to look in a shop window, while the "boy" would raise his hat "in the approved music hall style." Both would be "putting on the high hat," each pretending to be in a "loftier" social position than they "really are."[106]

By the standards of other classes, these courtship practices were extremely informal and casual: "Young people make their own arrangements" and transform the streets of London into "Love Lane," observed Clarence Rook.[107] Although "chance encounters" between strangers occurred on the streets or on public transport, most courtship relations were collectively staged in public, monitored through neighbors and local gossip.[108]

Even in a peer culture, these informal practices were heavily weighted in favor of men.[109] Oral historians have claimed that succeeding generations of working women would rely on the goods, fantasies, and spatial opportunities of consumer culture to develop an "independent sense of self."[110] But, according to Sally Alexander, they did so in the face of an intergenerational silence about sexuality between mothers and daughters and a general disavowal of feminine sexuality in the wider working-class community.[111] Well into the mid-twentieth century, a radical disjunction existed between the media messages of sexual glamour and the profoundly impoverished popular vocabulary of female embodiment and feminine sexual desire.[112] Working-class women were not as "knowing" as male pests imagined and represented them to be.[113]

Although we need to know more about the sexual subjectivity of working-class women, we *can* assess the way the middle-class male fantasy of a normalized and licit sexuality of everyday life emerged to counter a feminist melodrama of sexual danger. In 1887, when middle-class women felt empowered to speak out in public and defend the social right to privacy for all "decent" women, their authority was immediately challenged by a competing and deeply misogynist populism, represented by "Socialist" and other "Men of the World," a populism (whether Tory or Progressive) that seemed to speak on behalf of the people and their pleasures against a powerful elite represented by strong-minded women.[114] In the late Victorian period, competing sexual politics found expression in competing popular genres, whether it was melodrama or the glamorized tale of the sexually available working girl. These two genres also offered competing visions of the metropolis: on the one

hand, a labyrinthine cityscape of light and darkness, of ominous secrets and sexual danger; on the other, an illuminated landscape of modern consumer culture, the site of eroticized, discursive improvisational encounters between men and women of different classes.

Since many of us live in cities that we imagine to be both labyrinths of sexual danger and illuminated sites of pleasure, it is worth considering the truths and fictions embedded in these narrative conventions. However self-serving, the male defense of street conversations articulated certain truths about the plurality of heterosexual styles and sexual norms in evidence in the urban center in the late nineteenth century. Alternatively, melodrama offered an important language of emotion to women, an opportunity to voice their anger against male threats to their bodily integrity, but it too purveyed a set of truths and fictions. Let us recall the opening quotes. When Elizabeth Robins wrote of the "darker moods of men" and the need to speak out against them, she was invoking the feminist tradition of melodrama. Yet when Helena Swanwick's mother, Mrs. Sickert, tried to control her daughter's movements around the city and hence her access to city pleasures, she too was summoning up a melodrama of urban sexual danger. Melodrama may have offered a powerful cultural resource for female political expression, but it set limits to what could be said, particularly in relation to female agency and desire. With its emphasis on pure victimized womanhood, it always placed some women—the "bad women" of Mrs. Sickert's imagination, the "painted, gaudily dressed women" of Mrs. Chant's political narrative—beyond the pale of feminine sympathy and community.

As polyvalent cultural legacies of the Victorian period, these genres and political discourses continue to inform sexual standards and expectations today. Women continue to embed complaints of street harassment in melodramatic narratives of sexual danger that highlight an embattled but defiant female self confronting the challenges of a threatening and sexualized urban environment. In the 1970s, once again, the popular women's magazines led the way in publishing personal narratives of "street hassling"; second-wave feminists used these narratives to defend the integrity of the female subject and to document a "male backlash" against women's massive entry into the spaces of production and politics.[115] Like the lady correspondents of the *Pall Mall Gazette* who invoked a liberal political discourse to condemn street annoyances, contemporary feminists have also denounced street harassment as a breach of public civility, as a violation of the rights of privacy and of "locomotion."[116]

Feminist commentators have also tried to make explicit what Swanwick and Robins had gestured toward in their memoirs: how "being spoken to" by a man on the street might contribute to the production of the female subject. We have seen how Robins and Swanwick introduced their stories of the London streets to document their personal struggles against the constraints imposed on women in the past, although they ultimately targeted different agents of gender discipline.

Similarly, many contemporary feminists agree on the strategic role of street harassment as a "quintessential moment of femininity," but in their narratives they differ in their assessment of the psychosocial mechanisms at work.[117] For some feminists, street harassment is a straightforward and universal experience of female "disempowerment"; for others, it is a more ambiguous and complex form of social interaction that vacillates "between playfulness and seriousness, abandon and reserve, eagerness and indifference."[118]

Finally, I want to suggest that Victorian categories and genres persist in contemporary feminist accounts of street encounters. In their desire to universalize the meanings of harassment, some feminist critics have consistently underplayed the variety of female responses to "street hassling."[119] Even more tenaciously, these critics have often resisted efforts to disaggregate male heterosexual performances on the streets.[120] This universalizing tendency has come under criticism by other feminists who are concerned to explore how harassment affirms the boundaries of class and race, *as well as* gender, and also from those of us who want to enunciate the rights and wrongs of women without homogenizing women's "experience" or denying the play of female desire and pleasure in urban spaces.[121]

Nonfeminist purposes too here been served by the legacy of Victorian categories and genres that persist in contemporary debates over sexual harassment in the streets and in the workplace. During the Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas hearings (1991), for example, some critics of policies designed to protect individuals from sexual harassment tried to discredit Hill and her feminist sympathizers by mobilizing a series of counternarratives.[122] One populist version, memorably enunciated by sociologist Orlando Patterson in the pages of the *New York Times*, pitted "knowing" women of the people against puritanical, careerist middle-class women.[123] Like the late Victorian musical comedies (or the correspondence of some male pests), this counternarrative does more than undercut the right of "strong-minded women" to speak for all women. It also treats social differences in heterosexual styles as autonomous, fixed and immutable, outside the political domain and isolated from the operation of a fluid commercial market in ideas and fantasies.

In assessing contemporary disputes over public culture and sexuality, then, it is important to recognize how Victorian popular genres and discourses still inform many levels of cultural and political practice today. Representations of the city as a dangerous sexual labyrinth or as a fairyland of consumer pleasure, where women figure as embattled urban denizens or as self-confident, streetwise working girls, not only surface in mass market fantasies. They also shape political narratives of street and sexual harassment: both the ones that pit women of the people against prudish feminists or those that demand for women the right to privacy in public. These stories of women and modernity emerged out of political and cultural conflicts in the past, and they contribute directly to our own contested political histories—histories of gender, class, ethnicity, and feminism.[124]

Notes

Versions of this essay were presented to a number of audiences, including the "Going Public" Conference at Columbia University (1991), the Center for Literary and Cultural Studies at Harvard University (1992), and the Gauss Seminars at Princeton University (1995). I would especially like to thank Toby Ditz, Martha Howell, Margaret Hunt, Thomas Laqueur, and Rebecca Walkowitz for their helpful comments.

1. Helena M. Swanwick, *I Have Been Young* (London, 1935), 82.
2. Elizabeth Robins, *Both Sides of the Curtain* (London, 1940), 167.
3. Other middle-class women, with different political commitments, often remember the London of their youth differently. When episodes of sexual harassment are conspicuously missing from female memoirs of the period, as they are from the autobiographies of antifeminists such as Mary Hughes or Margot Asquith, this absence often signaled an opposing narrative design: a desire to represent "being at home in the city" as a "natural" condition of one's own personal superiority, without reference to a collective history of struggle. See Margot Asquith, *The Autobiography of Margot Asquith*, ed. Mark Bonham Carter (1962; reprint, London, 1985), 45; M. V. Hughes, *A London Child of the 1870s* (Oxford, 1977); Judith R. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London* (Chicago, 1992), chap. 2; Martha Vicinus, *Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1850–1920* (Chicago, 1985), 220.
4. The West End has both a highly "imagined" and historically shifting geography. The West End originally designated an area between the City and the royal palaces of Westminster. Between the late sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, the aristocracy moved their homes from the City to the squares of the West End. Commerce followed along, moving out of the City and on to Bond Street, Oxford and Regent Streets, Piccadilly, and the Strand. Laborers and artisans also migrated to parts of the West End, so that, in the early modern period, inhabitants with an enormous range of incomes coexisted in this part of town. Despite this diversity, by the early nineteenth century, the West End came to stand for Society. By the mid-nineteenth century, it underwent transformation as a heterogeneous site of commercial culture. In all its incarnations, as Erika Rappaport has observed, the West End was in many ways an "imagined territory." See Erika Rappaport, "The West End and Women's Pleasure: Gender and Commercial Culture in London, 1860–1914" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1993), 11. See also Lynn Walker, "Vistas of Pleasure: Women Consumers of Urban Space in the West End of London, 1850–1900," in Clarissa Orr Campbell, ed., *Women in the Victorian Art World* (Manchester, 1995), 70–85. See also R. Malcolm Smuts, "The Court and Its Neighborhood: Royal Policy and Urban Growth in the Early Stuart West End," *Journal of British Studies* 30, no. 2 (April 1991): 117–49. P.J. Atkins, "The Spatial Configuration of Class Solidarity in London's West End, 1792–1939," *Urban History Yearbook* (1990): 36–65.
5. Paul Patton, "Imaginary Cities: Images of Postmodernity," in Sophie Watson and Katherine Gibson, eds., *Postmodern Cities and Spaces* (Oxford, 1995), 112–21.
6. Micaela di Leonardo, "Political Economy of Street Harassment," *Aegis* (Summer 1981): 51, 52; quoted in Cynthia Grant Bowman, "Street Harassment and the Informal Ghettoization of Women," *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 3 (January 1993): 524. See also Carol B. Gardner, *Passing By: Gender and Public Harassment* (Berkeley, 1995); Laura Ring, "Sexual Harassment and the Production of Gender," *differences* 6, no. 1

(Spring 1994): 163. I am following the example of Bowman, "Street Harassment," 523 n. 31, in treating male harassment of gay men as the "subject of a separate discussion."

7. On shop assistants and clerks see Peter Bailey, "Ally Sloper's Half Holiday: Comic Art in the 1880s," *History Workshop Journal* 16 (Autumn 1983): 4–31; "Champagne Charlie: Performance and Ideology in the Music-Hall Swell Song," in J. S. Bratton, ed., *Music Hall: Performance and Style* (Philadelphia, 1986); *Olivia's Shopping and How She Does It: A Prejudiced Guide to the London Shops* (London, 1906); Derek Hudson, *Munby, Man of Two Worlds: The Life and Diaries of Arthur J. Munby* (London, 1972), 35, 98–99.
8. On sexual harassment and contestable truths, see Ring, "Sexual Harassment," 163; Tania Modleski, "Breaking Silence, Or an Old Wives Tale: Sexual Harassment and the Legitimation Crisis," *Discourse* 16, no. 1 (Fall 1993): 109–25.
9. On the Victorian transformation of the West End, see Donald J. Olsen, *The Growth of Victorian London* (London, 1976); Robert Thorne, "Places of Refinement in the Nineteenth-Century City," in Anthony D. King, ed., *Buildings and Society: Essays on the Social Development of the Built Environment* (London, 1980); James Winter, *London's Teeming Streets, 1830–1914* (London, 1993), chaps. 1 and 2; John Summerson, *Georgian London* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978). M. H. Port, "Metropolitan Improvements: From Grosvenor Square to Admiralty Arch," *London Journal* 7, no. 2 (Winter 1981): 194–206; Francis Sheppard, "London and the Nation in the Nineteenth Century," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 5th series, 35 (1985): 51–74; Gavin Weightman and Steve Humphries, *The Making of Modern London* (London, 1983).
10. D. A. Reeder, "A Theatre of Suburbs: Some Patterns of Development in West London, 1801–1911," in H. J. Dyos, ed., *The Study of Urban History* (New York, 1968), 235–71.
11. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* chap. 2.
12. Olsen, *Growth,* 82.
13. Alderman Laurence, *Hansard Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, vol. 189 (1867), cols. 1527–30, quoted in Winter, *London's Teeming Streets,* 47.
14. Charles Eyre Pascoe, *London of To-Day, 1888* (London, 1888), 27–29; quoted in Olsen, *Growth,* 98. See also Rappaport, "The West End."
15. Summerson, *Georgian London,* 181; Olsen, *Growth,* 51–53.
16. Hermione Hobhouse, *A History of Regent Street* (London, 1975), 74.
17. Howard Robertson, quoted in ibid., 130.
18. Hobhouse, *Regent Street,* 72; Erika Rappaport, "The Halls of Temptation: Gender, Politics, and the Construction of the Department Store in Late-Victorian London," *Journal of British Studies* 35 (January 1995): 58–83.
19. G. A. Sala, "Young London," *Daily Telegraph* (London), 5 June 1879. Thanks to Erika Rappaport for this reference.
20. "The Philosophy of Shopping," *Saturday Review,* 16 October 1875, 488–89. Thanks to Erika Rappaport for this citation.
21. Alison Adburgham, *Liberty's: A Biography of a Shop* (London, 1975).
22. The description of the West End as a "fairyland" comes from R. D. Blumenfeld, *R. D. B.'s Diary, 1887–1914* (London, 1930), 104. Henry Mayhew, *The Shops and Companies of London and the Trades and Manufacturies of Great Britain* (London, 1865), 21:57.
23. Simon Jenkins, *Landlords to London: The Story of a Capital and Its Growth* (London, 1975), 113; Francis Sheppard, *London, 1808–1870: The Infernal Wen* (Berkeley, 1971), 115; Summerson, *Georgian London,* 171; Charles Booth, *Life and Labour of the People in London,* 3d series: Religious Influences (London, 1905), 3:97, 98.
24. John Tagg, "The Discontinuous City: Picturing and the Discursive Field," in *Grounds of Dispute: Art History, Cultural Politics, and the Discursive Field* (Minneapolis, Minn., 1992),

139; T. J. Clark, *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers* (New York, 1985).
25. Tracy C. Davis, *Actresses as Working Women: Their Social Identity in Victorian Culture* (London, 1991), 139–45.
26. Colin Ford and Brian Harrison, eds., *One Hundred Years Ago: Britain in the 1880s in Words and Photographs* (Cambridge, 1983), 178; Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship Between Classes in Victorian Society* (Oxford, 1977); Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* chap. 1; Stefan Petrow, *Policing Morals: The Metropolitan Police and the Home Office, 1870–1914* (Oxford, 1994), part 3.
27. Tagg, "Discontinuous City," 136.
28. See my earlier version of this discussion in *City of Dreadful Delight,* 127–31.
29. Griselda Pollock, "Vicarious Excitements: *London: A Pilgrimage* by Gustave Doré and Blanchard Jerrold, 1872," *New Formations* 2 (Spring 1988): 39; Alison Adburgham, *Shopping in Style: London from the Restoration to Edwardian Elegance* (London, 1979).
30. On the retail revolution, see Hamish Fraser, *The Coming of the Mass Market, 1850–1914* (Hamden, Conn., 1988). On studies of the department store, see Adburgham, *Shopping in Style;* Bill Lancaster, *The Department Store: A Social History;* Rappaport, "The West End"; Michael B. Miller, *The Bon Marché: Bourgeois Culture and the Department Store, 1869–1920* (Princeton, N.J., 1981); Susan Porter Benson, *Counter Cultures: Saleswomen, Managers, and Customers in American Department Stores, 1890–1940* (Urbana, Ill., 1956); William Leach, *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power, and the Rise of a New American Culture* (New York, 1993).
31. Lady Jeune, "The Ethics of Shopping," *Fortnightly Review* 57 (January–June 1895): 125–32.
32. Adburgham, *Shopping in Style,* 154; Erika Rappaport, "A New Era of Shopping: The Promotion of Women's Pleasure in London's West End, 1909–1914," in Leo Charney and Vanessa Schwartz, eds., *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life* (Berkeley, 1995), 131.
33. Rappaport, "A New Era," 133; Frances Sheafer Waxman, *A Shopping Guide to Paris and London* (New York, 1912).
34. M. V. Hughes, *A London Child of the 1870s* (Oxford, 1977), 46.
35. Alison Adburgham, *A Punch History of Manners and Modes, 1841–1940* (London, 1961); " 'Pro' and 'Con' Sketches," *Moonshine,* 24 January 1885, 48; "Why She Wore It," *Ally Sloper's Half-Holiday,* 6 August 1887, 251; Patricia O'Brien, "The Kleptomania Diagnosis: Bourgeois Women and Theft in Late Nineteenth-Century France," *Journal of Social History* 17 (1983): 65–77; J. C. Bucknill, "Kleptomania," *Journal of Mental Science* 8 (1862–63): 262–75; J. H. Balfour Browne, "Partial Moral Mania," *British and Foreign Medico-Chirugical Review* 1 (24 December 1887): 476; "Uncontrollable Impulses," *Foreign Medico-Chirugical Review* 14 (27 January 1894): 183.
36. "Shop Rovers and Shop Prowlers," *Draper's Record* 9 (3 October 1891): 661.
37. Wendy Forrester, *Great-Grandmama's Weekly: A Celebration of the* Girl's Own Paper, *1880–1901* (Guildford, Eng., 1980), 86.
38. "Business Habits," *Queen* 86 (12 October 1889): 506; "Shopping," *Queen* 91 (2 April 1892): 520.
39. Rachel Bowlby, *Shopping with Freud* (London, 1993), 99.
40. "Shopping."
41. Casey Finch, " 'Hooked and Buttoned Together': Victorian Underwear and Representations of the Female Body," *Victorian Studies* 34 (Spring 1991): 336–63.
42. *Here and There,* 20 July 1872, 346, quoted in Davis, *Actresses,* 137.

43. Blumenfeld, *R. D. B.'s Diary,* 9. This anecdote follows on a discussion of the Cass case.
44. Sir Edwin Ray Lankester to Karl Pearson, 1887, Pearson Papers, University College, London, 10/47. Sixteen thousand items are collected in the Pearson Papers, University College, London. Citations to the manuscript letters and records are indicated by "Pearson Papers" followed by the locating numbers; citations to the typed transcripts of documents from the collection by Pearson's daughter, Helen Sharpe Hacker, are indicated by "Pearson Transcripts" followed by the locating numbers.
45. Lynda Nead, *Myths of Sexuality: Representations of Women in Victorian Britain* (Oxford, 1988), 180.
46. Marianna Valverde, "The Love of Finery: Fashion and the Fallen Woman in Nineteenth-Century Social Discourse, *Victorian Studies* 32, no. 2 (Winter 1989): 168–88; Eric Trudgill, "Prostitution and Paterfamilias," in H. J. Dyos and Michael L. Wolff, eds., *The Victorian City: Images and Reality* (London, 1973), 2:696.
47. Quoted in Nead, *Myths of Sexuality,* 181.
48. On the "Girl of the Period" see ibid., 180, 181; Nina Rinehart, "'The Girl of the Period' Controversy," *Victorian Periodicals Review* 13 (Spring–Summer 1980): 3–9; Nancy Fitch Anderson, *Woman Against Women in Victorian England: A Life of Eliza Lynn Linton* (Bloomington, Ind., 1987).
49. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* 150.
50. Zuzanna Shonfield, *The Precariously Privileged: A Professional Family in Victorian London* (Oxford, 1987), 46, 51; Blumenfeld, *R. D. B.'s Diary,* 112.
51. Thanks to Margaret Hunt for this perception.
52. Jeannette Marshall always made sure to take no notice, however intensely men "stared." Shonfield, *Precariously Privileged,* 32. See also *Girl's Own Paper,* 6 December 1890.
53. "Answers to Correspondents," *Girl's Own Paper,* 1881, quoted in Forrester, *Great-Grandmama's Weekly,* 160.
54. See, for example, "Paterfamilias" and "Cowardly Insults to Ladies," *Times,* 7 January 1862; "Puella" and "The Streets of London," 9 January 1862; "A London Man," "Addressing Women in the Streets," 17 January 1862; Eliza Lynn Linton, "On Walking," *Temple Bar* 5 (April–July 1862): 132–41; "Street Impertinences to Working Women," *Queen* 66 (July–December 1879): 207; "Walking Alone," *Queen* 71 (January–June 1882): 375; Mark Twain, *A Tramp Abroad* (London, 1880); "Miranda," "Bayswater After Dark," *Bayswater Chronicle,* 26 June 1880; Michael Curtin, *Propriety and Position: A Study of Victorian Manners* (New York, 1987), chap. 6, 238–46.
55. See Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* chaps. 3 and 4.
56. The "Maiden Tribute" graphically described the way the "daughters of the people had been snared, trapped and outraged either when under the influence of drugs or after a prolonged struggle in a locked room"; the "Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon" appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette* (*PMG*) on 6, 7, 8, and 10 July 1885. It was reissued in *The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon: The Report of the Pall Mall Gazette's Secret Commission* (London, 1885). The quotations from the "Maiden Tribute" are taken from the reprint.
57. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* 82, 83. In addition to its age-of-consent and anti-prostitution clauses, the Act made indecent acts between consenting male adults illegal, thus forming the basis of legal proceedings against male homosexuals until 1967.
58. Olive Schreiner to Maria Sharpe, 24 November 1887, Pearson Transcripts, D2, 3;

Maria Sharpe, "Autobiographical Notes About the Men and Women's Club," Pearson Papers, 10/1.

59. Emma Brooke, "Notes on a Man's View of the Woman Question," 1885, Pearson Papers, 10/2.
60. See Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* chap. 4.
61. "Police Outrage on a Lady," *PMG,* 5 January 1886.
62. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* 127.
63. Between 30 June and 31 July 1887, the *PMG* carried thirty-seven items devoted to the Cass case. See Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* 128–31. For home office correspondence on the Cass case, see Home Office (hereafter abbreviated "H. O.") 144/4721/x15239; H. O. 144/4721/x15239b; H. O. 144/x1523923a. For the impact of the Cass case on police policy toward streetwalkers, see H. O. 45/10523/140292/71 and a "Memorandum on the Cass Case Prepared in Connection with the Savage Case," H. O. 144/4721/x15239/33. Petrow, *Policing Morals,* 133–34, 139; Winter, *London's Teeming Streets,* 176, 178–79, 183.
64. *Daily News* (London), 6 July 1887; *Times,* 8 July 1887; *Times,* 7 November 1887: "Regent-Street at Night," *Times,* 29 November 1887; *Daily Telegraph,* 2 July 1887; "To the Editor," *Daily Telegraph,* 6 July 1887; *Justice,* 16 July 1887; *Commonweal,* 16 July 1887; *Graphic,* 9 July 1887; *St. James Gazette,* 12 July 1887. See also "A Chorus of Condemnation," *PMG,* 7 July 1887. "The Press on the Question of the Day," *PMG,* 8 July 1887.
65. "Correspondence," *Daily Telegraph,* 5 July 1887.
66. "A Father of Daughters" to the Editor, *Daily Telegraph,* 3 July 1887; "Paterfamilias" to the Editor, *Daily Telegraph,* 3 July 1887. On the increase in girls in business, see Meta Zimmeck, "Jobs for the Girls: The Expansion of Clerical Work for Women," in Angela John, ed., *Unequal Opportunity: Women's Work and Employment in England, 1800–1918* (Oxford, 1986), 153–78.
67. *PMG,* 30 June 1887.
68. "How Ladies Are Annoyed in London Streets," *PMG,* 19 July 1887. In a prefatory statement, W. T. Stead explained that he had solicited three ladies of "our acquaintance" to write of their experience, and he invited other "ladies" "among our readership" to offer their testimony of being "hunted into hansoms and shops and omnibuses" to escape insults of pests of the streets. Between 5 July and 27 July, Stead excerpted twelve letters from ladies about their experience of the streets. These excerpts appeared in five articles. Besides the article cited above, see also "The Police Outrage in Regent Street," 5 July 1887; "How Ladies Fare in the Streets of London," 21 July 1887; "How Ladies Fare in London Streets: The Other Side of the Question," 22 July 1887; "The Male Pests of the Street: More Experiences and Suggestions by the Victims," 23 July 1887. Quotations from lady correspondents are drawn from these columns.
69. "Police Outrage in Regent Street."
70. "The Male Pests of the Street."
71. Ibid.
72. "How Ladies Fare in the Streets of London." "The Male Pests of the Street."
73. "How Ladies Fare in London Streets."
74. "Mrs. Laura Ormiston Chant," *Who Was Who, 1916–28* (London, 1928), 189. For Mrs. Chant's subsequent crusade against the Empire Theatre, see Mrs. Ormiston Chant, *Why We Attacked the Empire* (London, 1894); Edward Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain Since 1700* (London, 1977), chap. 9; Lucy Bland, *Banishing*

the Beast: English Feminism and Sexual Morality, 1885–1914 (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1995), chap. 3.

75. "How Ladies Are Annoyed."
76. See Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* 73–76; Pamela Walker, " 'Pulling the Devil's Kingdom Down': Gender and Popular Culture in the Salvation Army, 1865–1895" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1991).
77. Josephine Butler, "Catherine Booth," *Contemporary Review* (November 1890): 648.
78. Mrs. General Booth, "Women as Preachers," *PMG,* 31 January 1886.
79. On the liberty cap, see Lynn Hunt, *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution* (Berkeley, 1984), chap. 2.
80. This emulation may be seen in the career of Annie Besant, who adopted the dress of factory girls during her socialist phase; Rosemary Dinnage, *Annie Besant* (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1986), 79.
81. Peter Cominos, "Late-Victorian Sexual Respectability and the Social System," *International Review of Sexual History* 8 (1963): 18–48, 216–50.
82. Stead published excerpts from nine letters from "gentlemen" who supported the views of lady correspondents. Only two were identified by their proper names; others were identified by their occupation ("a Surgeon," "a reverend gentlemen," a "legal" correspondent) or by their membership in the Army and Navy Club. One correspondent was identified as "paterfamilias"; most of them wrote of shopping ladies as family members—sisters, mothers, daughters. See "How Ladies Fare in the Streets of London" and "The 'Male Pest.' "
83. "How Ladies Fare in the Streets of London."
84. "What the 'Male Pests' Have to Say for Themselves," *PMG,* 30 July 1887; "The Other Side of the Question." Stead published excerpts from five letters from male pests, identified as "A Plea for Followers," "Le Monsieur Qui a Suivi les Dames," "An Observer in Mayfair," and two "Men of the World," one from "Cambridge," another called "A Socialist."
85. "The Other Side of the Question." On the theme of Oriental sequestration of women, see Billie Melman, *Women's Orients: English Women and the Middle East, 1718–1918: Sexuality, Religion, and Work* (Ann Arbor, 1992); Reina Lewis, *Gendering Orientalism: Race, Femininity, and Representation* (London, 1996).
86. John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (New York, 1973).
87. Laurence Senelick, "Melodramatic Gesture in Carte-de-Visite Photographs," *Theater* 18, no. 2 (1987): 5–13; "Eroticism in Early Theatrical Photography," *Theater History Studies* 11 (1991): 1–49; Tracy C. Davis, "The Actress in Victorian Pornography," *Theatre Journal* 41, no. 3 (October 1989): 294–315; Helmut Gersheim, *The History of Photography: From the Earliest Use of the Camera Obscura in the Eleventh Century up to 1914* (Oxford, 1955), 230–32.
88. Gersheim, *History of Photography,* 295; 304–5; Robert E. Mensel, "Kodakers Lying in Wait," *American Quarterly* 43 (March 1991): 24–45; *British Journal of Photography* (23 December 1895): 818.
89. "What the 'Male Pests.' "
90. Peter Bailey, "Parasexuality and Glamour: The Victorian Barmaid as Cultural Prototype," *Gender and History* 2, no. 2 (Summer 1990): 148–72. See, for example, "A Moral and a Moke," *Ally Sloper's Half-Holiday,* 2 July 1887.
91. Peter Bailey, "Conspiracies of Meaning: Music Hall Culture and the Knowingness of Popular Culture," *Past and Present* no. 144 (August 1994): 138–70.

92. In October 1894, E. Ray Lankester was arrested for not "moving on" in Piccadilly Circus at midnight. He wrote to the secretary of state, explaining that he had been mistaken for a souteneur. Besides introducing himself as an Oxford professor and member of "well-known clubs," he also took the trouble to describe what he was wearing at the time of the arrest: the "usual garment of a London resident . . . a tall hat and frock coat"; E. Ray Lankester, 1 November 1895, H. O., 45/9711/A51190.
93. Peter Stallybrass, "Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed," in Margaret W. Ferguson et al., *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago, 1986), 123–42; Geoffrey Crossick, "From Gentlemen to the Residuum: Languages of Social Description in Victorian Britain," in Penelope J. Corfield, ed., *Language, History, and Class* (Oxford, 1991), 165–66, 177–78.
94. "What the 'Male Pests.'" See the correspondence cited in note 44 between Karl Pearson and E. Ray Lankester, both of whom considered themselves to be radicals and sympathetic to socialism. See also Annie Besant's condemnation of E. Belford Bax's "misogynist" comments about the Cass case: "Misogyny in Excelsis," *To-Day,* August 1887, 51–56.
95. Miss Cass, quoted in "The Police Outrage in Regent Street: The Experience of the Victim," *PMG,* 4 July 1887. As Peter Bailey observes, the shop girl as milliner "pursued an occupation that had throughout the century been regarded as a cover for prostitution"; "'Naughty but Nice': Musical Comedy and the Rhetoric of the Girl, 1892–1914," in Michael R. Booth and Joel H. Kaplan, eds., *The Edwardian Theatre: Essays on Performance and the Stage* (Cambridge, 1996), 46.
96. On Stead and the New Journalism, see Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* chaps. 3 and 4; Jürgen Habermas, "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964)," *New German Critique* 5, no. 2 (1974): 49–55.
97. Simon Watney, *Policing Desire: Pornography, AIDS, and the Media* (Minneapolis, Minn., 1989), 42.
98. W. T. Stead, "Government by Journalism," *The Contemporary Review* 49 (1886): 654–74.
99. David Cannadine, "The Context, Performance, and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the Invention of Tradition, c. 1820–1977," in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983), 101–65; Thomas Richards, "The Image of Victoria in the Year of Jubilee," *Victorian Studies* 30, no. 4 (Autumn 1987): 7–32.
100. Jane MacKay and Pat Thane, "The Englishwoman," in Robert Colls and Philip Dodd, *Englishness: Culture and Politics, 1880–1920* (London, 1986), 191–229.
101. Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1986), 20–23. Marina Warner, *Monuments and Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form* (New York, 1985). Henry Mayhew and Bracebridge Hemyng, "The Prostitute Class Generally," in Henry Mayhew, ed., *London Labour and the London Poor* (1861; reprint, New York, 1968), 4:205.
102. Jane Traies, "Jones and the Working Girl: Class Marginality in Music-Hall Song, 1860–1900," in Jacqueline Bratton, ed., *Music Hall: Performance and Style* (New York, 1987), 3.
103. "The Business Girl's Beauty," *Girl's Friend,* 17 February 1912; *Girl's Friend,* 18 November 1899.
104. "Your Editor Advises," *Girl's Friend,* 3 June 1911.
105. John R. Gillis, *For Better, For Worse: British Marriages 1600 to the Present* (New York, 1985), 271–75.

106. Frederick Willis, *101 Jubilee Road: A Book of London Yesterdays* (London, 1948), 82, 83.
107. Clarence Rook, *London Sidelights* (London, 1908), 31–41.
108. *Girl's Friend,* 21 September 1912; *Girl's Friend,* 24 February 1912; "How Broken Hearts Are Averted," *Weekly Dispatch* (London), 20 May 1912; Ginger Suzanne Frost, "Promises Broken: Breach of Promise of Marriage in England and Wales, 1753–1970" (Ph.D. diss., Rice University, 1991), 108, 169, 182.
109. Steve Humphries, *A Secret World of Sex: Forbidden Fruit: The British Experience, 1900–1950* (London, 1988), chap. 4.
110. Elizabeth Roberts, *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working-Class Women, 1890–1940* (Oxford, 1985), 73; Melanie Tebbutt, *Women's Talk? A Social History of "Gossip" in Working-Class Neighbourhoods, 1880–1960* (Aldershot, Eng., 1995), 148–50; Sally Alexander, "Becoming a Woman in London in the 1920s and 1930s," in *Metropolis London: Histories and Representations Since 1800,* ed. David Feldman and Gareth Stedman Jones (London, 1989), 245–71; Bailey, " 'Naughty but Nice,' " 55.
111. Sally Alexander, "The Mysteries and Secrets of Women's Bodies: Sexual Knowledge in the First Half of the Twentieth Century," in Mica Nava and Alan O'Shea, eds., *Modern Times: Reflections on a Century of English Modernity* (London, 1996), 114.
112. Ibid., 166.
113. As Peter Bailey observes, "knowingness" for women "may have signaled a defensive competence"; it may have "functioned in scouting the risks of . . . ambiguous new freedoms"; Bailey, "Conspiracies of Meaning," 165.
114. Gareth Stedman Jones, "Working-Class Culture and Working-Class Politics in London, 1870–1900: Notes on the Remaking of a Working Class," in *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working-Class History, 1832–1982* (Cambridge, 1983), 232, 233; Patrick Joyce, *Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class, 1840–1914* (Cambridge, 1991), see notes 43 and 94.
115. Bowman, "Street Harassment," 522, 523; Karin Winegar, "What I Want is an Hour on the Jogging Path Without Men's Catcalls: Is That Too Much to Ask?" *Glamour,* June 1980. Pam McAllister, "Wolf Whistles and Warnings," *Heresies* 6 (1978): 37, 39; di Leonardo, "Political Economy," 54–56; Cheryl Benard and Edit Schlaffer, "Man on the Street," *Ms.,* May 1981, 18–19; Catherine Mackinnon, *Sexual Harassment of Working Women* (New Haven, Conn., 1979). For discussions of street harassment among British feminists, see Dusty Rhodes and Sandra McNeill, eds., *Women Against Violence Against Women* (London, 1985); Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight,* chap. 8.
116. Wendy Brown, "Feminist Hesitations, Postmodern Exposures," *differences* 3, no. 1 (1991): 63–84.
117. Muriel Dimen, *Surviving Sexual Contradiction,* quoted in Bowman, "Street Harassment," 133.
118. Ring, "Sexual Harassment," 135.
119. In the same women's magazines that first publicized street hassling, some letters appeared from female correspondents who insisted they liked the attention of "wolf-whistles" (but not the more offensive interactions cited in the articles). See "Letters from Readers," *Glamour,* November 1992, quoted in Bowman, "Street Harassment," 534 n. 81.
120. See, for example, Benard and Schlaffer, "Man on the Street."
121. Ring, "Sexual Harassment," 143.
122. Modleski, "Breaking Silence"; Toni Morrison, ed., *Race-ing Justice, En-gendering Power: Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence Thomas, and the Construction of Social Reality* (New York, 1992).

123. Orlando Patterson, "Race, Gender, and Liberal Fallacies," *New York Times,* 20 October 1991, sec. 4. See also Bowman, "Street Harassment," 532.

124. On *Mona Lisa*, see Pauline Kael, "The Current Cinema: 'Brutes,'" *New Yorker,* 16 June 1986, 114, 118, 119. On musical comedy see Bailey, "'Naughty but Nice,'" 55; Robert C. Allen, *Horrible Prettiness: Burlesque and American Culture* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1991), 201–7.