

of porn everyone knows is there (and in his head during sex), while his female other makes sure her vibrator is well hidden and resists asking her partner to use it during sex together, for fear of making him feel insecure.

And all of this and more has gone on for so long and been so widespread that what should be the simple given of our yes often seems an unattainable ideal.

That is the work of ages to try to undo or revise. It's a monumental tangle, so it's going to take monumental work and time to untangle. But I don't want to find us trapped by it, especially when getting to the good stuff is about more than just rectifying and repairing an ugly, tired history.

What if her foundation looked like this: Her family recognized that serious or casual, long-term or short, all wanted sexual relationships have value, and that whatever risks of negatives we take with sex are offset by the possibility of great positives? Academic contests, college applications, and sports tryouts aren't seen as things to avoid simply because they may have unsatisfactory outcomes: We recognize that risking hurt or disappointment for something that may be beneficial is often worthwhile. What if her family felt the same way about their daughter's experiences with sex? What if rather than nurturing an environment of sexual passivity or silence, her parents provided her with a safe space for sex, active help and encouragement with birth control and sexual health, and direct discussion about sexuality, including her own sexual desires – not just her desires for emotional closeness or security, but masturbation, anatomy, and body image, and the ways in which sex is often unrealistically presented by peers and media? What if her parents spoke to her about their own early sexual experiences realistically, both their joys and their bummers, and what they've figured out about sex since then?

5.5

“Charity Girls” and City Pleasures: Historical Notes on Working-Class Sexuality, 1880–1920

Kathy Peiss

Here Kathy Peiss describes an urban subculture of young women who orchestrated their premarital social lives in the street, dance hall, theater, and at work, places that did not exist for their rural or immigrant mothers, or that would have been out of bounds for them. Since Peiss's sources only record one moment in the life cycles of these “charity girls,” we cannot know how enduring were their exuberance and adventurous social experimentation. How successfully did they avoid pregnancy? How soon did they marry and how drastically did marriage alter their social independence? We do know that because they earned money and lived in a large city, these working-class women had an unprecedented freedom to enter the marketplace of pleasures, where they

bargained for still more with the coin of female sexual allure. The meaning of premarital sex, the social manner of sex and its language, the pool of potential partners – all these the factory girls helped transform in one generation. One result was an enlarged area of opportunity for women to choose, to play; another was the creation of new arenas for their sexual harassment.

Uncovering the history of working-class sexuality has been a particularly intractable task for recent scholars. Diaries, letters, and memoirs, while a rich source for studies of bourgeois sexuality, offer few glimpses into working-class intimate life. We have had to turn to middle-class commentary and observations of working people, but these accounts often seem hopelessly moralistic and biased. The difficulty with such sources is not simply a question of tone or selectivity, but involves the very categories of analysis they employ. Reformers, social workers, and journalists viewed working-class women's sexuality through middle-class lenses, invoking sexual standards that set "respectability" against "promiscuity." When applied to unmarried women, these categories were constructed foremost around the biological fact of premarital virginity, and secondarily by such cultural indicators as manners, language, dress, and public interaction. Chastity was the measure of young women's respectability, and those who engaged in premarital intercourse, or, more importantly, dressed and acted as though they had, were classed as promiscuous women or prostitutes. Thus labor investigations of the late nineteenth century not only surveyed women's wages and working conditions, but delved into the issue of their sexual virtue, hoping to resolve scientifically the question of working women's respectability.¹

Nevertheless, some middle-class observers in city missions and settlements recognized that their standards did not always reflect those of working-class youth. As one University Settlement worker argued, "Many of the liberties which are taken by tenement boys and girls with one another, and which seem quite improper to the 'up-towner,' are, in fact, practically harmless."² Working women's public behavior often seemed to fall between the traditional middle-class poles: they were not truly promiscuous in their actions, but neither were they models of decorum. A boarding-house matron, for example, puzzled over the behavior of Mary, a "good girl": "The other night she flirted with a man across the street," she explained. "It is true she dropped him when he offered to take her into a saloon. But she does go to picture shows and dance halls with 'pick up' men and boys."³ Similarly, a city missionary noted that tenement dwellers followed different rules of etiquette, with the observation: "Young women sometimes allow young men to address them and caress them in a manner which would offend well-bred people, and yet those girls would indignantly resent any liberties which they consider dishonoring."⁴ These examples suggest that we must reach beyond the dichotomized analysis of many middle-class observers and draw out the cultural categories created and acted on by working women themselves. How was sexuality "handled" culturally? What manners, etiquette, and sexual style met with general approval? What constituted sexual respectability? Does the polarized framework of the middle class reflect the realities of working-class culture?

Embedded within the reports and surveys lie small pieces of information that illuminate the social and cultural construction of sexuality among a number of working-class women. My discussion focuses on one set of young, white working women in New York City in the years 1880 to 1920. Most of these women were single wage earners who toiled in the city's factories, shops, and department stores, while devoting their evenings to the lively entertainment of the streets, public dance halls, and other popular amusements. Born or educated in the United States, many adopted a cultural style meant to distance themselves from their immigrant roots and familial traditions. Such women dressed in the latest finery, negotiated city life with ease, and sought intrigue and adventure with male companions. For this group of working women, sexuality became a central dimension of their emergent culture, a dimension that is revealed in their daily life of work and leisure.⁵

These New York working women frequented amusements in which familiarity and intermingling among strangers, not decorum, defined normal public behavior between the sexes. At movies and cheap theaters, crowds mingled during intermissions, shared picnic lunches, and commented volubly on performances. Strangers at Coney Island's amusement parks often involved each other in practical jokes and humorous escapades, while dance halls permitted close interaction between unfamiliar men and women. At one respectable Turnverein ball, for example, a vice investigator described closely the chaotic activity in the barroom between dances:

Most of the younger couples were hugging and kissing, there was a general mingling of men and women at the different tables, almost everyone seemed to know one another and spoke to each other across the tables and joined couples at different tables, they were all singing and carrying on, they kept running around the room and acted like a mob of lunatics let lo[o]se.⁶

As this observer suggests, an important aspect of social familiarity was the ease of sexual expression in language and behavior. Dances were advertised, for example, through the distribution of "pluggers," small printed cards announcing the particulars of the ball, along with snatches of popular songs or verse; the lyrics and pictures, noted one offended reformer, were often "so suggestive that they are absolutely indecent."⁷

The heightened sexual awareness permeating many popular amusements may also be seen in working-class dancing styles. While waltzes and two-steps were common, working women's repertoire included "pivoting" and "tough dances." While pivoting was a wild, spinning dance that promoted a charged atmosphere of physical excitement, tough dances ranged from a slow shimmy, or shaking of the hips and shoulders, to boisterous animal imitations. Such tough dances as the grizzly bear, Charlie Chaplin wiggle, and the dip emphasized bodily contact and the suggestion of sexual intercourse. As one dance investigator commented, "What particularly distinguishes this dance is the motion of the pelvic portions of the body."⁸ In contrast, middle-class pleasure-goers accepted the animal dances only after the blatant sexuality had been tamed into refined movement. While cabaret owners enforced strict rules to

discourage contact between strangers, managers of working-class dance halls usually winked at *spieling*, tough dancing, and unrestrained behavior.⁹

Other forms of recreation frequented by working-class youth incorporated a free and easy sexuality into their attractions. Many social clubs and amusement societies permitted flirting, touching, and kissing games at their meetings. One East Side youth reported that “they have kissing all through pleasure time, and use slang language, while in some they don’t behave nice between [sic] young ladies.”¹⁰ Music halls and cheap vaudeville regularly worked sexual themes and suggestive humor into comedy routines and songs. At a Yiddish music hall popular with both men and women, one reformer found that “the songs are suggestive of everything but what is proper, the choruses are full of double meanings, and the jokes have broad and unmistakable hints of things indecent.”¹¹ Similarly, Coney Island’s Steeplechase amusement park, favored by working-class excursionists, carefully marketed sexual titillation and romance in attractions that threw patrons into each other, sent skirts flying, and evoked instant intimacy among strangers.¹²

In attending dance halls, social club entertainments, and amusement resorts, young women took part in a cultural milieu that expressed and affirmed heterosocial interactions. As reformer Belle Israels observed, “No amusement is complete in which ‘he’ is not a factor.”¹³ A common custom involved “picking up” unknown men or women in amusement resorts or on the streets, an accepted means of gaining companionship for an evening’s entertainment. Indeed, some amusement societies existed for this very purpose. One vice investigator, in his search for “loose” women, was advised by a waiter to “go first on a Sunday night to ‘Hans’l & Gret’l Amusement Society’ at the Lyceum 86th Str & III Ave, there the girls come and men pick them up.”¹⁴ The waiter carefully stressed that these were respectable working women, not prostitutes. Nor was the pickup purely a male prerogative. “With the men they ‘pick up,’” writer Hutchins Hapgood observed of East Side shop girls, “they will go to the theater, to late suppers, will be as jolly as they like.”¹⁵

The heterosocial orientation of these amusements made popularity a goal to be pursued through dancing ability, willingness to drink, and eye-catching finery. Women who would not drink at balls and social entertainments were often ostracized by men, while cocktails and ingenious mixtures replaced the five-cent beer and helped to make drinking an acceptable female activity. Many women used clothing as a means of drawing attention to themselves, wearing high-heeled shoes, fancy dresses, costume jewelry, elaborate pompadours, and cosmetics. As one working woman sharply explained, “If you want to get any notion took of you, you gotta have some style about you.”¹⁶ The clothing that such women wore no longer served as an emblem of respectability. “The way women dress today they all look like prostitutes,” reported one rueful waiter to a dance hall investigator, “and the waiter can some times get in bad by going over and trying to put some one next to them, they may be respectable women and would jump on the waiter.”¹⁷

Underlying the relaxed sexual style and heterosocial interaction was the custom of “treating.” Men often treated their female companions to drinks and refreshments, theater tickets, and other incidentals. Women might pay a dance hall’s

entrance fee or carfare out to an amusement park, but they relied on men's treats to see them through the evening's entertainment. Such treats were highly prized by young working women; as Belle Israels remarked, the announcement that "he treated" was "the acme of achievement in retailing experiences with the other sex."¹⁸

Treating was not a one-way proposition, however, but entailed an exchange relationship. Financially unable to reciprocate in kind, women offered sexual favors of varying degrees, ranging from flirtatious companionship to sexual intercourse, in exchange for men's treats. "Pleasures don't cost girls so much as they do young men," asserted one saleswoman. "If they are agreeable they are invited out a good deal, and they are not allowed to pay anything." Reformer Lillian Betts concurred, observing that the working woman held herself responsible for failing to wangle men's invitations and believed that "it is not only her misfortune, but her fault; she should be more attractive."¹⁹ Gaining men's treats placed a high premium on allure and personality, and sometimes involved aggressive and frank "overtures to men whom they desire to attract," often with implicit sexual proposals. One investigator, commenting on women's dependency on men in their leisure time, aptly observed that "those who are unattractive, and those who have puritanic notions, fare but ill in the matter of enjoyments. On the other hand those who do become popular have to compromise with the best conventional usage."²⁰

Many of the sexual patterns acceptable in the world of leisure activity were mirrored in the workplace. Sexual harassment by employers, foremen, and fellow workers was a widespread practice in this period, and its form often paralleled the relationship of treating, particularly in service and sales jobs. Department store managers, for example, advised employees to round out their meager salaries by finding a "gentleman friend" to purchase clothing and pleasures. An angry saleswoman testified, for example, that "one of the employers has told me, on a \$6.50 wage, he don't care where I get my clothes from as long as I have them, to be dressed to suit him."²¹ Waitresses knew that accepting the advances of male customers often brought good tips, and some used their opportunities to enter an active social life with men. "Most of the girls quite frankly admit making 'dates' with strange men," one investigator found. "These 'dates' are made with no thought on the part of the girl beyond getting the good time which she cannot afford herself."²²

In factories where men and women worked together, the sexual style that we have seen on the dance floor was often reproduced on the shop floor. Many factories lacked privacy in dressing facilities, and workers tolerated a degree of familiarity and roughhousing between men and women. One cigar maker observed that his workplace socialized the young into sexual behavior unrestrained by parental and community control. Another decried the tendency of young boys "of thirteen or fourteen casting an eye upon a 'mash.'" Even worse, he testified, were the

many men who are respected – when I say respected and respectable, I mean who walk the streets and are respected as working men, and who would not under any circumstances offer the slightest insult or disrespectful remark or glance to a female in the streets, but who, in the shops, will whoop and give expressions to "cat calls" and a peculiar noise made with their lips, which is supposed to be an endearing salutation.²³

In sexually segregated workplaces, sexual knowledge was probably transmitted among working women. A YWCA report in 1913 luridly asserted that “no girl is more ‘knowing’ than the wage-earner, for the ‘older hands’ initiate her early through the unwholesome story or innuendo.”²⁴ Evidence from factories, department stores, laundries, and restaurants substantiates the sexual consciousness of female workers. Women brought to the workplace tales of their evening adventures and gossip about dates and eligible men, recounting to their co-workers the triumphs of the latest ball or outing. Women’s socialization into a new shop might involve a ritualist exchange about “gentlemen friends.” In one laundry, for example, an investigator repeatedly heard this conversation:

“Say, you got a feller?”

“Sure. Ain t you got one?”

“Sure.”²⁵

Through the use of slang and “vulgar” language, heterosexual romance was expressed in a sexually explicit context. Among waitresses, for example, frank discussion of lovers and husbands during breaks was an integral part of the work day. One investigator found that “there was never any open violation of the proprieties but always the suggestive talk and behavior.” Laundries, too, witnessed “a great deal of swearing among the women.” A 1914 study of department store clerks found a similar style and content in everyday conversation:

While it is true that the general attitude toward men and sex relations was normal, all the investigators admitted a freedom of speech frequently verging upon the vulgar, but since there was very little evidence of any actual immorality, this can probably be likened to the same spirit which prompts the telling of risqué stories in other circles.²⁶

In their workplaces and leisure activities, many working women discovered a milieu that tolerated, and at times encouraged, physical and verbal familiarity between men and women, and stressed the exchange of sexual favors for social and economic advantages. Such women probably received conflicting messages about the virtues of virginity, and necessarily mediated the parental, religious, and educational injunctions concerning chastity, and the “lessons” of urban life and labor. The choice made by some women to engage in a relaxed sexual style needs to be understood in terms of the larger relations of class and gender that structured their sexual culture.

Most single working-class women were wage-earners for a few years before marriage, contributing to the household income or supporting themselves. Sexual segmentation of the labor market placed women in semi-skilled, seasonal employment with high rates of turnover. Few women earned a “living wage,” estimated to be \$9.00 or \$10.00 a week in 1910, and the wage differential between men and women was vast. Those who lived alone in furnished rooms or boarding houses consumed their earnings in rent, meals, and clothing. Many self-supporting women were forced to sacrifice an essential item in their weekly budgets, particularly food, in order to pay for amusements. Under such circumstances, treating became a viable

option. "If my boy friend didn't take me out," asked one working woman, "how could I ever go out?"²⁷ While many women accepted treats from "steadies," others had no qualms about receiving them from acquaintances or men they picked up at amusement places. As one investigator concluded, "The acceptance on the part of the girl of almost any invitation needs little explanation when one realizes that she often goes pleasureless unless she does accept 'free treats.'"²⁸ Financial resources were little better for the vast majority of women living with families and relatives. Most of them contributed all of their earnings to the family, receiving only small amounts of spending money, usually 25¢ to 50¢ a week, in return. This sum covered the costs of simple entertainments, but could not purchase higher priced amusements.²⁹

Moreover, the social and physical space of the tenement home and boarding house contributed to freer social and sexual practices. Working women living alone ran the gauntlet between landladies' suspicious stares and the knowing glances of male boarders. One furnished-room dweller attested to the pressure placed on young, single women: "Time and again when a male lodger meets a girl on the landing, his salutation usually ends with something like this: 'Won't you step into my place and have a glass of beer with me?'"³⁰

The tenement home, too, presented a problem to parents who wished to maintain control over their daughters' sexuality. Typical tenement apartments offered limited opportunities for family activities or chaperoned socializing. Courtship proved difficult in homes where families and boarders crowded into a few small rooms, and the "parlor" served as kitchen, dining room, and bedroom. Instead, many working-class daughters socialized on streetcorners, rendezvoused in cafes, and courted on trolley cars. As one settlement worker observed, "Boys and girls and young men and women of respectable families are almost obliged to carry on many of their friendships, and perhaps their lovemaking, on tenement stoops or on street corners."³¹ Another reformer found that girls whose parents forbade men's visits to the home managed to escape into the streets and dance halls to meet them. Such young women demanded greater independence in the realm of "personal life" in exchange for their financial contribution to the family. For some, this new freedom spilled over into their sexual practices.³²

The extent of the sexual culture described here is particularly difficult to establish, since the evidence is too meager to permit conclusions about specific groups of working women, their beliefs about sexuality, and their behavior. Scattered evidence does suggest a range of possible responses, the parameters within which most women would choose to act and define their behavior as socially acceptable. Within this range, there existed a subculture of working women who fully bought into the system of treating and sexual exchange, by trading sexual favors of varying degrees for gifts, treats, and a good time. These women were known in underworld slang as "charity girls," a term that differentiated them from prostitutes because they did not accept money in their sexual encounters with men. As vice reformer George Kneeland found, they "offer themselves to strangers, not for money, but for presents, attention, and pleasure, and most important, a yielding to sex desire."³³ Only a thin line divided these women and "occasional prostitutes," women who slipped in and

out of prostitution when unemployed or in need of extra income. Such behavior did not result in the stigma of the “fallen woman.” Many working women apparently acted like Dottie: “When she needed a pair of shoes she had found it easy to ‘earn’ them in the way that other girls did.” Dottie, the investigator reported, was now known as a respectable married woman.³⁴

Such women were frequent patrons of the city’s dance halls. Vice investigators note a preponderant number of women at dances who clearly were not prostitutes, but were “game” and “lively”; these charity girls often comprised half or more of the dancers in a hall. One dance hall investigator distinguished them with the observation, “Some of the women ... are out for the coin, but there is a lot that come in here that are charity.”³⁵ One waiter at La Kuenstler Klause, a restaurant with music and dancing, noted that “girls could be gotten here, but they don’t go with men for money, only for good time.” The investigator continued in his report, “Most of the girls are working girls, not prostitutes, they smoke cigarettes, drink liquers and dance dis.[orderly] dances, stay out late and stay with any man, that pick them up first.”³⁶ Meeting two women at a bar, another investigator remarked, “They are both supposed to be working girls but go out for a good time and go the limit.”³⁷

Some women obviously relished the game of extracting treats from men. One vice investigator offered to take a Kitty Graham, who apparently worked both as a department store clerk and occasional prostitute, to the Central Opera House at 3 A.M.; he noted that “she was willing to go if I’d take a taxi; I finally coaxed her to come with me in a street car.”³⁸ Similarly, Frances Donovan observed waitresses “talking about their engagements which they had for the evening or for the night and quite frankly saying what they expected to get from this or that fellow in the line of money, amusement, or clothes.”³⁹ Working women’s manipulation of treating is also suggested by this unguarded conversation overheard by a journalist at Coney Island:

“What sort of a time did you have?”

“Great. He blew in \$5 on the blow-out.”

“You beat me again. My chump only spent \$2.50.”⁴⁰

These women had clearly accepted the full implications of the system of treating and the sexual culture surrounding it.

While this evidence points to the existence of charity girls – working women defined as respectable, but who engaged in sexual activity – it tells us little about their numbers, social background, working lives, or relationships to family and community. The vice reports indicate that they were generally young women, many of whom lived at home with their families. One man in a dance hall remarked, for example, that “he sometimes takes them to the hotels, but sometimes the girls won’t go to [a] hotel to stay for the night, they are afraid of their mothers, so he gets away with it in the hallway.”⁴¹ While community sanctions may have prevented such activity within the neighborhood, the growth of large public dance halls, cabarets, and metropolitan amusement resorts provided an anonymous space in which the subculture of treating could flourish.

Notes

1. See, for example, Carroll D. Wright, *The Working Girls of Boston* (1889; New York: Arno Press, 1969).
2. "Influences in Street Life," *University Settlement Society Report* (1900), p. 30.
3. Marie S. Orenstein, "How the Working Girl of New York Lives," New York State, Factory Investigating Commission, *Fourth Report Transmitted to Legislature*, February 15, 1915, Senate Doc. 43, val. 4, app. 2 (Albany: J. B. Lyon Co., 1915), p. 1697.
4. William T. Elsing, "Life in New York Tenement-Houses as Seen by a City Missionary," *Scribner's* 11 (June 1892): 716.
5. For a more detailed discussion of these women, and further documentation of their social relations and leisure activities, see my dissertation, "Cheap Amusements: Gender Relations and the Use of Leisure Time in New York City, 1880 to 1920," Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1982.
6. Investigator's Report, Remy's, 917 Eighth Ave., February 11, 1917, Committee of Fourteen Papers, New York Public Library Manuscript Division, New York.
7. George Kneeland, *Commercialized Prostitution in New York City* (New York: The Century Co., 1913), p. 68; Louise de Koven Bowen, "Dance Halls," *Survey* 26 (3 July 1911): 384.
8. Committee on Amusements and Vacation Resources of Working Girls, two-page circular, in Box 28, "Parks and Playgrounds Correspondence," Lillian Wald Collection, Rare Book and Manuscripts Library, Columbia University, New York.
9. See, for example, Investigator's Report, Princess Cafe, 1206 Broadway, January 1, 1917; and Excelsior Cafe, 306 Eighth Ave., December 21, 1916, Committee of Fourteen Papers. For an excellent discussion of middle- and upper-class leisure activities, see Lewis A. Erenberg, *Steppin' Out: New York Nightlife and the Transformation of American Culture, 1890-1930* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981).
10. "Social Life in the Streets," *University Settlement Society Report* (1899), p. 32.
11. Paul Klapper, "The Yiddish Music Hall," *University Settlement Studies* 2, no. 4 (1905): 22.
12. For a description of Coney Island amusements, see Edo McCullough, *Good Old Coney Island; A Sentimental Journey into the Past* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957), pp. 309-13; and Oliver Pilot and Jo Ransom, *Sodom by the Sea: An Affectionate History of Coney Island* (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1941).
13. Belle Lindner Israels, "The Way of the Girl," *Survey* 22 (3 July 1909): 486.
14. Investigator's Report, La Kuenstler Klause, 1490 Third Ave., January 19, 1917, Committee of Fourteen Papers.
15. Hutchins Hapgood, *Types from City Streets* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1910), p. 131.
16. Clara Laughlin, *The Work-A-Day Girl. A Study of Some Present Conditions* (1913; New York: Arno Press, 1974), pp. 47, 145. On working women's clothing, see Helen Campbell, *Prisoners of Poverty: Women Wage-Earners, Their Trades and Their Lives* (1887; Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970), p. 175; "What It Means to Be a Department Store Girl as Told by the Girl Herself," *Ladies Home Journal* 30 (June 1913): 8; "A Salesgirl's Story," *Independent* 54 (July 1902): 1821. Drinking is discussed in Kneeland, *Commercialized Prostitution*, p. 70; and Belle Israels, "Diverting a Pastime," *Leslie's Weekly* 113 (27 July 1911): 100.
17. Investigator's Report, Weimann's, 1422 St. Nicholas Ave., February 11, 1917, Committee of Fourteen Papers.
18. Israels, "Way of the Girl," p. 489; Ruth True, *The Neglected Girl* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1914), p. 59.

19. "A Salesgirl's Story," p. 1821; Lillian Betts, *Leaven in a Great City* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1902), pp. 251–52.
20. New York State, Factory Investigating Commission, *Fourth Report*, vol. 4, pp. 1585–86; Robert Woods and Albert Kennedy, *Young Working-Girls: A Summary of Evidence from Two Thousand Social Workers* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913), p. 105.
21. New York State, Factory Investigating Commission, *Fourth Report*, vol. 5, p. 2809; see also Sue Ainslie Clark and Edith Wyatt, *Making Both Ends Meet: The Income and Outlay of New York Working Girls* (New York: Macmillan, 1911), p. 28. For an excellent analysis of sexual harassment, see Mary Bularzik, *Sexual Harassment at the Workplace: Historical Notes* (Somerville, Mass.: New England Free Press, 1978).
22. Consumers' League of New York, *Behind the Scenes in a Restaurant: A Study of 1017 Women Restaurant Employees* (n.p., n.p., 1916), p. 24; Frances Donovan, *The Woman Who Waits* (1920; New York: Arno Press, 1974), p. 42.
23. New York Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Second Annual Report* (1884), pp. 153, 158; *Third Annual Report* (1885), pp. 150–51.
24. Report of Commission on Social Morality from the Christian Standpoint, Made to the 4th Biennial Convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the U.S. A., 1913, Records File Collection, Archives of the National Board of the YWCA of the United States of America, New York, N.Y.
25. Clark and Wyatt, *Making Both Ends Meet*, pp. 187–88; see also Dorothy Richardson, *The Long Day, in Women at Work*, ed. William L. O'Neill (New York: Quadrangle, 1972); Amy E. Tanner, "Glimpses at the Mind of a Waitress," *American Journal of Sociology* 13 (July 1907): 52.
26. Committee of Fourteen in New York City, *Annual Report for 1914*, p. 40; Clark and Wyatt, *Making Both Ends Meet*, p. 188; Donovan, *The Woman Who Waits*, pp. 26, 80–81.
27. Esther Packard, "Living on Six Dollars a Week," New York State, Factory Investigating Commission, *Fourth Report*, vol. 4, pp. 1677–78. For a discussion of women's wages in New York, see *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 35; and vol. 4, pp. 1081, 1509. For an overview of working conditions, see Barbara Wertheimer, *We Were There: The Story of Working Women in America* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977), pp. 209–48.
28. Packard, "Living on Six Dollars a Week," p. 1685.
29. New York State, Factory Investigating Commission, *Fourth Report*, vol. 4, pp. 1512–13, 1581–83; True, *Neglected Girl*, p. 59.
30. Marie Orenstein, "How the Working Girl of New York Lives," p. 1702. See also Esther Packard, *A Study of Living Conditions of Self-Supporting Women in New York City* (New York: Metropolitan Board of the YWCA, 1915).
31. "Influences in Street Life," p. 30; see also Samuel Chotzinoff, *A Lost Paradise* (New York: Knopf, 1955), p. 81.
32. On the rejection of parental controls by young women, see Leslie Woodcock Tentler, *Wage-Earning Women: Industrial Work and Family Life in the United States, 1900–1930* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 110–13. For contemporary accounts, see True, *Neglected Girl*, pp. 54–55, 62–63, 162–63; Lillian Betts, "Tenement House Life and Recreation," *Outlook* (11 February 1899): 365.
33. "Memoranda on Vice Problem: IV. Statement of George J. Kneeland," New York State, Factory Investigating Commission, *Fourth Report*, v.1, p. 403. See also Committee of Fourteen, *Annual Report* (1917), p. 15, and *Annual Report* (1918), p. 32; Woods and Kennedy, *Young Working-Girls*, p. 85.

34. Donovan, *The Woman Who Waits*, p. 71; on occasional prostitution, see U.S. Senate, *Report on the Condition of Women and Child Wage-Earners in the United States*, U.S. Sen. Doc. 645, 61st Cong., 2nd Sess. (Washington, D.C.: GPO), vol. 15, p. 83; Laughlin, *The Work-A-Day Girl*, pp. 51–52.
35. Investigator's Report, 2150 Eighth Ave., January 12, 1917, Committee of Fourteen Papers.
36. Investigator's Report, La Kuentler Klause, 1490 Third Ave., January 19, 1917, Committee of Fourteen Papers.
37. Investigator's Report, Bobby More's, 252 W. 31 Street, February 3, 1917, Committee of Fourteen Papers.
38. Investigator's Report, Remy's, 917 Eighth Ave., December 23, 1916, Committee of Fourteen Papers.
39. Donovan, *The Woman Who Waits*, p. 55.
40. Edwin Slosson, "The Amusement Business," *Independent* 57 (21 July 1904): 139.
41. Investigator's Report, Clare Hotel and Palm Gardens/McNamara's, 2150 Eighth Ave., January 12, 1917, Committee of Fourteen Papers.

5.6

When You Meet a Lesbian: Hints for the Heterosexual Woman

Indiana University Empowerment Workshop

- Do not run screaming from the room ... this is rude.
- If you must back away, do so slowly and with discretion.
- Do not assume she is attracted to you.
- Do not assume she is not attracted to you.
- Do not assume you are not attracted to her.
- Do not expect her to be as excited about meeting a heterosexual as you may be about meeting a lesbian ... she was probably raised by them.
- Do not immediately start talking about your boyfriend or husband in order to make it clear that you are straight ... she probably already knows.
- Do not tell her that it is sexist to prefer women, that people are people, that she should be able to love everybody. Do not tell her that men are as oppressed by sexism as women and women should help men fight their oppression. These are common fallacies and should be treated as such.
- Do not invite her someplace where there will be men unless you tell her in advance. She may not want to be with them.
- Do not ask her how she got that way ... Instead, ask yourself how you got that way.
- Do not assume that she is dying to talk about being a lesbian.
- Do not expect her to refrain from talking about being a lesbian.
- Do not trivialize her experience by assuming it is a bedroom issue only. She is a lesbian 24 hours a day.