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This article examines the role of prostitution in Portland in 1912-14, 
and the unsuccessful efforts of a Progressive-inspired Citizens’ Commit-
ettee to wipe it out. More broadly, however, it analyzes changing social and 
gender roles and the specifically masculinist rhetoric with which the Cit-
izens’ Committee—especially its two leaders, Rt. Rev. Robert Codman, 
Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Maine, and Dr. Frederic H. Gerrish, 
dean of Maine’s medical community — made sense of those changes. For 
Codman, Gerrish, and other Anglo-American men of their generation, 
the campaign against the “social evil” became a template upon which to 
project their anxieties about the social transformation of Portland, and 
the lives of its young men and women, on the eve of World War I. 
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Southern Maine. Solomon received his Ph.D. in history from Northwestern 
University in 1969. He taught social history and the history of sexu-
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LGBT communities in Maine. For his scholarly work and public present-
tations on stereotyping and sexuality, he was awarded Equality Maine’s 
Lifetime Achievement Award in 2007. Solomon lives in Bowdoinham.

ON JULY 4, 1913, thousands of Portlanders gathered on the Eastern 
Promenade to witness what organizers enthusiastically (if inaccurately) 
claimed to be the first municipal pageant ever produced in the United States. The extravaganza began with a re-enact-
ment of George Cleeve’s settlement of Portland in 1633 and ended, two 
and a half hours later, when an actress portraying present-day America 
led “the Pageant Players, according to their epochs [to] sing the new na-
tional anthem, ‘America the Beautiful’ as they march[ed] up the road 
from the pageant grounds. The audience [stood] . . . and join in the
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Portrait of John Calvin Stevens, Portland, ca. 1930. One of Portland’s most influential citizens in the early twentieth century, Stevens played an important role in Portland’s Progressive movement. Focused on the eradication of prostitution from Portland’s streets, Stevens and other members of the Citizens Committee were bent on the task of protecting “the young people of this city from the corrupting influences of the social evil,” and maintaining the reputation of Maine’s booming young city. Courtesy of the Maine Historical Society.
singing. In the harbor, the battleship [USS Idaho] fired . . . a salute of guns.”

Pageant organizers had reduced Portland’s complicated history to a simple narrative—the triumph of Man over Nature, Prosperity over Adversity, Concord over Diversity and Dissent—in order to reveal a “glimpse of the City of today, the Portland that is so dear to its people and [that] gives promise of a future big and growing ever more interesting.” Long after the music and the cannon salute faded, good feeling lingered in the air.

As Portlanders reveled publicly in a summer of optimism and self-congratulation, John Calvin Stevens, Maine’s leading architect and member of the pageant committee, was meeting privately with a small group of other influential citizens “to protect the young people of this city from the corrupting influences of the social evil.” For a year and a half, Stevens and his colleagues on the Citizens’ Committee had employed private investigators who followed streetwalkers, visited dance halls and brothels, and spied on hotel clerks and bell boys engaged in the shadowy world of prostitution. Their First Report, published on February 1, 1914, described a city tottering on the edge of moral chaos, completely different from the sanitized and self-confident Portland of the Fourth of July celebration eight months earlier.

Stevens was understandably proud of his booming city. In the decade before World War I, Portland was transformed by the construction of a new City Hall, a Cumberland County Courthouse, a Federal Courthouse, the Portland Museum of Art, and Baxter Boulevard. But Stevens also cautioned that “civic pride and civic conscience mean the determination to better all fairly good conditions, to remedy all bad conditions, even to the extent of making some personal sacrifice in order to bring about the result that shall put Portland at the head of all the cities in her class.” Stevens was among a dozen of Portland’s most notable citizens comprising the Citizens’ Committee. Others included U.S. Attorney Robert T. Whitehouse; businessmen Alexander Laughlin, Franklin C. Payson, and Constant Southworth; and attorneys Clarence Hale, Howard R. Ives, Charles F. Libby, Stephen C. Perry, and Harry M. Verrill. All of them understood that “the social evil” was one of those “bad conditions” standing in the way of Portland’s future.

Foremost among the members of the Citizens’ Committee were its President, Right Rev. Robert Codman, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Maine, and Dr. Frederic H. Gerrish, the most respected member of Maine’s medical community. Their leadership reflected a confidence in
reformed government that animated the Progressive movement nationwide. Beneath that confidence, however, Codman and Gerrish, like many others, harbored deep fears about the loss of male agency and autonomy in America’s rapidly urbanizing society.

This article examines the response of the Citizens’ Committee, and especially of Gerrish and Codman, to commercialized sex in Portland from 1912 to 1914. More broadly, it is about changing social and gender roles and the specifically masculinist rhetoric with which the Citizens’ Committee and its members made sense of those changes. For Codman, Gerrish, and other Anglo-American men of their generation, the campaign against the social evil became a template upon which to project their anxieties about the social transformation of Portland and the lives of its young men and women on the eve of World War I.

Social Evil and Male Agency in Portland

At age thirty three, Dr. Frederic H. Gerrish was a rising star on the Maine medical scene in 1878. Already respected as a teacher at the Bowdoin Medical College and a pathologist and physician at the recently incorporated Maine General Hospital, Gerrish had received his M.D. from Bowdoin just nine years earlier. Given the honor of addressing the annual meeting of the Maine Medical Association in 1878, he chose as his subject “the duties of the medical profession concerning prostitution and its allied vices.” In uncompromising language, he asserted that prostitution was “so prominent a feature” of modern urban life “that it is called The Social Evil, the definitive article being required to indicate the pre-eminence of its position” amid the myriad challenges facing medical and social reformers.5

Three and a half decades later, now enjoying an international reputation and the unchallenged leadership of Maine’s medical community, Gerrish brought to the Citizens’ Committee a steadfast conviction that the social evil was still the preeminent challenge facing the city of Portland. Even though Salvarsan, the first effective treatment for syphilis, had been discovered in 1909, its use did not become universal among American physicians for at least another decade. Along with syphilis and other venereal diseases, outbreaks of measles, tuberculosis, and scarlet fever were common in American cities before World War I, and Portland was no exception.6 Gerrish’s concerns about Portland’s public health were extremely well-founded, and no one in Maine better understood the medical and epidemiological issues associated with prostitution than he did.
In its narrowest sense, the aim of the Citizens’ Committee was ending prostitution in Maine’s largest city. By invoking the highly-charged and widely-used specter of “social evil,” however, Gerrish and his colleagues were in fact revealing a much broader moral and political agenda. “Social evil” was an amorphous and shifting term, harboring a host of anxieties about new forms of leisure, consumption, and gender relations that were transforming industrial society at the turn of the twentieth century. Public health needs certainly provided the impetus for Portland’s anti-prostitution campaign, but they explain only part of the picture. In spite of the widespread Progressive-era confidence in science and reform, it was fear about the loss of male agency and control that most profoundly animated Gerrish and his colleagues.

Embedded in the rhetoric of social evil and male agency was an unease about the pernicious effects of the “solitary vice”—masturbation—as well. Nineteenth-century physicians treated masturbation as a horrible disease affecting the young, leading to nervousness, insomnia, skin eruptions, and then, inexorably if untreated, to tuberculosis, blindness, and death. Expert opinion located the epidemic primarily in middle-class, as opposed to working-class populations, where the solitary vice...
undermined solid Victorian values like team-work and self-control. In the words of historian Thomas Laqueur, “masturbation [was] the sexuality of modernity and of the bourgeoisie who created it.” Progressive-era campaigns against the social evil may not have mentioned the solitary vice explicitly, but the two were inextricably linked for the generation of middle-class men, including those on the Citizens’ Committee, who came of age during the anti-masturbation campaigns of the mid- and late-nineteenth century. Prostitution and masturbation were inseparable issues in discussing the corruptibility and moral agency of young men.

In New York, a Committee of Fifteen published a pioneering report titled *The Social Evil* in 1902, and this was followed in 1911 by the formation of the Vice Commission of Chicago. These two citizen reform campaigns provided the prototype for similar campaigns across the nation, including the campaign in Portland. Of the twenty-nine urban areas (as well as three states) producing vice commission reports between 1910 and 1917, Portland was among the smallest: only Elmira and Rockland County, both in New York; Paducah, Kentucky; and Baton Rouge, Louisiana, had smaller populations.

The Portland Citizens’ Committee met from October 31, 1912, through November 18, 1914, and published the *First Report of the Citizens’ Committee of Portland* on February 1, 1914. The committee claimed to have the “moral and financial support of nearly one hundred” citizens of Portland, but there is no evidence of any such involvement. Like New York’s Committee of 1000 and Philadelphia’s Committee of Seventy, the number gave symbolic weight to its claim of broad support.

A web of social and civic relationships connected these men to each other. Except for Perry, who was active in local Democratic politics, the Citizens’ Committee was overwhelmingly Republican, and all, or nearly all, of its members were Protestant. All of the directors, except for Laughlin and Perry, belonged to the prestigious Cumberland Club, and Gerrish, Hale, Ives, Whitehouse, and Stevens belonged to the equally illustrious Fraternity Club. Hale, Libby, Ives, and Gerrish sat on Bowdoin’s Board of Overseers, and Whitehouse was Chairman of the Trustees of the Maine Board of Charities and Corrections, while Codman served as President of that organization. Even though no women sat on the committee, the wives of several members—most notably Margaret Rollins Hale, Florence Brooks Whitehouse, and Hilda Libby Ives—were themselves engaged in reform and charitable activities that
reinforced the social cohesion of the committee. There were no Jews or people of color on the committee. On the model of the New York and Chicago commissions, Portland’s Citizens’ Committee employed undercover agents—including college students—to carry out their investigations. C. Walker Hayes, the Executive Secretary, supervised the investigators and corroborated their findings with his own inspections.

The First Report was divided into five sections: “The Social Evil upon the Streets”; “Dance Halls”; “Pandering and the Cadet System”; “Hotels and Lodging Houses”; and “Regular Houses of Ill-Fame.” Appendices presented statistics on disorderly houses and houses of ill fame and their proprietors, drawn from Superior Court and Municipal Court records. The report identified the streets where disorderly houses and houses of
ill-fame were located, but not their specific addresses; it described patterns of multiple offences, but not the specific identities of individual offenders. Investigators’ notebooks no longer exist, nor do the pre-1908 records of the Municipal Court, which went up in smoke when a fire destroyed Portland City Hall that year. An elaborate coding system, referencing its subjects by letters and numbers, certainly protected the Committee’s sources in 1914, but nine decades later, it frustrates the historian hoping to add flesh to the data.

People arrested for operating houses of prostitution were charged either with keeping a house of ill-fame or keeping a disorderly house. During the period between January 1904 and May 1913, according to the report, the Superior Court heard 162 such cases, 113 against women and 49 against men (including 18 instances of a man and woman charged jointly, at the same address), which resulted in 39 sentences, 35 fines, one case placed on probation, and 2 cases found not guilty. The statistics of the First Report indicate considerable recidivism.14

At the top of Portland’s prostitution pyramid, according to the First Report, were sixteen disorderly houses. No more than four of these were “typical parlor houses of ill-fame with a madame and girls where prostitution is practiced on premises, where no auxiliary fruit stand, lunch room, liquor, or other business is operated.” An investigator found one of these brothels “patronized chiefly by traveling salesmen and business men”; another investigator visited a house with “three Maine girls and one French girl.” The report continued that the madame was “going to Boston for a while, and will return in May, when she will have a good supply of French girls.” These references to “parlor houses,” travel across state borders, and foreign women resonated with the nation-wide fixation on white slavery that led to passage of the 1910 Mann Act, which banned conducting women across state lines for “immoral purposes.” Girls working in the other disorderly houses were more likely to solicit their customers off-premises, or through an open window, and bring them inside the establishment for sex. Annie Friedman, who ran a brothel at 59 Commercial Street in the early 1920s, reportedly put a pot of red geraniums in the window whenever she had a new girl. Two of the sixteen disorderly houses were reported to be “negro place[s],” and nine of them were located on the waterfront.15

In addition to sixteen brothels, there were at least thirteen “second-class hotels” and “loose lodging houses” that “not only consent, but encourage, and [even] cater chiefly” to prostitutes. Several other establishments were complicit in permitting prostitution. Except for four
locations on B Street near Union Station, an African-American neighborhood, all the mentioned rooming houses and hotels were within the commercial heart of the city: Commercial Street had seven locations; Fore Street, twenty-three; Congress Street, seventeen; India Street, four; Federal Street, four; Franklin Street, two; and Free Street, two. Unlike other American cities with circumscribed red-light districts, Portland’s social evil was dispersed along the major commercial and business arteries, all within a ten-minute walk of Post Office Square.16

A customer looking for sex could contact some of these establishments by telephone (“girls are handy, so they can be called”). More typically, he would meet the prostitute at a downtown fruit stand, tobacco shop, lunch counter, or dance hall—forms of new consumerism often catering to single men—and accompany her to a hotel with a desk clerk willing to look the other way and a bell boy eager to provide cheap booze. Some of the women described in the First Report were full-time prostitutes, and others “semi professionals”; some had “cadets,” who, for money would procure women for immoral purposes; others did not. 17 All of them inhabited a shadowy world of unlicensed rooming houses, cheap hotels, and people on the take.

The most sensational face of the social evil might have been the brothel madame or the seasoned streetwalker; much more problematic, however, was the teenage girl with which the First Report began.

[Investigators] witnessed soliciting in restaurants and dance halls, and saw men and girls making appointments. Such soliciting was found on streets and corners centrally located in respectable neighborhoods. It was by no means confined to the waterfront or to the haunts of sailors and soldiers. Further, it is most significant that in these same localities the investigators found many young girls, under sixteen years of age, unprotected, loitering at late hours about the streets, and ready to talk with men, apparently doing it for fun.18

Streets had long been the center of male working-class sociability in Portland and other American cities. By the beginning of the twentieth century, however, young women were increasingly looking outside the household for recreation and entertainment. More young women were entering the labor force, and fewer were living at home. Large numbers rented rooms away from their families. Unable to entertain friends where they lived, they turned to the new forms of commercialized entertainment—nickelodeons, amusement parks, dance halls, ice-cream parlors—that were transforming American social life.
In fall 1913, as Citizens’ Committee investigators were sleuthing around dance halls and street corners, the Portland Board of Trade commissioned an extensive recreation survey of the city’s youth, one of dozens conducted nationally by the Playground and Recreation Association of America. Howard R. Ives, sitting on the Portland School Committee and the Citizens’ Committee, spearheaded the survey. Like those of his fellow directors, Ives’s efforts against the social evil were woven seamlessly into his other civic activities. A series of articles in the Portland Evening Express summarized the survey’s findings. Portland was full of young working women, many living in rented rooms and boarding houses, unable to entertain friends, male or female, at home.

Special inquiries among younger working girls living in one of the central neighborhoods show that most of them are seldom home evenings. Of course, there are exceptions to this statement. The girls say that they go frequently to motion pictures, usually in groups. Walking on Congress Street and Middle Street is usual. The estimate of one group of girls is: ‘We spend two or three nights a week at the movies, a night a week at the Fraternity [boys’ playground behind the Fraternity House on Center Street] and the rest of the time walking. We almost never stay at home.’ This condition is virtually true of large numbers of girls.

To Portland’s young working-class women, Congress Street and Middle Street were places for strolling, window-shopping, and striking up conversations with men “for fun”; in the eyes of Citizens’ Committee investigators, these same streets were zones of prostitution. One investigator was solicited “in one evening by four different girls, all about seventeen years of age”; another evening, he witnessed about twenty girls soliciting. Here leisure and commerce, rough trade and polite society, bumped into each other. Congress Street and Middle Street connected the working-class neighborhoods of Munjoy Hill and Gorham’s Corner to the newer neighborhoods to the west. Most Citizens’ Committee directors lived in the genteel West End, but their offices were on Fore Street, Commercial Street, Middle Street, and Exchange Street, all within a short walk of the rooming houses and brothels detailed in the report. Citizens’ Committee directors may well have been approached by the same girls who were chatting up their undercover investigators.

Working-class immigrant youth were colonizing the streets and parks of American cities, and Portland was no exception. Between 1900 and 1910, foreign-born arrivals increased Portland’s population by 16.8 percent. Deering Oaks Park, Lincoln Park, the Eastern and Western
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Promenades, as well as the amusement parks at Riverton and Peak’s Island provided new venues for public, visible social activity, or what historian Christine Stansell has described as “the eroticization of public space.” Newly-arrived Italian and Jewish immigrants rubbed elbows with middle-class Protestant Yankees. “Young people coming from better families” were dancing the Bear and the Bunny Hug along with prostitutes in Portland dance halls. The “extreme dancing” and dim lighting in these places was, in the words of one investigator, “the worst that I ever witnessed.”

The Portland Evening Express reported that “more of the foreign element are out evenings than was formerly the case, as they are becoming familiar with the American ways.” Everywhere in Portland old ethnic and social markers were being obliterated, and nothing seemed clear any more. Most female adolescents walking the streets wearing the latest fashions and hairstyles were not streetwalkers, but respectable working-class women engaging in innocent leisure-time activities. “The most obvious needs shown by [the survey] are better opportunities for a normal social life in the case of one-third of the women who are deprived of good home opportunities.” Thus the moral reform crusades launched by the Citizens’ Committee conflated prostitution with a much broader and equally troubling transformation in working-class leisure and immigrant activity in Portland.

If the public behavior of young women was of concern to town fathers, so too was that of the city’s young men. Two weeks before the Citizens’ Committee published its findings, the Portland Evening Express carried a front page story about Portland’s “large and constantly increasing army of idle and mischievous boys and young men.” The young men examined by the Recreation Survey spent 74 percent of their free time away from home, usually in unsupervised and unorganized activities. “In general,” the report summarized, “the opportunities for [supervised] social pleasures, outside of dancing, are few.” Most significant, however, in terms of the social promiscuity of streets and dance halls, was the fact that “twenty-two per cent consider ‘walking’ among their chief recreations.”

Nearly every front page of the Portland Evening Express during this period reported crimes involving young men and young women—albeit in decidedly different ways. Young women engaged in crime were almost always contextualized within the white slave panic. For example, an eighteen year old Fairfield school teacher who ran away to Boston with her boyfriend was examined under the Mann Act by U.S. District Attorney (and Citizens’ Committee director) Robert Treat Whitehouse; nine-
teen year old and twenty one year old Portland women figured in prostitution trials in Lawrence, Massachusetts, and Brooklyn, New York. Troubled boys, on the other hand, were simply demonstrating adolescent immaturity; worthy of a second chance, they were described in much more forgiving tones. Two ten year old boys accused of stealing seventy-five dollars from the safe of a Congress Street grocery store were “seemingly unaware of the serious nature [of their] escapades,” and were “taken before Judge Merrill ... and given a good lecture.” An eighteen year old messenger accused of stealing $159 had “the respect and sympathy of every employee in the office of that establishment,” and “no resentment ... because he has seemed unusually bright, eager to learn, to serve and accommodate.”

The popular press accentuated class differences as well. For every account of derelict working-class youth, the Portland Evening Express carried multiple stories of Ivy League athletic teams, extolling the virtues of team play and character-building. The recreation survey revealed that less than a quarter of Portland’s adolescent males “attend gymnasium [and only] twenty-six percent play baseball or football, some only occasionally.” Left unsupervised, male adolescents were prey to vagrancy, common crime, and prostitution—social evils, broadly defined—but also to the solitary vice as well. The antidote to these assaults on male agency was unequivocally clear: a regime of constant supervision and socialization.

Nowhere was this confidence in the sovereign power of supervision and socialization more powerful than in the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA). Drawing upon the support of businessmen, the Maine YMCA pursued an aggressive state-wide campaign, including Boy Scout troops and programs targeted specifically to railroad workers and lumbermen. On the eve of World War I, at a time of “decadence of home life and home influence,” the Maine YMCA claimed to hold the world’s record, six years running, for the largest YMCA boys’ conference in the world.

The YMCA movement had originally focused on bible study and prayer meetings, but by the beginning of the twentieth century, physical fitness and sex education were at the core of its programs. The YMCA dedicated its first independent facility in Portland in 1899. Like dozens of similar YMCA’s nationwide, the Congress Square building (on the site of today’s Portland Museum of Art) was designed as “an intricate instrument for the improvement of young men.” State-of-the-art athletic facilities enhanced the teaching of teamwork and fair play, but even more
fundamental to YMCA character-building was the ability to “maintain complete supervision from centralized locations, to insure that men’s behavior was beyond reproach at least during the time they spent [at] … YMCA.” The Congress Street building was serving thousands of Portland’s young men and within a decade needed to renovate and expand its facilities.

Supervision was not an abstract or theoretical problem for Portland YMCA directors when they dedicated the new facility on October 31, 1913. In 1912, over fifty men and boys, all of them solidly middle-class and respectable, had been implicated in a homosexual sex scandal at the YMCA in Portland, Oregon. Newspaper reports raised fears about a nationwide homosexual underworld, and targeted the morals of adults and

Portland YMCA building, ca. 1900. Part of the campaign against Portland’s problems with the “social evil” and the “solitary vice” was a belief that young men required constant supervision and directed socialization. The emergence of the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) was a reflection of this belief and part of America’s campaign to protect its young men. Portland’s first YMCA was dedicated in 1899, its goal being to “maintain complete supervision . . . to insure that men’s behavior was beyond reproach at least during the time they spent [at] … YMCA.” Courtesy of the Maine Historical Society.
youth identified with YMCA programs. The Oregon scandal was followed, in 1919, by a similar case in Newport, Rhode Island, which implicated YMCA members as well as local Episcopal clergy. YMCA facilities were becoming identified as “central institutions of gay male life,” and YMCA officials everywhere—including those in Portland, Maine—were fixated on homosexual activity as never before.32

The description of the YMCA’s new facilities in the Portland Evening Express enthused that “from the lobby to the gymnasium, through the various rooms, everything is in the finest condition” and referred, in very general terms, to the “up-to-date and well-planned plant.” The focus of the article, however, was upon the enhanced supervision of young boys afforded by the changes:

The boys’ department has been provided with adequate rooms on the same floor as the adult department, although separated from the latter in a way, and always under the direct supervision of the secretary of that department.... The gymnasium has also received attention in the changes that have been made, the physical director being provided an office from which he may at all times have supervision of the gymnasium. The locker rooms have been changed over so that the boys’ lockers are always under supervision when the boys are using them.33

Inescapable tension between men and boys (“on the same floor...but separated”), and apprehension about adolescent sexuality and autonomy (“always under supervision”) permeated Portland’s new YMCA, as well as other moral reform efforts. Beyond the solitary vice loomed the social evil; beneath Progressive-era middle-class confidence in the power of hygiene, cleanliness, and moral reform ran deep-seated anguish about male sexuality and agency.34

Portland Reform Leaders: Frederic H. Gerrish

Nowhere were these contradictions more apparent than in the careers of Frederic H. Gerrish and Robert H. Codman. Gerrish is remembered today as a leader of the Bowdoin Medical College, the Maine Medical Hospital (forerunner to Maine Medical Center), and numerous local and national professional organizations, as well as for his innovations in surgery and efforts in introducing the germ theory of infection into American surgical practice. In a wide-ranging career animated by a “protean inventiveness,” the twin concerns of social evil/solitary vice remained constant.35 Gerrish’s first address to the Maine Medical Association, in 1878, examined prostitution; his last published work, in 1917,
focused on masturbation. Like other physicians of his generation, Gerrish was at once a product of the anti-masturbation crusade and one of its soldiers.

Gerrish began his 1878 address on *The Duties of the Medical Profession Concerning Prostitution and Its Allied Vices* with the assertion that economic and social conditions, rather than moral depravity, forced women into prostitution. European reformers, who advocated bringing prostitution under state surveillance through programs of licensing and medical supervision, had it all wrong, in Gerrish’s opinion. “In order to stop the supply,” Gerrish argued, “we must remove the demand ... which is almost wholly the result of [the] bad and deficient education” of young men.

All around us are evidences of the short-comings of our vaunted system of training youth; everywhere we see the densest ignorance of the laws of being, of the rules of health, of the essentials of ethics; but in nothing is ignorance so apparent as with regard to the functions and proper uses of the generative organs. Whenever the sexual appetite is spoken of, its satisfaction is called a physical necessity, an imperious and unconquerable requirement of the system, a demand of nature which cannot be ignored. Our children are taught (alas! By what tutors!) that their venereal desires must be gratified, and that the failure to do this will result in illness and impotence. As the legitimate fruits of such instruction, we have masturbation, prostitution, sodomy, prevention of conception, seduction, rape, abortion, and the numberless diseases which follow in their wake. What better can be expected?

The social evil, in other words, was fundamentally a result of corrupted masculinity, not of female depravity or social inequity. The link between the social evil and the solitary vice that Gerrish made in 1878 remained unchanged throughout his career.

Gerrish reiterated this link in the years before World War I, not only to medical audiences, but also to laymen in talks, for example, before the Portland’s Fraternity Club, where members of the city’s social elite met to debate the leading questions of the day. Never was he more impassioned than when addressing young men. *Sex-Hygiene: A Talk to College Boys,* is the text of his annual lecture to Bowdoin’s first-year students. Published in 1917, it was the capstone of Gerrish’s life-long battle against the twin scourges of social evil and solitary vice. Masturbation and prostitution, he began, represented the breakdown of male agency. “The solitary vice, being vice, is bad; but the social evil is vastly more vicious.” Male self-indulgence led to prostitution and venereal disease,
corrupting a young man’s body and leading inexorably to the destruction of his family and his future.\textsuperscript{38} Gerrish appealed to his young listeners to rise above their bodies:

Let your ideals be far higher than that! Be not satisfied with exemption from physical disease, with guiltlessness of gross offenses against criminal law! Your aim should be to pass through the furnace of temptation without the smell of fire upon your garments; to keep your minds unsullied by the filth that is all around you; not only to guard yourselves against corruption, but to keep others from contamination; to remember that you are your brother’s keeper, and your sister’s; that the purity of womanhood is a sacred trust to every man, who is worthy of the name; and that no woman is to be considered so debased that some selfish act of yours may not push her further down toward utter ruin.\textsuperscript{39}
Sex-Hygiene may be the most extreme reflection of Gerrish’s discomfort about social change, but pronouncements about the horrors of modern city life punctuate the last decade of his life. In 1910, for example, Gerrish lashed out at the Carnegie Foundation, which had called for shutting down 100 of America’s 131 medical schools—including the Bowdoin Medical College. Seeking to regularize the licensing and education of America’s physicians, the Carnegie study (commonly called the Flexner Report, after its author, Abraham Flexner) advocated clinical and laboratory teaching instead of tradition-bound lecture-based curricula, precisely the kind of lectures Gerrish had given for decades as the pillar of the Bowdoin medical faculty. In Gerrish’s opinion, a young man studying medicine without the guidance of a seasoned lecturer was no different from a youth newly arrived in an unfamiliar city: “without this preliminary assistance he wastes much time and effort in wandering about its streets—going into unimportant places, missing some of the best sights, wearying himself to little advantage.” His comments about the medical world of “Old Portland” betray a nostalgia not only for the values of old-school medical education, but also for a city disappearing before his eyes. In 1921, a year after Gerrish’s death, Bowdoin Medical College closed its doors.

For many men of Gerrish’s generation, the changes to American urban life on the eve of World War I were difficult to fathom. Gerrish may have developed liberal opinions about women’s right to vote and to practice medicine, but his beliefs about male agency and moral education remained unchanged throughout his career.

Robert Codman

If Gerrish provided medical and scientific expertise to the Citizens’ Committee, Robert Codman, its president, provided religious leadership. Codman was born in Boston in 1859, scion of one of Boston’s most venerable families. After graduating from Harvard College, Codman practiced law. When his brother Archibald, a clergyman, died, Codman entered the ministry. He was ordained an Episcopal priest in 1894 and a year later became rector of St. John’s Church in Roxbury. He was called to the diocese of Maine as Bishop in 1900. Codman was of a generation of Protestant leaders committed to revitalizing a feminized church with a more masculine, socially-engaged Christianity. He brought his energy to the Anti-Tuberculosis Society and the Maine State Conference of Charities and Corrections, serving as president of both.

The earliest public evidence of Codman’s interest in combating the
social evil was his endorsement, in 1911, of parish-level discussions of “Sex Hygiene,” “The Perils of the Street,” and “The Opportunities of the Home.” In the pages of *The Northeast*, the diocesan newspaper, Codman defined the social evil in specifically male terms: “it is nothing short of criminal for parents to send their boys into the world, ignorant of the temptations they are to meet, unacquainted with the mysteries of life, unable to learn the truth about their own nature, save as they gain distorted and corrupt knowledge from evil companionships.”\(^4\) Two years
later, and now president of the Citizens’ Committee, Codman was even more emphatic: “it is our conviction that little headway will be made toward the solution of the problem [of the social evil] until it is recognized and treated chiefly as a man problem.” His specific choice of words—“man problem”—was certainly not accidental. Codman was exploiting the “boy problem,” a host of fears within middle-class Anglo-American circles about the deleterious impact of immigrants, congested cities, and other social ills upon their sons.45

Codman was the founder and public face of the Citizens’ Committee. He hosted its early meetings and was the only one among its directors whose obituary mentioned the Citizens’ Committee. Indeed, his death in 1915 was largely responsible for its demise.46 At first glance, Codman’s August 1912 “Bishop’s Letter” seems unremarkable: a call to serve the sick, the orphaned, and the poor; to increase donations; to work with other Christian denominations, and to improve “the moral and philanthropic welfare of our state and of our city.” But then Codman signaled the foundation of the Citizens’ Committee, its first meeting a few weeks away:

The state and city regulations controlling the temptations of vice must be studied and improved. Boys and girls must be rescued from the awful dangers of which they are so ignorant that they know not enough to be afraid. The poor should be better housed and protected against the greed of their landlords. Something should be done for the sailor who enters the port of Portland, to fall into the greedy and wicked hands of unscrupulous persons. Something must be done for the lumberman, as he comes forth from the woods, only too inclined to do wrong himself and to lead others to do wrong with him, as he comes down through the little villages and towns of our state.47

As this passage indicates, Codman shared the opinions of psychologist G. Stanley Hall, YMCA leader Luther Gulick, and others, that cities threatened the physical and moral health of innocent young men.48 Codman’s Portland was a dark and dangerous place—sailors “falling” into the hands of predators, rural lumbermen coming “down” into temptation and confusion—in stark contrast to the unsullied vitality of outdoor life.

Until the formation of the Citizens’ Committee in 1913, the focus of Codman’s public life was the Anti-Tuberculosis Society.49 The focus of his private life was his yacht, Calumet, and the young boys of his diocese. Codman’s public and private passions were directly related to each
other, insofar as he believed that the only antidote to urban life was vigorous exercise, fresh air, and the sea. Witness Codman’s “Extracts from the Bishop’s Journal,” published in the August 1913 North East:

Monday, June 30, 1913. Opened the camp at Goose Island, Casco Bay, with fifteen choir-boys from St. Luke’s Cathedral. It is a most ideal spot for a boys’ camp. Not far from the open sea, at the southwest end of a long island....Some of the boys turn somersaults when they land on the island: there is no better way to express the joy of arrival.

It is the plan of the Bishop to be with the boys as much as possible. Here lifelong friendships are made, and future vestrymen and valuable laymen are produced for the Diocese. But the plan of the Bishop cannot be carried out as he would wish, because he must leave the camp and go begging in the summer chapels for his missions. This week, however, is to be spent with the choir-boys.

Saturday, July 5. One day in the week, I returned to Portland to attend to business. The other days and nights I have been on the island. A quiet Fourth of July on the island was preferred to a noisy one at home. The boys know I love them, but they do not know how much. Today the choir-boys are brought back from the island. Many shoulders, arms and backs badly sunburned..... I am wondering whether it does not take away about all the pleasure of sailing a boat to have five or six wriggling, restless boys on board. No harm done during the week beyond an occasional bruise or scratch, the breaking of a gaff, and the spending of a night in a sail-boat without wind.....

I am obliged to leave the camp in the middle of the week in order to attend to business in Bangor and to reach the summer chapels on the island of Mt. Desert. I cannot bear to leave the lads.”

Codman used even more highly-charged language in his 1913 “Bishop’s Address,” comparing the church to an adolescent boy “just bursting into manhood,” who

feels his body far too small for the inner life within him. He is restless, eager to measure his new and growing strength, and, full of ideals, imagines everything possible and within his reach. He is a living body, with a growing life pressing from within and forcing the body to grow big enough to hold the growing spirit. So it is with our Church. It is today a living body, throbbing and bursting and struggling with a growing life, passing as it were from youth to manhood and outgrowing the short clothes. The restlessness, the reaching out after great things, is but evidence of a present growth that is pregnant with work and effort for the future in Jesus Christ our Lord.

[The Church] is like a pair of short trousers which an overgrown lad is outgrowing, and as he strides forward in his efforts to walk and
John LaFarge’s, “American Madonna,” 1904, for the Cathedral of St. Luke’s on Portland’s State Street. Progressive reform included a celebration of the male body as a symbol of physical strength and Christian power in the face of concern over increasing effeminacy in men due to industrialization and the influx of diverse ethnic immigrants. In 1904, the Rev. Robert Codman commissioned John LaFarge to depict a “sturdy, manly” Jesus, “picturing His strength as well as His purity.” The result was the “American Madonna,” considered one of LaFarge’s most important works. It remains an ornate feature of the Cathedral of St. Luke’s in Portland.  *Courtesy of the Cathedral of St. Luke’s, Portland, Maine.*
to run there is no danger that the body shall break, but there is great
danger lest the trousers split, and the rent grow worse and worse till
some other garment is found more fitted for a man than for a boy.51

It is difficult to imagine such language appearing in a church newsletter
today. A century ago, however, when the modern categories of homosex-
ual and heterosexual were just being formed, these journal entries did
not necessarily carry the implications that they might today. Within the
context of Progressive Era Muscular Christianity, Codman’s glorification
of adolescence and male energy was not at all unusual.52

Physical strength and Christian power were inseparable; Muscular
Christianity celebrated the male body in the pulpit as well as the gymna-
sium. Artists were encouraged to turn away from the traditional represen-
tation of an effete, frail Jesus to what G. Stanley Hall called the “ideal
of what the manly man should be.” In 1904, Codman commissioned
such an image, in honor of his deceased brother Archibald, for the
Cathedral of St. Luke on State Street. Instead of a vulnerable newborn
infant, artist John LaFarge depicted Christ as “a sturdy, manly little child,
of about five, thus picturing His strength as well as His purity.”53 The
“American Madonna,” as it became known, was one of LaFarge’s most
important works, and it expressed Codman’s Muscular Christianity as
unequivocally as his writings in *The Northeast.*

Church reform was shot through with highly-gendered, masculinist
language. “The women have had charge of the church work long
enough,” argued the Religion Forward Movement, which in January
1912 brought a national team of experts to Portland to revitalize male
laity and clergy. The movement hoped to inspire “systematic organized
and efficient church work so that all religious activities will be made as
effective as are the great businesses of the day.” Boy Scout leaders claimed
there were 100,000 boys in Maine desperate for “a virile personality and
fellowship” to save them from their primitive natures. As the Maine
YMCA newsletter put it, “What Shall It Profit A State If It Gain The
Whole World And Lose Its Own Boys?”54

Muscular Christianity encouraged emotional same-sex relation-
ships; it was not unusual for YMCA professionals, for example, to forego
heterosexual marriage altogether. Codman, a life-long bachelor, was lit-
tle different: he married Margarette Biddle Porter on September 16,
1915, when he was fifty-six years old, just three weeks before he died of
complications resulting from a brain tumor.55
Morality and Politics

The Citizen’s Committee met for the last time on November 18, 1914, nine months after publishing its First Report. Within a year, President Codman and Vice-President Libby were dead; on November 10, 1916, Howard Ives, the youngest member of the committee and the most likely to provide continuing leadership, succumbed to tuberculosis. The leaders of the crusade against the social evil in Portland were passing on, as were many of its national leaders. Some of the First Report’s recommendations did take effect—the regulation of dance halls in 1914, and the creation of a Recreation Commission in 1916—but there is no indication that prostitution in Portland changed appreciably. The campaign against what John Calvin Stevens had called “the bad conditions” standing in the way of Portland’s greatness disappeared, leaving little trace other than the cryptic accounts of the First Report.

In 1918 the Portland Chamber of Commerce organized a Committee on Municipal Research, with former Citizens’ Committee director Stevens as its chairman. Lofty calls for replacing Portland’s mayor-council system with a more efficient city manager-council form of government barely masked the ethnic, social, and economic interests of the reformers. As with the earlier crusade against social evil and private vice, the new city manager government was inspired by a belief that city life was spiraling out of control. It was, at least in part, an effort by Portland’s Progressive Protestant elite to rein in the rising political power of the Democratic Party and its largely Roman Catholic and Jewish working-class membership. For all intents and purposes, the 1912-1914 campaign to save Portland from moral disorder had reappeared—this time in explicitly political terms. In 1921, Stevens led a new Citizens’ Committee of 100 in a vigorous but unsuccessful city-wide referendum for charter reform. Two years later, Stevens and his fellow reformers succeeded, and in 1924 the first government in the new system was seated.

The line between morality and politics is thin and often illusory, and crusades like the 1912-1914 campaign against the social evil are seldom far removed from economic, political, or cultural issues. Portland’s 1921 Committee of 100—a coalition of Anglo-American merchants, bankers, religious leaders, large taxpayers, and (unlike the earlier Committee of 100) prominent club women—shared many of the anxieties that animated the Committee of 100 of 1912-1914. The focus of the crusade may have changed, but underlying fears about agency and control had not. The coalition that reformed Portland’s government in 1923
could trace its roots to the Citizens’ Committee, and its crusade against the social evil, a decade before.
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