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INTRODUCTION. IT’S A WONDERFUL LIFE

1. It’s A Wonderful Life, dir. Frank Capra (1947).


CHAPTER 1. SEGREGATING VICE, 1890–1909


2. Thomas Nast, “An Independent Victory,” Harper’s Weekly (19 July 1884), 465. The quotation Nast repeated was a Cleveland campaign slogan, but it originally came from General Edward Bragg of Wisconsin. See M. R. Werner, Tammany Hall (1928; Garden City, NY, 1932), 301.


20. [Steffens], Autobiography, 387; Frederick H. Whitin to Judge Lane, Birmingham, Alabama, 26 Sept. 1911, box 1, C14; Witte to Gaynor, 11 Sept. 1912, GWJ-87, Mayors’ Papers, New York City Municipal Archives and Records Center, cited in Gilfoyle, City of Eros, 410n49; Woolston, Prostitution in the United States, 103. The quotation is from Robert M. Fogelson, Big-City Police (Cambridge, MA, 1977), 10.
Public Drinking in Chicago and Boston, 1880–1920 (Urbana, IL, 1983), 237; Gilfoyle, City of Eros, 265–267.


34. Parkhurst, Our Fight With Tammany, 10.


37. For this reason, the Committee of Fourteen, which existed from 1905 to 1932, could make the claim in 1918 that New York had never had a segregated vice district. See Frederick H. Whitin to Joseph Mayer, 7 Aug. 1918; Joseph Mayer to Frederick H. Whitin, 13 Aug. 1918; Frederick H. Whitin to Joseph Meyer [sic], 21 Aug. 1918; all box 4, C14. See also Frederick H. Whitin to L. C. Buckley, 16 Oct. 1917, box 4, C14; Joseph Mayer, The Regulation of Commercialized Vice: An Analysis of the Transition from Segregation to Repression in the United States (New York, 1922), 11; Waterman, Prostitution and Its Repression, 14; Gilfoyle, City of Eros, 199, 222–223.

1997). See also chapters two and ten in Gilfoyle, *City of Eros*, which “tour” New York’s sex districts.


43. “Disorderly Tenement Houses,” NYC15. Throughout the year, the Committee of Fifteen sent investigators back to the tenements to check that prostitutes had not returned.

44. “To Rouse the Public Is Fifteen’s Aim,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, 11 Jan. 1901, card no. 43; “City Is Cursed by ‘Devils on Top,’” *New York Herald*, 14 Jan. 1901, card no. 65; both vol. 2, box 32, NYC15. Even when the Committee of Fifteen announced that it was not political, both friends and foes found this claim specious. See “Fifteen Committee Not Anti-Tammany,” *New York Press*, 12 Feb. 1901, card no. 189, vol. 4, box 32; “Vice Crusade Drags,” *Mail and Express*, 14 Feb. 1901, card no. 195, vol. 4, box 32; “The Vice System,” *Commercial Advertiser*, 26 Apr. 1901, card no. 695, vol. 12, box 33; all NYC15. The typed abstracts of daily events, as well as the clipping vols., show the
extent to which Tammany actions and the anti-Tammany campaigns were integral to the Committee of Fifteen’s mission.


52. Myers, History of Tammany Hall, 304. See also Reynolds, Machine Politics in New Orleans, 129, 158–159; Noel, City and the Saloon, 104, 107.


56. Frederick H. Whitin to John P. Peters, 17 Nov. 1906; Frederick H. Whitin to Judge Lane, 26 Sept. 1911; both box 1, C14; Peters, “Story of the Committee of Fourteen,” 378–379; Wagner, “Virtue Against Vice,” 138, 138n39. See also Whitin’s condemnation of the Chicago Vice Commission’s recommendations because of their impracticality in Survey 26 (6 May 1911): 218.


59. The following were members of the Committee of Fourteen at its founding: Rev. Lee W. Beattie, Hon. William S. Bennet, Mr. Samuel W. Bowen, Prof. Francis M. Burdick, Rev. Father William J. B. Daly, Rabbi Bernard Drachman, Rabbi Pereira Mendes, Rev. John P. Peters, Mr. George Haven Putnam, Mr. Thomas H. Reed, Mr. Noah C. Rogers, Rev. Howard H. Russell, Mrs. V. G. Simkhovitch, and Mr. Lawrence Veiller. See “The Abolition of the Raines Law Hotels and the Work of the Committee of Fourteen,” *Lincoln Magazine* (June 1905), vol. 1, box 86, C14. At its incorporation almost two years later, the constituency of the Committee had changed. The directors were Ruth Baldwin, Lee Beattie, William Bennet, Francis Burdick, Frances Kellor, William McAdoo, Pereira Mendes, John P. Peters, George Haven Putnam, Howard Russell, William Jay Schieffelin, Isaac Seligman, Mary Simkhovitch, and Francis Louis Slade. See “Certificate of Incorporation,” [Jan. 1907], vol. 1, box 86, C14. See also Peters, “Story of the Committee of Fourteen,” 361; Wagner, “Virtue Against Vice,” 114–115.


Reform, Legal Culture, and the Polity, 1880–1920 (Chapel Hill, NC, 1995), 27. For example, in Chicago, where liquor licenses were $500, saloonkeepers added approximately $3.3 million to the city coffers in 1894. See John E. George, “The Saloon Question in Chicago,” Economic Studies 2 (Apr. 1897): 78.


73. “Statement for Publicity by the Chairman,” [1907], vol. 1, box 86, C14; Wagner, “Virtue Against Vice,” 121–122. See also George, “Saloon Question in Chicago,” 67. For an example of the alcohol trade’s self-regulation in a smaller city, see Rosenzweig, Eight Hours, 183–190.

74. The Committee of Fourteen started an informal protest list in 1905, and by 1906 the list was a formal fixture in their scheme. “Statement,” Feb. 1906; Bulletin #21, 5 Oct. 1908, vol. 1, box 86; “1918 Protest List,” 12 Nov. 1918, Bulletin #1196, Bulletin Book #9, box 88; all C14; Wagner, “Virtue Against Vice,” 119–120. It is unclear if the number of representatives from each group varied, so I have used the one case where the makeup of the Joint Committee was mentioned, “In the Spring of 1906,” n.d., file: “Surety Companies,” box 20, C14.

75. Bulletin #30, vol. 1, box 86; Bulletin #21, 5 Oct. 1908, vol. 1, box 86; “Cooperation between the Committee of Fourteen and the Surety Companies,” [1916], file: “Surety Companies,” box 20; all C14. The Committee of Fourteen turned to the surety companies rather than the Excise Department because the latter had no discretionary power. Its commissioners could revoked licenses, but they could not refuse to issue a license. See Committee of Fourteen to Albert J. Hopkins, 6 July 1910, box 1, C14.

76. Fritz Laelzer to the Committee of Fourteen, 28 Sept. 1916, file: “Lenox Ave.–Lexington Ave.,” box 17; John Rafferty to the Committee of Fourteen, 13 Sept. 1911, box 1; Proprietor of 27 East 22nd Street to the Committee of Fourteen, 30 Sept. 1913, file: “Abington Sq.–Bradhurst Ave.,” box 17; Bobby Moore to the Committee of Fourteen, 26 Sept. 1916, file: “West 4th–40th Sts.,” box 17; William Banks to the Committee of Fourteen, 25 Sept. 1914, file: “West 4th–40th Sts.,” box 17; Proprietor of 520 Eighth Avenue to the Committee of Fourteen, 2 Sept. 1914, file: “Eighth Ave. #22-989,” box 17; all C14.
77. See the various “Excise” files that comprise most of box 20 in the C14 records.  
78. Contrary to the popular stereotype, there were a number of women saloon proprietors. For example, between Oct. 1906 and Nov. 1907, 19 percent of the proprietors arrested for liquor-law violations were women (111 men, 28 women, 11 indeterminate). See “Special Sessions,” Oct. 1907; “Special Sessions Cases Disposed Of October 1906 to September 1907, charged with violation of Sec. 322 of the Penal Code and the Liquor Tax Law,” [1907]; both file: “Court of Special Sessions,” box 65, C14.  
79. Bulletin #19, 14 May 1908, vol. 1, box 86; Bulletin #7, 18 May 1907, vol. 1, box 86; Bulletin #3, 22 Mar. 1907, vol. 1, box 86; Bulletin #29, Aug. 1909, vol. 1, box 86; “Cooperation between the Committee of Fourteen and the Surety Companies,” [1916], file: “Surety Companies,” box 20; all C14. The Committee of Fourteen needed the surety companies because the courts often decided in the favor of proprietors charged with liquor-law violations. For example, between Oct. 1906 and Nov. 1907, the Excise Department brought 142 cases of liquor-law violations to the Special Sessions Court. In 64 percent of these cases, the proprietors were able to keep their liquor licenses and, equally importantly, retain the right to acquire one the following year. See “Special Sessions”; “Special Sessions Cases Disposed Of October 1906 to September 1907”, both C14.  
82. George Kneeland to Frederick H. Whitin, 5 June 1911, box 1; J. Frank Chase to Frederick H. Whitin, 14 Sept. 1917, box 4; Frederick H. Whitin to Robbins Gilman, 31 Dec. 1917, box 4; “Surety Companies,” 26 Oct. 1912, file: “Surety Companies,” box 20; all C14; Waterman, Prostitution and Its Repression, 104–107. See also Duis, Saloon, for a comparison of saloon reform in Boston and Chicago.  
87. State Report on the Chicago Police System as Made by the Committee of Inves-
tigation Appointed by the 40th General Assembly, Special Session, 1897–1898 (Springfield, IL, 1898), 3, 10, reprinted in Chicago Police Investigations, 3; Lloyd Wendt and Herman Kogan, Lords of the Levee: The Story of Bathhouse John and Hinky Dink (Indianapolis, 1943), 115–116; Fogelson, Big-City Police, 5, 8–9.


89. Piper, Report of an Investigation, 15.


93. Vice Commission of Chicago, Social Evil, 5–4; “Vice Commission to Clean Chicago,” Survey 23 (26 Mar. 1910): 961–962; Barnes, “Story of the Committee of Fifteen of Chicago,” 146–147. The following were members of the Chicago Vice Commission: Dr. W. L. Baum, Mr. David Blaustein, Father James F. Callaghan, Dr. Anna Dwyer, Dr. W. A. Evans, Father Albert Everst, Rev. Dr. Frank W. Gunsaulus, Mr. W. W. Hallam, Dr. Abram W. Harris, Dr. William Healy, Prof. James M. Hyde, Mrs. Ellen M. Henrotin, Rabbi Abram Hirschberg, Father E. A. Kelly, Rev. John G. Kircher, Mr. Louis O. Kohtz, Mr. P. J. O’Keefe, Judge Harry Olson, Judge Merritt W. Pinckney, Mr. Alexander Robertson, Mr. Julius Rosenwald, Dr. Louis E. Schmidt, Bishop C. T. Shaffer, Hon. Edwin W. Sims, Edward M. Skinner, Dean Walter T. Sumner, Prof. Graham Taylor, Prof. W. I. Thomas, Prof. Herbert L. Willett, and Hon. John L. Whitman. When Prof. Hyde died, Prof. Charles R. Henderson replaced him. See Vice Commission of Chicago, Social Evil, 2, 7–8.


27. [Newark Citizens’ Committee], Report, 64.
30. For a definition of “parlor house,” see Vice Commission of Philadelphia, A Report on Existing Conditions with Recommendations to the Honorable Rudolph Blankenburg, Mayor of Philadelphia ([Philadelphia], 1913), 6–7; [Newark Citizens’ Committee], Report, 35.
33. For descriptions of brothel parlors, see [Lancaster Citizens’ Committee], Report, 25; [Little Rock Vice Commission], Report of the Little Rock Vice Commission, May 20, 1918; And the Order of Mayor Chas. E. Taylor to Close All Resorts in Little Rock by August 25, 1913 ([Little Rock, AR], 1913), 9; Frost, Gentlemen’s Club, 52–53, 60, 85, 108–111.
34. Madams could buy beer wholesale at $0.05 a pint, but they sold it as high as $1.00 a pint. See [Portland, OR Vice Commission], Report, 24, 28, 40. See also Vice Commission of Chicago, Social Evil, 111.


43. *Sporting and Club House Directory; Blue Book Collection; George J. Knee-


52. [Portland, OR Vice Commission], *Report*, 62.


54. [Portland, OR Vice Commission], *Report*, 22.


57. Wisconsin Vice Committee, *Report*, 59; [Hartford Vice Commission], *Report*,...


60. [Lancaster Citizens’ Committee], *Report*, 50.


72. Quote from Erenberg, Steppin’ Out, 150. See also Vice Commission of Philadelphia, Report, 72; Bowen, Public Dance Halls, 4; Peiss, Cheap Amusements, 101–102.

73. [Citizens’ Committee of Portland, ME], First Report, 12; Vice Commission of Philadelphia, Report, 72.

74. [Citizens’ Committee of Portland, ME], First Report, 13. See also [Social Survey Commission of Toronto], Report, 50; Bridgeport Vice Commission, Report, 40.

75. Bridgeport Vice Commission, Report, 40; [Citizens’ Committee of Portland, ME], First Report, 23; [Moral Survey Committee], Social Evil in Syracuse, 45.


77. [Lancaster Citizens’ Committee], Report, 51–53. See also [Law and Order League of Charleston, SC], Special Report, 27, 60–61.


80. “Arthur E. Wilson States”; Quan Yick Nam; both NYC15; Story #449, Kehillah; [Lancaster Citizens’ Committee], Report, 52; [Executive Committee], Vice Conditions in Elmira, 36.

81. [Newark Citizens’ Committee], Report, 62. See also “Report of J. Kreisworth,” NYC15; Story #11; Story #12; both Kehillah; [Little Rock Vice Commission], Report, 25; [Portland, OR Vice Commission], Report, 127–129; Foster, Pops Foster, 34.

82. [Vice Commission of Minneapolis], Report, 110.

84. “Hoyt’s ‘A Stranger in New York’: A woman is always as old as she looks, but a man is as old as he feels” (Cincinnati, 1897), poster, card #var1994000929/PP, TPC; [Moral Survey Committee], Social Evil in Syracuse, 19, 34.

85. [Moral Survey Committee], Social Evil in Syracuse, 47; [Portland, OR Vice Commission], Report, 28; “Scarlet World,” Sunday Sun, 31 Jan. 1904, 4; Rose, Storyville, 137, 139–140. See also Arceneaux, “Guidebooks to Sin,” 397–405.

86. Clarke, “Report for Jacksonville, Fla.,” 2; Bridgeport Vice Commission, Report, 45; Frost, Gentlemen’s Club, 134–137.

87. Edgar Selden and Herbert Ingraham, “You Needn’t Go to College if You’ve Been to College Inn” (New York, 1911), sheet music, item 186, box 154a, LSLC. See also Percy Gaunt and Charles H. Hoyt, “The Bowery,” I Wants to Be a Actor Lady, liner notes, 13.


89. [Portland, OR Vice Commission], Report, 27. See also Vice Commission of Philadelphia, Report, 75; [Newark Citizens’ Committee], Report, 42; Bowen, “Dance Halls,” 385; Rosen, Lost Sisterhood, 106–107; Frost, Gentlemen’s Club, 100; Chauncey, Gay New York, 61.

90. Story #113, “Rosie Hertz,” 14 Oct. 1912, Kehillah; [Portland, OR Vice Commission], Report, 25, 35; Kneeland, Commercialized Prostitution, 81; Johnson, Autobiography; Asbury, Barbary Coast, 225; Foster, Pops Foster, 33; Rose, Storyville, 40–42; Rosen, Lost Sisterhood, 87–88.
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