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Intimidated from leaving the house [of prostitution], forced to submit her person to the last indignity that can be inflicted upon a woman, here she was a slave as was ever any negro upon Virginian soil.¹

On 2 January 1880, Alfred Stace Dyer, a publisher and opponent of state-regulated prostitution, wrote to the *Daily News* to expose the fact that young English girls were immured in the licensed brothels of the near Continent. With this, the phenomenon of sex trafficking entered popular consciousness in England and the country’s anti-trafficking movement was inaugurated. The domestic campaign against the regulation of prostitution, led by the revered women’s rights activist Josephine Butler, had been the prime force in England’s fight against systematic female sexual exploitation since 1869. The anti-trafficking movement, in contrast, was, and would continue to be, dominated by men.

The leaders of the new movement predicated their rhetoric on distinct concepts of domesticity, masculine duty, and nationhood. Configurations of these concepts formed the ideological bedrock of dominant representations of sex trafficking during the first chapter of anti-trafficking activism in England between 1880 and 1912 (the year in which the Criminal Law Amendment (CLA) Bill that was promoted as the country’s first anti-trafficking measure was being debated). Employing variations of the doctrine of social purity, the leaders represented themselves as archetypal ‘fathers’ who, by defending the nation’s daughters from trafficking, were preserving English domesticity, the moral fabric of society, and ultimately the welfare of the nation and empire. They promoted the need for other ‘ordinary men’ to follow their lead and help repel what they urged was a profound racial threat to national interests. Amid controversy over the 1912 CLA Bill, certain male activists subverted these notions through discourses that condemned anti-trafficking advocates, and turned ‘the home’ into a contested terrain for the men engaging with the question of sex trafficking. They cast particular organizations that were campaigning against trafficking as the real threat to English
womanhood and domesticity, and positioned themselves, the (male) critics of anti-trafficking protest, as the true heads of household and guardians of national interests.

The centrality of concepts of masculine domesticity in dominant discourses of sex trafficking, I argue in this article, had important consequences. It caused a repressive politics of patriarchy to prevail in key portrayals of trafficking that exalted ‘the respectable white English male’ above all others. Specifically, it caused representations that progressively stigmatized the victims of trafficking, marginalized women, and demonized certain ‘foreigners’ to accompany – and detract from – the practical inroads that were made by the country’s anti-trafficking movement throughout the period.

Literature on the history of sex trafficking in England does not engage with the theme of domesticity in key representations of trafficking. Nor does it engage to any great extent with the notions of masculinity in these representations. The few in depth studies that have been conducted on the portrayal of sex trafficking in English history focus on the construction of victimhood and the ways in which male activists used notions of femininity to represent trafficked women in particular moments of the period 1880–1912. As a consequence, scholarly interest has been devoted to the discourses of ‘white slavery’, which were typically mobilized by anti-trafficking advocates to cast trafficking as a crime perpetrated on passive, unsuspecting young women. Mary-Ann Irwin probes the interconnected ideas of race and gender that activists used to cast ‘the white slave’ as a suffering innocent in both the first trafficking scandal and the revelations of domestic juvenile prostitution exposed by journalist WT Stead in ‘The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon’ articles for the Pall Mall Gazette in 1885. Jo Doezema looks into the political implications of the portrayal of ‘the white slave’ in late-nineteenth century Britain and the United States. She demonstrates that ‘white slavery’ rhetoric served to draw a moral distinction between consenting and non-consenting trafficked women, and so forge an enduring definition of ‘the good trafficking victim’ that stigmatized women who elected to engage in migratory sex work. Taking a different tack, Ian C. Fletcher examines the ways in which the gendered plight of ‘the white slave’ was embraced or eschewed by the groups comprising the women’s suffrage and the socialist movements to muster support for their respective
causes during the debate over the 1912 CLA Bill. He thereby pays valuable attention to a variety of prominent women’s, as well as men’s representations of ‘white slavery’, and illuminates some key rhetoric struggles of the day over the issue of trafficking.4

Beyond the construction of ‘the white slave’ and her plight, however, we know little about the ways in which activists configured their discourses to convince the English public that trafficking was an issue of great importance. Helen J. Self, Julia Laite and others have pointed to the significance of sexualized xenophobia in early twentieth-century organizational representations of trafficked women, and the relationship reformers drew between trafficking and ‘unwanted’ foreign immigration.5 No one, though, has fully grappled with the question of how trafficking was elevated to the status of a national problem. Pursuing this line of inquiry stands to tell us a great deal about the complex mesh of ideas and ‘rhetorical levers’ that made portrayals of trafficking ‘work’, and about the wider cultural significance of trafficking in England at given moments. We also know little about how the discourses of ‘white slavery’ (or any other form of discourses of trafficking) changed across the years under consideration. This needs to be addressed so that we can understand the different core ideas, rhetorical devices, and politics that characterised key responses to trafficking over time, when and why dominant representations of trafficking were reconfigured, and with what implications to the portrayal of sexual exploitation in England.

In this article, I endeavour to begin filling these gaps. I explore the ways in which three self-styled ‘ordinary men’ of the nation who played central roles in the debate over sex trafficking at key moments between 1880 and 1912, mobilized notions of patriotic domesticity in their respective discourses to appeal to, and rally support from, the English public. The first of these men is Alfred Stace Dyer, the leader of the country’s first anti-trafficking campaign between 1880 and 1885. The second is William Alexander Coote, the head of the National Vigilance Association (NVA) and founder of the first international anti-trafficking taskforce, the English-led International Bureau for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic (hereafter International Bureau) whose nascent phase spanned from 1899 to c.1909. The third man is A. Neil Lyons, an outspoken socialist critic of the
furore over ‘white slavery’ that developed during the debate over the 1912 CLA Bill. As well as outlining the nature of sex trafficking and anti-trafficking protest in England at the moment in which he was writing, I examine the linkage that each activist drew between ‘the man’ (be it, himself or another), ‘the home’, race, ‘the nation’, and ‘the empire’ in his discourses. I analyse what the linkage reveals about the way in which trafficking was portrayed, and the ideologies that underpinned key responses to trafficking at that moment. Further, I trace what the three discourses reveal about how, and with what consequences such portrayals and ideologies changed across the period.

**Alfred Stace Dyer**

At the time of England’s first sex trafficking scandal in 1880, Alfred Stace Dyer was a publisher specialising in work on moral questions and the Secretary of the Friends’ Association for Abolishing State Regulation of Vice. Despite being active in a number of radical causes, he was perhaps an unlikely leader of the country’s nascent anti-trafficking campaign. He was a working-class man in a middle-class dominated reformist milieu, and ‘from his boyhood was of frail physique’. Indeed, his involvement with the issue of trafficking came about more by luck than judgment. In autumn 1879, Dyer had heard from an acquaintance about an English minor detained in a Belgian brothel. He quickly set about making inquiries, and, with the help of Josephine Butler, the leader of both the domestic campaign for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts and the British division of the International Federation for the Abolition of State Regulation of Vice, he co-ordinated the girl’s repatriation. Dyer wrote his letter to the *Daily News* and sparked heated debate in the press over the existence of a Continental traffic in English girls.

In Belgium and France prostitution was tightly regulated by the state and constituted a ‘guaranteed industry’. It was illegal to coerce a girl under twenty-one to become a prostitute (even though the age of consent was in line with Britain at thirteen). In Britain, however, where prostitution was only regulated in certain towns and not so as to license the practice per se, it was perfectly legal to induce a girl over the age of thirteen into prostitution at home or abroad. Moreover, while it
constituted a misdemeanour to abduct a girl under sixteen, the law did not afford girls between sixteen and twenty-one any protection. Therefore, English girls were particularly susceptible to being trafficked to meet the demand created in the centres of licensed prostitution across the Channel. Brothel keepers in Belgium and France would evade prosecution for having girls under the age of twenty-one working on their premises by coercing them to give false ages, and often false names, when registering as prostitutes. Brothel madams frequently supplied underage English girls with counterfeit passports to give weight to their claims.⁷

Well aware of this, Dyer formed the London Committee for the Exposure and Suppression of the Traffic in English Girls for Purposes of Continental Prostitution, with his male City friends, Butler, and some other repeal advocates. He and two fellow activists embarked on an investigatory trip to Belgium where they confirmed that English girls were indeed being detained in licensed brothels.⁸ The London Committee began a protracted process of lobbying the English government for action against trafficking, and Dyer published what became a widely distributed pamphlet, *The European Slave Trade in English Girls* to highlight the Committee’s cause. Yet the government was not persuaded to act. Eventually, thanks to a letter written by Butler to the repeal campaign periodical *The Shield* that implicated the Belgian authorities in trafficking, the government commissioned an inquiry that subsequently confirmed Dyer and Butler’s allegations.⁹ In 1881, a Select Committee was appointed to investigate ‘the law relating to the protection of young girls’ and, the following year, a CLA Bill was introduced, which advocated raising the age of consent to sixteen. The bill was finally passed in 1885, largely due to the influence of Stead’s ‘The Maiden Tribute’ revelations.¹⁰

Concepts of masculine domestic duty and, specifically, a ‘patriotic fatherhood’ ran through Dyer’s discourses during the first trafficking scandal. They were integral to both the reformer’s claims to authority within the country’s campaign against trafficking and his pleas for public action. In his core rhetoric, Dyer co-opted notions derived from evangelical Christianity concerning the importance to society of righteous domesticity, the significance of ‘the man’ as a defender of his household and provider for his dependents, and the significance of ‘the woman’ as a child-bearer and
spiritual leader of the family. These had purchase, if only in theory, in 1880s bourgeois circles. He positioned himself as not only the founding father of the English anti-trafficking movement, but also a model father figure. He was performing his natural patriotic duty by chivalrously protecting the nation’s daughters from the men generating trafficking and, in turn, protecting individual English homes, and English society as constituted by the sum of those homes, from moral corruption.

Dyer exhibited many of these ideas in his controversial letter to *The Daily News*. Introducing his cause to the English public, he mobilized what would become a characteristic juxtaposition of ‘the respectable English home’ and ‘the Continental house of prostitution’ to emphasize the purity and value of the former against the immorality and danger of the latter:

Not five months ago a virtuous young English woman was courted in London by a man of gentlemanly exterior, who promised her marriage if she would accompany him for that purpose to Brussels. Inexperienced in the world, only 19 years of age, and away from the home of her parents, she was induced to take the offer...Arrived in Brussels, the young woman was taken direct to a licensed house of ill-fame... Intimidated from leaving the house, forced to submit her person to the last indignity that can be inflicted upon a woman, here she was a slave as was ever any negro upon Virginian soil. Meanwhile, in a little country home in the south of England, her mother felt that her own heart was breaking, as no news came from her lost child, and the father went about his daily toil assured that his life was being shortened by the great sorrow that had fallen upon him.

Dyer proceeded to explain how he coordinated the repatriation of the girl, before stating, ‘[i]t is impossible to tell how many daughters of respectable parents have gone abroad under false representations and are now imprisoned in houses of ill-fame... My object in communicating these sad facts is to put parents and others on their guard...’
Importantly, Dyer cast his ‘fatherly duty’ as being of national importance by using ideas of race to conceptualize the crime of trafficking. Firstly, rather than attributing sex trafficking to the system of regulated prostitution, and the victimization of certain English girls to the failings of English law, Dyer portrayed trafficking as the product of a targeted attack, generated by the male patrons of Continental brothels, that threatened every member of England’s pure female population. The idea that a woman or girl could consent to enter into prostitution, yet could still be subjected to sexual exploitation and coercion, simply did not occur to him. Reconfiguring the ‘Old Corruption’ argument of English radical tradition that admonished ‘the debased aristocrat’ for preying on working-class girls, and also invoking deep-rooted ideas of French decadence, Dyer depicted ‘wealthy Continental debauchés’ as the chief agents of trafficking because they instinctively craved English girlhood, the world’s purest and most coveted flesh. In his pamphlet he scaremongered, charging that these men compelled ‘the keepers of licensed houses of prostitution [to] enter into costly researches for new, and if possible, perfectly innocent victims; and hence also, English-speaking girls, who are perhaps the most valuable because the most in request by [them]’.

Dyer went further. He suggested that the wealthy men of Belgium and France were those generating trafficking simply because they could afford the price attached to English girlhood, and that, in effect, all Continental men had ‘brutal lusts’ and craved such ‘premium merchandise’. Tellingly, Dyer subjected the (male) procurers and pimps of the Continent to relatively little criticism. He focused any scorn on the fact that they pandered to ‘debauchés’ inborn perversion. Similarly, while condemning the Belgian and French states for facilitating the exploitation of his countrywomen through the regulation of prostitution, he indicted only a few individual state functionaries for their role in serving the wealthy men who craved sex with young English girls.

Secondly, Dyer depicted the abuse of pure English girlhood through sex trafficking as of unparalleled severity and danger to national life. Turning the term ‘white slavery’ into a racially-charged metaphor, he condemned the treatment of his countrywomen through trafficking as ‘infinitely more cruel and revolting than negro servitude [of old], because it is slavery not for labour but for lust;
and more cowardly than negro slavery, because it falls on the young and helpless of one sex only’. English girls were, he emphasized, ‘[at threat] from being decoyed and sold into the cruellest and most indecent...slavery that the world has ever known’. In so doing, he rehearsed many of the basic arguments that had been mobilized by activists rallying against the ‘white slavery’ of English labourers during the Factory Agitation of the 1820s to 1840s. He deployed long-standing notions of the superior entitlement of English subjects as members of the pre-eminent ‘anti-slavery’ nation, whilst casting black slaves, who of course had been emancipated through government intervention, as a maltreated yet less worthy ‘race apart’. Dyer established his particular slavery analogy to achieve a clear rhetoric goal. He wanted to convey to the English public that trafficking represented an exceptional atrocity because it entailed the sexual enslavement of England’s daughters, the most innocent and vulnerable of English subjects, and, by implication, precipitated the moral and physical corruption of the nation’s future mothers and homemakers. He pointed to the relationship between trafficking and the subversion of domesticity in his pamphlet, lamenting, ‘six months from entering into such a house [of prostitution], every vestige of womanhood is gone’ in English trafficking victims, ‘and the pure and lovely girl from six months before, becomes literally a wild beast’. His message was plain: Sex work, forced or otherwise, turned even the ‘(white) English rose’ into something less than human – an uncivilized ‘race apart’ – that had no place in a respectable home, and no place in national life.

When he described the danger of trafficking to the nation, Dyer was suggesting the danger of trafficking to the British Empire at large. He wrote in a climate of growing inter-European imperial competition, and a climate in which, as Robert J.C. Young suggests, ‘the [perceived] differences between European races and their national characteristics were increasingly emphasized’. Through his condemnation of ‘Continental debauchés’ for striving to sexually enslave his countrywomen, Dyer evoked the threat posed by sex trafficking to England’s status as a superior imperial power. After all, England’s daughters were seen as not only the guarantors of respectable English domesticity and the nation’s next generation, but also, according to the increasing prevalence of Social Darwinist ideas in
the conceptualization of the British Empire, the guarantors of the ‘imperial race’. Their sexual domination and adulteration by the men of rival nations could, according to this logic, only emasculate England on the world stage.

Thus, to Dyer, it was not simply a few English homes that were under threat from sex trafficking (or, at least, his definition of sex trafficking). It was the very fabric of English society, English civilization, and English superiority. In marking out his fatherly credentials, Dyer expressly defined himself in opposition to the freedom-denying ‘Continental debauché’ as an exemplary, morally (and sexually) normal male subject. In his eyes, he was performing his ‘domestic duty’ as a patriotic Englishman by protecting the bodies, the purity and, fundamentally, the liberty of the whole country’s girlhood. With it, he protected the essence of what made his nation great.

Dyer effectively inaugurated the country’s anti-trafficking movement, and raised unprecedented public awareness of sex trafficking. However, in portraying himself as a certain type of father figure, he made such inroads at the expense of the very fight he championed, and at the expense of many of the groups he co-opted into his rhetoric. He cast sex trafficking in particular, and serious sexual exploitation in general, as an assault on English domesticity rooted in the natural superiority of the nation’s girlhood and the innate inferiority of Belgian and French men. Moreover, he articulated the severity of this assault by not only criminalizing ‘Continental types’ but also downplaying the suffering and civilization of exploited people of colour. Women and girls, especially of the working classes, fared little better. Despite extolling the virtues of English femininity, Dyer marked them out as helpless ‘victims-in-waiting’ whose destinies were in the hands of men and whose worth was located primarily in the physical. The principal male actors of his discourses, by contrast, excepting the sorrowful father of the trafficking victim, were marked as either valiant fatherly rescuers (as in Dyer’s self-representation) or loathsome defilers who had the power to save or ruin the day. National difference, which Dyer also took to be racial difference, was portrayed as the determinant of the fate of each sex – that is, before trafficking had the chance to upset the ‘natural
order’ of things and tarnish the superiority of English girls. This rule was not applied universally. To Dyer, black slaves were merely members of an uncivilized homogenous category.

William Alexander Coote

By the 1890s, amid mass migration from Europe following the Long Depression and the increasing persecution of Jews in and beyond Imperial Russia, sex trafficking had become a global phenomenon. Hundreds of women travelled from Continental Europe to destinations including Johannesburg, Calcutta and Buenos Aires under the auspices of third parties, to sell sex in a lucrative multiethnic and multidenominational trafficking industry. Some were duped into being trafficked. Some accepted a procurer’s ‘job offer’ knowingly. Many, regardless of initial consent, were later exposed to sexual abuse and coercion. Of the 6,413 women who registered as prostitutes in Buenos Aires between 1889 and 1901, 4,361 originated from Europe, with 1,211 coming from Russia alone. England became a prime conduit for traffickers, playing host to the major passenger ports of Hull, London, Southampton, and Liverpool. The country also housed two of the world’s leading anti-trafficking initiatives run by the social purity groups, the NVA and the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women (JAPGW). These groups, which were both founded in 1885, had, by the late 1890s, developed into truly international anti-trafficking taskforces. The JAPGW ran, or helped establish, a number of Jewish anti-trafficking groups at key global trafficking destinations. The multidenominational NVA, meanwhile, played a key role in founding both the International Congress for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic and the Congress’ permanent body, the International Bureau, in 1899. The latter quickly became a global taskforce with an impressive range of national committees.

William Alexander Coote, a former compositor and a devout Christian who, like Dyer, had a working-class upbringing, was the leader of the NVA and, effectively, also the leader of the new global anti-trafficking movement. After a divine vision, he had overseen the inauguration of the Congress and made sure that his association was dominant in the International Bureau. The Bureau
comprised five of the most influential men from the NVA’s Executive Committee, with a few representatives from other member nations sewn on for good measure. This gave Coote a considerable power base. The Bureau was the nexus of the new taskforce through which all information on trafficking was passed, and to which all national committees were accountable. It strove to obtain multilateral government co-operation and to secure suppressive international legislation, whilst distancing itself from the campaign against state-regulated prostitution.

With sex trafficking now a truly global phenomenon, the sort of claims made by Dyer to fatherly authority could no longer stand. Certainly, Coote, in a manner reminiscent of Dyer, suggested himself to be the ‘visionary father’ of the nascent global anti-trafficking movement, as well as a tireless paternal defender of the daughters and the households of his ‘international family’. He defined trafficking, for the most part, as the victimization of flighty, credulous yet innocent foreign girls by amorphous ‘foreign’ forces within England. In so doing, he echoed ideas of the danger of working-class female independence that Sally Ledger suggests were fanned in turn-of-the-century England by working women’s militant trade unionism. In 1907, he emphasized the value of the anti-trafficking work he oversaw at the nation’s railway stations to English domesticity:

Here [at the station] the young woman, who, rebelling against her conception of the undue restraint of home, has run away, and is now taking her first steps to so-called freedom…[Here]…if they are strangers in the city,[they] wend their weary way in the hope of help. Especially is this so in regard to foreign young women. It is their only landmark. There, they fully realized that they had left home…

Coote, however, represented himself as a different type of father figure to Dyer. He, perhaps surprisingly, positioned himself as a ‘normal man’ who was conferring an exemplary patriotic service to English domesticity and society by helping to shield the nation’s sons, and thereby its daughters, from the foreign women who were engaged in organized sex work in the country. These women, in
his eyes, were wayward others who had been trafficked into England knowing that they would enter prostitution, or who had migrated to England of their own volition to sell sex. Defining society as not only the sum of English households but also, in itself, a domestic unit, Coote cast himself as defending the nation from the ‘malign influence’ of such working-class foreign prostitutes (regardless of whether or not they had technically been trafficked). His solution was to get such ‘undesirable foreigners’ to go back to their own homes. The NVA did recognize that women who ‘do know, before they start, what business they are going into’ were caught up in ‘practically an immoral international traffic in human flesh’. However, Coote accorded them little sympathy because of what he saw as their electively vicious ways, and failed to recognize the abuse they might sustain.

Significantly, although Coote referred to the role of foreign traffickers and pimps, or as he cast them, ‘the male parasites of evil’, when outlining his fatherly duty, he placed more importance on checking ‘the fearful menace to the social life of the community at large’ caused by women who had entered the country ‘for the sole purpose of carrying on the business of prostitution’.

The Englishmen who used the services of prostitutes, meanwhile, were altogether spared the kind of censure directed towards the foreign sex worker. Concern was instead being expressed for their well-being. Coote thus departed from Dyer’s emphasis on the culpability of the male customers of trafficked women, interpreting the ‘Englishness’ of male customers as a marker of their natural respectability, prudence, and, indeed, entitlement as purchasers of sex. The ‘foreignness’ of the trafficked women, meanwhile, was taken as a marker of the type of dangerous debauchery once associated with ‘the Continental profligate’. Curiously, the two activists were united in marginalizing (male) pimps and procurers as ancillary offenders.

Coote set out his ‘fatherly’ stance in his testimony to the 1903 Royal Commission on Alien Immigration (RCAI). The Royal Commission was charged with assessing the impact of immigration amid the influx of poor East European Jews into the East End of London and into English cities including Leeds, Liverpool, and Manchester. The Commission in part prompted the 1905 Aliens Act, which denied entry into the country to, and sanctioned the expulsion of, foreigners who were
impoverished, who had attained serious criminal convictions, or who were in ill-health. Coote emphasized the singular danger of the vice that working-class female foreigners disseminated and suggested that Englishmen who brought this vice home caused wide-ranging detriment to national interests, and especially to English girlhood. It is important to note that his interpretation of sex trafficking and organized prostitution was anti-alienist and xenophobic rather than antisemitic, condemning the influence of ‘vicious foreigners’ rather than ‘vicious Jews’:

Another phase of the foreign woman is that she has introduced into England what is called special forms of vice [sic]…[T]hey are some of the most destructive forms of vice and you must remember these forms of vice are brought in contact with our young men, who are simply demoralized, body, soul and spirit. Our English girls do not understand that sort of thing, because simple prostitution, from my experience, will not pay…[W]e should have the power to repatriate women of this class, who come here simply for the purpose of pursuing this occupation. It is not that they err or slip into it, but they come deliberately to carry on this business, which is inimical to the welfare of every section of the community.

This was no small indictment, considering that members of the NVA typically believed that the ‘best thing in this world is a true Christian home, and the most appalling and hellish thing in this world is that which devastates the home and wrecks the life of the family’. In a society still heavily influenced by anxieties over imperial competition and Social Darwinist thought regarding national efficiency and empire, Coote’s assertions about the impact of sex trafficking on English domesticity positioned trafficking as a threat to the country’s status as an imperial power even more forcefully than did Dyer’s discourses. Now, both the male and the female guarantors of England’s prosperity – both the incumbent and the future generation of soldiers,
workers and statesmen, as well as mothers and homemakers – were prone to irredeemable corruption if exposed to the fetid foreign by-products of trafficking.

Coote’s emphasis on ‘the vicious foreign woman’ is symptomatic of the policy pursued by his association. In 1902 an International Agreement on trafficking was forged by Congress members that committed contracting governments to, not least, ‘undertake to have a watch kept…for persons in charge of women and girls destined for an immoral life’, and to arrange the repatriation of trafficked women or, in practice, women engaged in selling sex in a foreign country. The NVA took it upon itself to oversee the implementation of the Agreement in Britain. Through its International Guild of Service for Women, the Association embarked upon a travellers’ aid programme at the country’s ports and railway stations, based not only on providing help upon request for lone foreign female travellers, but also interrogating and intervening to physically and morally guide the girls it deemed susceptible to vice. It also focused on giving ‘unofficial assistance’, by way of persuasion and/or arranging one-way steamer tickets, to get foreign women selling sex in the country to return home.

This focus was given impetus when, under the 1905 Aliens Act, magistrates were granted unrestricted power to force the immediate repatriation of foreign prostitutes. Foreigners found guilty of serious prostitution-related offences were liable to expulsion under the new law and the NVA continued to assist in the prosecution of individual traffickers. However, much like the group’s propaganda, the practical anti-trafficking programme pursued by the NVA came to focus principally on facilitating the removal of ‘undesirable foreign women’ from the country. Indeed, Coote and his colleagues had long called for immigration restriction, and drafted the section concerning ‘criminal aliens’ in what they termed the ‘Undesirable Aliens Act’.

Yet, through his self-portrayal as an exemplary ‘national father figure’, Coote did more than support the Restrictionist cause. He also, whether intentionally or not, strengthened its ideological foundations. Coote operated in a society in which anti-alienist propaganda directed at ‘the male pauper alien’ was rife. Anti-alienists such as Arnold White drew upon Social Darwinist ideas (and, in White’s case, Antisemitic calumny) to decry these newcomers as moral and physical degenerates
who, through their displacement of English labour, their contribution to overcrowding in the East End, as well as their innately corruptive properties, represented ‘a danger menacing to national life’. Anti-alienists, moreover, explicitly drew links in their rhetoric between the health of the nation and the health of the empire, with White warning that the ‘malaise’ inflicted by alien immigrants upon London, would, given the city’s status as the heart of the empire, dramatically weaken England’s potency as an imperial power.\textsuperscript{37} In casting ‘the vicious foreign woman’ as a depraved outsider who both gravitated towards a career in vice and came to the country expressly to pursue this career to the detriment of English domesticity, Coote effectively promoted the extension of these prejudices. He lodged a case for ‘alien women’ being even more blighted and contaminative than ‘alien men’, and reinforced the idea that England was a special target for what the NVA termed the ‘moral refuse of Europe’.\textsuperscript{38} He thus further demonstrated the ‘commonsense’ in the restriction or repatriation of ‘undesirable foreigners’ to safeguard England’s future prosperity both at home and internationally.

Despite the considerable advancements made by the NVA in the domestic campaign against sex trafficking, and despite Coote’s impressive work in forging the International Bureau, trafficking was once again represented by the country’s dominant authority on the subject as a ‘foreign problem’ inflicted upon England. However, this time, it was cast as a problem that was thrust upon England by foreign working-class women and girls who had brought their predicament upon themselves as either naive wayfarers or depraved professional prostitutes. While some culpability was occasionally apportioned to the foreign male trafficker, the onus was placed more determinedly with the sexually exploited. The logic behind this was simple, and the prejudice clear: The greater the level of agency a woman exercised outside the home, in terms of labour and/or sexual relations, the more ‘dangerous’ and culpable for any injury sustained to her person she was – especially if she happened to be foreign and working-class. Trafficked women and girls were criminalized as, at best, half-victims according to their perceived level of innocence (read: lack of independence). (Male) traffickers and pimps, meanwhile, regardless of their class, were implicitly absolved as mere half-criminals. In a departure from the portrayal of trafficking as the burden of ‘the English rose’, working-class English girls were
acknowledged as potential, but unlikely, victims of trafficking compared to their foreign counterparts. Presumably their ‘Englishness’ was deemed to endow them with the moral and intellectual capacity to avoid such danger. English women engaged in selling sex abroad received little attention and less censure. Revealingly, the members of the NVA did not use ‘white slavery’ as a metaphor to condemn the subjugation of ‘pure and innocent’ English women as Dyer had. Instead, they deployed it as a basic term to refer to trafficking. The xenophobia and ethnocentricity that had characterised the dominant representations of sex trafficking during the country’s first trafficking scandal were, in this way, reconfigured, and supplemented with a more misogynistic and bourgeois-centric interpretation of causality.

In the country’s most authoritative discourses of sex trafficking, national difference continued to be constructed as racial difference. However, unlike Dyer’s specific vilification of the Belgian and the French, the dividing line was drawn between the English and the inhabitants of the rest of the world. The nationalities of the participants in trafficking were not ordered into a hierarchy as they had been previously. Working-class French subjects, Russian subjects, German subjects involved in trafficking within the country, whether from Jewish or Christian backgrounds, were lumped into the same category of ‘foreign refuse’. The superiority of the English, meanwhile, was taken as a self-evident truth that did not warrant any justification. Trafficking, in an age in which anti-alienism and social Darwinian ideas of national efficiency had currency, was tacitly positioned as yet another object lesson in why the health of the English social body, and, ultimately, English interests overseas, were under threat from innately inferior, poor foreigners. Anti-trafficking protest, meanwhile, came to represent a channel for the authority of the white, middle-class Englishman, to which the rest of the world had restricted access.

A. Neil Lyons

The bill promoted as the country’s first anti-trafficking measure progressed through parliament at the height of the ‘Edwardian Crisis’. With mounting pressure on the government from
extra-parliamentary campaign groups to act upon the question of Home Rule for Ireland, the rights of labour, and votes for women respectively, the passage of the 1912 CLA Bill was hardly a burning political issue. Yet, the measure – which provided for the arrest without warrant of suspected procurers, harsher penalties for brothel-keepers and souteneurs, including flogging for men in the latter class, action against landlords whose premises were used for prostitution, and the broadening of the definition of solicitation to incorporate women – had a significance beyond its four clauses.39 In the tumultuous political climate, embracing or eschewing a measure such as the CLA Bill for the political mileage it promised became the order of the day. This was particularly true among the groups comprising the women’s suffrage movement and the socialist movement whose members recognized the value of engaging with a question intimately linked to women’s rights and industrial exploitation. Trafficking also became the subject of moral panic and hyperbole like never before largely because of the widespread investment in the debate over the bill.

Supported by the Unionist MP, Arthur Lee, the CLA Bill passed both its second reading in spring 1912 and the committee stage, but, starved of government backing, it was repeatedly blocked. This, and the failure of the 1912 Conciliation Bill, which advocated the extension of the franchise to some propertied women, led many female suffrage groups to advocate the CLA Bill as necessary ‘women’s legislation’. They began promoting the measure as a ‘fitting memorial’ to WT Stead, the man deemed responsible for the 1885 CLA Act, who had died aboard the Titanic days before the CLA Bill failed. A Pass the Bill Committee was quickly launched.40 Following a persuasive deputation by the Women’s Liberal Federation in June and increasing suffragist militancy, the government finally agreed to give facilities to the bill, provided it passed its Second Reading, which it promptly did. That July, the bill was diluted in Committee such that only a policeman above the rank of sergeant could undertake an ‘arrest on suspicion’. This sparked debate among suffrage organizations as well as many socialist groups over the efficacy of the measure, and concern about the repressive consequences of ‘arrests on suspicion’. In October, the government announced its intention to press for the restoration of the original clauses of the CLA Bill. With the passage of the bill
seemingly imminent, particular controversy arose in and outside parliament over the bill’s so-called ‘Flogging Clauses’. Flogging had previously been reserved for incarcerated men who incited mutiny under the 1898 Prisons Act, homosexuals under the 1898 Vagrancy Act, and robbers who deployed considerable violence under the 1863 Garrotters’ Act. The CLA Bill advocated a significant extension of the punishment. By November, the CLA Bill had its first clause reinstated and, after a great deal of debate among parliamentarians over the ‘Flogging Clauses’, the bill passed into law the following month.\textsuperscript{41}

Thus the dominant discourses of sex trafficking switched hands from the leaders of anti-trafficking initiatives to the members of the groups comprising the women’s suffrage and the socialist movements, who engaged with the issue of sex trafficking and the CLA Bill as part of their wider campaigns. A.Neil Lyons was one of the new ‘owners’ of the issue of sex trafficking. A middle-class journalist and author, Lyons was a frequent contributor to the popular independent journal the *Clarion*, which had been founded in 1891 to promote socialism, and which espoused utopian socialist principles (whilst also opposing women’s suffrage).\textsuperscript{42}

In a two-part article for the *Clarion* entitled ‘White Slaves and Nasty Nonsense’, which appeared during the controversy over ‘the Flogging Clauses’ and was soon after published as a pamphlet, Lyons subverted the ideas of domesticity, race, nation, and empire that informed the social purity-based rhetoric of Dyer and Coote. He represented himself as a paternal figure who was doing his patriotic duty by defending his wife and home, and implicitly also all England’s ‘daughters’ and households, as well as all Englishmen, from a direct onslaught by the supporters of the anti-trafficking cause. He did so in an exceptionally scathing critique, centred on the Ladies National Association (LNA), a group that was campaigning against state-regulated prostitution together with championing a number of women’s rights issues – and for no other reason than the LNA happened to be involved in producing a pamphlet advocating the CLA Bill that had been delivered to his home. Importantly, he overlooked the male-led organizations of the anti-trafficking movement.
Lyons’ somewhat counterintuitive focus is revealing, and renders his article an important and insightful discourse to compare with the anti-trafficking rhetoric of Dyer and Coote. In the first lines of ‘White Slaves and Nasty Nonsense’, Lyons identified ‘the National Vigilance Society [sic], or an off-shoot of that morbid institution’ as the party ultimately responsible for the ‘indecent literature’ that was sent to his household. His conviction did not waver. However, upon noting the LNA’s imprint at the foot of the pamphlet, he proceeded to direct his vitriol exclusively at the female group, bemoaning all that was wrong with social purity-based anti-trafficking protest through attacking what was a minor force in the campaign for the CLA Bill. His article reflects the fact that criticisms of the definitions of domesticity, masculinity, and national interests that the leaders of the anti-trafficking movement had forwarded could be projected onto individuals and groups outside the anti-trafficking movement, according to the agenda and biases of particular activists. As will be shown, tensions between and within the socialist and the suffragist movements often underpinned this process, and, particularly in terms of certain socialist condemnations of the CLA Bill, caused misogyny to colour popular representations of sex trafficking like never before.

Terming the bill ‘The Flogging Act’, Lyons painted the ‘puritan ladies’ of the LNA as bourgeois Pecksniffs with persecutory complexes who were rallying for a law against ‘white slavery’ (that is, trafficking as a crime upon non-consenting women) as a ruse to oppress the nation’s men and who, through ‘infiltrating’ the nation’s households, were endeavouring to proselytize English women to the same ‘persecutory disorder’. Lyons did not feel the need to comment on the fact that he was from the same social class as the members of the LNA, nor that he aligned himself with a section of the socialist movement that actively promoted a set of moral and economic reconfigurations that would have required the removal of the privilege of his class. He suggested that it was the members’ status as hypocritically and viciously moralistic, and worse, hypocritically and viciously moralistic women, that made their class position and political goals so objectionable and dangerous. Confusing trafficking with prostitution, and diagnosing the latter as something that could be eradicated only through an economic settlement that allowed women money enough not to sell sex, and men money
enough to marry for love, Lyons cast the flogging of souteneurs and the CLA Bill as a whole as futile. Meanwhile, he painted the members of the LNA as ‘foreigners’ hostile to national life:

These Ladies, Nationally Associated, promoted their purity by thrusting upon my household a vulgar, flamboyant, indecent, and wholly untruthful work of fiction, and by inviting my wife to participate in a meeting ‘For Women Only’ to be held at the public hall of an adjacent village for the purpose of discussing the advisability of whipping men.

...The young women of England – ‘the greatest danger is incurred by girls who come from the most protected homes’ – are described as being in hourly perils...Men and women are said to be lurking at every hand, ready to drug and imprison our wives and daughters.\(^44\)

Lyons went on to diagnose the ‘Pure Ladies’” ‘disease’:

[I]t is evident to me that the Ladies of Tothill Street possess a complex which is composed of certain fixed ideas about whipping, drugging, organized procuration, etc...I am forced to the conclusion that the complex is an exaggerated and unhealthy one...however perfect the process of ‘rationalization’.\(^45\)

Similarly, the author and feminist Rebecca West in a previous *Clarion* article and a ‘Notes of the Week’ piece in the modernist journal, *The New Age*, suggested the CLA Bill was advocated by psychologically-disturbed female activists and/or male parliamentarians who fetishized torturing men.\(^46\)

Lyons’ choice to focus his critique of the LNA and the issue of sex trafficking on the ‘Flogging Clauses’ of the CLA Bill is telling. The brutal corporal punishment of flogging had long been linked to slavery in English popular consciousness, through generations of abolitionist protest.
Notably, flogging was typically gendered as a male punishment, a means of effecting the physical emasculation of a member of the putatively stronger sex and his subordination to his (male) superiors. Moreover, flogging, through its putative link to slavery, was also associated with notions of masculinity and patriotism. The pillar of the labour movement, the British Socialist Party, condemned the CLA Bill’s ‘deadly blow at that personal liberty which has always been regarded as one of the heritages of Englishmen’. In this view, anyone who advocated the flogging of men on English soil was not only inhumane but also automatically antithetical to England’s male population and national life in general. At a time when anti-suffragists were claiming that emancipated women would vie to tyrannize every man, and militant suffragists were producing inflammatory anti-male rhetoric, the fact that female-led groups were among the most vociferous advocates of the CLA Bill was also highly controversial. Fuel was added to the fire because such groups were seemingly endorsing flogging as a solution to ‘white slavery’. Indeed, the Labour Party via The Daily Herald praised Lyons for highlighting the ‘misguided viciousness of the preachers of the White Slave Jehad’. Lyons’ notion of the racial and ideological otherness of the (female) advocates of the CLA Bill, and the acute danger to Englishmen and national interests posed by their vindictive moral belligerence is echoed forcefully in this suggestion that those protesting against ‘white slavery’ were conducting their campaign as if they were Muslims warring against unbelievers.

Further, Lyons’ references to the psychological and the sexual are salient. He was writing when the pseudo-scientific discipline of sexology was gaining currency in progressive bourgeois circles, and putatively criminal or subversive sexual behaviour outside ‘hetero-normative’ unions was being classified in terms of mental pathology, biological dysfunction, and, ultimately, racial degeneracy. Indeed, theories of pathological typologies of female sexuality provided a language for popular misogyny and particularly anti-suffragist rhetoric. Writing to The Times in 1912 on ‘militant hysteria’, the outspoken anti-suffragist Sir Almroth Wright proclaimed, ‘[f]or man the physiology and psychology of woman is full of difficulties. He is not a little mystified when he encounters in her periodically recurring phases of hypersensitiveness, unreasonableness, and loss of
the sense of proportion’. Lyons was also writing when sexologists were focusing attention on flagellation itself, a punishment that had long been the subject of anxiety in political, medical and reform circles regarding its application in schools, the armed forces, and the penal system. Flogging thus came to be categorized as rooted in pathological sexual deviance and, significantly, a deviance related to perverse female sexuality and/or homosexuality, particularly among ‘the better classes of society’. The desire to flog was branded ‘Flagellomania’ and its ‘pathology’ carried weight as scientific fact.

Lyons was not the only contributor to the debate over the CLA Bill. While harbouring reservations about the measure, the country’s main women’s suffrage groups advocated the bill as a necessary stop-gap provision ahead of emancipation to check the abuses of a ‘male state’. The Labour Party and the Independent Labour Party endorsed the bill as a means of protecting women ahead of laws to establish a fairer economic distribution. However, the fact that Lyons’ piece for the popular Clarion journal played a part in the debate is highly significant. It contributed to trafficking being linked in the public eye, to some extent, with fallacy and fantasy and packaged as a symptom of the mental or moral malaise of reactionary middle-class conservatives with axes to grind and fancies to tickle. It positioned trafficking as a complex to be scrutinized, explained and warned against by ‘sane’ paternal authority figures in the interests of a healthy society. Perhaps most problematically, it tacitly advocated that trafficking be downgraded from a sexual crime perpetrated against women to a problem fabricated by women to live out a slavish, sexualized obsession to persecute and ‘enslave’ men. Trafficking was classified as the subject of a faddish and violent sex war – the latest excuse for deviance – that was dangerous, physically as well as morally, but not as much to women as to true men, to the masculinized body politic and to the nation at large. In what was a key discourse on sex trafficking, the plight of ‘the trafficked woman’ was thereby plunged further into obscurity and the value of ‘the white middle-class male visionary’ underlined. Anti-trafficking protest, meanwhile, was portrayed as the pursuit of hypocritical female tyrants from the very class that profited from the
industrial exploitation that was precipitating organized vice. It was, moreover, portrayed as a pursuit that was devoid of credibility due to both its danger to men and its superfluity to the nation’s women.

Conclusion

The anti-trafficking movement that developed in England over the period 1880–1912 was influential in making the fight against sex trafficking a serious national and international cause. It raised public awareness of the crime, and implemented a multifaceted, countrywide preventive programme. It helped pressure the government to act against trafficking and paved the way for the anti-trafficking initiatives pursued by the United Nations today.

However, the way in which sex trafficking was represented by key voices both within and outside the movement led to the issue of trafficking becoming inextricably linked with a series of assumptions and prejudices that fundamentally contradicted the movement’s self-professed commitment to suppressing sex trafficking in all its forms and providing succour for all people victimized by the crime. Dyer, Coote, and Lyons’ respective discourses of sex trafficking provide a powerful insight into the fundamental role of notions of masculinity, domesticity, race, nation, and empire in this process. Depictions of manly duty to ‘the home’, whether as a domestic unit or as the country at large, provided a powerful means for each of the three activists to, in his own way, persuade the English public to view sex trafficking as a pressing problem that required compassion and support. Yet they allowed each to forcefully define sex trafficking as a ‘national problem’ with a special bearing on England – a peculiar assault upon the country by vicious ‘outsiders’ – whose chief victims were respectable Englishmen and women. They thus facilitated authoritative misrepresentations of what was (and is) a broad transnational phenomenon determined largely by socio-economic, rather than national or ‘racial’ difference.

Looking at the broader picture, the three activists’ contributions to framing the issue of sex trafficking suggest the profound political power of configurations of masculine domesticity in turn-of-the-century England. They suggest the ability of such configurations to stir national sympathy and
to highlight injustices, to define sexual danger, and to justify forms of activism. Perhaps most importantly, they suggest the ability of configurations of masculine domesticity to endorse a politics of belonging, and to, literally, bring home ideas of who should and who should not play an active role in English national life.
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