Introduction

In this introduction we essentially address the Victorian Age and woman's role in this era. Many concepts surge from this most interesting topic. Woman's role as mother, as wife, as daughter and even her womanhood are analysed through the diverging spheres of her existence and her place within a male dominated society. This dissertation intends to contrast the double standard with which women were faced in the 1800's. First of all, we propose a general introduction about broad concepts related to the Victorian woman and then aim to explore the conditions that led to and forged the initiative of feminist¹ thought through the works of Josephine Butler namely Social Purity (1879) and Truth Before Everything (1897). Other feminist theorists will be also approached in order to expand on the essential ideas proposed by Butler and her legacy.

This introduction focuses primarily on the role of women in Victorian society, however to be able to categorize this well known era, it is important to refer to it historically. There is much argument as to what is considered as the Victorian era in terms of historical dates. Some will argue that it is linked to the reign of Queen Victoria, the Queen of the British Empire from 1837 to the end of the century. But the Victorian era is much more; it can be considered as an institution within itself of moral

¹ Feminist: A person who believes in and support women to have their rights, power and opportunities as men. (Advanced Lerner's English Dictionary 2003: 527).
and social conduct dictated by very strict codes and rules. This dissertation intends to illustrate the various roles that women played in this restricted society offering several examples, such as their role as mothers, the jobs and education that were accessible to them, the etiquette which they had to succumb to, obliging them to resort to a limited existence. Victorian society was a dominating society, as it controlled the weak. Women were looked at as belonging to a lower class² and therefore were not entitled to the same rights as men. Men were looked upon as belonging to a superior race and being the ones who provided the birth-right to their namesakes, therefore they were considered as the most important elements of society.

The Degradation of Married Women in the Victorian Era

Married women in the Victorian period had a subaltern role because they were financially and legally dependent on their husbands, and no responsibilities or obligations were placed before them, other than caring for their homes and families. Their area of expertise was the private sphere³ in their homes as mothers, homemakers and devoted domestics. Victorian brides relinquished all rights to property and personal wealth to their husbands. Women were considered as legally incompetent and irresponsible, and any financial legal resources had to be approved and sanctioned by their husbands. Marriage was the main goal in a girl's life as this would be one of the main ways of being respected by society. Young women were prepared for a romanticized idea of marriage from an early age, but this discrepancy was very apparent in terms of women's sexuality.

As women were not conceived to have or pursue sexual desire most women would arrive at the nuptial evening in a complete state of ignorance and even panic. On the other hand, those women who remained unmarried were not favourably looked upon. They were considered less important even among their own sex and many times a spinster could only

² Class: as socioeconomic differences between groups of individuals which create differences in their material prosperity and power. (Giddens 1993: 738).

³ Public and private spheres were two opposed designations. In the nineteenth century, the first one referred to the world ruled by men, the ones who were socially active, had a ease, the right to vote, while the second one referred to women who remained confined to their homes, without any freedom or rights, and considered inferior.
Queen Victoria, Queen of British Empire from 1837 to the end of the century.
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work in the very limited professions that were at her disposal to lead a modest life. By this we understand how important the institution of marriage was, as this was the only way for women to leave their families and through marriage guarantee some sort of sustenance in life. In a sense this corresponded to a destiny that they could not escape from. Furthermore, many times they did not have the opportunity to choose their future husband. As we have seen above, legally, married women had rights similar to the rights of children. The law regarded a married couple as one person. The husband was responsible for his wife and bound by law to protect her. She was supposed to obey him. The personal property the wife brought into the marriage was then owned by the husband, even in case of a divorce. The income of the wife belonged completely to her husband and the custody of children belonged to the father as well. As a matter of fact, he was able to refuse any contact between the mother and her children and the wife was not able to sign a contract on her own. She needed her husband's agreement. On the other hand, being married meant that she could not be punished for certain offences, such as theft or burglary if she acted under the command of her husband. It was impossible to charge the wife for concealing her husband and for stealing from her husband as they were one person in law. Women had no legal say in how many children they would have nor would they get custody of children if the marriage ended in divorce. However, claims that wives were legally "property" of their husbands are bluntly exaggerated.

Beating somebody else's wife was a serious crime, much more serious than damaging a property. In case of disaster or other danger, women (including married women) were supposed to be saved before men, which is also inconsistent with their proposed "property" status. They had no right to sue for divorce or to the custody of their children should the couple separate. They could not make a will or keep their earnings. Just as the wife had to subject herself to her husband's will, so this too applied itself within the bedroom. Victorian women were conceived as pious, gentle, virtuous and as such they were also considered asexual and without sexual desire. Sexual relations within Victorian marriage were unilaterally based on men and male needs. Neither a woman’s desire, nor her consent was at issue. As a patriarchal authoritarian institution where the husband was considered above
all as family protector and representative, it easily leads to a permissive and abusive environment within the couple. Frequently a husband would take what he considered as his property even if by force. On the other hand, since it was generally forbidden to be educated in sexual matters, and due to a romanticized and idealized image of a pure and gentle woman (almost seen as untouchable) most brides were frightened, even hysterical about the conjugal nuptials. For many women the wedding night experience was nothing more than a bodily assault. Any hope for a mutually satisfying sexual relationship was doomed from the start, as the pre-conceived idea was that a man exercised his rights and desires by satisfying his sexual needs, while the wife performed her duty.

Walter Houghton suggests that there was a definite mind set during this period which contrasts to the way the Victorian age was generally viewed. There existed an underlying certitude of an unchanging frame of mind where scholars still hoped to find this foundation and persisted in looking at things from a static point of view. The Victorian tend to divide ideas and people and actions into tight categories of true-false, good-bad, right-wrong; and not to recognize the mixed character of human experiences. (Houghton 1957:162).

However, simultaneously England was engaged in profound questioning about the intellectual and moral bases of life. Human experience cannot be developed without one of these. For all Humanity is a combination of all these categories. (Houghton 1957:10-15) The conservative role of this period claimed the "love – honor - obey" as the three well known conceptions for being a good wife. A woman existed to entertain her master and her lord.

Although the concepts of womanhood were being challenged, as is shown by the three generalized conceptions of women in the Victorian age, most English society thought higher education or having a professional career and having the right to vote was unwise and dangerous for women living in a male dominated society. Thus, while for women, the house became like a closed box in which women should stay confind from birth to death, forbidding any outlandish influences that would enter this domain and therefore interfere
with the fixed conceptions of womanhood, for men, all the outside world was accessible to them. Whatever they said or did was acceptable and forgiven by society because they were the house owners and the economic supporters. Meanwhile, women should appreciate what they had and men should not be exhausted with the chores of the home. Thus, women played all the supervised roles at home alone: cooking, keeping the house clean and teaching and nursing her children without a man's support because it was considered that he did the bigger share. It was her duty doing it alone.

Besides, any error that might happen towards him or his children was unforgiving. Everything should be in the right place and perfectly done. The idea of a woman's purity extended not only to her qualities and virtues as pure and pleasing in demeanor as well as her almost angelical presence within the home. A man's home was his haven and the role of his wife was the guardian angel of this place. Therefore being an angel meant to act correctly at all times and always calmly. Men's faults are to be forgiven and their excuses acceptable even if the victim was a woman, while women's faults were forbidden because they were always the bearers of sin. (Houghton 1957: 341-372)

Women as Generals of Household

'The Household General' was a term coined in 1861 by Isabelle Beeton. Women were expected to organize parties and dinners to bring prestige to their husbands, also making it possible for them to meet new people and establish economically important relationships, while simultaneously making sure that enough time was devoted to her children and towards improving her own abilities and cultural knowledge. Another duty described by Beeton is that of being the "sick-nurse" who took care of family members who were sick. This required a good temper, compassion for suffering and sympathy with sufferers, neat-handedness, quiet manners, love of order and cleanliness; all qualities a woman worthy of the name should possess in the 19th century. A woman in Victorian times was also obliged to take care of her parents in case of illness, irrespective of the time it took as well as interfering with her own interests. The relationship that a woman had in the Victorian era in regard to her brothers was special. Sisters had to treat their brothers as they would treat
their future husbands. They were dependent on their male family members as the brother’s affection might secure their future in case their husband treated them badly or they did not get married at all. Also, it was very easy to lose one's reputation, but was difficult to establish a reputation. For example, if one person in a family did some thing horrible, the whole family would have to suffer the consequences.

**Women and sex**

Curiously enough, for a society with strict moral codes, which condemned impropriety and was extremely prudish, prostitution in the Victorian times was very common. Much like masters would sleep with their slaves, whom they considered unequal, it was considered acceptable for a man to sleep with a prostitute. A woman who had a sexual relationship out of the wedlock was considered "damaged goods" and would lose her reputation very easily. This idea of the girl who lost her way was so pronounced that she in fact, being shunned from society would have to resort many times to prostitution as a means of survival. Preachers often argued that prostitution could happen to any woman who violated the wishes of her husband. The logic here was that men who found out that their wife had been unclean in some way would kick their wives out of the house. In fact, being unclean was considered a generally acceptable reason for a man to divorce his wife. Then the wife would end up on the streets selling herself. It was a vicious cycle. Women could not have sex with other men without being considered unclean. Men were not restricted in this sense. In fact, it was often considered natural that a man might need the body of another woman. Because women had no rights, this behaviour could not be punished through divorce. Thus, women simply had to accept this behaviour.

As a matter of fact, marriage was planned with care to reinforce and sustain the status, heritage and well-being of a family. The marriage contract was based upon a written agreement where the wife's marriage dowry was given to the man whereupon it became his prerogative to protect her marriage portion. That meant that whatever the wife brought into
a marriage was therefore incorporated into her husband's possessions. In Carole Pateman's view the word slave relates to the concept of the subjection of women, and to the condition of the wife being the worker within the private and domestic sphere, not even being considered under the conceptions of a "wage-slave". In other words, the marriage contract is a kind of labour contract. While labourers have, through the succession of the years, gained rights and improvements of their wage conditions this has never never applied to a woman who has become a wife.

The use of the word in this term is regarded as a symbol that no one will assert that labourers and women are really slaves. In general, a slave is not a free person. There are never slaves without freemen and nobody can be at the same time a slave and a freeman. A slave must be one who does not have the right to share in the ordinary amount of liberty. Although Man is born free he never really grasps that freedom. This is to say, his freedom is incompatible with the social connection. No man is literally free because people are controlled by their behaviour towards each other, through their customs, their religious and social convictions. The condition of the slave is thus opposed to the freeman. Slaves are in a lower condition as compared with freemen. Every slave has his master to whom he is subjected. The master's power over his slave is unlimited, as we will later see when mentioning John Stuart Mill essays *On Liberty* (1859) and *The Subjection of Women* (1869). The master's free exercise of his power over a slave is seen as an improvement of his character and his exercise of this domain is without restriction. The proprietor may do with his property whatever he wants and there is no law forbidding him to do so. (Pateman 1988:116, 155-161) A slave is a man who is the property of another and not regarded as a human being but as a thing, politically and socially at a lower level. The slave is left to the discretion of the master, who has over him the right of property. A woman learns in her childhood all that is expected to be a man's slave and when a woman becomes the property of her husband, this implies compulsory labour and therefore, she works for him. The right of property in this case meant that the woman was seen as an object and in this case her husband had power over her will too. The wife was the slave of her husband, rather than his companion.
Actually, when women started to claim rights for slaves, they began to understand that their legal identity was equal to those they were fighting for.

**Women's Bodies as Pure**

Women's bodies were seen as pure and clean except when experiencing menstruation. A woman was not encouraged to wear any kind of cosmetics or any other adornments, or wear clothing that showed her skin, or even stockings or any other undergarment. Some believed this was because a woman's body was considered to be the property of her husband. As a result, women were not to advertise their bodies to other men. However, men also were discouraged to wear any kind of cosmetics or wear clothing that showed their skin or undergarments, so this was a part of the Victorian morals which affected both genders.⁴ There were other similar restrictions like discouraging the use word "leg" in presence of opposite sex, or the obligatory usage of bathing machines. These restrictions also affected both genders equally. The Victorian era is well known for its conservative and even prudish nature and women dressed accordingly. They would cover their entire bodies using a large range of clothes and undergarments as well as an assortment of accessories, hats, gloves, fans and umbrellas.

Oddly enough, for a society that proclaimed that a demure and docile aspect was what was expected of women, as though to create a diminished and discreet being. Actually, women often found themselves in an ambiguous society which enforced that they were seen and not seen at the same time. The way women dressed was controlled by a man, first by their fathers or brothers then by their husband. Young girls used to dress as their mothers, abiding obediently by the set rules. Let's briefly discuss the strict etiquette which men and women had to use to relate to each other, especially in sexual rapport. In terms of etiquette the life of an upper class Victorian was full of rules on how to behave. The most interesting rules came into action when two people of opposite sexes met or when appearing in public. Therefore, the Victorians found their codes to respect and obey as kind

---

⁴ Gender: A person's gender is the fact that they are male or female. (Advanced Lerner's English Dictionary 2003: 601)
of street manner law. There were rules for gentlemen as for ladies. There were street manner for gentlemen, such as:

- Never swear or talk loudly
- Always raise your hat to an acquaintance of either sex
- Always 'beg their pardon’ after bumping into someone or stepping on a lady’s dress
- Never lose your temper
- It is proper to offer a lady your arm, especially in the evening and it should always be the right arm. www.victorianstation.com

And also street manners for ladies:

A lady walks quietly through the streets, seeing and hearing nothing that she ought not to recognising acquaintances with a courteous bow and friends with words of greeting. She is always unobtrusive, never talks loudly, or laughs boisterously, or does anything to attract the attention of the passers-by. She walks along in her own quiet, lady-like way, and by her preoccupation is secure from any annoyance. A true lady is always modest, discreet, kind, and obliging. A lady must always refrain from using a gentleman’s Christian name. <www.victorianstation.com>

Flirtation was frowned upon in Victorian times and young people could not see each other without a chaperone, it was necessary to develop a kind of coded language that allowed the ladies to convey their feelings to gentlemen without anyone else noticing. For this purpose the lady would use her gloves, her fan and her umbrella. Here are a few examples:

- Gloves (While not wearing them)
  Holding the tips downward ~ I wish to be acquainted
  Smoothing them gently ~I wish I were with you
  Tapping the chin ~I love another
  Clenching in right hand ~ No
  Dropping one of them ~ Yes
Dropping both of them ~ I love you

• Fan

Carrying in left hand in front of face ~ I wish to be acquainted

Closing ~ I wish to speak with you

Twirling in right hand ~ I love another

Resting on left cheek ~ No

Resting on right cheek ~ Yes

Drawing across cheek ~ I love you

• Umbrella

Carrying elevated in left hand ~ I wish to be acquainted

Carrying over right shoulder ~ You can speak to me

Tapping the chin gently when closed ~I love another

Here are examples of flowers with specific meanings that would have been known to all Victorians:

Daisy ~ Innocence

Fern ~ Fascination

French marigold ~ jealousy

Narcissus ~ Egotism

Rose/Burgundy ~ Unconscious Beauty, Rose ~ Love.
This picture shows how woman was dressed and in her house.

<www.victorianengland.org.uk>
Women's Education as Unequal

Boys had a lot more opportunities in life in terms of education, profession and social development than girls did. Although the fist born boy had to follow in his father's footsteps, boys were given much greater advantages in terms of their education. They studied different subjects from girls. Whereas it was stressed that girls could only learn subjects which were considered adequate for home rearing and maintaining pleasant company such as etiquette, as with everything that had to do with children. Basically, they were taught to be good wives and mothers. As they were looked upon as a lower sex, they used to go to private schools where teachers were also women. Actually, education was extremely limited to women, as they were supposed to know the necessary things to bring up their children and to keep the house. Subjects as History and general Literature were of extreme importance, whereas Latin and Greek were of little importance. Women who wanted to study such subjects as Law, Physics, Engineering, Science or Art were not taken seriously and were generally dismissed. People thought it unnecessary for women to attend university for it was believed that women were not rational beings and were not capable of higher studies; this happened because as women, they were considered emotional and irrational creatures and studying could even make them ill. They were to stay more or less an "ornament of society" and be subordinate to their husbands. Yet, three medical professions were opened to women in the 19th century: nursing, midwifery, and doctoring. But it was only in nursing that women were widely accepted, as they were under supervision and authority of male doctors. The Victorians thought the doctor's profession characteristically belonged to the male sex and a woman should not intrude upon this area. In conclusion, Englishmen would not accept women in the roles of doctor or surgeon, confining them to the nursing profession which was believed suited women's intrinsic nature. In this domain, Florence Nightingale (1820-1910) was an important figure in renewing this traditional image of the nurse as the self-sacrificing, ministering angel, the "Lady with the lamp", spreading comfort as she passed among the wounded. She succeeded in modernizing the nursing profession, promoting training for women and teaching them courage, confidence and self-assertion.
Ladies Etiquette The picture present the symbols and signs which women made.

‹http://victorianerawomen/html›
As we know that Victorian ideas about religion or politics or education should have been closely related to the environment is only what we should expect. But offhand, we ought not to have supposed that such personal and elemental feelings as those about love and women would have been so strongly influenced by the hard competitive world of business or by the pressure of intellection and doubt. The Industrial Revolution creates the large, impersonal city and makes considerable wealth requirement as well as a sanction for marriage. These factors contribute to an alarming increase of prostitution; a fact which, in turn, contributes to a strong protective movement in morals (a code of purity, censorship, and prudery) and an effort to idealize love and woman, including the mother, in the case of product. (Houghton 1957: 393)

Outside of medicine, there were only a handful of legitimate paying occupations for a middle class woman such as writer or governess.
I. A war against social dangers

Josephine Elizabeth Butler (1828 -1906) was a Victorian feminist, that is a person who believed that women should have the same rights and opportunities as men. She was born in the village of Milfield, Northumberland and was the daughter of John Grey and Hannah Annett. Her father was the cousin of the British reformist and Prime Minister Charles Grey, second Earl Grey and a slavery abolitionist himself. He was also the radical agricultural reformer and chief Whig agent in the North. In 1833 he was appointed manager of the Dilston Estate, near Corbridge, Northumberland, and the family moved there. Josephine Butler was raised in the household of an upper-middle-class family, in a liberal atmosphere and given an unusually good education. This education entailed Bible studies and Blue Books, foreign languages, history, and classics. Her family's wealth, her strongly religious demeanor, and her connections to the politically powerful provided enough of a shield for Butler to address the most forbidden of Victorian age's subjects: sex. Her socially conscious education and her religious beliefs prompted a crisis when she was eighteen. In 1852, Josephine married George Butler, a scholar and cleric, whose career in the academic world and the Church of England was often severely hindered by his wife’s controversial activities, but he always supported her in everything she did. George included his wife in all of his socializing, research, and conversation; yet, his colleagues often resented her presence as well as her defense of women's point of view. She gave birth to four children. In 1863 her only daughter, Eva, died. This led Josephine to seek solace by ministering to people with greater pain than her own. She began her work for poor worker women and prostitutes in Liverpool in 1866. Against her friends and family's advice, she began visiting Liverpool's Brownlow Hill workhouse which led to her first involvement with prostitutes.

Her greatest efforts were directed against the Contagious Diseases Acts and she wrote many books and pamphlets in support of the cause. Butler began to research the lives of prostitutes, debunking prevalent prejudices that prostitutes were sexual predators and revealing the grinding and ineradicable economic pressures behind their trade. She also discovered that many prostitutes, especially ex-servants, were initially victims of rape or seduction. She involved herself in the campaign for higher education for women, also regarded women as being exploited victims of male oppression, and she attacked the double standard of Victorian sexual morality. The laws were also flawed in that they affected only women. As it is widely known, the Victorians had double standards in relation to sexuality, whereby the same sins committed by different genders entailed different penalties. For men, the penalties were usually non-existent, while the opprobrium that ought to have been borne by both parties (according to the beliefs of the time about the importance of sexual purity) was endured solely by women. The Contagious Disease Acts reflected this same idea that the burden of blame in a mutually "guilty" relationship could be relocated from one partner and settled on the other only in this case. The unconscious assumption was that the blame for the disease could be pinned on one gender alone. Obviously, a hygienic reform that only targeted half of the participants could not be effective. Moreover, it implicitly condemned women and in fact augmented male patronage of prostitutes. Because the acts affected the working class, women who had to walk and live in poor districts, the backlash against these measures produced few results at first. Those middle and upper-class men with political influence were more interested in protecting their boys from unclean women. Butler was breaking the taboo on the subjects
about which a woman could know "let alone speak." If one of those who lived in the respectable society broke this taboo, she could easily be dismissed as morally corrupt:

Is it not time that the woman's voice should be heard in this matter, that she should have a veto upon that immoral claim which men have passed on to their descendants, generation after generation, to the sacrifice, in the interests of impurity, vast armies of her sisters, women born with capacities, as others, for honorable relationships and spiritual perfecting? Women have at last spoken, thanks be to God! (Butler 1879: 8).

But as Butler was self-evidently a virtuous and religious woman, her rebellion was that much more radical. She was asserting that respectable women could and should undertake crusades on an entirely new and forbidden territory. She also represented an inadvertent gender war in that she advocated women of different classes coming together to resist male governmental oppression.

Butler's campaign was actually one of the first to cross the class line in her reforms, and one of the first women to claim that sex is an overriding condition uniting women in their sympathies and responsibilities, despite all other differences. Men were not held accountable in any way for the spread of venereal diseases, the ostensible justification for requiring the health certificates in the first place. Butler's first public crusade was to halt the extension of the Contagious Disease Acts and then to repeal the existing laws. The virtue in question was the virtue of respectable women, who would be protected from seduction only if men had access to prostitutes. As for the virtue of men, male immorality was treated as a trivial matter, and the virtue of prostitutes did not count at all. It was taken for granted that it was impossible for men to live without sex, and it followed logically that prostitutes had to exist. Another consequence of the prevailing hypocrisy was that it was thought improper for a respectable woman even to mention the subject of prostitution in public. In the early
years of the campaign, the Ladies’ National Association\(^5\) was formed by Josephine Butler against the Contagious Diseases Acts. Although many contemporaries were scandalized by genteel women speaking at public meetings about such inflammatory and transgressive matters, others rallied to the cause, and these social activists acquired valuable political experience. Parliament finally repealed the Acts in 1886, and this end to this noxious legislation has been considered a major feminist triumph.

The reason why it is possible for purity workers, good and pious people, men and women busy with good workers, to approve of the State superintendence of sexual vice, is this- that our race is suffering from a species of moral atrophy, from a fatal spiritual sense to perceive it is paralysis of the sense of justice. Many literally do not know what justice is. The dead. They can no more perceive its presence or absence than a blind man can perceive the presence or absence before him of a house or a tree. The recognition of the principles which have made England what she is, which have given her any claim to be called grate, seems to be all but lost. (Butler 1897: 13)

\(^5\) A number of individuals established the National Association for the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act. No women were originally included in the organization though many later joined it. The Ladies National Association for the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts was formed on New Year's Day 1870; one of their first actions was to publish in the *Daily News* a protest against the Acts. This was signed by 124 women including Florence Nightingale, Josephine Butler, Mary Carpenter, and Lydia Becker and drafted by Harriet Martineau and became known as the Ladies’ Protest. (<http://www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/search2?coll_id=6838&inst_id=65>)
Streets were shelters for fallen women.

Women conditions after the Industrial Revolution

<www.victorianengland.org.uk>
Moreover, this social agenda was often denounced in the press, and Mrs. Butler was ostracized in polite society, not just for being mistaken in opposing the Acts, but for shamelessness and indecency of her social intervention. The consensus of opinion was that it was better to sweep the whole subject under the carpet. Mrs. Butler’s response to the regulations’ case was to argue that, if prostitution was really a necessity, then the state should be grateful and tender to prostitutes instead of oppressing them (Butler 1990: 110-113). She refused to accept that it was necessary, however, and commented that:

The public acknowledgement of such a supposed necessity is deeply degrading to men, both as an avowal that they are utterly and hopelessly the slaves of their own passions, and as an incentive to increased immorality. (Butler 1870:112).

She was aware of the theory that sexual abstinence was harmful to men’s health, which had already gained ground in some medical circles, although it had not yet been given a pseudo-scientific foundation by Freudian psychology. In a letter to her sister in 1875 she described it as:” This materialism which sets the body above the soul.”(<www.liberatarian.co.uk>) A year later, in a letter to two friends, she referred to the need for “The Purification of the medical profession and the exposure and defeat of those widely materialist doctrines respecting the necessity of unchastely.” (<www.liberatarian.co.uk>).

Josephine Butler was ahead of her time in realizing the importance of vested interests in the state apparatus, and she saw that the doctors who were employed to run the special hospitals were a good example.

In a letter to colleagues in 1872 she wrote that:

“When a host of salaried, permanent officials is once established, the system to which they belong must be perpetuated for their sakes”.

(<www.liberatarian.co.uk>).
Actually, Mrs. Butler knew from her experience in Liverpool that many girls from poor families drifted casually in and out of prostitution, but the Acts had such a stigmatizing effect on them that it could become impossible for them to escape from this kind of life and find other work, so that the drift became a one-way process. W.T. Stead launched a new organization called the National Vigilance Association,\textsuperscript{6} to campaign for higher standards of sexual morality in British society. Josephine Butler supported the new campaign at first, as did many members of the Ladies’ National Association, but she soon started to have second thoughts when she realized the direction in which Stead and some of his friends were heading. She had always believed very firmly in protecting women and children against abuse and coercion, but as a libertarian, she believed strongly that people should be free to think what they want to. W.T. Stead, on the other hand, made it clear that he wanted the law to intrude far into those areas of sexual behaviour which by libertarian standards should be strictly matters of personal conscience. Within a short time, Mrs. Butler decided to break off all links with the National Vigilance Association. A few years later she summed up her views in a letter to a friend:

\begin{quote}
I have never heartily sympathized with the work of the Vigilance Society, and undoubtedly they have done much good, many good things. But there is a constant tendency towards external pressure, and inside that a tendency to let the pressure fall almost exclusively on women because it is more difficult, they say, to get at men. It is dangerous work, in reference to personal liberty, but few people care for liberty or personal rights now. Our only hope is in a higher standard. (<www.liberatarian.co.uk>).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{6} The National Vigilance Association was formed in August 1885 for the enforcement and improvement of the laws for the repression of criminal vice and public immorality. In 1917 the aims of the National Vigilance Association itself broadened once more to embrace the protection of women, minors (including young men) and children. In 1952 National Vigilance Association and British National Committee amalgamated once more, ending both their independent existences. Consequently, a new group emerged which was named as the British Vigilance Association. (www.aim25.ac.uk).
At about the same time Josephine Butler also commented that:

We have learned that it is not unusual for men and women to discourse eloquently in public, of the home, of conjugal life, of the divinity of womanhood and yet be ready to accept and endorse any amount of coercive and degrading treatment of their fellow creatures, in the fatuous belief that you can oblige human beings to be moral by force, and in so doing that you may in some way promote social purity. (<www.liberatarian.co.uk>).

Mrs. Butler’s differences of opinion with the National Vigilance Association became clearly visible in an incident in Winchester in 1894, when the local National Vigilance Association branch asked her to support a campaign to close down a music hall in the town where the owner was allowing prostitutes to pick up men. She had always supported strict laws against soliciting in the streets, whether by prostitutes or by would-be customers, but she did not believe the law should interfere with this kind of behaviour in private places. She wrote back to the National Vigilance Association, turning down their request and explaining that:

I continue to protest that I do not believe that any real reform will ever be reached by outward repression. The principle of the Federation has always been to let individuals alone, not pursue them by any outward punishments, not to drive them out of any place, so long as they behave decently but to attack organized prostitution, that is when a third party, actuated by the desire of making money, sets up a house in which women are sold to men. (<www.liberatarian.co.uk>).
Although she never actually used the words “consenting adults in private”, which were made famous by the Wolfenden\(^7\) Committee more than sixty years later, her own views on the proper role of the law in relation to sex were obviously running along very similar lines. Until her death in 1906 she maintained a principled stand against coercive intervention in matters of private morality. In 1902, when she was a widow living alone in a flat, a young woman moved into the flat below her and started working, quietly and unobtrusively, as a prostitute. The neighbours petitioned the landlady to evict the girl, but Mrs. Butler refused to sign. As always, she took the view that when another person’s private behaviour was causing no harm or nuisance to other people, it was wrong to interfere. Josephine Butler could not accept that the facts were changed upon women, when they were much more Victorians than men, who were. A few years ago the historian Edward Bristow called Josephine Butler “a non-repressive puritan”. (\(<www.liberatarian.co.uk>\)). This apparently paradoxical description shows how difficult it can be for people who are used to think in terms of the concepts and categories of the permissive society to understand her philosophy. It is part of our modern conventional wisdom that the hypocrisy of Victorian times and the cynical moral relativism of today are the only possible attitudes to sex and no alternatives exist. Josephine Butler’s career stands as proof that this is not the case. Her life history should also serve to refute a few other fashionable modern myths. There is a widespread belief in permissive circles that all women who are against sexual permissiveness are either ugly, sexually frustrated, or both. Josephine Butler, by contrast, was described by her contemporaries as a very attractive woman, and by all accounts her marriage was an extremely happy one. Josephine’s readers may judge for themselves whether she was lacking in courage. Whatever her virtues, it should not be supposed that her character was entirely faultless. Josephine Butler was inclined to be vain about her personal appearance, and was often given to self-publicizing and showing off. Being a country landowner’s daughter, she sometimes had a trace of snobbery in her attitude towards traders and businessmen. Above all, her single-minded

\(^7\) The committee of 14, including three women, was led by John Wolfenden (1906-1985) who had previously been headmaster of Uppingham and Shrewsbury and in 1950 became Vice Chancellor of the University of Reading. He later became Director of the British Museum. (\(<http://www.sportdevolopement.org.uk/htm/wolfenden>\)).
dedication to her chosen cause often made her blind to the facts of political reality. She resented it when public attention was distracted by other important issues like the Franco-Prussian War and Irish Home Rule, and she easily grew impatient with politicians who did not share her own priorities. It can be noticed that she was always convinced that her health was about to break down through sheer exhaustion, but although she did once suffer a genuine collapse due to overwork (in 1875, after her Continental tour), she eventually lived well into her seventies. It is worth noting here that, despite all the energy and effort which she put into her campaigns on the question of prostitution, they did not occupy all of her time.

In 1871 she found the time to set up the Vigilance Association for the Defense of Personal Rights,⁸ which campaigned on other issues such as the illegitimacy laws and laws which restricted the employment of women. The campaigns against the Contagious Diseases Acts and child prostitution have often been described in print, but many books do not make clear the libertarian background of Josephine Butler’s views. Changing views on prostitution remained a major topic of social and moral concern. Panic over prostitution was at its height in the 1850s and early 1860s. In part, this was because it betokened visible female freedom from social control. As daughters, employees or servants, young women were subjected to male authority; as trollops, they enjoyed economic and personal independence. The reaction was a sustained cultural campaign, in sermons, newspapers, literary and visual art, to intimidate shame and eventually drive fallen women from the streets by representing them as a depraved and dangerous element in society, doomed to disease and death. Refuges were then opened and men patrolled at night to persuade girls to leave their life of vice. In fact, the seldom-voiced truth was that in comparison to other occupations, prostitution was a leisured and profitable trade, by which women improved their circumstances, helped to educate siblings and often saved enough to open a shop or lodging house. Gender conceptions shape the lives of all people in all societies. They influence all aspects of our lives, the schooling we receive, the social roles we play, and the

---

⁸ The Personal Rights Association was founded in England in 1871. It was concerned with legislation, especially in matters affecting the interests of women, and the personal rights and liberties of the people. (<www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Personal_Rights_Association>).
power and authority we have. Population processes, where women and men live, how they bear and rear children, and how they die, is shaped by gender as well. Gender refers to the different roles men and women play in society, and to the relative power they wield. While gender is expressed differently in different societies, in no society do men and women perform equal roles or hold equal positions of power. The impact of this inequality on women's lives varies tremendously. In general, as the differences between men and women's roles diminish, women gain status and power within a society and begin to control their reproductive lives. When women have more autonomy, maternal and child health tends to improve, fertility and childhood mortality tend to decline, and population growth slows.

In *Social Purity*, Josephine Butler was against the status of Church in saying that God supports the stronger. The stronger ones meaning authority and men who exercised their power over the weak, that is, slaves or women. Butler suggested that the Church should change its rules regarding this matter, but it would be unjust that only this institution should change, as this would not create enough of an impact on society. The law should be replaced in order to go with the customs of the society.

Being a passionate Christian, one of Butler's main concerns lied within the abhorren sin of prostitution and although very much against this deviant behaviour, she was very compassionate about the welfare of these women, because she believed they were the exploited victims of male oppression. She strongly supported the idea that God's mandates were for both sexes. Each has his/her part in their duties to one another and rights that should claim respect from each other. Of the many critiques that Butler makes, one particularly substantiates the above-mentioned idea, that vice is morally forbidden but the law legalizes it. The intolerable situation in which England found itself in terms of prostitution, shows that women were judged harshly and not listened to with pity, but rather withheld from their basic rights as human beings, while men went unpunished in spite of perpetuating and sustaining the immoral situation of prostitution. The predominant reason for sustaining this vice being that, both slaves and women feared and even respected their

---

9 Deviant behaviour means a morally unacceptable one. Frequently, it describes sexual attitudes.
master. The necessity for money and a place to live were undeniable factors, which made this unfair situation possible.

When a national campaign began in 1869 to repeal the Contagious Disease Acts, Josephine Butler was one of its main supporters. As a matter of fact, they protested the passage of each Act. Consequently, they felt they needed an irreproachable and respectable woman to head their movement, command the public's attention, and demonstrate that the Contagious Diseases Acts was really a women's issue.

The Contagious Disease Acts (1864, 1869 and 1886) introduced a form of state regulation of prostitution in order to control the spread of venereal diseases, especially in the British Army and Royal Navy during the 1860s. Within ten miles of one of eighteen specified naval and garrison towns, local prostitutes could be reported to a magistrate and obliged to attend an inspection at hospitals created for that purpose. If these women were infected, they could be detained for up to nine months for treatment. Refusal to attend could be met with forcible examination or by custody. These were the facts about male sexuality disclosed by the campaigns of Josephine Butler. The general belief in the Victorian era was that the difference in how the singular sexes were treated was based on the belief that men and women were essentially different, physically, mentally and morally. Because of this, it was only natural for the man to be the ruler, and for the woman to be the subject. Boys were taught to be tough and hard working, while girls were brought up to be only good wives. Yet, the definition of a good wife had begun to change at the times. Then, instead of being a child bearer, a good mother and a good housekeeper, she expected to be the perfect woman who represented her husband’s status. The strict morals connected with sexuality began to form some time before Victoria took the throne, but it was her husband’s ideas, which were accepted by the majority of people as being right, that formed the moral backbone of the era. Any sexual activity outside marriage, even during courtship, was condemned. A girl who had lost her virginity was considered as 'damaged goods' and would have great difficulty in finding a husband. Undoubtedly, there were double standards, but a man’s promiscuity was more easily accepted than a woman’s, but in
principal and in public the rules applied to both sexes. The way that Victorians thought about love and sensuality is perhaps best reflected in the way it was written about at that time. Victorians condemned male sexual access to fallen women and were specifically directed at women in order only to protect the health of men. If the priority had been to fight venereal diseases, then inspecting the prostitutes’ clients would also have been required by the Acts. However, the assumption was that, while men would be offended at the intrusion, the women were already so degraded that further humiliations were of no consequence. These acts became a feminist cause because they permitted the police to detain and inspect any woman suspected of venereal infection, and, it was claimed, innocent women found themselves forced to undergo humiliating inspections.

This legalisation of vice, which is the endorsement of the "necessity " of impurity for men, and the institution of the slavery of women, is the most open denial which modern times have seen of the principle of the sacredness of the individual human being. It is the embodiment of Socialism in its worst form. (Butler 1879: 15).

Sexuality was something considered soiled and disgusting but very necessary for the continuing of the human race. Love was something pure and holy; it had the power to make sexuality into something almost pure. To love a pure woman and even just being in the company of one made celibacy bearable for a man. Someone even said that a somewhat repressed and therefore glorified passion could be seen in the kindness and chivalry towards women.

The sexuality of men and women was seen as two very different things, men were the ones who had lusts and wants, whereas women were so effortlessly chaste that their company alone was sufficient to suppress men's desires. It became clear that in some social circles, morals were not as strictly obeyed as in others, but in general and in public, these rules were followed. It was, in fact, very difficult to break them as it usually had to involve at least two people who were willing to become social outcasts in the case of discovery. Butler was a pious woman, but her criticism of the double standards incorporated by
society regarding sexuality, also included the Church. In her address, she elaborated about the position, which the Church has taken through its ministers, and how it aided the idea of women's subjugation to men:

The double standard of morality owes its continued existence very greatly to the want of a common sentiment concerning morality on the part of men and women, especially in the more refined classes of society. (Butler 1879: 4).

Women were really conditioned by society and trust those in power. When the entire society rests on privileging men, this colludes in keeping women in their place or subservient to men:

This unequal standard more or less has coloured and shaped the whole of our social life. Even in lands where a high degree of morality and attachment to domestic life prevails, the measure of the moral strictness of the people is too often the bitterness of their treatment of the erring woman, and of her alone. Some will tell me that this is the inevitable rule, and that the sternest possible reprobation of the female sinner, as being the most deeply culpable, has marked every age and all teaching in which the moral standard was high. No! Not every age, nor all teaching! There stands on the page of history one marked exception; and, so far as I know, one only that of Christ. (Butler 1879: 2).

Concurrently, whatever ill fate, weakness, or pain befell a man emanated from the dark powers of a woman. This belief was reinforced by the story of Eve who carries out the devil's wishes by tempting Adam to eat the forbidden fruit. These beliefs vilify women by making them responsible for what they did to men:

The warnings of God are concealed and young men and women are left to be taught by sad and irremediable experience the moral truths which
should be impressed up on them early in life by faithful instructors. (Butler 1879: 5).

Butler's interpretation of this belief was that God decreed to man that he should treat woman with tenderness and gentleness. Adam called a woman his own in terms of endearment and not one of scorn.

As a matter of fact, when studying the society in which Josephine Butler lived, we see that there was an exchange between the two types of nature that God had made, man's strength and woman's tenderness.

The strength of man was to cover the woman as if it was a covering of protection. Therefore, an exchange between the two natures, strength and gentleness, promoted the idea of one, as a unit and not divided by taking different ways, the saving of female victims of vice, is after all, not a thorough reform, in the largest view of this sorrowful question. (Butler 1879: 13).

The rule was to combine the two powers, strength and gentleness. The strength that was part of man meant to protect the gentleness of woman. Therefore, the strength of the woman's softness is the spirit of his ruling power. In other words, she is compassionate enough for him to rule her gently and not harshly, the Englishman is a powerful agent for evil, as for good. In the best times of our history, my countrymen possessed pre-eminently vigorous minds in vigorous bodies. (Butler 1879: 14).

According to Butler, if God managed to create this harmony why did men intend to misuse this power? God had intended it to be so. Both a man and a woman got their life from the same God. Although the scriptures state that a woman came from a man, this did not imply a relation of subjugation but rather one of unity. She came out from his rib close to his heart and deep inside his body and there within lies the wisdom that God created a man and a woman to help each other, he did not create a woman to be in a lower position than a man. Their lives depend on their being and working together. Because neither man nor woman could live alone, the nomination was given to both of them according to their
nature and not as one being stronger than the other is. The power held by male clergy is increased by their gender and the political reality of patriarchy rather than acknowledging the privilege of their gendered status and using that privilege responsibly, male clergy are defenceless to assuming the privilege as God given and hold women responsible, instead, for the aberrant behaviour of the clergy. The maligning of women for their gender reinforces their lesser status, in effect, directs, and warrants their treatment as objects. This can be linked to John Stuart Mill's suggestion that there are two steps by which the power of government can achieve liberty and obtain political rights. Mill claimed that people should have absolute freedom to do what they want, "self-governing" and he referred to the Christianity as a doctrine.

Lastly, suffer me to say one word more. I believe the secret of true manliness lies, more than in anything else, in humility; and yet the true nature of humility is often imperfectly understood. It is so far from implying a cringing attitude before our fellowmen, that it induces the very opposite- a courageous independence of character, and (what often seems to those who do not understand the secret) a bold self-reliance. It is a virtue not easy of attainment. When the young escape the graver moral perils, they sometimes fall into other errors which they do not suspect, a certain conceit and want of simplicity which are not beautiful in the sight either of God or man. (Butler 1879:17).

According to Mill, people are evil, and they are susceptible to influences of power and become affected by it as" the power governed people". Tyranny is a form of political despotism, so tyranny is a cruel way of using power.

But God overruled for good the enactment of this masterpiece of tyranny and immorality. It awakened the slumbering conscience of our people. It is to this that you owe it, my friends, that there is now a "holy war" being waged openly against impurity, in which you are invited to join: how then could I be silent on this point? (Butler 1879: 12).
Finally, we realize that Mill had a strong aversion to conformity. Mill believed that conformity is the default of society. The public should not have the power's core over their elected governing body. The power of "the government" is more dangerous when it depends on unreliable opinion. However, forming this opinion requires the silence of many voices. (Mill 1859:1-6) As Mill points out that all opinions need to be heard in order to decide what truth is. The majority is not guaranteed to be correct. The majority have no true authority and no absolute certainty. When reading Butler's *Social Purity* and Mill's *On Liberty*, we think she agreed with Mill's opinion that women should be listened as the government should listen to her people without distinctions that men assert for ages and the only ones who ever speak freely. Women have to express their ideas, exercise their rights of having their own minds, thoughts and experiences and not only be men's fellows. This is much similar to the working class's suffrage, as people should be given the opportunity to be heard with respect. Mill argued then that in order to make good decisions man must use discussion, experience and search for opposing arguments. He pointed out that even in the Christian doctrine, which is assumed by Christians to be correct; the importance of listening to all sides is expressed. Man is not evil if he argues against the basic beliefs that are held up by the society. Referring to Socrates as a proof, that people can misjudge even the good reasons, even Marcus Aurelius wrongly judged and refuted Christianity. Belief in God should not be the limit of our judgment on someone:

Beginning from the eldest even to the youngest, they went out, scared by the searching presence of Him who admitted not for one moment that God's law of purity should be relaxed for the stronger, while imposed in its utmost severity on the weaker. (Butler 1879: 3)

Equality, which women looked for, had nothing to deal with authority as much as they looked for being treated as human beings and get their natural rights, which Josephine Butler made clear that the Church is fair enough if the society obeys the rules. If society gave women their rights, do not you think their situation will be different? They will have their positions in society. Butler was not against men, she believed in their thoughts and
power and however, she was not against women as well, she defended and helped them to get at least their natural rights and determine their identities within society. *Social Purity* is a declaration of war and independence. A war against social dangers, which threatens individuals in general and particularly women and working-class:

An English high-class journal confessed this, when it dared to demand that women who are unchaste shall henceforth be dealt with "not as human beings, but as foul sewers," or some such "material nuisance," without souls, without rights, and without responsibility. (Butler 1879: 16)

Actually, Butler presented her thoughts by asking questions and quoting letters written by working people from Europe. In addition, Mill seeks the same principles that defended individuals' liberty and which he applied with his wife whom he appreciated emotionally, mentally and intellectually. Therefore, equality cannot be a model for all persons because every person has his own identity and experiences that distinguished him from others. (Himmelfarb 1989: 3-22) Mill placed a limitation on personal freedom and he believed in autonomy except when people proved to be placing others in danger with their actions. Personal liberty is treated by the society, which gives autonomy to the majority. To achieve happiness a person should be completely free to take decisions and decide what is good or not for him/her. In other words, social control, traditions cannot be good for everybody. Experience is important in a human being's life. Mill claims that people have different opinions irrespective of their experiences. It is important that each person have his or her own desires, interests and impulses. Feelings and mental activities are practiced by making a choice; however, a person who does not practice choice is no more than an ape. "As human beings, our feelings affect our judgment. Our conscience controls our acts and not desires." (Mill 1859: 56,58)

Actually, Mill argued that it was not fair to judge a human being like this because he is creative, and not a machine. Individual development is limited by the social part of human nature. Mill asserted the importance of genius in the society; even if they were few they should be given freedom of thought and encourage them. Genius does not fit in the
usual form of the society. In addition, genius always gives the right opinion, i.e. "fruits of originality". Mill believed that individuality should come at all costs. Human beings are not alike even if their life style is the same. For instance, what fits a person's desires or interests is not acceptable for another. Genius includes men and women as individuals within society. Women were not able to take part in parliamentary politics; they did not have the vote until 1918. In the nineteenth century, people got married to protect themselves from sin and therefore falling deeply in love was either forbidden or simply seen as a fanciful idea by the costumes of the society. Marriage was seen as a normal type contract in which a couple could participate in a major ritual impurity, allowing for sexual interaction to seem normal in so far as it was an evolutionary necessity. Moreover, the fruits of a relationship permitted a bountiful family as well as the legitimization of future hereditary obligations. The family was the most important subject of the Victorian Age. For these reasons people thought that every person had to get married. Thus, an unmarried woman would be subject of questioning and doubts about her impurity. A woman who was not married was questionable, but her purity was in fact her reputation. If this was tarnished, she was very ill-considered within society. Yet, marriage goals differed between classes. For instance, the upper-class chose their partners from the same wealthy class for social reasons and political support. In other words, marriage for the upper-class meant the couples share the families' heritage. However, the working-class look at marriage as a deal from which they could gain, if lucky, a substantial amount of money. At the same time, middle-class had the same plan for marriage. A woman was regarded as a good wife according to what she brought to her husband's house. Women sought independence through marriage, because this was for women the only way to leave their father's house and their father's sustenance. Becoming a wife meant that a woman became a mistress of a new household, and although independent from her family, she merely changed from one limited domestic sphere to another.

Dr. Gregory stated

"a woman was born to suffer" as if it was her choice to be born a woman.
According to his quotation, women were born slaves "Your whole life is often a life of suffering. You cannot plunge into business, or dissipate yourselves in pleasure and riot, as men too often do, when under the pressure of misfortunes. You must bear your sorrows in silence, unknown and unpitied. You must often put a face of serenity and cheerfulness, when your hearts are torn with anguish or sinking in despair". (Lerner 1978:175)

Obviously, women's life was full of sacrifices since they were born. After the industrial revolution, women got some rights, the right of working and even if they misused this right, they gave the feminist movements the opportunity to speak about, protect and defend them and as Butler quoted:

There are persons of all ages in whom it is so ingrained that if seems to require some great and overwhelming sorrow, or some grievous self-knowledge, to bring them to an attitude of perfect and absolute simplicity before God, and to destroy the root whence all affectations or character and manner take their rise. (Butler 1879: 18).

Individuals who seek independence in such a dominant society, their independency related to their society and always apply within its rules. Even good living or work chances are arranged for them and not by them. In other words, they cannot practice their right to choose or argue because rulers think that everything is set in a good way for them. On the contrary, it is set for government's justice, for the rich and not for the poor, for the rulers and not for the public who present minority and not majority. Industrial revolution has its positive influences on the working-class. They become a part of society who listened to and they become an educated class. Their suffrage, voices and opinions spread through political and social essays and supported by middle-class who believe in their liberty and they have to be self-governed. Moreover, the revolution leads to rethink of religion rules that they obey according to the rules of society. (Hollis 1973: 364-366)

Next to the women who most directly suffer, in fact or through sympathy, from this social wrong, the working classes in general are they whose
position in respect to it most urgently claims for them a hearing. They are not the class who make themselves heard by writing books and articles. (Butler 1879: 8)

Strictness considered a woman no more than man's property and that is available any time for their needs. Therefore, being a new woman with new identity provoked the conservatives after the industrial revolution, which gave a woman an opportunity to work. Even though, her feminine style changed and she came out from her old picture. This changing was harsh and painful but it does help the feminine movement a lot. Heathen history helps new philosophies to understand women needs very well. In other words, not only to avoid invisibility or mythology but reality, as the new philosophies seem to be new religion that applies only for male's desires. In addition, philosophies as Marxism and Freudian look at women and men as a reality and this makes feminism deal with equality as a reality and rebel against holy rules that repress them as individuals, judge them as impure, and vices. Butler suggested that civil society end conflict between men and women. Individuals ruled by civil rules and not by religion or doctrine law. (Butler 1879: 6-9)

I have heard that in heathen times there were temples of Venus, where there were priestesses who were also the victims of shameful lust. But I believed that eighteen centuries ago Eternal Love had appeared upon the earth. (Butler 1879: 8).

Women are societal conditioned to take direction from, defer to, and trust those in power. When the entire society rests on privileging men and colludes to keep women in their place or subservient to men, the relation between political thoughts and marriage is alternate but unequal. Within society rulers and individuals both seek liberty however one fulfill by power and others submit to power as in freedom of thought or sexuality which a husband achieve with suppress towards his wife voice. Otherwise, a husband thinks if he slack some of ambitions or selfish lusts, he gives up his manly rules or rights which society consider it as a wrong for the reason that a man suppose to have the power in every matter. Thus, it cannot be an absolute because Mill believes in women's capacities. (Himmelfarb1989: 10, 20)
Social Purity show Butler's concerns towards women affairs that can be understood as a subjection of men and which can be seen as an argument for Mill's The Subjection of Women but fortunately it is not. For the reason that Butler's and Mill's principles of liberty go hand in hand. Mill believes, as Butler does, in sex equality and showed more concern especially after his relationship with Harriet Taylor and because he himself argued the rules of marriage in contemporary society. Moral influence of the social customs is a good ground for Butler, as a woman, to state first. Butler disagreed the declaration of inequality since the beginning of the creation. Mill and Butler have the same opinion that social attitudes and moral standards shaped social life and within their influences, people could lead their life to freedom of living. The influences of Victorian's morals force down women's rights as they created unequal morality within society and separated it into two codes of morality "one for men and other for women" as Butler states:

The root of the evil is the unequal standard in morality; the false idea that there is one code of morality for men and another for women, which has prevailed since the beginning, which was proclaimed to be false by Him who spoke as the Son of God, and yet which grew up again after his time in Christian communities, endorsed by the silence of the Church itself, and which has within the last century been publicly proclaimed as an axiom by almost all the government of the civilized and Christian world."(Butler 1879: 2).

Since the power is given to the stronger (a man), he accepts a woman as his substandard. In this case, as Mill asserted, there was no comparison between slaves and women. Both have a master and there is no law to protect their rights. Women suffer in community and as households. They suffer from unequal treatment and opportunities within society:

It is for the newly-born "nation within the nations" to protest that there is no such thing as a political whole, which is entitled to violate or dispense with
the smallest right of the meanest worm that crawls its floor; that there is no such a thing as a national unity of so splendid a tradition that the smoke of one personal wrong may not quench it”. (Butler 1879: 16)

By the 1870s and 1880s, evolutionary ideas of male sexuality as a biological imperative, which added fuel to many male writings on gender, were countered by those who argued that civilisation enabled humans to transcend animal instincts. This view acquired a public voice through the Social Purity campaign against the sexual double standards, and for male as well as female continence outside marriage. Though female purity campaigners were often ridiculed as new puritans who had failed to attract a partner, the movement did succeed in raising public concern over brothels, indecent theatrical displays and images of naked women in art (the reason why Victorian female nudes are idealised and air-brushed). Private sexual behaviour is hard to assess, though many hints that considerate husbands, as it is natural for men to be women's rulers and who do not insist on intercourse. However, there is plain evidence that the early Victorian family of six to eight or more children was on its way out by 1901. In 1850s, a family that consists of more than seven live children was considered as a small family. While at the end of the century five or six children was considered as a big family. Family size is one of the main obstructions that Victorians faced. The house was crowded of children and servants, but more or less couples lived a separate life. At that time, the wife took care of children and the house; the husband could travel away for business or enjoy his life without his wife and children. This explains how they were emotionally isolated from each other. From 1870s, couples in all classes choose to limit and plan family size by a variety of methods within a culture of self-denial. This took place despite the fact that contraceptive knowledge was not a familiar topic and that methods were not publicly available. The emergence of the new woman accompanied further changes. These included a limitation of family members as well as a challenging of the prevailing sexual attitudes between this new woman and her male supporters. In other words, men are awake and consciously believers and responsible for their actions, so why they do mistakes if they consider themselves clean and not guilty?
Are not they human as women? (Hoppen 1998: 316-323) "Gender is neither the causal result of sex nor as seemingly fixed sex." (Butler 1990: 9, 10)

As other Victorian entities, Ruskin criticized the liberal thoughts that came from United States. He said liberty in American society was limited therefore; in his opinion, liberty was the other face for capitalism while Victorian society refused capitalism. Ruskin was against individuals' liberty and he considered individuals as a part of society that could not be separate from its body. Human's relations could not be an absolute. Therefore, individuals' liberty is socially limited. Thus, he believes in government's power and refused argumentations and persuasive principles. (Ramos 2001: 260, 261) Personally, I think what he claimed at is capitalism itself. While the United States spread liberty all over the world, her people suffer and slaves trade increase within society. Therefore, American society is a paradoxical society. In addition, Mill shows a paradox in liberty's principles, as he, indirectly, followed every opinion with the opposed one. Individuals obey society's rules even by fear of law punishment, religion or from moral sanctions; therefore, individuals' liberty cannot be achieved. (Fitzjames 1993: 8) The relation between political thoughts and marriage is alternate but unequal. Meaning, society rulers and individuals both seek liberty, however one fulfill by power and others submit to power as in freedom of thought or sexuality which a husband achieve with suppress towards his wife voice. Otherwise, a husband thinks if he slacks some of ambitions or selfish lusts, he gives up his manly rules or rights which society consider it as a wrong for the reason that a man suppose to have the power in every matter. Thus, it cannot be an absolute because Mill believes in women capacities. (Himmelfarb 1989:10-20)

Through my study and by following the Victorian's reaction towards prostitutes which shows that Victorians considered prostitute as a social evil and was judged by genders roles. Society's strict manners can be a good example by realize gender's differences which gave freedom of thought and speak to a gentleman. Even a man himself had to follow some rules to become a gentleman.
However, upper-class men were born gentlemen because of a family name as if it was their birth right. Other classes would not join the upper-class even if they followed it social standards and this shows that Victorian society was a paradoxical one, in which hierarchy really ruled.
II. Faith, Justice and Cultural Codes

Female writings symbolized, for a long time, a shelter for innocence and purity but after the industrial revolution women broke society's strict bounds that kept them in a matrix. Women were always voiceless in Church or in politics parties. Feminism proved that women's writings could discuss politics as they could discuss religion or romance. Feminist writings pictured reality of women's deprivation as dolls' houses controlled by their masters and they were suppressed and besieged by strict moral rules that were taught as religious rules or laws, which had to be always obeyed. Therefore, feminist writings described women as slaves, so their writings expressed their opinions and issues as human beings. Women were badly used by men as being considered weak creatures and in custody in their houses. Rebellion was the spirit of feminism by which they wanted to have power. Josephine Butler repealed all opinions that were against her campaigns and protected vice in men as it was a word of god and she considered it an oppression and injustice that was practiced by upper classes against the lower classes. When a victory was won in England in 1886 she kept going on her campaigns and started her continent tours in Europe and India to fight against the Contagious Disease Acts and proofed that laws and systems of societies might be wrong and useless. As we can read in *Truth before Everything*:

We are once more,-as in 1869 and the following years,- face to face with a powerful body of persons desiring the adoption in our midst of the regulation of immorality by the State. By the force of circumstances, or I would rather say, by the Providence of God, my name (unworthy as it may be) came, after
years of arduous work, to be placed at the front of this special movement on behalf of justice. I have, therefore, a solemn responsibility pressing upon me at this time. In the midst of the "strife of tongues" on this question, in the Press, and in official quarters, and hearing in the midst of that strife the voices of some of whom we had hoped better things, raised in unison with those which advocate a "Legislation of despair," I feel have a word to say, and I must say it. (Butler 1897: 1).

and she added:

I judge with gentleness those of my fellow women who are now using their influence against the just and holy cause for which I have spent my life. Our warfare has never been against persons, but against vicious principles, against widely promulgated falsehoods, while we have only withstood or done battle with individuals when they became the exponents or incarnation of the base theories and principles which we oppose. (Butler 1897: 2).

As prostitution was one obvious social problem that lay in the fact that the law did not distinguish between prostitutes and other women of the lower classes, and another was that, contrary to common Victorian belief that any extramarital sexual experience inevitably doomed women to a life of prostitution, lonely death, many women only worked intermittently as prostitutes. Josephine Butler, whose daughter's death sent her out to help fallen women, took her personal grief and channelled it productively into their dealings with the world outside. She said:

We earnestly plead with you to look beyond the horrible statics of disease to the still more terrible facts of which it is at once the index and the inevitable outcome. (Butler 1897: 28)

As prostitution was a permanent and necessary evil, they condemned male sexual access to fallen women and were specifically directed at women in order to protect the health of men. If the priority had been to fight venereal diseases, then inspecting the
prostitutes' clients would also have been required by the Acts. However, the assumption was that, while men would be offended at the intrusion, women were already so degraded that further humiliations were of no consequence.

The British army did not permit enlisted men to marry, facing two consequences of this prohibition that officials deemed unacceptable. In theory, several different solutions to this problem were possible:

Soldiers and sailors could have been inspected by physicians.

- Enlisted men could have been permitted to marry.
- Homosexuality could have been permitted
- Members of the armed forces could have access to condoms.

The first solution was tried but abandoned because it supposedly demoralized men, the second was not tried until much later, and Victorian morality would not permit the last three. Instead, the legislation sought to preserve the health of the military by permitting policeman to arrest prostitutes in ports and army towns and bring them in to have compulsory checks for venereal disease. Butler claimed that moral elements and sexual morality was never mentioned in military's promotions,

A man who has spent much of his time in hospital from these disgraceful diseases may, if he be a well conducted soldier in other respects when he is out of hospital, get his discharge with a character described as 'exemplary.' Should not the War Office decide at once, as it can if it please, that the 'medical history sheet' shall be taken into consideration as well as the defaulters' sheet' in giving the soldier a character? (Butler 1897: 27)

If the women were suffering from sexually transmitted diseases they were placed in a locked hospital until cured, a situation considered unacceptable by Josephine Butler:

We demand that there should be no reversion to an immoral and discredited system, but that practical steps should be taken which, while supplying adequate
means for the voluntary treatment of disease, should be based on-

(1.) A positive discourage of sexual vice;

(2.) And a positive recognition of the merits of abstinence from vice.

(Butler 1897: 26).

As we know Victorian society was shaped by strict cultural and social manners which affected the way of their living. As we mentioned, there were manners for seating, eating, talking and walking. Manners such as children should keep silent while parents talked and during the main meals all the family members should have the meals together. In fact, moral attitudes differ according to people, place and time. Therefore, we cannot put moral rules for people and enforce them to obey and behave politely. Religion is the right and best way for a human's protection along one's life.

I do not deny customs of society but I do not accept the double standards that confuse individuals and make them ask whether they obey law or religion. Personally, I believe that the combination of religion and law shaped the customs of society as it is a kind of balance between god's orders and human laws. The confusion, in which we live in nowadays, is due to our misunderstanding of god's law. Actually, we try to make changes that we think may suit our needs but what we came up with is a mess in our world. We made the mess and still ask who is guiding us, religion or conventions? Customs are invisible rules, in other words, unwritten, but they control the biggest part of our deeds and life. However, reason and logic are in conflict with most of these customs which shape our life. I will not discuss or evaluate conventions negatively or positively because I believe the way to discuss these conventions has to be by individuals, who have to judge them methodically at first, then rationally and logically. Only individuals have the right to decide if the laws suit his/her needs or not. In other words, they need to apply a method to help them to understand the conventions before any judgment. Should we obey the laws because we are commanded to do? Or obey them because we want to as they give wise advices such as how we should speak, walk, eat and laugh? I think the answers to these questions will be yes, we should
obey them to have a better life.

In the Victorian age to obey society's costumes meant to have a kind of routine that was followed for ages. Thus, to accept any new ideas or thoughts would make society change or even disappear.

The disparagers of culture make its motive curiosity; sometimes, indeed, they make its motive mere exclusiveness and vanity. The culture which supposed to plume itself on a smattering of Greek and Latin is a culture which is begotten by nothing so intellectual as curiosity; it is valued either out of sheer vanity and ignorance, or else as an engine of social and class distinction, separating its holder, like a badge or title, from other people who have not got it. (Golby 1986: 199).

Morals attitudes differ from one society to another and if they were similar the comparison would be useless. Therefore, there would not be different civilizations through ages; besides every culture has its own customs that suit it.

I am quite aware that the opinions of my own class in political matters have not yet received their due weight; but we cannot be indifferent in matters of this description, so immediately affecting The liberty, the social relationship of our sisters and daughters, and so surely, although it may be in an indirect manner, sapping and weakening our whole system. (Butler 1897: 18).

These differences could be acceptable but if we look at them from another point of view, we will find out there are complicated cultural and social problems. This leads us to think about such cruel customs that are acceptable in some cultures such as children sacrifices or to give the right for a man to kill his mother, sister, wife or cousin because she is not pure. Thus, if we define customs as the fruits of human activities and society's identity, we have to accept it even if it is illogical or irrational. This means we have to be blind and voiceless. Societies which look at other cultures with a critical eye may argue that the others are strange. In addition, to give a logical excuse that there are conventions which we think have an absolute power over human beings, are nothing more than a
human legacy and which we accepted as they are. This objection leads us to the costumes of society present in its own culture and if we can not use our costumes to argue others, thus the others can not argue ours. There are always difficulties of judgment.

To consider costumes as unwritten rules means they may be only human beings' imagination. As some found difficulties to put a specific definition for costumes may suggest define it as religious orders. Thus it takes the religious form and then it will be easy for society to enforce people to obey. However, this opinion leads us to another, genius and knowledgeable individuals can not be believed in their capacities of conventions' understanding. They might be isolated or killed under the name of society's protection because it does not fit and support the ruler's power.

Culture is then properly described not as having its origin in curiosity, but as having its origin in the love of perfection; it is a study of perfection. It moves by the force, not merely or primarily of the scientific passion for pure knowledge, but also of the moral and social passion for doing good. (Golby 1986: 200)

Because, we always find in conventions some details which can not be understood by science even if we replaced conventions legacy by science. Therefore, scholars' opinions can not be trustful whether it is rightness or not:

Tell these gentlemen that we workmen know what is lawful and what is unlawful, what is moral and what is unmoral, better than they do. We answer them that God and conscience existed before their science, and that if their knowledge produces such fruit, the sooner they forget it the better it will be for their own souls and the souls of those whom they wish to influence. (Butler 1897: 17).

This argument makes us question how can we distinguish conventions? How are we able to know which are virtual and which are useless and which should be changed or delayed? We may think we can live without them or easily change and this is a problem itself because we have to expect the results and how it will affect on society.

A transformation from past to present by teaching children how to learn from the past could be a tradition which a family uses to protect traditions. To convince that morals are
comparative and not standard means nothing more or less important than other. Therefore, marriage goals are much more than a biological relationships, it is a chain of sociological relationships and progress through generations.

Our part of conflict is not the least important part; it is vital, its roots are deep, its influence is as wide as the world. What more vital, next to our relations with God, than our relations- men and women- with each other? (Butler 1897: 4).

Finally, we can understand from the above assertions that conventions can not be limited because societies are complex forms and we have to deal with them carefully. As we know, the Victorian age witnessed great changes not only in economical, social and cultural issues but also in the political system as the British Empire reached the zenith of its greatness to cover a quarter of the globe. Commerce and industry expanded rapidly and rail tracks and water courses crossed the nation's length. Science and technology advanced and the size of the middle class grew immensely. Furthermore, the government offered democratic reforms, allowing, for example, greater numbers of people to vote. Despite the prosperity of the Victorian age, the workers in the factories and farms lived in destitution and many people fought for better social, economic and political conditions.

The writers of the Victorian age also covered the contrast between the wealth of the high and middle classes and the shameful state of the poor class as well as analyzing the weakness of faith in traditional values at the end of the nineteenth century. For many critics, the Victorian age is characterized by its religious and intellectual fanaticisms that were explicit in many contemporary essays. Yet, gradually their opinion changed, or rather, their mentality blossomed with the movement that assisted them by expanding their perceptions to understand religion in a rational manner and which explained or clarified religious meanings in a smooth manner. Despite the objections that faced this movement in which the development of science had a very important rule, namely in relation to religion, it continued, proved its strength and was able to soften Victorian minds and bend the rigid
Victorian chains. It was gradually absorbed by society that was transferred from a state of intolerance to mental openness. The transformation of the Victorian mind to a state of flexibility assisted the female movement to perfect its role in demanding for women’s rights. And proving also their existence as active social elements and high-lighting the vital role that could be played given full rights and freedom, despite the refusal of the Queen and her continual attempts to silence these movements, perhaps because of her feeling that it might cause a revolt against her policies:

Julie V. Daubié, authoress of "Le femme pauvre du XIX me Siécle," wrote to me from Paris in the years when we first demanded the repeal of the Contagious Disease Acts:- "Beware of imitating official France in this matter. This law has so infamous a character as the protector of the disorders of men, at the contempt which exists among us for the executive authority can only be attributed to the disgust which every honest man feels for every police functionary engaged in this business. You have the inexpressible happiness of having a moral Government, responsible functionaries, and Queen who is the model of every virtue of public and private life.Supplicate that honourable and single-hearted woman to take in hand the cause of human dignity and of virtue, and obtain from the wisdom of your Parliament a solemn affirmation of the authority of reason over subversive passions. (Butler 1897: 4, 5)

Butler made reference to the principal of casting doubt on the credibility of the individual and society. The mistrust of the individual in the extent of the credibility of the government to fulfill its promises versus the individual performing compulsory matters which the government viewed as responding to his individual needs while, in fact, their essence was to fulfill the needs of the government.

The mistrust was thus mutual and the circle of doubt could expand to include a third side which was religion that, in its teachings, rejected the principle of doubt as it weakened the power of the individual’s belief and, subsequently, lessened his or her worship of God.
This is exactly what may occur between a married couple when, once one doubt the sincerity of his/ her partner, problems begin. Should these problems be exacerbated, one of the couple, if not both, will search for a quiet place to find unobserved pleasure. This, in Butler’s opinion, meant an escape to illegal ways that threatened the lives of the individuals and society:

Not to speak of the bitter hardships, the violence and slavery to which the miserable women under this State control are subjected, the young men who come in contact with them lose all generous feeling, and corrupted before they are full grown, they acquire the skepticism which withers the hearts and falsifies the conscience. The number of State victims to vice grows every day to excess, and marriage becomes always rarer. (Butler 1897: 5)

The idea of mistrust is useful in bringing to mind that societies are complex enough to demand careful treatment, especially in light of the attempts that commenced in the twentieth century to fuse all traditions and create a new social order, even a new man from scratch. Yet this idea has no worth in the extent of specifying whether any particular tradition should be excluded or adopted. The problem in this line of defense is that it can defend tradition generally but is unable to defend a particular tradition from criticism or doubting. Essentially, this is the reason. The original quote states that it may be dangerous to change any tradition, not that it is either logical or illogical, but simply that we do not know whether the result of this change is beneficial to society or not. As an example, this theory states that the abolition of the tradition of slavery may release unforeseen catastrophic results. It is for this reason that some defended slavery before its demise. It appears that we have, finally, resolved this dilemma of judging traditions as whether they are logical or not. Any tradition that leads solely to extinction is an illogical tradition.
All that these theories concur to is that traditions are ferries that pass on information through generations. In the end, we may evaluate them as right or wrong. The logic of traditions may be justified to the extent that they are a means to convey the truth. Therefore, with this idea, you will change from defending tradition to clearly destroying it and replacing it with a scientific text since science will present the idea more precisely and correctly than tradition. The truth is that the ignorant mass will retain the tradition while the educated elite will certainly cast it away:

But "how is it possible," I hear it asked, "that purity workers should ever range themselves on the side of the State organization of a hideous vice"?", "The discovery of the true answer to the above question might bring some hope of the recognition of the seriousness of this lapse of a return to moral sanity. (Butler 1897: 13)

Factually, traditions begin in the form of direct orders but, in succeeding stages, transform from orders to suggestions and advices, I have ever maintained that the principles which underlie all just law respect for the human person, for the personal rights of all, for the claim to liberty of all who are not legally judged and condemned as criminals, for the equality of all—rich and poor.

In returning to the beginning, we may state that the degree of error that the intelligent explanation of tradition as an essential part of instructional terms is controversial and present within the efforts expended to find a goal or a neutral means to judge a certain tradition. This is apparent in the attack of the ideas of renaissance of traditions as old superstitions. It may be, thus, stated that every tradition we follow may be divided into two stages, firstly as behavioral phenomena or as an instinct code present in our intellective or neurological system and secondly, the correlative value that can be discussed, analysed or defended by words. Namely, the instinct code of any tradition will first appear in the form of commands, instructions and prohibitions in a manner to program the individuals to avoid
the prohibited. The other form may be termed as the ideological structure of traditions; a collection of superstitions and expressions that the society uses to justify commands and prohibitions. It is the form employed as a strong excuse to justify the custom from which it initially arose and that is the embodied shape in social thought. When we evaluate any tradition as to whether it is beneficial or not, we must remember its two separate forms. We have two standards by which we evaluate any tradition. The first is the extent of benefit of the tradition on the first level or, in other words, its instinct code. The second standard is the ideological or intellective structure resulting from it and its value to that society. But the tradition should not lose its moral value and thus become subject to criticism, comparison and questioning. What distinguishes a specific tradition from another one in a different society? The code is not only important to produce honorable men and women in the eyes of their society. To produce a collection of good social traditions, the society must first produce effective individuals able to attain these values. You have to produce individuals with great daring to protect their society. You have to produce sages to maintain a stable path for society. You have to produce individuals able to control their motives in order to make society orderly. These preceding reasons explain fully the violent reaction in society towards people who try to change a tradition or a particular value. That does not only subject the surface ideology of a society to danger but also the moral value on which was built that tradition or that inherited instinct code. This means that when we speak on the individual level, we fail to evaluate it on the community level. Does not a society have the right to defend its pampered customs against the attack raised by controversy and doubt? Especially when the aim of the discussant is to destroy the foundations of that custom and radically change it? These deep-rooted customs are as inherent as the DNA of the group as a whole. It tells us of the reaction that must be demonstrated at the appearance of social sentiment such as disgrace, honor and pride. It tells how we must behave. It makes us what we really are within the society exactly as our parents told us how to behave when we were children. It is confirmed as a constitution that rules our existence. We cannot question whether these instinct traditions are beneficial to a
certain society because, by themselves, they form this society and they are the necessary precondition to achieve any social system. Therefore, it is wrong to evaluate any custom or tradition in an abstract manner.

Thus, imitation is the sole means possible to convey the vital social tradition. It functions as a recipe to make an individual feel and behave as does the society in which he lives. Those traditions do not ask us directly and sternly to follow them. We are given the right to choose between good and evil but by saying that if you performed a good deed one will be returned to you or its value credited to you. This means that if you wish to reach a certain society and that these are the choices you have after you have achieved the required bases to reach this society. When we view these customs, traditions or rules in this manner, we immediately realize that it is useless to describe them as correct or otherwise. They are correct in the society in which they emerged and are practiced and considered wrong by another society practicing different customs befitting the culture of its people and environment. So let us recognize a glaring truth. No one can be in a position to judge a tradition as better or worse in several civilizations and societies. But there is a standard by which an individual may determine the most appropriate for him/her. If we wish to generalize the idea in a larger manner, we may question ourselves as whether we appreciate our status as it is today or as it was in the past. Both mentalities, of the individual and society, can perform the comparisons and discover which they prefer, what has passed or what will come.

An individual may opt to experiment new matters he/she likes and refuses to return to the old. And this applies to society too. Revolutions that erupted during past ages might have been because of or aimed at change and anticipating the better. The whole society may carry out a revision of many of its traditions in order to preserve its independence and not fall prey to rebelling imperialism. The only way to achieve that is to mimic the culture of the occupier and draw it into the society and then evaluate it within their society. This clarifies the value of the transfer of traditions between societies. They are old in societies that established them but are new in the society that imports and adopts
them. In the first instance, they represent the wisdom of our forefathers and in the second, represent innovation and regeneration resulting from humanity. The tradition may also be a negative inheritance and become a burden on present generations or a means to transport the present generation to a form in harmony with another tradition from another society. Society may resurrect a new spirit into a tradition that is slumbering or considered dead, to revive it from an old trace to a milestone of the future.

Society may also change the shape, ideology or legend of a tradition and retain its instinct code. It may also justify the presence and code of a tradition by competing or contradicting it with another. An individual who embraces a religion may justify his exemplary behavior in the name of his religion while one who embraces another religion would justify his behavior in carrying out a similar act to the first to his own religion. In reality, numerous customs have persisted in their elemental instinct code despite the change to its ideology that is apparent or explanatory to its presence. There may also appear a totally different possibility. An individual or a society may totally refuse to imitate a tradition in its instinct code and ideological constitution, in form and content, for a moral value that surfaces forcefully. This experiment in transformation is an important key to comprehend this distinctive phenomenon which releases a new base for imitation that creates a change between the path of the past and present in a clear manner.

The accumulative growth of any tradition in its instinct code is the most change that deeply befalls a society and it shakes the society more in the traditional and ideological notions as it changes the bases of the tradition in its essence. These changes, in a wider sense, are termed a “cultural revolution”. After such a major change, individuals think entirely differently and their sentiments and reactions change drastically and they begin to feel ashamed of what they were proud of in the past. In certain situations, it is due to the appearance of groups of higher power. In other cases it occurs due to the appearance of an old tradition, its revival and its attempt to emulate just as classical paganism appeared during the European Renaissance.

So, the theory of change is the major key to understanding the nature of traditions and
transformed customs. For one who is convinced in the relativity of moral, he/she truly knows that there is no moral standard more or less significant than another in an absolute manner. Yet he/she cannot deny that others are totally convinced that the moral standards they adopted are higher than those they collected by accumulation. They may term it illusion but he/she realizes that the power of this illusion lies in creating permanent and deep behavioral changes in the group. Or, in summary, the more supreme is the moral value of a civilization, the harder it is to maintain. A society that wishes to preserve its civilization has first to convey its knowledge through which it safeguards its cultural standard. If a society wishes to find the means that would ensure and safeguard the transfer of its techniques, its members should sense that they have a moral obligation to leave behind a better world for their children and grand children. Grand children (the 3rd generation) are an important junction in civilizations so civilizations continue when there is a widespread sense of moral duty to convey the civilization from the first generation to the grand children. A society that does not have this sense may flourish for a generation or two but it will certainly recede after that. Do traditions preserve the cultural standard of a society or not?

The degree of success of a tradition is judged not only by preserving the standards of a civilization but when it possesses the effectiveness that establishes for future development of the society not only on the material level but also in building the human character on the individual and group levels, or in other words, when the tradition has a clear outlook of the future. By meaning, tradition is the value that keeps us civilized and offers us the means to be more so. It is a social reconstruction when it materializes in future generations and the foundation for a new, sound and futurist social structure. For case of discussion, we allow for the presence of the social construction of reality while we have to remember that the fact is that this social structure has been successfully achieved in the past. I move with this to the present. We need to realize that this factual social structure ensures the foundations of future social pillars that cannot be visualized without. At the time when people undertake building a social fact, they, in turn, produce people capable of
building a morally superior social fact to the preceding it. Actually, it is the social fact that refuses the regress to inferior moral state.

Safekeeping the human rights of women is more important than safekeeping civil rights; so society may retain its balance though women’s merit for civil and human rights is not a favor from men but a God-given right as Butler said:

“Men and women alike in the most exalted social classes frequently possess extraordinarily little knowledge of the conditions of life among the poor, and consequently little sympathy with humbler people who are the most liable to suffer under grievances imposed officially, over and above the hardship incidental to their condition. High rank itself tends to confuse and obscure the mental vision on a subject concerning which, of all others, we need to know the instincts and conviction of the people, and to make room for the expression of the great heart of toiling and suffering humanity, which still so largely beats true among us, and in all”. (Butler 1897: 8).

But history testifies to the fact that women have succeeded to a great extent in influencing society when they enjoyed full human rights in love and tenderness of society for them and the appreciation of men for their role in building the nation even when they did not enjoy the full social rights enjoyed by men. Women have, in past centuries, participated in building the history of modern Europe despite not attaining the civil rights they have nowadays. Europe witnessed the achievements of Queen Victoria in Britain, Empress Catherine in Czarist Russia and the role of Jeanne D’ Arc in uniting France. Other civilizations that respected women and surrounded them with love and appreciation also had an abundant share of historic women. The Egyptian civilization produced Cleopatra and so was the case with the Islamic nation that produced to the world numerous women who made history and changed its course also and are headed by Mothers of the Believers, Khadija and Aisha, may God be pleased with them. Civilizations produce

---

10 Khadija: She was the first wife of Prophet Mohammad, peace upon him. They had two boys: Abu Alkassim and Abdullah, and four girls: Zainab, Rukaiya, Um Kalthum and Fatima, may God be pleased with them. All died before his death except Fatima who died six months after his death.

11 Aisha: She was the third wife and they, may God pleased with them, did not had any children.
great women when women were blessed with the respect and appreciation of society and it surrounded them with love and affection and not with competitiveness and exploitation. He/she who thinks that women were neglected in human history before the twentieth century should re-read history for a lot has passed him/her by. History did not mention Aisha, may God be pleased with her, Cleopatra or Queen Victoria only because their societies encompassed them with love and esteem but because women in those historic eras were focus of love and esteem by all society for all women. Women in those days did not need to disrobe to be known and become famous and they were not used as an object for advertisement or become a truck driver to enjoy freedom.

As a conclusion, human mind could not understand that morals can not be achieved by force. In other words, when we enforce someone to do something he/she does not like this means we consider him/her stupid and delay his/her ability to choose the right because we control their thoughts and guide them to the way which we think is the best for all and not for individual freedom. Although, we find out that we control the human character. As a man born free, so he wants to practice this freedom and no matter whatever it takes. However; he rebels against any rule that might control his free will. Thus, his right choices' are controlled by force and then his decisions are distorted.

If a man is giving an absolute power he will destroy his moral behaviour and this gives him the freedom of doing whatever he wants and treats a woman badly since he has the power to do. He can beat or kill her without judgments. From this point there should appear another power which controls his power and teach him how to use it in the right way because she is a feminine and first of all she is a human. A feminine has a distinguished characteristic but humanity does not. In other words, culture shapes individual's character a man or a woman is a human and each of them has his/her own personality and character to choose the best for his/her life and practice his/her freedom within a society and this can be achieved by culture. We can say that moral and culture are chained together by the power of religious convictions, dissolution and liberality.
Conclusion

In this dissertation I discussed the often complex attitudes about social and cultural life and analysed the assumptions stating that the Victorian age was simply a repressed one, in which all natural feelings were regarded as sinful. After all, the Victorian age also saw an explosion of scientific and psychological thinking on the very nature of human love and sexuality. Therefore I tried to at least take an interdisciplinary look at Victorian ideas about sex and love as reflected in literature and other cultural works.

In this dissertation I presented some ideas about Victorian society and questions of prostitution in the history of Victorian sexuality. The Victorians were quite prudish. In my study I progressed from the life of Queen Victoria to her people's life as I tend to think of etiquette and quiet tea parties where open discussions about anything, took place, least of all sex, which strictly taboo subject. I tried to spot light about how were the Victorian's ideas about love and sex before and after marriage. And also to analyse how women's positions were defined by their society and how the Victorians were considering women as a second class.

As we know, from the legal point of view, married women had rights similar to children's rights. This means they were subaltern to men. According to their own witness and manifestations, many people born during the Victorian age were both uninformed and emotionally reserved about sexual matters. If the husband did not demand the fulfilments of his nuptial rights, sex would not exist in marriage. Victorian marriage was a patriarchal and rigid tradition wherein a husband was the family protector and representative. The typical Victorian man was raised on matters of courtship merely exercising his rights and
the wife had to perform her duties. As women issues were not to be discussed, prostitution increased a lot during this period. Women's condition in general was actually worsened through the first Contagious Diseases Prevention Act in 1864. In towns with a large military population women suspected of being prostitutes had to subject themselves to a genital examination and they were harshly treated. If they refused, they were imprisoned immediately; if they were with an illness they were sent to hospitals and isolated until they were cured. This law was applied to women only since military doctors believed that these shameful examinations would destroy a man's self-respect and this shows another indication of the double standard which characterised Victorian society. Because the decision about who was a prostitute was left to the judgment of police officers, far more women than those who were really prostitutes were examined. After two extensions of the law, the unjust acts were finally repealed in 1886. One of whom who took this matter seriously and considered it as a social problem that should be healed and stopped was Josephine Butler who helped to form a society which worked to repeal these acts. The Anti-Contagious Diseases movement was led by Josephine Butler, who argued that contagious diseases examinations effectively encouraged prostitution and women should not be deprived of civil liberty as only male lust was to blame for public vice. In her opinion these were the important issues. In addition, the emergence of polite women speaking on topics previously deemed unacceptable for them to discuss underlined women's changing roles during the Victorian period.

Josephine Butler desired to rescue prostitutes and avoid her habits of spending time in streets for this purpose; however, her life is richly documented and her activities on this subject and there is no evidence that she ever, in fact, copulated with any of them or did anything but take tea or talk with them and try to convince them to forsake their sinful ways as she did with her neighbour.

Butler's *Social Purity* (1879) opened the door widely for discussing prostitution as a social evil. One of the reasons that women would go into prostitution was simply because it was very gainful. By reading *Social Purity* we realized that prostitution was a leisureed
and beneficial trade, by which women improved their positions, helped to educate siblings and often saved enough money to open a shop or lodging house. In an age where feminism and the women's equal rights movement was just a beginning making serious evolutions, as the options available to women were limited.

In her *Truth Before Everything* (1897) she discussed the fields of gender, health, medicine and sexuality which the Victorians seldom lived up to their stereotypes. The Victorian period is commonly viewed by people as an era of moral strictness, attended by extinguished sexuality. However, this is not exactly true. According to our study, Victorians had a very powerful, if officially repressed, sexual appetite. Add to this the paradox, which we find out, that prostitution became legal and we could see how this problem really worked out.

Although, there was the career of governess, in which one had to be respectable and educated to break into that career and this was only possible in middle and upper classes. Domestic duties were possible for lower classes as well but they were very low paying. Prostitution, on the other hand, offered a relatively high wage, with easier working conditions and fewer hours than in other available jobs. As well as, a prostitute was more socially liberated than women from other classes. As a matter of fact, by the mid of the century, many people were affected by venereal diseases and the number was increasing and thus prostitution begun to be an economical problem for both individuals and society. Moreover, the main problem related to prostitution was the high possibility of venereal diseases which society should be protected from.

By 1864, venereal diseases were a major problem among soldiers and sailors in the British Army and Navy. The British Congress passed then a set of laws called the Contagious Diseases Act which made it possible for police to arrest a prostitute if she was found to have venereal disease. Prostitutes were routinely examined at military bases, if they serviced those bases. Women's group rose up in fury over the Act, which was extremely discriminatory against prostitutes, denying them even basic rights. This led to the establishment of new legislation in 1886, which replaced the Contagious Diseases Act.
Victorian prostitution still interests us today as it exerted over its contemporaries, as does Victorian womanhood more generally. Discussions of Victorian sexuality and attitudes to women often assume that for the Victorians there were two clearly distinct kinds of women, the pure and innocent and the unchaste and fallen women. Actually, this statement illuminates a slight apprehension of the meaning of prostitution and an awareness of nuances of good and bad women in Victorian age. As a matter of fact, we can recognize that many people in England was the belief in what might be defined as the partial or retrievable fall. Mason in *The Making of Victorian Sexual Attitudes* comments upon the tendency of Victorian social observers to exaggerate the number of prostitutes and amount of prostitution occurring in the rapidly expanding cities of the nineteenth century. Working-class women might be presumed by middle-class observers to be prostitutes, or at least well on the way to falling, through gross misreading of the behavioural codes of different social classes. The middle class ideology which was increasingly identifying respectable womanhood with the home and private life, tended to see women in the public realm as falling away from this ideal. An ideal which took no account of the realities of life for working-class women. Particularly, women's regular places of public amusement were imagined to be there on business as prostitutes rather than for harmless recreation. Mason suggested that there were refuges for prostitutes by the end of nineteenth century as well as more transient forms of assistance. Different institutions specialised in different areas of work among endangered girls and women, refuges for the once fallen, penitentiaries for the more hardened sinners and even discriminated between the more common kind of prostitute and those of higher social class. Mason had indicated indistinct boundaries between the protective and the punitive, and points out that rescuing and policing prostitute were not the dichotomous operations they have been depicted as by various writers. Both activities were among a range of strategies pursued by individuals and organisations concerned about the social evil. In fact the big gap in attitudes towards prostitution was probably not between those who proffered different solutions for what they perceived as a
problem, but between those who in fact, saw it as a difficult moral and social problem and those who took what Mason has called the line of feminists' classic moralism based on an acceptance of the double moral standard as natural, assuming prostitution to be an ineradicable and necessary institution of society. (Mason 1994: 215 - 223). This is an area of fascinating paradoxes which demands further explorations far more subtle than assumptions about the delineation of the prostitute as a stigmatised and outcast other. Mason, for example, registers the curious and paradoxical imbrications of the idea of sisterhood between female rescue workers and the fallen women who worked among, alongside the notion that intelligent and pious ladies of the rescue movement were morally immune to the vices with which they came into contact. (Mason 1994: 117-122) He sometimes seemed to be going along the same road while we can no longer think of England and respectable ladies. It still behoove us to be cautious and critical of the evidence and to be aware that women were operating within a system in which the beliefs and expectations of males about their own sexuality, as well as that of women, had a significant impact.

I was delighted to read Josephine Butler's gratifying works, *Social Purity* and *Truth Before Everything* as I wish I could cover at least a small part of them and I am sure there are still many ideas that would be present in this dissertation.

In conclusion I have mentioned in discussing prostitution and put it in human rights frame and now we may imagine that there was a social problem and we can not ignore or change human nature in order to justify the double moral standard.
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