

### 3.2 ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF SPACES OF IM-/MORALITY. A POWER ANALYSIS PERSPECTIVE ON THE PROBLEMATIZATION OF PROSTITUTION C. 1900

Heike Mauer

The objects under examination in this case study are the ‘problematization’ of prostitution in Luxembourg in the early twentieth century and the related construction of spaces. Michel Foucault uses the term problematization to refer to the process of questioning the answers provided by politics to the problems posed them (see Foucault 1984: 385). This problematization is permeated with power relationships, which are also examined. Files of legal and police authorities, parliamentary debates and newspaper reports are used as sources. First the historical context and the central issue of the paper are presented.

Around the turn of the century, sexuality and especially prostitution rose to the level of a ‘problem’ throughout Europe. There were many reasons for this: governments, military and colonial administrations held prostitution responsible for the spread of venereal diseases; the public was concerned about the issue of so-called ‘white slavery’, i.e. the trafficking of girls. At the same time, the ever-stronger women’s movements were criticizing the double standards of the bourgeoisie, which restricted women’s sexuality to marriage, yet allowed men extramarital and premarital sexual contacts through regulated prostitution (see Herzog 2011: 6ff.). In Luxembourg, too, the government targeted prostitution as a propagator of venereal diseases. For instance, the health report of 1907 spoke of “a significant increase in venereal diseases in recent years” and the medical inspector demanded “regulation of prostitution to prevent venereal diseases. [...] We must not forget the quality of the people by focusing on quantity”<sup>11</sup> (Collège Médical 1908: 16). Consequently, a government commission was appointed to combat prostitution. The trafficking of girls was also publicly scandalized in the newspapers (see, for instance, *Luxemburger Wort* 1904b). The bourgeois women’s movement in Luxembourg only indirectly addressed prostitution by criticizing proletarian living conditions from a moral perspective (see Goetzinger 1997: 67). By contrast, the *Katholische Frauenbund* (Catholic Women’s Association) began in 1911 to gather signatures for a petition against the so-called hostess bars (*Animierkneipen*) considered to be the “most dangerous strongholds of venereal disease”, because “that is where alcoholism and prostitution join hands”<sup>12</sup> (*Das Volkswohl* 1911).

**11** | Personal translation of: “[...] in den letzten Jahren eine bedeutende Zunahme der venerischen Erkrankungen”, [...] “durch Reglementierung der Prostitution der Zunahme der venerischen Erkrankungen vorzubeugen [...].”

**12** | Personal translation of: “[...] gefährlichsten Horte der Geschlechtskrankheiten” [...] “Alkoholismus und Prostitution reichen sich hier die Hand.”

In a word, around 1900 prostitution was also ‘discovered’ in Luxembourg as a social problem which seemed to be getting increasingly out of control. This started a debate involving parliament, police, legal authorities and the political public concerning the existing prostitution policies and their practical implementation. The background for the problematization of prostitution was the rapidly advancing industrialization of the country, especially in the so-called Minette Basin (ore basin) and the concomitant increase in (labour) migration (see Scuto 2012: 67ff.). Hence in 1911 the above-mentioned government commission pronounced:

“[W]hen commerce and industry attracted to the newly emerging centres thousands of men living in forced or voluntary celibacy and furnished them with ample, relatively well-paid work, prostitution appeared at the head of those elements which exploit the weaknesses and passions of the workers”<sup>13</sup> (Archives Nationales de Luxembourg (ANLux) J 64/39: 243).

We shall first examine which spaces of im-/morality are in general constructed, which social, political and territorial boundaries are drawn for this purpose and which dimensions these construction processes encompass. Subsequently we shall inquire into the power relationships created, negotiated and transformed by the construction of spaces of im-/morality. Our particular interest here will be the relationship between the various power logics of sovereignty, discipline and governmentality distinguished by Foucault which – as the hypothesis argues – at the same time permeate the construction of im-/moral spaces.

### 3.2.1 Im-/Moral Spaces as the Result of Demarcatory Policies

One dimension of the construction of im-/moral spaces in Luxembourg is the drawing of boundaries between national and foreign. The nation of Luxembourg, the territory of the Grand Duchy, is here imagined to be a space of moral integrity threatened by debauched foreigners crossing the borders:

“The domestic landlords of Esch are justifiably complaining about unscrupulous competition on the part of foreigners who are routinely [...] allowed to keep a public house. [...] Professional trollops come from neighbouring countries, rent a room in the vicinity of such bars and engage in prostitution”<sup>14</sup> (*Luxemburger Wort* 1904a).

---

**13** | Personal translation of: “[L]orsque le commerce et l’industrie attirèrent dans les centres naissants des milliers d’hommes vivant dans un célibat forcé ou volontaire, et leur fournirent un travail abondant et relativement bien rémunéré, la prostitution apparut à la tête des éléments qui exploitent les faiblesses et les passions des travailleurs.”

**14** | Personal translation of: “Die einheimischen Wirte von Esch beklagen sich mit Recht über eine schmutzige Konkurrenz seitens Ausländer, welche ohne weiteres [...] das Halten einer Schankstelle gestattet wird. [...] Gewerbsmäßige Racoleusen kommen aus den

And in 1907 a member of parliament asked:

“Why do we not more often make use of the legal lever of deportation? [...] If we would make more use of our right of deportation, then many vendible harlots would have to leave the public houses and cross the border, taking much that is sordid with them”<sup>15</sup> (Chambre des Députés 1907: 265).

One reason that this identification of morality with the nation and of immorality with the intrusion of foreigners could function was the exceptional position of prostitution legislation in Luxembourg. Unlike Belgium, France and the German Empire, the regulation of prostitution in Luxembourg at the beginning of the twentieth century was not implemented by the vice units responsible at the local level. Luxembourg had neither established controlled brothels nor a requirement for prostitutes to register with the police. Prostitution was thereby factually prohibited, yet on the other hand prostitutes did not have to fear demeaning forcible medical inspections by the police – as long as they were able to conceal their activities from the police. The authorities were certain that foreign prostitutes – from Metz, for instance, and other cities of the German Empire – were coming specifically to Luxembourg for that reason. A report made by the Hollerich police in 1908 states “[A]fter a time [...] it turned out that the same were largely under police inspection which they had eluded due to venereal disease”<sup>16</sup> (ANLux J 64/39: 392f.). And the *Verein für Volks- und Schulhygiene* (Society for Public and School Hygiene) lamented:

“When it is known that in Germany prostitutes are continuously inspected by the police and forced to undergo treatment if they are found to be diseased, it is easily understandable that all professional prostitutes find their way to our free country and our hostess bars [...]”<sup>17</sup> (Pier/Meyers 1910b: 25).

---

Nachbarländern herüber, mieten sich in der Nähe solcher Wirtschaften ihr Zimmer und treiben die Prostitution gewerbsmäßig.”

**15** | Personal translation of: “Warum gebrauchen wir nicht öfters die gesetzliche Handhabe der Ausweisung. [...] Würden wir mehr von unserem Ausweisungsrecht Gebrauch machen, dann müsste manche feile Dirne aus den Wirtshäusern über die Grenze gehen und manches Elend würde mit ihr aus den Wirtshäusern wegziehen.”

**16** | Personal translation of: “[N]ach einiger Zeit [...] stellt es sich heraus, dass dieselben grösstenteils unter Sittenkontrolle standen, welcher sie sich wegen Geschlechtserkrankung entzogen haben.”

**17** | Personal translation of: “Wenn man weiss, dass in Deutschland eine Sittenkontrolle besteht, welche die Prostituierten einer dauernden sitten- und sanitätspolizeilichen Kontrolle und im Erkrankungsfall einer Zwangsbehandlung unterwirft, so ist es leicht begreiflich, dass alle gewerbsmässigen Prostituierten den Weg in unser freies Land und in unsere Animierkneipen finden [...].”

There were similar fears regarding living together out of wedlock (concubinage), which was associated with prostitution. In contrast to neighbouring countries, concubinage was not prohibited, and the canton of Esch became, according to the authorities, a destination for foreigners living in concubinage (ANLux J 64/39: 372).

This already indicates a further dimension: the regionalization of immorality. It was primarily the heavily industrialized south, marked by a ‘proletarian culture’ (see Chapter 5.5), as well as the area around the train station in the capital city and the neighbouring parishes of Hollerich and Bonneweg, that were declared to be immoral spaces. Bars and cafés employing women as waitresses and/or maidservants were the main places where prostitution was secretly practised; there were hardly any streetwalkers. With regard to waitresses, the police commissioner of the city of Luxembourg stated as early as 1891 that they were “more often than not foreigners” and “a large number of them had a poor reputation for morality or had already been convicted of prostitution or [...] venereal disease”<sup>18</sup> (Archives de la Ville de Luxembourg (AVL) LU 11 - IV/2 447 1891). During a parliamentary debate on a new law governing public houses about the turn of the year 1907-08, the Public Prosecutor’s Office told the Minister of State that the “evil of the cabaret is the most hideous wound eating at the body of society”<sup>19</sup> and that restaurants and public houses with waitresses were clandestine brothels (ANLux J 64/39: 412). The new law passed in late 1908 limited the number of such establishments and also provided stricter requirements for foreign landlords, who now had to prove residence in the Grand Duchy for at least five years in order to be able to open a public house (see Mémorial 1908).<sup>20</sup> A nationwide regulation of waitress service was not adopted, though. The local level remained in charge of overseeing and setting up brothels, for safeguarding morals, safety and public peace (see Mémorial 1843). And the inconsistent municipal ordinances (which only existed in the Minette basin and the capital city) regulating women serving tables in the public houses, hotels and restaurants also remained in effect, even though they were held to be inefficient. Thus the problem of prostitution in hostess bars remained largely unresolved for the general public.

However, inns and public houses were ambivalent spaces, not considered exclusively immoral. The *Verein für Volks- und Schulhygiene* for instance emphasized

**18** | Personal translation of: “[...] ces femmes en majeure partie étrangère”; “Un grand nombre de ces filles jouissaient d’une mauvaise réputation morale ou ont déjà subi des condamnations du chef de prostitution ou pour [...] maladie vénérienne.”

**19** | Personal translation of: “Le mal du cabaret est la plaie la plus hideuse qui ronge le corps social.”

**20** | Fayot (1979: 29) holds industrialization responsible for the large number of public houses and rampant alcoholism. This is supported by the spatial concentration of public houses: in 1897, 64 % of the total of 2,856 public houses were located in the canton of Esch. This would equal 56 residents per public house.

a desire to protect “honest landlords against [...] unfair, damnable competition [...] in the fight against the unhealthy excesses of the catering trade”<sup>21</sup> (Pier/Meyers 1910a: 21). Even the popular *Obermosel-Zeitung* in Grevenmacher made a passionate plea for the pub as the people’s ‘reception room’ in 1906:

“At the public house, workers discuss their common interests, the tradesman and the farmer hear of new experiences and goals, the merchant learns what the public would like. [...] The public house is a democratic institution *par excellence*. All classes of the population meet there [...]. The public house thus promotes relations amongst the various classes which are becoming more necessary to the existence of a commendable society”<sup>22</sup> (ANLux J 64/14).

As regards the construction of im-/moral spaces, it is significant that both public and private spheres represent gendered conceptions. Along with regionalization and the dichotomy between the familiar and the foreign, the gendering of public and private forms another dimension in the process of constructing im-/moral spaces. This also aids in understanding the ambivalent position of the public house as a space that is at once social, democratic and morally two-faced.

Nevertheless, the relationship between public and private is complicated, as is the gendering of this relationship. This distinction was crucial to the bourgeois societies of the nineteenth century (see Hausen 1992), which excluded women from public life on pseudoscientific grounds, associating them with private, intimate and family matters (see Krause 2003: 25). The constitution of a public sphere in which men as citizens consort with one another politically and economically but to which women have no legal access is thus itself an expression of gender relations. Gendered power relations are thereby naturalized, normalized and made invisible. Although the separation between a familial private sphere with feminine connotations and public (gainful) activity with masculine connotations became a reality in nineteenth-century bourgeois families at best, the gendered dichotomy of public/private represents nevertheless an important perceptual structure of the social. It produces an interpretation of women’s actions – in contrast to their actual public presence – that is different (e.g., unseemly, apolitical etc.) than similar actions of men (see Lang 1995: 83). When it comes to prostitution policies, the state does not restrict itself to setting a framework, as in other areas of

**21** | Personal translation of: “Beim Kampfe gegen ungesunde Auswüchse des Wirtegewerbes [...] [die] “[...] ehrlichen Wirte] [schützen zu wollen] “gegen eine unlautere, verdammenswerte Konkurrenz.”

**22** | Personal translation of: “Im Wirtshause besprechen die Arbeiter ihre gemeinsamen Interessen, hört der Handwerker und der Bauer von neuen Erfahrungen und Zielen, erfährt der Kaufmann manche Wünsche des Publikums. [...] Das Wirtshaus ist eine demokratische Einrichtung *par excellence*. In ihm berühren sich alle Stände der Bevölkerung [...]. Das Wirtshaus vermittelt also Beziehungen der einzelnen Stände untereinander, die zum guten Bestehen der Gesellschaft [...] notwendiger werden.”

policy, but intervenes directly in the boundaries between public and private. This particularly affects the ability of prostitutes to safeguard their privacy in the face of state policies that directly control their bodies and pathologize their personalities (see Kontos 2009: 234). Historically, such policies were strongly guided by the norm of bourgeois gender relationships and endeavoured to include the proletariat in such gender arrangements (see *ibid.*: 240).

In Luxembourg, as well, the problematization of prostitution targeted primarily suspicious women – such as waitresses. The clients were almost entirely ignored by officials and the general public. In 1910, the *Verein für Volks- und Schulhygiene* wrote in regard of the spread of venereal diseases through prostitution:

“From 1898 to 1908 inclusive, 110 female persons in this country were sequestered by the police due to venereal disease [...]. In the two years 1909 and 1910 [...] 61 + 21 = 82 venereally diseased [...]. We cannot know how large is the number of male persons who were infected by these sources of contagion, how many illnesses, how much misery this brought to how many families”<sup>23</sup> (Pier/Meyers 1910b: 25).

Although men were regarded as a part of the activity of prostitution, it was as a matter of course assumed here that men were infected by the “sources of contagion”, that is to say, played a passive role and were certainly not actively involved in passing on diseases to prostitutes. Whether the “misery” refers only to the man’s illness, or also to its potential to be passed on to wives and family members, remains implicit.

In 1908, the Hollerich police made an issue of the role of clients with regard to prosecution:

“It is also immensely difficult to find witnesses in order to initiate proceedings against the landlords for running a house of ill repute without permission, because the very same usually turn out to be persons from the upper classes and married, and they all maintain the greatest reserve in their testimonies, even to the point of denying everything to the investigating officers and even the courts, in order to avoid a conjugal scandal”<sup>24</sup> (ANLux J 64/39: 390).

**23** | Personal translation of: “In den Jahren 1898 bis 1908 einschliesslich wurden hierlands 110 weibliche Personen wegen Geschlechtskrankheiten polizeilich sequestriert [...]. In den beiden Jahren 1909 und 1910 [...] 61 + 21 = 82 Geschlechtskranke [...]. Wie gross die Zahl der männlichen Personen ist, die durch diese Ansteckungsherde infiziert wurden, wieviel Krankheiten, wieviel Elend dadurch in viele Familien gebracht wurde, entzieht sich unserer Kenntnis.”

**24** | Personal translation of: “Auch ist das Feststellen von Zeugen, um das Verfahren wegen Haltens einer Unzuchtstätte ohne Ermächtigung gegen den Wirt einleiten zu können, eine ungemein schwierige Sache, indem dieselbe sich gewöhnlich aus Personen besserer Stände, und Verheiratheten herausstellen, und sie in ihren Aussagen die grösste

While it is still possible to discern the police's regret in these lines that clandestine prostitution usually remained unpunished due to male reticence to testify, the statements of the public prosecutor in Luxembourg City have an altogether more understanding tone:

"The testimony of persons who are only occasionally involved in such affairs, in a momentary neglect of duty, is detrimental to their reputation and brings unrest and discord into families in such a way that one might ask if the means be not worse than the evil"<sup>25</sup> (ANLux J 64/39: 197).

Prostitution appears to disrupt the bourgeois model of the gendered separation between public and private in that prostitution and sexuality are publicly established and embedded in a market-based economy (see Schulte 1979: 17). Hence, focusing on the prostitutes on the one hand and not pursuing the clients on the other upends the gendering of public and private space. As long as it was primarily men who were pursuing their political and economic interests in the public house, it remained intact as a public space in which the bourgeois order of the sexes was upheld. The presence of waitresses and prostitutes, by contrast, transformed it into an immoral space. Here the immorality is primarily imputed to the prostitutes whereas the behaviour of the clients is tolerated – also by certain authorities – with reference to the protection of their privacy.

### 3.2.2 Power Logics of Spatial Construction

Now that we have so far identified three dimensions of the construction of spaces of im-/morality, we shall turn to the power relationships inherent in them. Prostitution in the Grand Duchy is connected to sovereignty through the distinction between what is permitted and what is forbidden, it constitutes a statutory offence. From the point of view of disciplinary logic, the prostitute is a delinquent subject. From the perspective of governmental logic, prostitution presents a safety risk, since it spreads venereal diseases through the population.

My further discussion will primarily concern the relationship of the various power logics to one another, since it can be assumed that prostitution policies do not follow a single logic. This manifests itself in the above-mentioned demand of the *Collège Médical* that prostitution be regulated in order to prevent venereal

---

Zurückhaltung bewahren, ja geradezu, um einen Ehescandal zu vermeiden, alles sowohl vor dem untersuchenden Beamten, wie auch vor Gericht in Abrede stellen."

**25** | Personal translation of: "Les témoignages de personnes mêlées à des affaires de ce genre par occasion et dans un moment d'oubli de leurs devoirs, ternissent des réputations et portent le trouble et la discorde dans les familles, de sorte que l'on peut se demander si le remède n'est pas pire que le mal."

diseases and improve the ‘quality’<sup>26</sup> of the population. A regulatory system which forces prostitutes to be controlled by the police and by doctors corresponds to a ‘disciplinary regime’ (Kontos 2009: 260). However, this is not an end in itself, since the intention is to protect the population from venereal diseases. To this extent, regulating prostitution is a biopolitical goal (see Foucault 2003 [1997]: 239ff.) which follows the governmental power logic of the security dispositif.

In the first part of this paper, the process of distinguishing between the familiar and the foreign, or between the national and the foreign, was highlighted as a dimension of the construction of im-/moral spaces. It is therefore not surprising that administrative measures – especially deportation – taken by the immigration police play a major part. The Aliens Police Act 1913 defined the practice or promotion of prostitution as a “danger to public safety and order” (Mémorial 1913), so that the expulsion of suspicious foreigners – mostly women – became an integral part of prostitution policy. The practice of deportation can first be characterized as a connection between a sovereign and a disciplinary logic of power: the sovereign state uses police as a means to restore the integrity of the territory. However, a governmental logic also comes to bear in the practice of expulsion in the form of a security dispositif in that the authorities work with a logic of suspicion when exercising it. This logic is intended to minimize risks by identifying dangerous – that is, potentially delinquent – subjects. Hence we read in a police report in Esch/Alzette, for instance, that

“A. is cohabiting with the foreigner S. in B., a local tavern. A. spends nearly the whole day with the guests in the tavern of her lessor. Her pimp [S.] works very little and [therefore] the two cohabitators can have no other source of income than what A. earns through professional prostitution”<sup>27</sup> (ANLux: Police des Étrangers No. 84003 1913).

Based on this suspicion, the authorities revoked A.’s residence permit for the Grand Duchy. This paved the way for deportation without requiring definitive evidence. In 1913, the police in Hollerich wrote:

“The same is under strong suspicion of engaging in professional prostitution and can be seen wandering about for this purpose almost every evening in the streets near the local train station, as well as in the notorious Italian taverns. However, it has not yet been

**26** | At that time, ideas of the ‘degeneration’ of society included notions that sexual misconduct not only compromised individuals, but also resulted in effects on the population (for example, on the genetic make-up, criminality etc.) (see Foucault 2003: 252f.).

**27** | Personal translation of: “A. in der hiesigen Schenke B. mit dem Ausländer S. in wilder Ehe lebt. A. treibt sich fast den ganzen Tag in der Schenke ihres Wohnungsgebers mit Gästen umher. Ihr Zuhälter arbeitet sehr wenig und [somit] können die beiden Konkubinaten keine andere Erwerbsquelle haben, als dem [sic] Verdienst der A. durch die gewerbsmässige Prostitution.”

possible to convict the same of prostitution”<sup>28</sup> (ANLux: Police des Étrangers No. 85665 1913).

The construction of the risk, of the dangerous milieu, or of the prostitutes as a threatening subject, is directly related to the space constructions outlined above. The ‘proof’ of prostitution, or of the construction of the prostitute as a delinquent subject in need of deportation, is essentially based on their association with spaces connoted as immoral, such as public houses and especially the hostess bars. Spending time in an area ‘of ill repute’ creates an identity as a prostitute in the eyes of the police and must accordingly be understood as a subjectification process (see Chapter 5.1). At the same time, these power logics are highly gendered: female prostitutes are the ones being identified with these immoral spaces, while the clients’ identity remains undetermined, since they – as already quoted – only participate occasionally, in a “momentary negligence of duty.”

The initiatives of the moral social purity and abstinence movements, which were closely allied with the elites in state and society and demanded tougher control mechanisms for law enforcement, remained at first firmly committed to sovereign-disciplinary power logics. At the same time, they urgently called for a moral self-guidance of individuals. Both aspects must be understood in their gendered dimensions. The abstinence movement<sup>29</sup>, the *Verein für Volks- und Schulhygiene* (Society for People’s and School Hygiene), as well as the above-mentioned campaign of the *Catholic Women’s Association* demanded from the government primarily measures against the waitresses – some flanked by provisions for the (male or female) operators of public houses. No demands were made for punishment of the clients nor for tougher controls on the male patrons of public houses. At the same time, considerations regarding moral self-conduct were focused on bourgeois gender norms, on the feminine connotation of the private sphere of the family and intimacy, and thus particularly on women: “A woman [...] knows how to make hearth and home a place of happiness and peace, whither a man likes to return from the office, workshop or factory, and where he will enjoy spending his time”<sup>30</sup> (*Das Volkswohl* 1903: 91). So if a woman constitutes

---

**28** | Personal translation of: “Dieselbe steht dringend unter dem Verdachte die erwerbsmässige Prostitution auszuüben, und kann man selbe fast allabendlich zu diesem Zwecke sich in den Strassen an hiesigem Bahnhof, sowie in den berüchtigten Italienerkneipen herumtreiben sehen. Selbe konnte jedoch bis dato der erwerbsmässigen Prostitution nicht überführt werden.”

**29** | The *Verein gegen den Mißbrauch der geistigen Getränke* (Society Against the Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors) published the journal *Das Volkswohl* (The People’s Welfare) and was especially active against the hostess bars.

**30** | Personal translation of: “Die Frau [...] versteht es, aus dem heimatischen Herd den Ort des Glückes und des Friedens zu machen, wohin der Mann aus dem Bureau, aus der Werkstatt, aus der Fabrik gerne heimkehrt, wo er gerne verweilt.”

herself as a housewifely subject and comprehends the related reproductive practices (cooking, washing, cleaning) as the tasks she is to fulfil, she would be able to fashion her home as a “place of happiness” for her husband. In this perspective, not only is the conjugal household imagined to be a place of morality, but rather the woman should at the same time be able through her self-conduct to keep her husband from entering immoral spaces which could corrupt him with alcohol and prostitution, such as the hostess bars. The *Verein für Volks- und Schulhygiene* also defined the “founding of housekeeping and cookery schools, so that a young woman may know how to make a man’s home attractive for him”<sup>31</sup> (Pier/Meyers 1910b: 26) as a preventive component in its battle against the hostess bars. Although an examination of living conditions amongst the Luxembourg working class by the *Verein für die Interessen der Frau* (Association for the Interests of Women) referred to the house as the “quintessential domain”<sup>32</sup> of a woman, the association nonetheless emphasized that poverty could prevent successful self-government. The result of the “housing misery”, it said, was that

[...] even the most capable woman [can] create no ‘home’ here despite the best of intentions. The man will prefer to spend his evenings at the public house rather than in such rooms, children will prefer to play on the street – and the feeling of home and the sense of family are destroyed”<sup>33</sup> (*Verein für die Interessen der Frau* 1907: 4).

Due to living in confined spaces and taking on male boarders, the morals of the children are at the same time “extremely endangered at the tenderest age”<sup>34</sup> (ibid.). Thus it can also be established that governmental self-conduct and subjectivation techniques (see Chapter 5.1) are closely related to the dimension of the gendered separation of public and private. Since women were directly encouraged to practise self-conduct but men only indirectly, we can speak of a gendered intensification of this power logic. This in turn raises the question of whether men at that time were considered as being at all capable of self-conduct since, as shown above, they were supposed to need the self-conduct of women and the creation of a home to keep them from going to immoral places. At the same time, it is remarkable that men were not generally made the target of disciplinary or legal action.

Finally, a case study shows that women accused of prostitution also bring their moral self-conduct into play towards the authorities in order to avoid being

**31** | Personal translation of: “[...] Gründung von Haushaltungsschulen und Kochschulen, damit die junge Frau es verstehe, dem Manne sein Heim anziehend zu gestalten.”

**32** | Personal translation of: “[...] urreigenste Domäne.”

**33** | Personal translation of: “Wohnungselend” [...] “[...] auch die tüchtigste Frau trotz besten Willens hier kein ‘Heim’ schaffen [kann]. Der Mann wird seine Abende lieber im Wirtshaus zubringen als in solchen Räumen, die Kinder werden lieber auf der Strasse spielen – und Heimgefühl und Familiensinn werden vernichtet.”

**34** | Personal translation of: “[...] im zartesten Alter schon schwer gefährdet.”

subjected to the legal-disciplinary action of deportation. They often point out that they have not violated the law of the land during their stay in Luxembourg. For instance, Else G. argues in a petition to the Public Prosecutor's Office in February 1915<sup>35</sup> that she had

"[...] lived for nearly six years in Luxembourg without having done anything wrong. [...] I have come to love the Luxembourg countryside very much during my many years there. [...] I neither worked in a café, nor did I cohabit with anyone. I came to live in the Poststrasse because I was running an Épicerie [grocer's shop] there and [...] I only remained nearby because I did not like to foray too far with my many belongings"<sup>36</sup> (ANLux: Police des Étrangers No. 30305 1915).

Else G. refers directly to a spatializing official practice of localizing prostitution in bars and cafés, as well as certain urban problem areas. In attempting to prove her moral self-conduct by mentioning her conformity to the law and her business activity, she hoped to be able to avoid being associated with these immoral spaces and thus being deported, despite the proximity of her place of residence to the aforementioned cafés. The authorities did not agree with her argumentation, however, and expelled Else G. in the spring of 1915 – quite in accord with the governmental logic of suspicion.

### 3.2.3 Conclusion

This paper shows, based on the example of the problematization of prostitution in Luxembourg c. 1900, that the construction of im-/moral spaces comprises several dimensions: a distinction between the national and the foreign, a regionalization and a gendering of public and private.

These dimensions of space construction take effect in processes of drawing boundaries and are at the same time permeated by power relationships. Although it is easy to identify certain asymmetries of power with regard to those involved in the problematization of prostitution and the actors affected by it, we were here

---

**35** | While Luxembourg was occupied by German troops, the Luxembourg authorities were still in charge of civil administration (see Trausch 2002). This did not result in any noteworthy changes to prostitution policies – in contrast to occupied Belgium, for instance (see Majerus 2003).

**36** | Personal translation of: "[...] fast 6 Jahre in Luxembourg gelebt, ohne mir auch noch das Geringste zu Schulden kommen zu lassen. [...] Das Luxembourger Land ist mir durch meinen langjährigen Aufenthalt dort [...] sehr lieb geworden [...]. Ich war weder in einem Café beschäftigt, noch habe ich in wilder Ehe mit jemand gelebt, dass ich in der Poststrasse wohnte, kam daher, dass ich eine Episerie [Lebensmittelgeschäft] dort führte und [...] blieb ich nur deshalb in der Nähe wohnen, weil ich mit meinen vielen Sachen nicht gern weit geplündert bin."

less concerned with the question of who possesses power and who lacks it. Rather, the question relevant to this investigation was, in the Foucauldian sense (Foucault 1983 [1982]: 216): how is power exercised? Using the power analysis outlined at the beginning of this chapter we could show that the various power logics of sovereignty, discipline and governmentality are intermeshed with one another in the spatial constructions related to the problematization of prostitution: the deportation of foreign prostitutes was an administrative practice which can first be understood as the interplay of sovereign and disciplinary power logic to secure and control the territory. At the same time, it is essentially based on a security dispositif, the logic of suspicion. The extent to which this intermeshing is a direct result of difficulties in the criminal prosecution of prostitution, which in turn refers to the explosive power of prostitution with regard to the gendering of public and private spaces, will have to be left for other studies to examine. In addition, it becomes clear that the spatial constructions, as well as the function and mode of operation of the power logics, have to be understood as gendered. Hence primarily women are deported on suspicion of prostitution. This is shown both by the absolute figures as well as the fact that prostitution accounted for more than fifty percent of the reasons for the expulsion of women throughout the period under review, while this proportion among men is inconsequential.<sup>37</sup> The dimensions of the drawing of boundaries between the national and the foreign, as well as the regionalization described above, lead to the formation of gendered identities, so that ‘the foreign waitress’ becomes the prototypical prostitute. Finally, the governmental techniques of self-conduct concentrate on female self-conduct, which is then indirectly supposed to keep men from entering immoral spaces. This power logic refers to the importance of the gendered separation of public and private in maintaining the bourgeois order in general, and in constructing spaces of im-/morality in particular.

## Sources

### Luxembourg National Archives

ANLux J 64/14 Revision du régime des cabarets, 1900-1912 (dossier).

ANLux J 64/39 Prostitution: rapports; reglements; propositions..., 1907-1917 (dossier).

ANLux J 71/1-J71/27 Police des étrangers – expulsions et renvois, interdiction (1881-1918).

ANLux Police des Étrangers No. 30305 (Else G.), 1915.

ANLux Police des Étrangers No. 84003 (Louise A.), 1913.

ANLux Police des Étrangers No. 85665 (Angèle T.), 1913.

---

**37** | These data are based on my own statistical evaluations of the deportation orders (ANLux J 71/1-J71/27 (1881-1918)).

### **Luxembourg City Archives**

AVL LU 11 - IV/2 447 Police amusements, cabarets et spectacles, 1891.

### **Luxembourg National Library**

Chambre des députés (1907): *Compte-Rendu des Séances de la Chambre des Députés du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. 1907-1908*, Luxembourg: Chambre des députés.

Collège Médical (1908): "Situation Sanitaire du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg pendant l'année 1907", in: *Annexe au Mémorial A n° 61 de 1908*.

Das Volkswohl. Organ des Luxembourger Vereins gegen den Alkoholismus (1903): "Der Alkohol und die Frau", edition of June 1903, 88-92.

Das Volkswohl. Organ des Luxembourger Vereins gegen den Alkoholismus (1911): "Die Animierkneipen in Luxembourg", edition of January-July 1911, 23f.

Luxemburger Wort (1904a): "Mehr als Schmutzkonkurrenz", edition of 12.3.1904, 2.

Luxemburger Wort (1904b): "Verschiedene Nachrichten", edition of 26.3.1904, 2.

Mémorial A Nr. 17 (1843): "Gesetz über die Einrichtung der Gemeinden und Distrikte vom 24. Februar 1843".

Mémorial A Nr. 17 (1855): Arrêté royal grand-ducal du 14 mai 1855 et règlement du 5 juin suivant, concernant les maisons de débauche et les personnes qui se livrent à la prostitution.

Mémorial A Nr. 49 (1913): "Gesetz vom 18. Juli 1913, über die Fremdenpolizei".

Mémorial A Nr. 76 (1908): "Gesetz vom 26. Dezember 1908, über die Schankwirtschaften".

Pier, J.P./Meyers, Michel (1910a): "Animierkneipen", in: *Verhandlungen des Vereins für Volks- und Schulhygiene während des Vereinsjahres 1910*, 20-21.

Pier, J.P./Meyers, Michel (1910b): "Die Animierkneipen", in: *Verhandlungen des Vereins für Volks- und Schulhygiene während des Vereinsjahres 1910*, 22-30.

Verein für die Interessen der Frau/Verein für Volks- und Schulhygiene (1907): *Einiges über Wohnungsverhältnisse der ärmeren Arbeiterbevölkerung in Luxembourg*. Luxembourg: M. Huss.