



1916

Copy: Statement of Professor A.A. Schaeffer

A.A. Schaeffer

Follow this and additional works at: http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_dabn

Recommended Citation

"Copy: Statement of Professor A.A. Schaeffer" President's Papers, AR-0001. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Special Collections.
http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_dabn/70

This Board of Trustees Minutes or Meetings is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of the President at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Charles W. Dabney, 1887-1904 by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

COPY

Statement of Professor A.A.Schaeffer

Mr Stough said on Sunday afternoon, June 4, to several thousand men assembled in the Stough Tabernacle that there was a certain professor in the University of Tennessee who taught in certain classes that "to lead a double life was alright", that the commission of sex offenses of the gravest sort was not followed by harmful physical consequences in after life, etc.

After having refused several times requests by the authorities of the University to name the professor in question, and the source of his information, Stough finally, stated that the professor mentioned was A.A.Schaeffer, and that his information came to him through several ladies who heard a lecture on "Heredity in Relation to Vice" given by request by this instructor to the Ani-Vice League of this city. Signed statements of these three ladies were produced by Stough on Wednesday, June 7.

An examination of these statements indicates that the sole source of information of these ladies is the lecture referred to at which none of my students were present. Now since Stough bases his case on the statements of these ladies, we must conclude that Stough knew, at the time he made his statement on Sunday afternoon, that he was speaking untruths.

Now the lecture referred to was given on June 19, 1913, in the Zoological Laboratory at the University. About thirty people were present- all ladies, and all, so far as I know, members of the Ani-Vice League, and practically all of them were strangers to me.

The statements of these three ladies allege that I said at that lecture:

- (1) that people who are mentally unbalanced should not marry.
- (2) that women should be moral but that it was alright for men to live a double life.
- (3) that I approved of a double standard for my son but that I wanted my women protected;
- (4) that I advocated the double standard for me.

Statement no.1 I made in the course of the lecture. The other three statements I did not make in the course of the lecture nor any statements remotely resembling them.

(It should also be remarked that the reckless use of language in these statements makes them devoid of any

specific meaning whatsoever). After the lecture was over, however, I talked about the "double standard" with three or four of the ladies who had shown their kindly interest in the lecture, and expressed their appreciation of it to me personally. In response to questions from these ladies I stated my views on the so-called double standard of morals as follows:

(1) It is a fact that there is one standard for judging the moral conduct of man and another standard for woman. The same infraction of our moral code in so far as sexual relations are concerned, which society condones in a man, causes a woman to be shunned. Nine out of every ten persons will agree that this is a fact, but most thoughtful people, I imagine, believe in their hearts that men and women should be judged in these matters by a single and the same standard, such is the case with larceny for example. (It must not be overlooked that when I stated the fact that a double standard exists, I neither approved nor advocated the double standard of morals, just as I neither approve nor advocate larceny, although I recognize as a fact that larcenies are committed).

(2) Social activities of men and women are also judged by separate and different standards, and this condition will doubtless continue to exist so long as human nature remains what it is, and so long as there is sentiment and affection in the human heart. Men accord privileges to women which they do not yield to other men; and on the other hand, men can take many "liberties" in social conduct with propriety, which in women would be considered decidedly improper. (As an illustration I spoke of propriety in costumes for bathing purposes). Society approves a great many of these double standards, and our police are bound by oath to enforce some of them.

One of the prominent members of the Anti-Vice League who took part in the informal discussion after the lecture, called on me the next day and held that since "I believed in a double standard" for men and women as regards purely social relations, I must logically also a double standard of morality as affecting sexual relations. But I could not agree to her point of view, and she left greatly surprised, apparently because she was unable to understand or appreciate my position as outlined above. (This same member reported my lecture in the Journal and Tribune of June 20, at some length- about half a column- but nothing whatever was mentioned therein of any discussion of single or double standards; apparently no importance was attached to this matter at the time).

These views I have always held and I wish to state specifically that they have not undergone any change in the last three years. And lest it might be thought that a motive underlies either the statements I am alleged to have made or those I actually made, I wish to state that in my whole life I have not been guilty of a single act to which either a single or double standard of morals applies.

(signed) A.A.Schaeffer.