Sodomy, Effeminacy, Identity: Mobilizations for Same-sexual Loves and Practices before the Second World War[1]

Gert Hekma

This chapter discusses early homosexual rights movements and some of their predecessors in their historical context. The main starting point is resistance to demonization of same-sexual practices by Church and state during the Enlightenment. Then, this abjection saw for the first time in European history substantial legal and philosophical opposition. Most remarkable were the views of the Marquis de Sade. Some countries legalized homosexual practices, beginning in France in 1791. Due to the French influence in that period, some states followed suit, but others did not. Changes from religious and legal to medical perspectives halfway during the nineteenth century led to lively debates in the German states regarding new laws, the creation of the word homosexual and new theories regarding this personage. In 1897, Berlin saw the establishment of the first homosexual rights movement and in the early twentieth century Germany took the lead with this new kind of science and activism.

In a culture in which the penis was the essential element for sexual relations and penetration the way to consummate them, lesbianism (or sapphism or tribadism) remained generally silenced and invisible and was only rarely punished. The main cases of prosecution of women were cases where they dressed and acted as men and sometimes married another woman. Sodomites and tribades were distinct, and the first attracted far more attention. Enlightenment medicine created a new distinction between male and female, stressing that male lives were public and sexual while female lives had to be kept private and asexual (Laqueur 1990: 114–48). Due to this viewpoint, lesbian sexual relations remained largely hidden from 1800 until the 1960s, including within the homosexual movement.

The chapter starts with enlightened attitudes regarding same-sexual experiences in the eighteenth century, continues with the beginnings of homosexual identification and emancipation in late nineteenth-century Germany and turn of-the-century pederast movements, makes some sidesteps to other European states and ends in the Weimar Republic. It shows that different ideas about homosexuality and homosexual politics existed in those early years in varying historical contexts.

---

1 Parts of the chapter have been taken from Hekma 2014. I want to thank Ben Garstka and the editors for their help with this chapter.

Sodomitical Backgrounds

Decriminalization of Sodomy

Sodomy was a sin for the Catholic Church from around AD 1000 (Jordan 1997), and was a crime in most European states since the thirteenth century, when the latter based their laws on religious principles (Brundage 1987: 213, 472–3). Most often, it was a capital crime irregularly enforced before the French Revolution. The general term of sodomy (or buggery, counter- or unnatural intercourse) has had many meanings, but the most prevalent referred to anal sex between men (and less of men with women or animals). It was a concept derived from the biblical city of Sodom whose inhabitants were believed to have committed sexual sins against God. The term could also be used to refer to masturbation or 'natural' variations such as extramarital coital sex. The norm was reproductive sex within marriage.

After the 1789 Revolution, France was the first country to abolish this law in 1791. Other countries followed the French example, but it remained on the books in England until 1967, in Germany until 1969, in the USA until 2003 and still exists in many former British colonies and Islamic states (Kane this volume).

Starting in the eighteenth century, the demonization of same-sexual practices by Church and state saw substantial legal and philosophical opposition. This age of the Enlightenment witnessed a sexual revolution that changed moralities and practices. This was especially the case in France, England (Dabhoiwala 2012), the Dutch Republic and the German states. It was foremost a positive change for heterosexual males of upper and middle classes, and less so for lower classes, women or sodomites. Laqueur (1990: 187–90) has indicated how women, who for ages had been viewed as more lustful than men (and should therefore be strictly controlled), were transformed during the Enlightenment into the chaste creatures they would fully become in Victorian times. Men held public positions while women were relegated to the private sphere as mothers and housekeepers. The reason was not changing biological views, but politics: men excluding women from the political equality that was promised during the French Revolution to all humans, including women and non-white "races." Citizenship rights became a male, white, heterosexual bourgeois privilege grounded in biological science. What emancipated women could do in reaction to this declaration was extol their chastity to claim superiority above males who remained slaves of their desires.

The criminalization of sodomy ended in 1791 in France; its new penal codes of 1791 and 1810 only punished crimes like rape and sexual assault, public indecency, prostitution of minors under 21 years and adultery — rather of women than of men (Sibalis 1996). What had been a capital offence for centuries was no crime any longer—a real revolution. Many mostly Catholic countries, often being under the influence of France, followed its example.[2] These changes were a result of the Enlightenment, when new ideas on politics, science and sex developed. It was believed that state and Church should be more clearly separated and also state and citizen, public and private. For many philosophers, it meant that they no longer considered a sin equivalent to a crime and believed the state should not interfere in the private life of citizens. Sodomy was a typical example of both cases: a sin that had become a crime and its prosecution often being an intrusion of privacy. The philosophers generally preferred prevention of the "Socratic" vice before it occurred rather than punishment of

2 Countries that abolished the sodomy crime in the nineteenth century were the Netherlands, Belgium, Bavaria, Hannover, the French cantons in Switzerland, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Rumania, and Luxemburg. With the unification of Germany in 1871, it kept the Prussian anti-sodomy law article (Hirschfeld 1914: 842–9).

unnatural intercourse afterwards, indicating a continuing depreciation of these practices (Stockinger 1979).

The first philosopher who discussed "the crime against nature" was Montesquieu. He began his short chapter in *De l'esprit des lois* (1748) by underlining the horror he felt for it. He remarked that three crimes deserved the death penalty—witchcraft, heresy and sodomy—but the first did not exist, the second was vague and the third was generally committed in secret and accusations often were calumnious. As counter-natural offences were highly dependent on social context, he preferred proscription above capital punishment. Nature, Montesquieu believed, would lead us to pleasures with the other sex when obstacles were removed. The Italian lawyer Cesare Beccaria (1764) held similar views: he felt horror for the crime but prevention was better than punishment. Voltaire (1764) believed that nature sometimes betrayed men in making wrong sexual choices, for example in the case of beautiful feminine lads, and favored lighter punishments. It was better to keep such vices secret than illuminating them with the fire of pyres (Blasius and Phelan 1997: 7–13; Merrick and Ragan 2001). As ambivalent was Rousseau, who described his horror for masturbation and homosexual seduction in his posthumous *Confessions*. According to him, the nuclear family is the oldest and only natural community (Hekma 1987: 26–31). The general idea of prevention was to counter homosociality in schools and institutions such as navy and army and to make boys and girls mix through co-education. If this was done, nature should take its heterosexual rights again. Another recurring argument concerned the climate where in warmer regions people should be more inclined to such vices (with Ancient Greece as a main example); the opposite of the widespread contemporary view in the South that homosexuality is a neo-colonial, Northern imposition.

In England, Thomas Cannon and Jeremy Bentham wrote in defense of pederasty during a time period where Greek texts were viewed as a staple of civilization. The courageous book of Cannon — *Ancient and Modern Pederasty Investigated and Exemplify'd* (1749) — is only known from the criminal records of the author's prosecution. Bentham's lengthy writings on the topic long remained unknown, and his essay "Paederasty" of 1785 was only published in 1978 by Louis Crompton. Bentham intended to issue a booklet against the existing law, but did not dare to do so. In his view, neither the person, nor his partner or the state suffered from the practice. Therefore, there was no need to forbid such pleasures. A few Dutch pamphlets also questioned whether the sin of sodomy should be a crime for the state (Hekma 1987: 93–4), and German scholars discussed Greek Eros. The authors who opposed the harsh penalties and whose works became influential were mainly French, which helped to put an end to sodomy laws in their country.

Keeping in mind the ambivalent feelings of the *philosophes*, it is surprising French revolutionaries decided to abolish the crime against nature. Actually, no mention of the subject is found in the discussions on the 1791 penal code, and this change appears as the result of radical secularization. This law forbade acts such as public indecency and corruption of minors under 21 for prostitution with low penalties, but consensual homosexual acts were not mentioned—not even in the case of minors apart from the corruption. However, because of the discretional powers of the police, such behavior was still prosecuted with arbitrary decisions (Sibalis 1996).

Catholic Bavaria saw a similar legal reform in 1813, when sodomy was removed from the criminal law books because it was not detrimental to the individual or the state. The main Bavarian law reformer P.J.A. von Feuerbach ([1801] 1803: 432–3), who formulated this opinion, however declared that there might be reasons to forbid sodomy in police rules (*polizeilich*) because it demonstrated contempt for marriage, endangered population growth and could lead to enervation of the body (an argument on sexual excess often used in debates on masturbation). These legal changes caused a real revolution: with one strike

many sexual activities, homosexual, heterosexual and bestial, were no longer crimes. This marked a major transformation in terms of homosexual rights: an official legislative reform that in many countries would require a long struggle.

The Marquis de Sade

The main defender of sodomy in the years of the French Revolution was Marquis Donatien A.F. de Sade (1740–1814). He took a totally different stance than the *philosophes*, extolling the pleasures of anal and railing against coital sex, for example in his lesbian novel *La philosophie dans le boudoir* (1795). This radical libertine fell victim to the laws of the Ancient Regime for his sexual failings, including sodomy. He was imprisoned for 32 years, and was twice condemned to death. The first sentence included sodomy, but was only executed *in effigie* (his image was burned) as the marquis had escaped with his male servant (the other culprit in this case) (Lever 1991: 215–16). Sade became the most famous victim of sodomy laws.

In prison, Sade started to write novels, which unveils his sexual philosophy. He defended what was forbidden by Church and state (sodomy, promiscuity and violence including lust murder), and rejected what they stood for (coital sex, marriage and reproduction). He had a philosophy of abundance against ideas of scarcity, of spending and joy against saving and restraint, of a violent rather than a good nature. Sade was an anarchist against the state and an atheist against religion. He poked fun at the Church and royalty and the morality they imposed, but also with Enlightened philosophers who did not want to forbid but rather prevent masturbation and male-male sex (Edmiston 2013; Hekma 2006; Le Brun 1986).

In times that a dichotomy of gender—with males being sexual and females chaste—was established, Sade made clear that women should enjoy sexual pleasures and become sexual subjects. In *La philosophie dans le boudoir*, he includes a tract "Français, encore un effort si vous voulez être des vrais républicains" (French yet another effort if you want to become real republicans) on sexual and legal politics. It endorses male and female prostitution, incest and pederasty, claiming that these pleasures are not against, but rather found in nature. The first champion of sodomy, including general promiscuity and prostitution, was a rarity in his time, and his advocacy remains unsurpassed and controversial—*un bloc d'abîme* (a sudden abyss) according to Le Brun. Those who reject his ideas should realize he uses the literary style of the novel to deliver his critique. His ideas have not come as a fixed ideology, but in an open form that promotes debate. The violence of his work clarifies his conception of nature against those who stress its goodness and turn a blind eye to a reality of death and destruction like Rousseau did with his idea of "a good nature." Sade was the essential controversial apologist of homo/sexual pleasures for his times and far after.

From Law to Medicine: The Emergence of the Homosexual

Although sodomy, understood as anal sex, had been decriminalized in some countries, it remained in books of forensic medicine where doctors explained the evidence of the "crime." There, it was only relevant in cases of sexual assault and public indecency. The authors were quite repetitive in what they wrote, and most assumed it was an abject practice. However, apart from moral ideas, they did not intend sexual theorizing. Writings about onanism or

masturbation were published separately from this forensic-medical literature.[3] Heinrico Kaan's dissertation, *Psychopathia sexualis* (1844), created a bridge between both kinds of literature. He considered masturbation as the starting point for all sexual aberrations. Someone who started to masturbate would end up, according to the excess theory of onanism, with other vices for which he cites the examples from forensic literature. The assumption was that people who engaged in these brutish practices would finish off with moral insanity, suicide or death through exhaustion. Causes of the behavior were largely social: reading the wrong books, having bad friends, eating overly hot food, alcohol, warm beds, horse-riding and so on.

The first new perspective in this body of literature came from the Parisian medico-legal specialist Claude François Michéa, who invented the word *philopédie* (his neologism for what was later named homosexuality) and was recently discovered to belong himself to this category. This doctor was registered several times by the police as pederast, and he served eight months in prison for public indecency at the end of his life (Féray 2015: 264–7). He deserves his fame because of his 1849 article on 'Des déviations maladives de l'appétit vénérien' (sickly deviations of the venereal appetite). He was the first physician to propose that *philopédie* was innate, and that it could perhaps be explained by a female remnant in the male—so explaining this desire as inborn and effeminate. He insisted that this topic belonged to the field of medicine, apparently not a widely shared idea at the time. In 1852, this theory was repeated by the German professor of forensic medicine Johann Ludwig Casper who made the same observation for a minority of the pederasts that had come to his attention (the excess theory explained the majority of cases). Although he used this word, at the same time he rejected it because not all cases followed the Greek model of a man with a boy. In his handbook of 1858—which has been regularly translated and reprinted—he brought more cases of innate "hermaphroditism of the mind" that did not have to involve anal sex, but could also be platonic. These men recognized each other everywhere in Europe and he tried, as many doctors did who repeated this observation, to find what their method was. There was an obvious need for new medical perspectives, terminologies and data. The radical change Michéa and Casper contributed was in causation. The old theory claimed that a lack of restraint (cultural cause) led to the wrong sexuality and physical ailments, the new theory that bodily aspects (nature) made people have a different sexual identity.

The Birth of Homosexual Activism in Germany

Ulrichs and Uranism

The German lawyer and "der erste Schwule der Welt" — the first gay of the world in Sigusch's words — Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–1895; see Kennedy 2001; Lauritsen and Thorstad 1974; Sigusch 2000) followed in the footsteps of Michéa and Casper to defend same-sex pleasures.[4] What he called "uranian" (suggesting heavenly love) in 1864 was coined as "homosexual" by

3 The moral, medical and educational demonization of "onanism"—especially of male adolescents—had begun in the eighteenth century with the full support of the *philosophes* (Laqueur 2003). It gave sexuality a negative imprint and put reproduction and coital sex central, while deriding other variations. Its main proponent was the "Enlightened" Doctor Tissot.

4 The Swiss hatter Heinrich Hössli wrote a two-volume *Eros. Die Männerliebe der Griechen* (1836–1838, *The Male Love of the Greeks*, reprint Berlin: Rosa Winkel, 1996) in which he suggested the emancipation of this Eros and contested its criminalization. His work remained without resonance.

Karoly Maria Kertbeny in 1869. Ulrichs wrote 12 pamphlets on uranism between 1864 and 1879, and was the first to publicly come out for his uranism in front of a German lawyers' meeting in Munich. With the unification of Germany, achieved in 1870, he was afraid that the draconic paragraph on unnatural intercourse of Prussia would prevail above legislation from Catholic southern German states such as Bavaria, where this law was already abolished. Confirming his fears, the infamous §175 forbidding counter-natural intercourse (soon defined as anal and intercrural, i.e. between the thighs) was introduced in 1871. Following Ulrichs' theory, a uranian was "a female soul in a male body," and this condition was not unnatural as posited by religion and law, but rather a natural variation. It found its origin in the embryonic stage, as with hermaphroditism (Ulrichs pursued this analogy by seeing uranism as a psychic version of bodily double-sexedness). It was an identity, a way of being, while sodomy had been a behavior, a way of doing.[5] Ulrichs claimed equal rights on the idea that uranism was a natural variation and not a counter-natural crime. In his two pamphlets of 1869 and 1870, Kertbeny proposed the liberal argument of equal rights of all citizens irrespective of their desires while also stressing the naturalness of homosexuality: "The modern constitutional state … has no reason to become involved with the question of sex where the rights of others are not injured" (in Blasius and Phelan 1997: 76). As we see, the two first apologists of homosexuality already diverged about reasons to demand abolition of the law.

Ulrichs' theory claimed that sexual desire was only possible between opposites, mainly male and female. Therefore, uranians would fall in love with their psychic antithesis, the male soul in a male body, a dioning or a heterosexual male in modern parlance. The same would be true for urnindes (lesbians): using contemporary terminology, a butch would fall for a femme. Uranian with uranian would be possible in chaste relations, for which Ulrichs imagined the possibility of marriage. Pleasure was available for uranians because many young, unmarried straight men were left without sexual possibilities as girls had to remain virgins until marriage and visiting prostitutes was costly. In that context, according to Ulrichs, straight young men would have sex with uranians for money, what he presented as an acceptable option in those times of rampant prostitution in Europe. The idea that sexual and gender inversion went together remained common until the 1950s—and much longer in medical theories—as was the practice of gender-inverted homosexuals preferring sex with straight people.

Ulrichs was highly successful with his theories of gender inversion in homosexuals. Many prominent psychiatrists and physicians, Carl von Westphal, Richard von Krafft-Ebing and later Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935, Herzer 1992), adopted his perspective. Westphal again created a new word, "conträre Geschlechtsempfindung" (in brief "sexual inversion"), that gained a certain popularity. This concept included gender inversion, and it would take some time before a clear distinction between transvestism and homosexuality emerged (Hirschfeld 1910).

Another debate was the normalcy versus pathology of such a condition. Most doctors would view uranism and other "perversions" as pathologies for the next century. Krafft-Ebing did so in his standard work *Psychopathia sexualis* (1886), but opposed criminalization of sexual inversion. The turn from homosexual rights to medicalization began with his book, which created the new genre of sexology (Sexualwissenschaft). This study, which has been regularly reprinted, translated and abbreviated, encouraged many people to recognize their

5 Foucault (1976) may have attributed this transformation to doctors who would have changed the legal terminology of the practice of sodomy into a homosexual identity, mentioning Westphal as his example. In fact, *philopèdes* and uranians, like Michéa and Ulrichs themselves, pioneered this change, which was later eagerly taken on and pathologized by doctors such as Casper, Westphal, and Krafft-Ebing (Oosterhuis 2000).

desires and to understand they were not alone (notwithstanding the pathologization of their innermost feelings).

Ulrichs' contribution was threefold. First he invented a uranian or homosexual identity and fixed it in nature. Second, he claimed this new figure had an effeminate gender identity, at least at a psychic level. Third, he inaugurated struggles for homosexual rights: he combated discriminatory laws and wanted to create visibility through collective organization and the foundation of a journal for uranians. One of Ulrichs' pamphlets doubles as the first uranian journal, *Uranus* (1870). Although he opposed sodomy laws, he denied anal sex was widespread among uranians. According to him, most of them found instead satisfaction in embracing each other as well as in mutual masturbation. Although he mainly considered adult male relations, his theorizing included relations between females and of adults with adolescents, in both cases keeping to the gender opposition principle. Numerous men from all over the world wrote to Ulrichs because he brought light into their lives. He became an icon for uranians far beyond Germany, and inspired people such as Magnus Hirschfeld, John Addington Symonds, Edward Carpenter, Marc-André Raffalovich and also straight science.

Hirschfeld and the WHK

Hirschfeld followed the lead of Ulrichs, but took a more prudent direction. He created many institutions, including the first homosexual rights movement, the Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee [WHK, Scientific-humanitarian Committee] in 1897, the voluminous *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* [Annual for Sexual Intermediaries, 1899–1923], the Institute for Sexual Sciences in Berlin (1919–1933) and the *World League for Sexual Reform* (WLSR, 1928–1933), the latter with Havelock Ellis and Auguste Forel (Herzer 1992, Hingst 1997). Hirschfeld was an industrious writer, lecturer, expert-witness and activist for various causes, especially homosexual rights. Never conceding he was himself a homosexual, as Ulrichs did, he was known and derided as a Jew and "auntie Magnesia," and was once the subject of an assassination attempt by the Nazis. The *WHK* prepared twice a petition against §175 (in 1897 and 1927). The number of subscribers increased from 700 to many thousands, including names such as Krafft-Ebing, Freud, Einstein, the brothers Thomas and Golo Mann, Bernstein, Bebel and Kautsky. In both cases, the *Reichstag* did not change the law. The Committee also produced a pamphlet *Wass soll das Volk vom dritten Geschlecht wissen?* [1901, What Should the People Know about the Third Sex?], of which 50.000 copies were distributed in the next decade (Steakley 1975: 30–32). This document was translated into Dutch in 1913 (*Wat iedereen behoort te weten over uranisme*—What Everybody Has to Know on Uranism) by the *Nederlandsch Wetenschappelijk Humanitair Komitee* (NWHK) and into English in 1915 (The Social Problem of Sexuality) by the *British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology* (BSSSP).

Hirschfeld's theory of sexual intermediaries or "third sex" implied that most people were not fully male or female, hetero- or homosexual, but somewhere in between. Variation was therefore natural and should be acknowledged in sexuality and gender. He conducted surveys, and came to the conclusion that homosexuals represented 2 percent of the population. Although the law was about anal and intercrural sex, he minimized its importance for homosexuals. Their preferred acts were manual sex at 40 per cent, oral at 40 per cent, intercrural at 12 percent and anal at 8 per cent. Pederasty was apparently less of an issue: Hirschfeld had few qualms to ascertain that 45 percent of the respondents had a preference for adolescents (Hirschfeld 1914: 281, 286–8).

Hirschfeld was well aware of the existence of female homosexuals—his major monograph was titled *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* [Homosexuality of Man

and Woman, 1914]. He sought to include them, albeit with little success, in the *WHK*. The main problem was that §175 targeted men, not women. This does not mean lesbians were free from discrimination, but rather that the topic was generally silenced. The major voice emanating from the German movement was Anna Rüling (1905), who reproached the feminist movement for not paying attention to homosexuality while the overall goals were similar: independence and gender equality. The subject may have been too controversial, but it must be acknowledged that a large part of the feminist leadership was lesbian (Rüling 1905: 145). In Germany, 2 million women were unmarried and the same number lesbian, half of whom were married due to social pressure. A million women could have found a husband—and apparently happiness—when lesbians did not marry. Twenty percent of prostitutes were lesbians and with better labor and gender conditions, they would have been able to choose another job and help create higher earnings for the other sex workers (Rüling 1905: 148; she did not think prostitution could be eradicated). Awareness of the lesbian question among feminists would have many benefits, not only for the social position of women loving women. The founder of the *Bund für Mutterschutz und Sexualreform* [League for the Protection of Maternity and Sexual Reform] Helene Stöcker spoke out in 1911 for homosexual rights as part of individual freedom: "If religion is a private matter, love life is no less." She became one of the directors of the *WHK*, the first woman to hold that position (Steakley 1975: 42).

The campaign to abolish §175 led to debates in the *Reichstag* on several occasions, the first one in 1898 when only the socialists supported the request. The Ministry of Justice advised Hirschfeld to educate the public (Steakley 1975: 31). In 1929, following proposals by the *WHK* and other sex reform organizations, the Penal Reform Committee of the *Reichstag* decided to remove the paragraph, but the stock market crash of that year interfered, and the parliament never discussed this proposal (Steakley 1975: 85).

Hirschfeld's mobilization had global repercussions: *WHK*, *Jahrbuch* and Institute had an international impact, his works were translated, and he lectured in Germany and the rest of Europe as well as the US, Japan, China, Indonesia, India, Egypt and Palestine at the end of his career (Herzer 1992). With the movie *Anders als die Andern* [Different from the others, 1919], he utilized cinema as a modern tool for homosexual emancipation (Steakley 2007). Despite all this, he did not succeed in changing the law: paragraph 175 was broadened by the Nazis in 1935 and was only abolished in 1969 for adult males above 21 years.

To sum up, the WHK was a member organization with a major journal, lobbying the general public and parliament, attracting signatures of many famous people against §175, with many activist and academic publications, organizing lectures and meetings for members, keeping up with modern media, initiating an international sexual reform movement, receiving worldwide attention from people like Gide and Isherwood—so it was, as other homosexual movements that became active in the 1920s, a full-blown homosexual rights movement that would put many modern gay organizations in the shadow.

Friendship Love and *Der Eigene*

At the time Hirschfeld started his *WHK*, men who became involved in and around the journal *Der Eigene* (1898–1931, Oosterhuis and Kennedy 1991) shed a very different light on the topic. Led by Adolf Brand (1874–1945), they celebrated male culture and, in a Greek tradition, eroticism between men and the celebration of male youngsters, beauty being a central part of it. Since the eighteenth century it had been discussed whether ancient Greeks practiced pederasty in a physical sense or, to phrase it in the terms of Johann Gesner (1752)—was Socrates a holy pederast? These "Socratic wars" remained undecided, but

philosophers took very different positions, from denying it, like Gesner, to affirming it, as Johann Georg Hamann (Derks 1990: 69–70). The men around *Der Eigene* endorsed the sexual interpretation. With Elisàr von Kupffer's (1872–1942; Ricci 2007) concepts *Lieblingsminne* and *Freundschaftsliebe* [lovers' affection and friendship love], they defended a homo-eroticism that was part and parcel of high culture, German *Bildung* (cultural education) and of most men's lives. Kupffer saw Hirschfeld's homosexual as a pitiful and mostly effeminate creature and decried the medicalization of something culturally valuable: male bonding that had inspired Goethe, Schiller and many others. He deplored homosexuals as erotomaniacs, degenerate men who were not able to restrain their desires. Psychiatrists put too much stress on their brutish lusts that the members of *Der Eigene* rather overlooked while stressing their virility (Oosterhuis and Kennedy 1991: 87). A centrepiece in their male culture was the adoration of adolescent males, very present in the iconography of *Der Eigene*.

They claimed this male sociability should be taught to a younger generation through intimate relations. Intellectual muse Benedikt Friedländer (1866–1908) celebrated, more so than the nuclear family, physiological friendship as "germ and origin" of patriotism. For this reason, he rejected laws and prejudices against "so-called homosexuality … Physiological male friendship, not the family, is the foundation of human social being … Every normal youngster is more or less capable to practice the physiological friendship; one should only do it, not repress it" (Friedländer 1909: 277). This group did not oppose pederasty, but rather did not speak about its sexual contents. According to Hans Blüher, who wrote *Die deutsche Wandervogel als erotisches Phänomen* [The German Youth Movement as an Erotic Phenomenon, 1912], the homosexual was a masculine example and an ideal leader of youth troops. Homosexuality was for these men not an innate identity, but an identification with male erotic culture. They did not see homosexuals as an abject minority, but rather as proud bearers of majority culture. Blüher's work was very popular and widely discussed. Few critics cared about his antifeminism, many lauded his patriotism and few accepted his view of inverts being youth heroes (Bruns 2008).

Feminism and Socialism

Both *WHK* and *Der Eigene* were male-dominated, as women suffered from Victorian ideology that defined them as non-sexual. One of the main goals of first wave feminism was, next to voting rights, the abolition of official recognition of prostitution. Women praised their own chastity against male sexual desires that endangered marriage and monogamy. Taking up the cause for lesbianism or prostitution also went against the grain of most of first wave feminism that stressed female sexual superiority through chastity.

Socialists supported feminists and opposed both prostitution and capitalist decadence including homosexual vices of upper class and clergy. Although socialists may have sustained the aims of the WHK, in general they favored family and reproduction. Friedrich Engels, for example, expected that men in the socialist future would be monogamous, as women already were (Hekma et al. 1995: 12), and railed in his correspondence with Karl Marx against Ulrichs (Kennedy 1995: 71).

Weimar Berlin

After the First World War, Berlin developed into the homo/sexual capital of the world. The city had then a rich gay subcultural history. This world of bars and parties, together with the anti-homosexual law as point of resistance, smoothed the creation of a homosexual

rights movement in 1897. Prepared by major homosexual scandals, the German population had developed a certain tolerance for homosexuality—more than the English after Wilde's disgrace. Since 1918, the city harbored many organizations and journals (Steakley 1975: 79), while a lively subculture catered to a gay and lesbian public. Due to inflation, poverty and low prices, Berlin attracted many tourists, and became "Babylon-on-the-Spree." The most important activist groups cooperated under the leadership of lawyer Kurt Hiller, who created the slogan "The liberation of homosexuals can only be the work of homosexuals themselves," a variation on the socialist call to arms with "workers" being replaced by homosexuals (Steakley 1975: 76). In 1927, one of the first successful gay demonstrations took place in a theatre where an offensive play was being shown (Sternweiler in Hingst 1997: 101).

The German homosexual rights movement, and the gay and lesbian culture that had been so vivid in the 1920s during the Weimar era were dismantled in 1933 when Hitler took power. Most movements and bars stopped immediately, or were forced to do so, and the Institute for Sexual Sciences was raided by the Nazis. Since 1930, Hirschfeld had been on his world tour, and he saw in a Parisian cinema how his bust and books disappeared in a "'bonfire" of degenerate science. Under the Nazis, §175 was extended and homosexuals were actively persecuted. Neither the organized movement, nor a lively subculture nor homosexuals in high places such as Ernst Röhm (commander of Hitler's storm troopers SA) could prevent the quick demise of progress in the field of homosexual activism realized in Germany.

Beyond Germany

The homosexual rights movement was very much a German affair. The *WHK* had chapters in various cities and also outside the country. For instance, a branch was established in The Hague in 1912. Several efforts to start one in Vienna at the time of the Great War did not succeed notwithstanding the support of both Hirschfeld and major sexologist Wilhelm Stekel. In 1914, the English started the *BSSSP* after a meeting with Hirschfeld in London. It mainly consisted of homosexual men (Cecil Ives, Edward Carpenter, Laurence Housman), but they chose a broader focus on sexuality to keep distance from the notorious German *WHK* (Weeks 1977: 131–7). In France, Jacques d'Adelsward Fersen edited 12 issues of a literary journal *Akademos* in 1909, which was like *Der Eigene*. Two other men started a journal for homosexuals which was twice forbidden, and successively changed its name from *Inversions* to *L'Amitié* (1924–1925). The aim of the journal was the defense of the homosexual, but it did not succeed in becoming influential. So, the country without anti-homosexual laws was the one to forbid such a journal (Barbedette and Carassou 1981: 269–74). In 1925, *L'Amitié* announced a new journal from the USA, *Friendship and Freedom* (Chicago, 1924–1925), again inspired by German examples. It only saw two issues, and was rather a simple newsletter, produced by Bavaria-born Henry Gerber for the *Society for Human Rights* whose minimal activities were soon stopped by police intervention (Kuhn 2011: 13). All of these modest movements and journals struggled for equality and visibility while offering relevant information to homosexuals. The example of Germany and Berlin inspired people all over Europe and beyond, and Hirschfeld became an international celebrity.

The foundation of Dutch *NWHK* followed the introduction of a new legal article in 1911, confirming the importance of having an anti-homosexual law for the creation of activism. This law raised the homosexual age of consent to 21, while the heterosexual one remained at 16. This was based on the idea that homosexuals recruited youngsters to fill their ranks, as they could not reproduce. With Hirschfeld's theory that homosexuality was innate, the

movement countered such views: one could not "become" a homosexual through seduction. The Dutch *NWHK* branch was largely the one-person movement of the jurist Jacob Anton Schorer who published newsletters, wrote articles and pamphlets, sent them out to doctors, lawyers and students, supported and brought together homosexuals, and assembled an important library for public use. The organization stopped after the Nazi occupation of the Netherlands. Both in 1932 and 1940, individuals published the magazines *Wij* [We] and *Levensrecht* [Right to live] after German examples, but were rapidly stopped due respectively to police pressure and the Nazi occupation (Meer 2007).

The *BSSSP* held lectures, organized debates and published texts. Its chair, Edward Carpenter, pursued a socialist, feminist and homosexual agenda and wrote about all these issues, including essays, an anthology of poetry and an anthropological study on "the intermediate sex" (in between male and female rather than a distinct third sex). In the grim times after the Oscar Wilde scandal, he and Havelock Ellis experienced difficulties in publishing their books on sexual inversion, but Carpenter nonetheless became a homosexual role model in England. BSSSP's publications were dealing with sexological issues, relevant literature such as Sade, as well as a revised version of the *WHK*'s pamphlet. A third booklet, authored by radical feminist Stella Brown, was entitled *Sexual Variety and Variability among Women* (1915, in Blasius and Phelan 1997: 186–9). Unlike most feminists, Brown claims that sexual emotions are as strong in women as in men, that many women are congenital lesbians, and that both genders show great variety. She rails against "cold women" who have a mania for prohibition (apparently of prostitution), while others enjoy masturbation or lesbian relations. Social conditions, such as a lack of contraceptives and economic dependence, inhibited females to freely follow their sexual instincts, and forced men to factitious promiscuity. In contrast, a sane social order would prevent such problems. Brown was distinguishing between innate and artificial lesbianism. The latter resulted from day-dreaming, suppression and late marriages and caused bodily and mental suffering. It was rare to come across a social analysis of lesbianism, with Brown creating a distinction between an innate lesbianism she defended and an artificial one she deplored.

Conclusion

The homosexual movements of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries made courageous headway, but rarely succeeded to change the law. What these trailblazers did, was to create new and very different images of homosexuality including a great variety of terminologies. The new views proposed by Michéa, Ulrichs and Hirschfeld are undoubtedly its major success. At the same time, however, other perspectives as the one of *Der Eigene* were left stranded because of the spread of ideas of an innate, minoritarian homosexual identity. Similarly, Sade had a strong underground influence on literature (Praz [1933] 1970), in twentieth-century French arts and philosophy, and among the sex radicals of the 1960s, but not so much on movements or legal changes.

Furthermore, the creation of a homosexual identity and a new terminology were essential steps towards homosexual organizing: uranians recognizing their identity and creating a community of like-minded being the precondition for the struggle for homosexual rights. In the terminology of Foucault, one could say that the new discourses created resistance and a reverse discourse, although in fact the oppositional theories of Michéa and Ulrichs preceded the psychiatric appropriation of their interventions. Thanks to these pioneering works, uranians realized who they were and that they were not the only one of their kind.

Soon, they established a homosexual rights movement that required the shared feelings of discrimination among this nascent group.

Scandals helped to make known what a homosexual was and to create more public visibility. Major ones regarded German nobility. King Ludwig II of Bavaria, who was notorious for his erotic interest in stable boys and soldiers, was forced to abdicate because of his erotic practices. He ended his life in a struggle with the psychiatrist who had declared him insane for these inclinations and who died as well (Häfner 2008). This happened in 1886, the same year that Krafft-Ebing published *Psychopathia sexualis*. King Karl I of Württemberg died before his loves with American young men—on whom he bestowed noble titles—got out of hand (Dworek 1988). Present as Prussian ambassador at both courts was Prince Philipp zu Eulenburg who became the central figure of the biggest homosexual scandal ever (named after him) while being adviser and best friend of the German Emperor Wilhelm II, whose politics were a target. At the centre of attention were the male intimacies of their friendship network. The question was whether these men had had sexual relations forbidden under §175—and Eulenburg had, with a young fisherman on the same lake where Ludwig II died. The scandal had many facets and was world news. It made the new figure of the homosexual widely known, as well as Hirschfeld who played a role as an expert on homosexuality (Domeier 2010). Other countries had their own scandals. The other major one regarded Oscar Wilde in 1895, who went to court for slander after his lover's father had accused him of being a "somdomite." In the end, Wilde was discovered to have indeed had sex with telegraph boys and was condemned to two years hard labor. His court case made the homosexual known in England and beyond (Sinfield 1994).

Another venue, which made homosexuals and lesbians increasingly visible was literature (Meyers 1977). American Walt Whitman was celebrated at home as bard of democracy and in Europe as major homoerotic poet. Wilde's name became synonymous with male love. Part of the proof against him was reading Joris Huysmans' yellow book. Huysmans was one of the many poets and novelists producing homosexual art such as Charles Baudelaire and Rachilde (both of whom referenced lesbianism), lovers Paul Verlaine and Arthur Rimbaud, Marcel Proust, Thomas Mann, Stefan George and many others did. André Gide came out in his work, and wrote a defence of homosexuality: *Corydon* (1924). Radclyffe Hall made the sexological stereotype of the masculine lesbian world-famous with her *The Well of Loneliness* (1928). The novel, forbidden in England, became a hit elsewhere and was for many decades the main model for lesbian identification in the Western world.

The images of the antipodes of proud male loves of noblemen and soldiers and abject sodomy worthy of capital punishment were replaced by pitied homosexuals who for most people became, beyond sinners and criminals, mad men. They were no longer kings with same-sex passions, but rather average men and women who were burdened with an abject identity, which could serve as a source for something greater to struggle for: homosexual rights. This fight was carried from Weimar Germany by the Swiss organization *Der Kreis* (see Jackson's chapter in this volume) that survived the Second World War into post-war times and it did so in three languages: local German and French and the one that would become the standard bearer of the new times, English, so the message of the old activism could linger on in a new gay world (Kennedy 1999).

References

Barbedette, G. and M. Carassou. 1981. *Paris gay 1925*. Paris: Presses de la Renaissance.

Blasius, M. and S. Phelan (eds). 1997. *We Are Everywhere: A Historical Sourcebook of Gay and Lesbian Politics*. New York and London: Routledge.

Brundage, J.A. 1987. *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bruns, C. 2008. *Politik des Eros. Die Männerbund in Wissenschaft, Politik und Jugendkultur (1880–1934)* [Politics of Eros: The male bond in science, politics and youth culture]. Cologne: Böhlau.

Crompton, L. (ed.). 1978. "Jeremy Bentham's Essay on 'Paederasty." *Journal of Homosexuality* 3 (4): 383–8; 4 (1): 91–107.

Dabhoiwala, F. 2012. *The Origins of Sex: A History of the First Sexual Revolution*. London: Penguin.

Derks, P. 1990. *Die Schande der heiligen Päderastie. Homosexualität und Öffentlichkeit in der deutschen Literatur 1750–1850* [The shame of holy pederasty: Homosexuality and public culture in German literature]. Berlin: Rosa Winkel.

Domeier, N. 2010. *Der Eulenburg-Skandal. Eine politische Kulturgeschichte des Kaiserreichs* [The Eulenburg Scandal: A Political Cultural History of the Empire]. Frankurt: Campus.

Dworek, G. 1988. "Ein Yankee am Hofe des Königs Karl" [A Yankee at the court of King Charles]. *Capri* 2 (4): 3–23.

Edmiston, W.F. 2013. *Sade: Queer Theorist*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation.

Féray, J.P. 2015. *L'impossible conciliation ou la vie héroïque du Dr Claude-François Michéa* [The impossible conciliation or the heroic life of Dr François Michéa]. Paris: Quintes-feuilles.

Feuerbach, P.J.A. von [1801] 1803. *Lehrbuch des gemeinen im Deutschland gültigen peinlichen Rechts* [Manual of common German criminal law]. 2nd edn. Giessen: Heyer.

Foucault, M. 1976. *Histoire de la sexualité* 1: *La volonté de savoir* [The history of sexuality 1: The will to know]. Paris: Gallimard.

Friedländer, B. 1909. *Die Liebe Platons im Lichte der modernen Biologie* [Platonic love seen from the perspective of biology]. Treptow bei Berlin: Zack.

Häfner, H. 2008. *Ein König wird beseitigt: Ludwig II von Bayern* [A king abdicates: Ludwig II of Bavaria]. Munich: Beck.

Hekma, G. 1987. *Homoseksualiteit, een medische reputatie*. Amsterdam: SUA.

____. 2006. "Sade, Masculinity, and Sexual Humiliation." *Men & Masculinities* 9 (2): 236–51.

____. 2014. "Sodomie, Unmännlichkeit and Knabenliebe." [Sodomy, unmasculinity and boy love]. In *Was ist Homosexualität? Forschungsgeschichte, gesellschaftliche Entwicklungen und Perspektiven* [What is homosexuality? History of research, social developments and perspectives], edited by Florian Mildenberger, Jennifer Evans, Rüdiger Lautman and Jakob Pastötter. Hamburg: Männerschwarm Verlag.

Hekma, G., H. Oosterhuis and J. Steakley. 1995. "Leftist Sexual Politics and Homosexuality." In *Gay Men and the Sexual History of the Political Left*, edited by G. Hekma, H. Oosterhuis and J. Steakley. Binghamton, NY: Haworth, pp. 1–40.

Herzer, M. 1992. *Magnus Hirschfeld. Leben und Werk eines jüdischen, schwulen und sozialistischen Sexologen* [Magnus Hirschfeld: Life and Work of a Jewish, Gay, and Socialist Sexologist]. Frankfurt: Campus.

Hingst, Monika et al. (eds). 1997. *Goodbye to Berlin? Hundert Jahre Schwulenbewegung* [One hundred years of the gay movement]. Berlin: Rosa Winkel.

Hirschfeld, M. 1910. *Die Transvestiten* [The transvestites]. Berlin: Pulvermacher.

____. 1914. *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* [The homosexuality of man and woman]. Berlin: Marcus.

Jordan, M. 1997. *The Invention of Sodomy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kennedy, H. 1995. "Johann Baptist von Schweitzer: The Queer Marx Loved to Hate." In *Gay Men and the Sexual History of the Political Left*, edited by G. Hekma, H. Oosterhuis and J. Steakley,. Binghamton, NY: Haworth, pp. 69–96.

____. 1999. *The Ideal Gay Man: The Story of Der Kreis*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park (also *Journal of Homosexuality* 38 [1–2]).

____. 2001. *Karl Heinrich Ulrichs. Leben und Werk* [Karl Heinrich Ulrich: Life and work]. 2nd edn. Hamburg: MännerschwarmSkript Verlag, 2001.

Kertbeny, K.M. 2000. *Schriften zur Homosexualitätsforschung* [Writings on homosexuality research]. Edited by M. Herzer. Berlin: Rosa Winkel.

Kuhn, B. 2011. *Gay Power! The Stonewall Riots and the Gay Rights Movement, 1969*. Minneapolis, MN: 21st Century Books.

Laqueur, T.W. 1990. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

____. 2003. *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation*. NY: Zone Books.

Lauritsen, J. and D. Thorstad. 1974. *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement (1868–1935)*. New York: Times Change Press.

Le Brun, A. 1986. *Soudain un bloc d'abîme Sade* [Sade, a sudden abyss]. Paris: Pauvert.

Lever, M. 1991. *Donatien Alphonse François, Marquis de Sade*. Paris: Fayard.

Meer, T. van der 2007. *Jonkheer Mr. Jacob Anton Schorer. Een biografie van homoseksualiteit* [Squire Jacob Anton Schorer: A biography of homosexuality]. Amsterdam: Schorer.

Merrick, J. and B.T. Ragan (eds). 2001. *Homosexuality in Early Modern France: A Documentary Collection*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meyers, J. 1977. *Homosexuality and Literature 1890–1930*. London: Athlone.

Oosterhuis, H. 2000. *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Oosterhuis, H. and H. Kennedy. 1991. *Homosexuality and Male Bonding in Pre-Nazi Germany*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth.

Praz, M. [1933] 1970. *The Romantic Agony*, translated by Angus Davidson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ricci, F. 2007. *Ritter, Tod und Eros. Die Kunst Elisàr von Kupffers (1872–1942)*. [Knight, Death and Eros. The Art of Elisàr von Kupffers]. Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: Böhlau.

Rüling, A. 1905. "Welches Interesse hat die Frauenbewegung an der Lösung des homosexuellen Problems?" [What interest does the women's movement have in the solution of the homosexual problem?] *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 7: 129–51. Partial English translation in *We Are Everywhere: A Historical Sourcebook of Gay and Lesbian Politics*, edited by M. Blasius and S. Phelan. New York and London: Routledge, 1997, pp. 143–50.

Sibalis, M. 1996. "The Regulation of Male Homosexuality in Revolutionary and Napoleonic France." In *Homosexuality in Modern France*, edited by J. Merrick and B.T. Ragan. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 80–101.

Sigusch, V. 2000. *Karl Heinrich Ulrichs. Der erste Schwule der Weltgeschichte* [Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: The first gay in world history]. Berlin: Rosa Winkel.

Sinfield, A. 1994. *The Wilde Century*. London: Cassell.

Steakley, J.D. 1975. *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*. New York: Arno Press.

____. 2007. *"Anders als die Andern." Ein Film und seine Geschichte* ["Different from the Others": A film and its history]. Hamburg: Männerschwarm Verlag.

Stockinger, J. 1979. "Homosexuality and the French Enlightenment." In *Homosexualities and French Literature*, edited by G. Stambolian and E. Marks, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, pp. 161–85.

Ulrichs, K.H. 1994. *Forschungen über das Räthsel der mannmännlichen Liebe* [Research on the Riddle of Male-Male Love]. 4 vols Edited by H. Kennedy. Berlin: Rosa Winkel.

Weeks, J. 1977. *Coming Out; Homosexual Politics in Britain, from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*. London: Quartet.