

patients but the writing and research about human sexuality until well past the middle of the twentieth century.

The psychiatrist or psychoanalyst saw patients who sought help with their problems, and the professional then usually published the case histories, including analysis and treatment. The result was almost a circular process: Because the Freudians dominated the publications dealing with sexual problems, they received the patients with such problems. While the urologist and gynecologist could deal with some aspects of sexuality, the psychiatrist and psychoanalyst had a theoretical construct into which all aspects of sexuality could be included. Moreover, Freudian theories inevitably spread to many other elements in the intellectual community, further adding to the dominance of his ideas. Though succeeding generations of psychoanalysts and disciples of Freud added to or slightly modified Freudian theories, the system itself was challenged only as a new generation of empirical data gatherers appeared, mainly in the universities, a setting previously not receptive to sex researchers except in the biological sciences. The new generation held professorships, which provided them with the financial security that Ellis never achieved through his writings and that Hirschfeld was born to. It also enabled them to challenge the medical dominance of sex research.

MAGNUS HIRSCHFELD

The most neglected, at least in America, of the three men discussed in this chapter is Hirschfeld. Undoubtedly influenced by his own homosexuality and transvestism, he did not pretend, at least at first, to be the dispassionate reporter of the varieties of human sexuality as Krafft-Ebing claimed to be. Instead he seemed, particularly in his early years, to have had an almost missionary zeal to bring the "truth" about sexuality to everyone. Though Hirschfeld started out as a political propagandist for homosexuality, he eventually became a significant researcher into human sexuality. A major reason for his comparative neglect, however, is that many of his contemporaries never forgot the fact that he had been a strong advocate for homosexuality and that sometimes, in his zeal, he tended to go to excess. In his later life, he was also a radical in politics, believing that only through changing the system could long-delayed changes in laws about sexuality take place. There were other reasons as well.

Hirschfeld's writings, for example, were often poorly organized and early on were not so well thought out, although he tended to improve with age. He turned out a variety of books and articles, some of which were outstanding and some of which seem to have been hurried into production to meet

deadlines or fill space. His own lifestyle also worked against him, and he was ready to give battle anytime he felt homosexual rights were being threatened. Sometimes he seemed to lack common sense. A good illustration of this last is his participation in the Harden-Eulenburg trial, an action brought by the enemies of Kaiser Wilhelm II and the imperial court.

HARDEN-EULENBURG-VON MOLTKE AFFAIR

Critics of the policies of Kaiser Wilhelm were afraid to attack the kaiser openly and thus sought to attribute to a cliquish group of his advisers, some of whom were believed to be homosexual, those policy actions that they opposed. A small group of opponents came to believe that an attack on the alleged homosexuality of his advisers might force the kaiser to dismiss them, which would then result in a change of policy. The seed for such an attack came from the kaiser's support of his friend Friedrich Krupp (1854–1902), who at age thirty-three had inherited control of the Krupp industrial empire. Though married, Krupp lived much of the time on the island of Capri off the coast of Naples, away from his wife. There he allegedly brought young fishermen, mule drivers, and others, some of whom were legally minors, to engage in sexual relations with him. Though homosexual activities in themselves were not against Italian law, corruption of minors was, and Krupp, after being declared *persona non grata*, was expelled from Italy for his alleged involvement with minors. In the ensuing scandal, Krupp died, probably by committing suicide, but the kaiser tried to quell the public uproar and defend the house of Krupp by giving his friend a state funeral.¹

Just how much influence the kaiser's enemies had in encouraging the Italians to bring charges is unclear, but his opponents saw the kaiser's efforts to minimize the scandal as a chance to claim that his court was riddled with homosexuality. Matters came to a head when Maximilian Harden, publisher of a Berlin periodical, *Die Zukunft*, and an opponent of imperial policies, charged that the kaiser was surrounded by a group of catamites who were perverting Germany policy. When this failed to bring a response, Harden mentioned two individuals by name: Prince Philip Fürst zu Eulenburg, former ambassador to Austria-Hungary, and Count Kuno von Moltke, military commander of Berlin. In October 1907, von Moltke launched a libel suit against Harden, but Harden produced extensive data about the alleged homoerotic tendencies of von Moltke, and Hirschfeld testified as an "expert witness" that von Moltke was a homosexual on the basis of such evidence. Harden was acquitted, but von Moltke appealed. In the second trial, Harden was convicted and sentenced to four months in jail, and much of the evidence produced in the first trial against von Moltke was demonstrated to be

fraudulent. Eulenburg, who was initially charged with perjury for denying his homosexuality, never was brought to trial.

Although Hirschfeld may have thought that he was only performing a professional service by testifying, his testimony played into the hands of those who wished to label homosexuals in high places as a peril to the fatherland, and neither the original conviction nor the eventual acquittal helped the cause of homosexuality. It also threw doubt on Hirschfeld's expertise, and more important, made him anathema to the kaiser and his court, whose support was essential if homosexuality was to be made legal.

Some of his critics also opposed Hirschfeld on more professional grounds. Sexologists like Moll, though initially somewhat supportive of Hirschfeld's ideas, ultimately ended up in open opposition both to his theories and to the nature of his research. The disagreements between Moll and Hirschfeld in their later years, however, were more than scientific or scholarly disputes. Although the disagreements did have a professional basis, the men increasingly seemed to have been motivated by personal hostilities and rivalries. Their conflict forced many in the sexology field to choose sides.

Freud also had initially praised Hirschfeld, and in fact, Hirschfeld had joined with Karl Abraham in founding the Berlin Psychoanalytical Society. In 1911, at the Weimar Congress of the Psychoanalytical Association, Freud treated Hirschfeld as an honored guest and described him as the Berlin authority on homosexuality.² When Hirschfeld, however, left the society shortly after the Weimar Congress, Freud put him down, calling his "departure no great loss" and Hirschfeld "a flabby, unappetizing fellow, incapable of learning anything."³ This not atypical Freudian putdown of his critics or "deserters" meant that many psychoanalysts, particularly those active in the United States, later ignored Hirschfeld's work.

HIRSCHFELD'S EARLY YEARS

Hirschfeld was the son of Hermann Hirschfeld, a well-known physician and philanthropist in the seaside spa of Kolberg in Pomerania, and Frederika Mann, a member of a prominent Jewish family from Pomerania. He, like his two brothers, decided to follow his father's footsteps and started his medical education at Strasbourg. He soon left there for Berlin, then moved to Munich. Hirschfeld also studied at Heidelberg and finally returned to Berlin to complete his studies. His dissertation was on the effects of influenza on the nervous system. He then visited the United States and returned by way of Morocco, Algiers, and Italy.

In 1894, he opened an office in his hometown as a general practitioner and obstetrician, but two years later he moved to Berlin where he became a

specialist in hydropathy. It was in Berlin that he launched his career as an investigator of sex. His first entry into the field was a thirty-four-page pamphlet titled *Sappho und Sokrates, Wie erklärt sich die Liebe der Männer und Frauen zu Personen des eigenen Geschlechts?* (Sappho and Sokrates, How Can One Explain the Love of Men and Women for Individuals of Their Own Sex?). Hirschfeld wrote the pamphlet shortly after learning of the suicide of one of his patients, a young homosexual officer who shot himself through the head on the eve of his marriage. Just before doing so, he had mailed Hirschfeld a letter in which he announced that he killed himself because he felt so tortured by the double life he was forced to lead. He urged Hirschfeld to tell others his tragic story in the hope that they could better understand the difficulties under which homosexuals lived. Writing under the name of Th. Ramien, Hirschfeld argued that homosexuality was part of human sexuality, that both its causes and its manifestations should be the object of scientific investigation, and that the penal laws against homosexuality should be changed in the interest of society.⁴

The pamphlet opened with a quote from Friedrich Nietzsche—"what is natural cannot be immoral"—and aroused more interest than might have been expected because of the publicity generated by the trial of Oscar Wilde in England. Hirschfeld, relying heavily on the work of Moll,⁵ and to a lesser extent on Krafft-Ebing, stated that all of the sciences had demonstrated that homosexuals composed a third sex. He then went much further than Krafft-Ebing, however, and declared that homosexuality was simply a variety of human sexuality. The key to his theory lay in embryology (as did that of Ulrichs), although he was not fully aware of what Ulrichs had written. He attempted a 10-point scale to classify people based on his basic three principles of development; actually there were six principles, because he felt females and males went through the same three phases but with slight differences.

HIRSCHFELD'S THEORY

Most people, according to Hirschfeld, were originally bisexual, but in the course of their natural development, they lost their desire for members of the same sex. These people were the heterosexuals who loved members of the opposite sex. The second category of individuals was made up of the psychohermaphrodites—men and women whose sexual organs had developed normally but whose feeling centers for one or the other sex were imperfect, and as a result, these people could love individuals of both sexes. The third category consisted of those individuals whose sexual organs developed normally but in whom the desire for same-sex individuals in the feeling center

failed to recede. The results were men who loved men and women who loved women. Hirschfeld continued to modify his theory of the causes of homosexuality over the next four decades but never really came to a satisfactory formulation, probably because none of what he said could really be proven.

The pamphlet *Sappho und Sokrates* represents the strength and weaknesses of much of Hirschfeld's later work. He dismissed outright those people who disagreed with him, was sloppy in his historical data (he had Sappho killing herself because of unrequited love for a woman), and was quick to claim earlier historical figures as homosexuals or lesbians without much evidence. He also assumed that his was the only correct explanation for homosexuality, a claim that was quickly challenged by other homosexuals. In fact almost immediately after the appearance of Hirschfeld's pamphlet, another pamphlet was brought out by the same publisher, Max Spohr. The anonymous author of this pamphlet held that homosexuality was not an inborn condition but rather was acquired through an individual's passage through life. The problem, however, was not with the individual who developed into a homosexual but that society punished the homosexual, when it should really accept him or her.⁶

Many of the ideas in this second pamphlet were similar to those expressed by Benedict Friedländer and Adolf Brand, who opposed Hirschfeld's notion of a third sex, and may well have been written by them. Friedländer later argued that theories such as Hirschfeld's made all homosexuals effeminate (or in the case of lesbians, masculine), while they regarded homosexuality as an idealized aspect of male bonding such as had existed in ancient Greece. For them, homosexual love was spiritual and not a physical or animal desire; in other words, sexual intercourse was to have no place in such relationship. Friedländer and Brand did note that sexual intercourse could (and did) take place, but in circumstances in which the idealized love between two such individuals led to an intimate sharing of bodily fluids, the act was different from animal love.⁷ This view was later more fully developed by Hans Blüher, who divided homosexuals into three types: the heroic male, the effeminate invert, and the suppressed homosexual.⁸ Though Friedländer and like thinkers recognized that society was organized primarily around the family and the state—a heterosexual base—they also believed it had a secondary base in male bonding, which involved homoerotic feelings; this was the major role for the heroic male.

HOMOSEXUALITY AND POLITICS

This split over possible theories for the existence of homosexuality went beyond hypotheses that neither side could prove or disprove; it was a political split as well—and Hirschfeld was very much a politician. On his twenty-ninth

birthday, May 14, 1897, Hirschfeld founded the Wissenschaftlich-Humanitäre Komitee (Scientific Humanitarian Committee) to give new life to the struggle started earlier by Ulrichs and others for the repeal of the antihomosexual provision, by then section 175 of the imperial penal code as adopted in 1871. The imperial law imposed a maximum of two years' imprisonment for "lewd and unnatural conduct" between males. As part of their campaign, the committee members circulated petitions to be signed by supporters of the legal change, and many people prominent in public life signed their names. For a time, the cause was adopted by some of the political parties. August Bebel, the leader of the German Social Democratic Party, spoke on the floor of the Reichstag in favor of the petition. As a result of his efforts, the petition was put on the agenda, although it was not officially discussed until 1905, at which time it was quietly removed.⁹ While awaiting such discussion, Hirschfeld and the committee persuaded district attorneys in several of the larger German cities to refrain from prosecution if consensual sex was involved.

The failure of the committee to achieve its political goals tended to accentuate the split between the followers of Hirschfeld on the one hand and Friedländer and Brand on the other. The unity of the group was further damaged over the Harden-Eulenburg-von Moltke trials, although Hirschfeld continued to push for reform all of his life.

More important in the long run than the political activities of the committee were its scholarly activities on behalf of homosexuality, particularly the publication, starting in 1899, of *Jahrbuch für Sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (Yearbook for Sexual Intermediates), the title of which reflected Hirschfeld's concepts about a third, or intermediate, sex. Hirschfeld edited the twenty-three volumes that appeared (under slightly varied titles) between 1899 and 1923. Many of those published during World War I, when paper rationing was severe, were little more than newsletters, and several issues were combined into one. The series was briefly revived in stronger form after the war, only to fold with the monetary collapse of Germany in the early 1920s. The journal was a mixture of scholarly articles, reprints of classical articles such as Kertbeny's earlier pamphlets, propaganda pieces, political essays, biographical studies, and special pleading. Though in its early issues it had significant contributors such as Krafft-Ebing, the journal generally was ignored by official science and scholarship in Germany. For anyone studying the history of sex, however, the series remains invaluable.

HIRSCHFELD THE RESEARCHER

Hirschfeld also began to carry out sex surveys, and his 1903 report that 2.2 percent of all those surveyed were homosexual led Moll to break with

Hirschfeld over what he felt were exaggerated statistics. Though Hirschfeld's claim seems a remarkably accurate one in light of current knowledge, it brought nothing but hostility to Hirschfeld, and it served as one more excuse for his enemies to attack him.¹⁰

The rejection of the petition for reformation of sex laws, and particularly the defection of various groups from Hirschfeld's committee, forced a rethinking on the part of Hirschfeld. Though he had claimed that science had demonstrated that homosexuality was not pathological, few had agreed with him, and his writings on the topic had been far more polemical than objective. For a time, he felt that science was not on his side, because of the various disagreements among both his followers and his opponents. It was in this setting that he turned to Iwan Bloch, who had been emphasizing *sexualwissenschaft*, or sexual science. It was through this new kind of sexual science that Hirschfeld sought to move the discussion of sex from the political arena to the scholarly, scientific disciplinary one, and in the process, he hoped to provide solutions to sexual problems.

Hirschfeld quickly rededicated himself to finding a scientific basis for his beliefs, and he embraced Bloch's new view of *sexualwissenschaft*. One of Hirschfeld's first acts was to begin publishing in 1908 a new journal devoted to sexology as a science: *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft*. The very first issue of this journal contained an article by Freud titled "Hysterical Fantasy and Its Relation to Bisexuality," and subsequent issues presented original works by Alfred Adler, Karl Abraham, and Wilhelm Stekel, among others. Hirschfeld, at that time, made a significant effort to include the Austrian psychoanalytical movement as part of the legitimate study of sexological science. Hirschfeld also traveled to Italy to solicit personally articles from Paolo Mantegazza and Lombroso, an indication that he hoped that sexology could become a new international science.

Hirschfeld also encouraged controversy. Helene Stöcker, an early Berlin feminist, contributed an article on the differences between the love lives of women and men; this was a response to a chauvinistic article on more or less the same topic by Wilhelm Sternberg. Stöcker was somewhat upset at the diversity of views in the journal and took Hirschfeld to task for publishing the Sternberg article, which she said was contrary to Hirschfeld's own views on the topic.

Journal articles came from a variety of disciplines, and during the first year, articles dealt with historical, philological, pedagogical, biological, medical, and ethnological aspects. Serving with Hirschfeld as coeditors of the journal were the Viennese ethnologist Friedrich Salomon Krauss and the Leipzig physician Hermann Rohleder, both instrumental in broadening the concept of sex research.

Unfortunately, the plans were far more ambitious than the finances. After only a year of publication, the journal was merged with *Sexual Probleme*, a more popular and less scholarly journal. The resulting amalgam appeared under the title *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft und Sexual Politik* and later under still different titles, as other attempts were made to revive it.¹¹ Undaunted by the failure of the journal, Hirschfeld, for his part, continued to apply what he believed was his newfound scientific objectivity to his research. His first work to qualify as a major contribution was *Die Transvestiten* (1910), a term he coined. This ignored classic (it was translated into English only in 1991) challenged the view that all cross-dressers were homosexual, since Hirschfeld found many such individuals were heterosexual. After examining possible correlations of cross-dressing with homosexuality, fetishism, and masochism, he said that while all might have some bearing, the transvestite was different. The difference between the homosexual man and the transvestite man (he also included some women) was not in behavior but in the focus of pleasure. Transvestites differed from fetishists, because fetishists tended to attach the object of the fetish to a beloved person, while transvestites focused on themselves and their clothing. While there was some masochistic tendencies, since male heterosexual cross-dressers tended to seek out masculine women, he felt that this was not a major causal factor.¹² His observations and data on cross-dressing, if not his theory, were not matched until the last decade of the twentieth century.

Hirschfeld then published *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (1914), in which he repeated his ideas, summarized above, with slight modification. His use of the term *homosexuality* consolidated it into the community.¹³ What is most valuable about Hirschfeld is the amount of data he compiled about homosexuality, transvestism, and other forms of sexual activity. He held that a variety of sexual behaviors were normal, and he was more interested in describing this variety than condemning it.

Hirschfeld was not content to rely solely on his practice or on case studies passed on to him by others; he set out to seek information from a large variety of informants. Shortly after 1900, he developed what he called a psychobiological questionnaire, which contained some 130 questions and which he administered to more than ten thousand men and women. On the basis of this, he wrote what he called his first sexobiological book, *Naturgesetze der Liebe*, which marked a breakthrough in his research: He was no longer just interested in the "pathological" but in sex behavior in general. This study was strongly influenced by the German evolutionary biologist Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919), who laid stress on the fundamental biogenetic law that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny, or that the organism in its development demonstrates, to a great extent, the morphological changes that

occurred during the evolution of the species. Haeckel, who developed a theory called monism, held that the material basis of true-life phenomena—nourishment and reproduction—was due to an intricate chemical interaction and said that an “erotic chemotropism” was the very source of love.

Hirschfeld adopted this belief and asserted that some kind of internal secretions, what we now call hormones, were the principal source of the feelings of love and sexual attraction. He held that the testes secreted a chemical substance that he called “gandrin” and the ovaries, something he called “gynecin,” although such substances had not yet been isolated.¹⁴ Part of the difficulty with Hirschfeld is that, as his biographer, Charlotte Wolff, said, “he tapped at the door of modern science but could not get it to open.”¹⁵ He wanted to find a biological explanation for all kinds of sexual behavior, and when the science of the time could not give them, he hypothesized such explanations. He often was on the right path, but sometimes his ideas were based on fallacies. In his defense, he occasionally seemed to realize there were difficulties with his concepts, such as the existence of a third sex, because he admitted that physically normal people could be homosexuals or bisexuals, but he still insisted on a third sex.

Part of the Hirschfeld’s difficulty derived from his use of the monist theory, which lay at the core of both his and Moll’s theories. Monism tended to deprive the idea of sexuality of its traditional, limited meaning. As Lawrence Birken pointed out, evolutionary theory posed a dilemma for sexologists, because by relating all forms of desire to each other, it gave them a generic unity that subverted difference. Yet, at the same time, it emphasized the possibility of controlling these desires by relating them to each other in a developmental hierarchy. In sexology, women and children became sexualized even as they continued as sexless denizens of the innocent world outside competitive society. Sexuality was simultaneously universal and the function of the adult male alone. The problem was the necessity of upholding the idea of difference with a theory that emphasized differentiation from a common sameness. As long as the accent was on the differentiation, difference could be sustained; but there was a gradual tendency to shift the emphasis to the common sameness underlying the apparent difference. In sexology, this saw a shift from the idea of an adult male sexuality to one of a universally defined sexuality.¹⁶ Birken held that “the phylogenetic origins of sexuality in primeval undifferentiated desire undercut any attempt to distinguish the sexual from the nonsexual. In this context, social energies might appear as nothing more than a rarefied form of sexual energy. In other words, the social appeared as a higher stage of the sexual, arising out of but in opposition to primeval desire.”¹⁷

It was Freud who broke through this difficulty, replacing the difference

between social and sexual desire with a concept by which social and sexual love become differentiated unequally from each other. In replacing difference with differentiation, Freud was able to explain precisely how relations within the family were connected to relations outside the family in a hierarchical order. The Oedipus complex of Freud, in a sense, was a defense against an even more unbearable idea, the dissolution of the hierarchical order of the sexes.

Hirschfeld, however, never visualized any of this debate as a problem and so never dealt with it. He remained interested in organization, continually trying to extend the network of sexologists and inform the public. The Humanitarian Committee, in spite of disaffections of some, continued to agitate for change, but Hirschfeld also wanted more data and information. In 1913, he was instrumental in the founding of the *Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Sexualwissenschaft und Eugenik* (Medical Society for Sexual Science and Eugenics), which was conceived of as the beginning of a worldwide movement for sexual reform. This led to a revival of the *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* under the editorship of Eulenburg and Bloch.

World War I proved to be a major setback to the German sexological movement. Hirschfeld, who had long been a pacifist, initially threw himself into the German war effort, and in his tendency to exaggerate, which always plagued him, he became the supreme German patriot. In his absolute certainty that Germany was in the right, he made statements that never should have been made. When his passions began to cool, he quickly abandoned his early enthusiasm for the war, ending up involved in the movement to oust the kaiser and establish a democratic government in Germany. For the rest of his life, he was strongly left wing—probably, at least for a time, a Communist—and this influenced the reception of his ideas about sex.

During the war he began publishing *Sexual Pathology*, which he regarded as an update to Krafft-Ebing. Though it has a large number of excellent observations, it is weakened either by poor theory or by unfortunate remarks. Still, one of his most important contributions was to challenge Krafft-Ebing’s baneful beliefs in the effects of masturbation. Amplifying on the studies of the German sexologist Rohleder, who had reported that 90 percent of all people younger than twenty had masturbated,¹⁸ Hirschfeld found that if anything this was an understatement and reported that in his estimation 96 percent had done so. He wrote that the harmfulness and consequences of masturbation have been greatly exaggerated. “In most cases the exaggerated fear of the harmful consequences of masturbation is far more harmful to health than the act itself. A certain lassitude and inability to concentrate may, of course, be induced by excessive masturbation, but will pass very quickly of itself if the subject’s mode of life is natural and normal.”¹⁹

Hirschfeld, however, could not quite overcome the nineteenth-century fears of masturbation, and believed, following others, that there was such a thing as hyperactive self-gratification and recommended sterilization of men and clitorrectomy in women to prevent it.²⁰

Overall, his *Sexual Pathology* is a considerable advance over what had gone before, and when he wrote of chromosomal abnormalities or hormonal abnormalities, he was reporting on the cutting edge of the known research, but when he advanced his beliefs about psychoendocrinism—the interaction of organic and psychological factors—he was going beyond what the science of the day could confirm. Science had not advanced far enough to give the kind of answers that he tried to give, and unfortunately, he did not always distinguish between what he believed and what the existing evidence could demonstrate. When data were lacking, he fell back on theories that, in the end, turned out not to be valid. In many areas, however, he was quite cautious. For example, though he rejected Freud's theory about sexuality *per se*, he agreed with Freud about the sexual origin of many neuroses and with his emphasis on it in hysteria and obsessional ideas. He did not agree with Freud on psychic influences and complexes or with infantile experience.²¹

In 1919, Hirschfeld finally realized a long-term dream with the foundation of his Institute of Sexual Science in Berlin; there he could consolidate and extend his data and house his library of more than twenty thousand volumes and thirty-five thousand pictures that supported his research. Using his psychobiological questionnaire, he continued his wide-scale study of sexual habits. He established a marriage counseling service, gave out advice on contraception and sex problems, and continued his prolific writing (he himself claimed 187 works).²² Increasingly, Hirschfeld and his colleagues branched out into studies of female sexuality, marriage, contraceptives, and prostitution, becoming less concerned with sexual variance and more concerned with general sexual problems.

INTERNATIONAL SEXOLOGY CONGRESSES

Still, Hirschfeld increasingly felt the key to understanding sexuality was endocrinology. In 1921, his dreams of having an international sexological movement came to fruition with the International Conference of Sexual Reform Based on Sexual Science, which took place in Berlin from September 15 to 20. The theme of the conference was the importance of internal secretions for human sexuality, but the papers from the thirty-six speakers were wide ranging and did not always hold to the theme. Included in the audience were physicians from Germany, Finland, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Holland, France,

the United States, Argentina, China, and Japan as well as the emerging independent Baltic states. Four of the participants were women. The fact that Hirschfeld was host and keynote speaker solidified his standing in the sexological community, and out of this meeting eventually came the World League for Sexual Reform. The economic and other postwar difficulties in Germany made it difficult to follow through on this until 1928, when J. Leunbach of Copenhagen organized the second meetings, this time known as the Congress of the World League for Sexual Reform. Coming from United States to the congress was Harry Benjamin, Margaret Sanger, and William Robinson, all of whom continued to be active in international sexological meetings; in a sense, these Americans were involved in the transitional development of one wing of the sexological movement.

Again Hirschfeld gave the opening lecture, and the league became formally organized with three co-presidents: Auguste Forel of Switzerland, Ellis of the United Kingdom, and Hirschfeld. The chief points of the league policy was an advocacy of sexual education, sexual equality of men and women, reform of marriage and divorce laws, encouragement of contraception and birth control, reformation of the laws on abortion, protection of the unmarried mother and the illegitimate child, prevention of sexually transmitted diseases, removal of the economic factors that led women into prostitution, promotion of a rational attitude toward sexually "abnormal" persons, and reformation of the laws regarding sexual offenses. In short, the platform combined Hirschfeld's ideas of sexual reform and research but the emphasis was on reform.

The Third International Congress, held in London, again saw Hirschfeld give the keynote address. He was followed by one hundred other speakers including such nonsexologists as the philosopher Bertrand Russell, the dramatist John van Druten, and the writer Desmond MacCarthy. Many of the talks were devoted to contraception and were marked by an effort by those in attendance to try to distance themselves somewhat from the eugenics movement.

The Fourth International Congress, held in Vienna in 1930, was again keyed by Hirschfeld, still one of the three co-presidents (Norman Haire of the United Kingdom and Leunbach were the others). The conference had fewer participants than the earlier ones, and many of the scheduled speakers, such as Ellis and Benjamin, could not attend, although their lectures were printed in the book of congress papers.

The Fifth Congress had originally been planned for Moscow and then for Paris but ended up, in 1932, in Brno, Czechoslovakia. This congress was important because, unlike the others, it took place in an academic atmosphere at a university. It also had the sponsorship of the Czech president, Jan

Masaryk. Many of the participants broadcast their speeches back to their own countries over the radio. In spite of such a public relations coup, the congress was the last to be held, partly due to the rapid decline of the German sexological movement but also due to the strong differences between Haire and Leunbach. Leunbach wanted the league to join with the revolutionary workers' movement, but Haire was determined to keep all revolutionary activity out of the league and to concentrate on educational projects. The ultimate result was the dissolution of the league.²³

HIRSCHFELD, THE NAZIS, AND HIS DEATH

The Brno congress marked the end of one phase of European sex research in other ways as well. Within a year of its conclusion, Nazi hoodlums, encouraged by the newly legitimized Nazi government, on May 6, 1933, broke into Hirschfeld's institute in Berlin. They destroyed the greater part of his collection and data and removed books from the library and publicly burned them. Hirschfeld was traveling at the time and learned of the destruction in Paris, where, in a cinema, he saw with his own eyes the destruction of much of his life's work. He tried to start again in France, but he died in Nice on May 14, 1935—his sixty-seventh birthday.

This portrait of Hirschfeld hints at the disputes in the sexological field of the time, but there is not enough space to amplify all the differences. Distinctions were strong and Moll in particular was quick to counter almost every move that Hirschfeld made. When Hirschfeld organized his Society of Physicians for Sexual Science and Eugenics, Moll offset it with the formation of his International Society for Sexual Research. When Hirschfeld organized the first international conference on sexology in Berlin, Moll planned another one. Economic conditions in Germany postponed Moll's conference until 1926, when the International Congress of Sex Research was held in Berlin, to which Hirschfeld was pointedly not invited.²⁴ Moll claimed that if he had invited Hirschfeld, many of the others would not have attended, because, he stated, that Hirschfeld was seen as an apologist for homosexuality. Most of those who attended the Moll conference did not know until after they arrived that Hirschfeld had been left out. Moll and Hirschfeld were on opposite sides of almost every issue. Hirschfeld himself, however, frequently appealed to Moll to lay aside their personal differences and asked Moll to join him in the search for the scientific truth, which Hirschfeld felt could be found. Hirschfeld could never understand why Moll was so opposed to him. He knew they disagreed, but felt that ultimately science would give the answers.

Hirschfeld was erratic, was sometimes extravagant in his claims, and did

not always think through his actions; he was left wing, very close to the Communist Party, and homosexual. Moll was cautious and conservative, a German nationalist, heterosexual, and very much concerned that homosexual researchers such as Hirschfeld would "infect" sex research. Moll challenged Hirschfeld's belief that he could diagnose homosexuality in children, was critical of his theory of sexual intermediaries, and could not abide Hirschfeld's belief that homosexuals had special virtues and were more democratic and more altruistic than heterosexuals.²⁵ Moll was particularly irked by Hirschfeld's claim that the science of sexology had been founded by Bloch and instead insisted that Krafft-Ebing deserved to have the credit.

Haire, who had studied briefly under Hirschfeld in Berlin and who served later as co-president of the World Congress, was fond of Hirschfeld. Still he found that Hirschfeld was often hard to take. He wrote, "As the rest of us, he had his imperfections. He was not always tactful. He didn't always stop to think how his actions might be interpreted by persons of ill will. He could be very selfish and exigent in small matters. His appearance was, I think, unprepossessing."²⁶

Hirschfeld's ultimate importance to sex research is not so much his theory, although he had important insights, but his data collection and his organizing ability. Though many of the sources for his data were destroyed by the Nazis, he had published significant amounts of his data, and later generations of researchers have found his cases to be invaluable. So-called research on sex had started out mainly as learned opinions and theories, based on historical and cultural data and a few clients, but the growth of case studies and the ability to compare backgrounds of different peoples (as both Moll and Hirschfeld did) opened up new horizons in sex research and led to challenging and modifying traditional ideas. For the most part, however, the state of knowledge in the biological nature of humans was not yet advanced enough to go beyond this. The fact that some researchers, such as Hirschfeld, were openly challenging societal attitudes and threatening to undermine traditional ideas was a major factor in the opposition to Hirschfeld as expressed by Moll and others.

HAVELOCK ELLIS

More successful and much less dogmatic and antagonistic was the English sexologist Havelock Ellis, whose *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1896–1928) popularized the concept of the individual and cultural relativism in sex. In a sense, Ellis was a naturalist, observing and collecting information about human sexuality instead of judging it. Always cautious, he avoided

SCIENCE
IN THE
BEDROOM

*A History of
Sex Research*

VERN L. BULLOUGH



BasicBooks

A Division of HarperCollins Publishers

1994