

Hubert Kennedy

Four in Gay History

Peremptory Publications

Concord, CA

2003

© 2003 by Hubert Kennedy

Four in Gay History is a Peremptory Publications ebook. It may be freely distributed, but no changes may be made in it.

Comments and suggestions are welcome. Please write to hubertk@pacbell.net.

Contents

Introduction	4
A Latter-Day Hadrian: Fitzroy Davis and <i>Der Kreis</i>	6
German Gay Activist Visits San Francisco – In 1931	9
Karol Szymanowski, His Boy-Love Novel, and the Boy He Loved	14
Johann Baptist von Schweitzer: The Queer Marx Loved to Hate	26

Introduction

Most of my research in gay history was into the lives of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs or John Henry Mackay or James Mills Peirce, but I also had occasion to write articles that do not deal directly with that trinity. Four of them are collected here.

The first recalls Fitzroy Davis, whom I met in New England shortly before his death in 1980. When I moved to San Francisco in 1986, I immediately joined the San Francisco Bay Area Gay and Lesbian Historical Society. My article on Davis was my first contribution to its *Newsletter* (which later evolved into *OurStories*). I welcomed the opportunity to identify him as “Hadrian,” the author of eleven articles in the trilingual Swiss journal *Der Kreis*. Otherwise that identification might have been lost forever, for there was nothing in any of his “Hadrian” articles that would lead one to suspect that Fitzroy Davis was their author. Later I also pointed out this identification in my book *The Ideal Gay Man: The Story of Der Kreis* (1999).

In my other article in the *SFBAGLHS Newsletter* (the second article here) I revealed an unknown fact about a much better known personality, the German sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld, who was the principal founder of the world’s first gay rights organization in 1897. I had obtained an autographed photograph of him that showed he had visited Albert Einstein in Pasadena in 1931, and I included a copy of that photograph with my little article, which described Hirschfeld’s stop in San Francisco on his round-the-world trip in 1931. I later lend that photograph to two exhibitions in Berlin; the second time I simply left the photo in Berlin, giving it to the Gay Museum there.

In 1993 Wolfram Setz published a newly translated (into German) chapter from a book by the Polish composer Karol Szymanowski in the series *Bibliothek rosa Winkel*, which he edited. Setz gave me a copy for possible review. Instead, I was so impressed by the book that I wrote an article about it and Szymanowski. It is the third article included here. The article also gave me occasion to describe more closely Szymanowski’s teenage boyfriend Boris Kochno, who was later companion and collaborator of ballet impresario Sergey Diaghilev. One thing gave me concern in my research: the date of Kochno’s birth. The most authoritative source said he was born on 3 January 1904, but several other reference works said he was born in 1903. In my article I simply noted the discrepancy. As

soon as my article appeared in print, the solution became obvious to me: The date 3 January 1904 was in New Style (Gregorian calendar), whereas Kochno was born in Moscow, which at the time of his birth still used the Old Style (Julian calendar), according to which he was born in December 1903.

The fourth article, about Johann Baptist von Schweitzer, was a contribution to the collection *Gay Men and the Sexual History of the Political Left* (1995). In fact, it was an elaboration of a talk I first gave in 1975 at the fourth Gay Academic Union Conference in New York, which was published two years later in *Fag Rag* (Boston). In it I revealed the homophobic views of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, which were contained in their correspondence. In the article of 1995 I added some remarks about boy-love and anarchism (which I thought appropriate to the volume in which the article appeared).

Hubert Kennedy

The San Francisco Bay Area Gay & Lesbian Historical Society Newsletter 4, no. 1 (September 1988), pp. 5, 8.

A LATTER-DAY HADRIAN: FITZROY DAVIS AND DER KREIS

by Hubert Kennedy

One night in November 1935 a touring production of *Romeo and Juliet* starring Katharine Cornell, then appearing at the Grand Opera House in Chicago, needed a walk-on. The 23-year-old actor who answered the call was Fitzroy Davis; it was his professional debut. Davis went on to have a long and varied career: by 1966 his credits as “actor, writer, singer, lecturer, director, critic, artist” took a column and a half of tiny print in *The Biographical Encyclopedia & Who’s Who of the American Theatre*.

Later, in *Contemporary Authors* (1975), Davis divided his career into three periods: actor 1935–62; singer 1962–70; writer 1970+; but of course these activities overlapped. *Quicksilver*, his first novel, was published already in 1942, and in the years 1958–65, using the pseudonym “Hadrian,” he regularly contributed articles to the Swiss gay journal *Der Kreis*. Davis, who never publicly revealed his identity as “Hadrian,” died in Putnam, Conn., on September 30, 1980. An obituary in the *New York Times* noted that he wrote *Quicksilver* and the screenplay for “The Heat’s On,” starring Mae West and Victor Moore (1943). In fact, he was credited with the dialogue for that film.

Born in Evanston, Ill., on February 27, 1912, Davis began acting in a school production at age five. Later, much later, he studied with Lee Strasberg. Thus *Quicksilver*, which tells the story of a tour of *Romeo and Juliet*, was based on solid personal knowledge, though this may only partly explain the success of the novel, which was on the *New York Times* Best Seller list for four weeks. There are several gay characters in the book, including the leading actress. Thus the novel was thought to contain revelations about Katharine Cornell’s lesbian activity during her tour with Shakespeare’s play. There was even a rumor that efforts had been made to buy up the edition of *Quicksilver*, to keep it from the hands of the public.

Some of the characters in *Quicksilver* showed up again in Davis' second novel *Through the Doors of Brass* (1974), which was based on his experience in Hollywood, but this book was not as successful as the earlier one. The reviewer for the *Library Journal* wrote: "There is some talk about sex but no sex scenes. Too bad; they might've helped." But Davis would not include them. As he once insisted to me: "There is no pornography of any kind in either book—heterosexual or homosexual; it is all psychological."

(I met Fitzroy Davis shortly before his death in 1980 and spoke with him only twice. He had time to write me only four letters, but when he saw my interest in his having written for *Der Kreis*, he sent me copies of a couple of issues. I was later able to read all but one of his ten articles in that journal. [Added in 2003: In fact, there were eleven articles—and I have read them all.])

The Swiss gay journal *Der Kreis*, under another name, had its beginning in Zurich in 1932 with a Fräulein Vock, later called "Mamma," as editor; the name of the journal was changed to *Der Kreis* (The Circle) in 1943. The actor Karl Meier, using the pseudonym "Rolf," became editor in 1942 and the journal continued under his leadership until its demise in the late 1960s. Already in 1944 it had a regular French section, and by 1952 also included texts in English.

In 1955 Rudolf Burkhardt, who used the name Rudolf Jung, became editor of the English section of this unique trilingual gay journal. On a trip to the United States, he met Fitzroy Davis in New York and asked him to contribute. Davis agreed, and the first of his articles appeared in October 1958. For all of them he chose the name of the Roman emperor Hadrian, which, as he informed me, "served to establish my maturity of years." Only in the last of them, however, in "Antinous 1965," did he try to speak in the voice of the emperor whose younger lover Antinous was drowned in the year 130.

The "Hadrian" articles of Davis are well-written and clear-sighted, if somewhat one-sided in their analysis. All are concerned with the difficulty of finding sexual/love partners. He is sometimes merely entertaining, for example, in his picture of New York's Central Park after dark ("Within the Enchanted Forest"), where he describes a "scene" now past. The humor is more sardonic, and a bit bitchy, in his report of vacationing in Provincetown ("The Queens' Summer Residence"). There, too, the customs have

changed: for example, Davis describes the “gay boys” as gathering in the evenings in the back room of a restaurant where “dancing is not permitted.”

Reading these articles today, one misses, most of all, any sense of resistance to a hostile society. Davis talks a lot about “Adjustment and Maladjustment” (it is the title of one article), but his complaints are all directed at other “gay boys.” Thus: “If there is one single quality we have found the most lacking in gay life, it is compassion” (in “Unholy Matrimony”); “The life of homosexuals is hard enough as it is without having so many of them set out purposely to be mean to each other” (in “On Being Friendly in Bars”). And there is a bitter, perhaps personal tone to his complaint (in “Antinous 1965”) that the Hadrians of today are lonely because “there are so rarely any Antinouses of today intelligent enough to respond to their appeal, to understand the value of an association with an older and wiser person.”

It is refreshing to read, in contrast, the articles of James (Barr) Fugaté, another American writer, in *Der Kreis*. His “In Defense of Swish” (1955), for example, shows a genuine sense of solidarity against the oppression from outside. Fugaté is better known to American gay readers as James Barr, author of the novel *Quatrefoil* (1950). Barr was also well known to Swiss gay readers, for Burkhardt had translated that novel into German and published excerpts from it in *Der Kreis*. In 1956 he also published a translation of Barr’s short story “Death in a Royal Family,” which originally appeared in *One* in 1953. This story was also the basis of a one-act play presented by members of “Der Kreis” in the fall of 1956.

Ten years later, Barr’s view of gay life, as seen in his novel *The Occasional Man* (1966), had dimmed and he disappeared from sight. Davis, too, no longer contributed to gay publications after his last article in *Der Kreis* in 1965. He continued to read the American gay press, but did not feel that they “ever tackle the real problems of homosexuality concerning how gays treat each other.” Davis’ views on this subject, when read in the context of the early 1960s, were indeed those of a wise latter-day Hadrian.

The San Francisco Bay Area Gay & Lesbian Historical Society Newsletter, Volume 5,
Number 2 (winter 1989): 1, 6

GERMAN GAY ACTIVIST VISITS SAN FRANCISCO – IN 1931

by Hubert Kennedy

When Magnus Hirschfeld visited San Francisco, the last American stop on his trip around the world, the noted sexologist was outspoken in his criticism of American prudery. A headline in the *San Francisco Examiner* for February 25, 1931, read: “Hypocrisy in U.S. Flayed by Dr. Hirschfeld.” Described by the reporter as a “German scientist of international repute,” Hirschfeld had arrived the day before at the St. Francis Hotel for a brief stop in San Francisco; this article appears to be his only published interview while here. The “hypocrisy” mainly referred to sexual matters, although Hirschfeld was also opposed to the Constitutional amendment prohibiting alcoholic drinks (repealed by another amendment in 1933). He was quoted as saying:

I have a great admiration for the American people, in the three months I have been here. I see a great desire of the people to have more knowledge.

The same as prohibition, the Anthony Comstock laws against information about sex and birth control have had broad consequences. It is not the right way. Before I came to America, I was more for prohibition. Now I see it is a great corruption.

(Comstock, the morals crusader, is estimated to have been responsible for the destruction of 160 tons of literature and pictures.)

Hirschfeld returned to this theme in his later account of his trip around the world (from San Francisco he continued on to Japan), where he gave a short impression of America; he liked the optimism of the immigrants:

And what I liked least about the United States? Unquestionably “Prohibition,” which was, at that time, doing serious harm, not only as regards the alcohol question, but also in sexual and other fields. Even to send articles on birth control through the mail is prohibited, and how minor a matter (although not an unimportant one) this is compared with other prohibitions, for hundreds of thousands of people have been stamped as criminals who are not criminals at all. Just because of this they are put at the mercy of real criminals whose extortions keep them in continual fear. This corruption became a cancerous growth in America and has had a shattering effect upon people with a sense of freedom and honor.

Although the language is not explicit, it is clear that he was referring to the laws against homosexuality then in effect throughout the United States. The repeal of such laws was, in fact, the principal concern of Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935), who is best known in gay history as the leader for many years of the first “gay rights” organization, the Scientific Humanitarian Committee, founded by him and others in Berlin in 1897. There were no doubt many undercurrents prompting that action; one of them, mentioned in the *Examiner* interview (and this appears to be the only evidence of it), was the Oscar Wilde case. As quoted in the *Examiner*:

A few of us said that jail was no help for such cases. We organized the Scientific Humanitarian Committee. Since that time, Europe has advanced a long way from its prudery. In thirty-five more years, America will advance.

This was optimistic propaganda, of course; Hirschfeld, homosexual and Jewish, wisely never returned to Germany and spent his last years in France where, in a cinema newsreel, he saw the Nazis destroy the valuable collections of the Institute for Sexual Science, founded by him in Berlin in 1919.

Before arriving in San Francisco, Hirschfeld had visited Southern California, where he saw the film studios of Hollywood and visited Albert Einstein in Pasadena. Hollywood is mentioned in his account of his trip; the only evidence for the latter is an autographed photo of himself (see the illustration) inscribed for an unnamed recipient: “Zur Erin-

nerung an unsere Begegnung bei Einsteins in Pasadena am 20.II.31" (As a souvenir of our meeting at Einstein's in Pasadena on February 20, 1931). Einstein had been in the United States two months; he left a week later to return to Berlin.

The further activities of Hirschfeld in San Francisco escaped the notice of the *Examiner*. The one article reported, "He will speak over KFRC tomorrow at 5:45, and may give a lecture before he sails March 5 for Tokyo." The radio station regularly scheduled news for 5:45, thus a brief interview was possible, but appears unlikely because of his poor English. The lecture (which would have been read) was also unlikely, since he moved up his departure date four days. One would like to think that he seized the opportunity on February 26 to hear Paul Robeson sing a program consisting entirely of spirituals. The *Examiner* waxed enthusiastic: "Physically splendid, Paul Robeson faced the great audience in Dreamland last night and sang as if he were the genius incarnate of the Negro race."

Hirschfeld left Europe on November 15, 1930, and was three months in the United States before continuing on west, first to Japan, then China, Indonesia, India and Palestine, before returning to Europe, but his account of his trip tells only the Asian portion and begins with his departure from the U.S.: "On March 1, 1931, I left the fabulously beautiful harbor of San Francisco on the Japanese steamer *Asama Maru*." One wishes he had reported, for example, on his visit with Einstein, who had earlier signed a petition to repeal the German anti-homosexual law, the petition circulated already in 1897 by the Scientific Humanitarian Committee.

Hirschfeld's prediction that "in thirty-five more years, America will advance" in its attitude toward homosexuality was overly optimistic, but in a limited sense has come true, and indeed in the limited sense of Hirschfeld's own propaganda, for he was willing to trade acceptance of an "age of consent" for the repeal of laws against "consenting adults." It should be pointed out, however, that he never achieved that goal in Germany. In fact, the strengthening of the anti-homosexual laws under the Nazis in 1935 had already been proposed during the Weimar republic.

And nothing has changed in Germany or the U.S. with regard to intergenerational sex. James Baldwin wrote in 1949:

A novel insistently demands the presence and passion of human beings, who cannot ever be labeled.... Without this passion, we may all smother to death, locked in those airless, labeled cells, which isolate us from each other and separate us from ourselves; and without this passion when we have discovered the connection between that Boy Scout who smiles from the subway poster and that underworld to be found all over America, vengeful time will be upon us.

Baldwin has proved to be a better prophet than Hirschfeld, for the “hypocrisy” he “flayed” remains, and “vengeful time” is now upon us.

References

James A. Baldwin, “Preservation of Innocence” (1949). Reprinted in *Out/Look, National Lesbian and Gay Quarterly*, No. 6 (fall 1989).

Magnus Hirschfeld, *Men and Women: The World Journey of a Sexologist*. New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1935.



Zur Erinnerung an
meine Besprechung bei
Leistung in Pasadena
am 20. II. 31

Maxwell L. ...

KAROL SZYMANOWSKI, HIS BOY-LOVE NOVEL, AND THE BOY HE LOVED

by Hubert Kennedy

Karol Szymanowski (1882–1937) was one of the greatest Polish composers and a central figure in Polish music in the first half of the twentieth century. He left a large body of compositions in nearly every form, most of them marked by strong individuality.¹ He was also the author of numerous biographical and critical articles in several languages.² That he was the author of a long novel on boy-love was not, however, generally known, until after his death, when his friend and literary executor, J. Iwaszkiewicz, allowed a brief passage to be read on Polish radio in March 1939. Although that short fragment was very discreet, it brought an angry letter from Szymanowski's mother. It was probably the title of the novel, *Ephebos*, more than anything else, that caused eyebrows to rise. Then, in September 1939, at the beginning of the Second World War, the house in which the manuscript was kept was burned. Apart from the title page, drafts of a foreword, and a few small fragments, it was thought that the two-volume novel was lost forever. But, in 1981, the Polish musicologist Teresa Chylinska discovered in Paris a 150-page Russian version of the novel's central chapter, "The Symposium," in the collection of the aging Boris Kochno (1904–1990). It was a treasured souvenir of his youth; Szymanowski himself had made the translation as a gift, and had also presented Kochno with four poems in French.

The original Polish of the chapter was painstakingly reconstructed, helped in part by the fact that Szymanowski's Russian often used Polish grammatical constructions. This chapter, the poems, and a passage from Iwaszkiewicz's memoirs describing the

1. For an excellent survey of the life and work of Szymanowski, see Teresa Chylinska, "Karol Szymanowski," *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan, 1980), 18: 499-504. For an authoritative study of Szymanowski's music, see Jim Samson, *The Music of Szymanowski* (London: Kahn & Averill, 1981).

2. For example: "Frédéric Chopin et la musique polonaise moderne" (1931) and *Wychowawcza rola kultury muzycznej w społeczeństwie* [The educational role of musical culture in society] (1931). Jim Samson reported that Alistair Wightman was preparing an English translation of Szymanowski's articles (op. cit., p. 9).

novel are now available in German translation.³

Karol Szymanowski was born on 6 October 1882 on the family estate Tymoszkówka in the Ukraine.⁴ At age fourteen he was impressed by hearing Wagner for the first time, in Vienna. He studied music in Warsaw (1901–1904) and in the following decade made a reputation for himself by composing music in the German Romantic tradition of Wagner and, especially, Richard Strauss. Then his interest shifted, as described by the British musicologist Christopher Palmer:

The young composer's interest in German musical culture began to decline steeply as a result of his travels with Stefan Spiess, first to Southern Italy and Sicily in April 1911, then to Sicily and North Africa in 1914. . . . It is possible that, like Gide before him, these journeys into exotic lands where forbidden fruit was freely to be had (especially by well-to-do foreigners) enabled him to realize the true direction of his sexual impulses, and that this affected in no small way the blossoming of his creative personality. Szymanowski made no overt declaration of his homosexuality in his music; *King Roger* is the only work in which any kind of homoerotic element is to be discerned, and this treatment of it is unsensational and unself-conscious. Rather is it his two-volume novel *Ephebos*, which is described by [Szymanowski's biographer] Maciejewski as Szymanowski's "apologia pro vita sua."⁵

Szymanowski's opera *King Roger*, set in medieval Sicily, was begun in 1918 and completed in 1924. As described by Chylinska, "The text, written jointly with Iwaszkiewicz, is based, broadly speaking, on the Dionysian thesis that only through bodily love can the mysteries of divine love be approached or creative work accomplished."⁶ At the conclusion of his description of the opera, Jim Samson wrote:

Here in these final pages, as Roger salutes Apollo in the rising sun, his vocal line achieves a dignity and strength which had formerly eluded it. His life has been enriched and transformed by the truths of Dionysus but he is no slave to them. He

3. Karol Szymanowski, *Das Gastmahl: Ein Kapitel aus dem Roman "Ephebos"*, ed. and trans. Wolfgang Jöhling (Berlin: Verlag rosa Winkel, 1993).

4. Chylinska, op. cit., p. 499. The date given here seems to be the most commonly accepted.

5. Christopher Palmer, *Szymanowski* (London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1983), p. 25.

6. Chylinska, op. cit., p. 501.

stands alone as a powerful symbol of modern Nietzschean man.⁷

Samson concludes, “In purely musical terms the opera has strong claims to be his masterpiece.”⁸

The middle period of Szymanowski’s musical development, a result of his visits to Sicily and North Africa, was his “period of greatest creative activity.”⁹ There was to be a third, “nationalist,” period later, when he made much use of Polish folk music, but his middle, “impressionist” period was his most fertile.

Palmer describes the effects of Szymanowski’s southern travels on his music: “Szymanowski’s contact with oriental and classical antiquity engendered a species of spiritual and aesthetic awakening, a quickened perception, an urge to be made perfect by the love of visible beauty.”¹⁰

This “visible beauty” takes on more human form in the memoirs of Szymanowski’s longtime friend, the pianist Arthur Rubinstein, who wrote of meeting Szymanowski in Paris in 1921:

Karol arrived two days later in good physical shape after all he had been through. . . . Karol had changed; I had already begun to be aware of it before the war when a wealthy friend and admirer of his had invited him twice to visit Italy. After his return he raved about Sicily, especially Taormina. “There,” he said, “I saw a few young men bathing who could be models for Antinoüs. I couldn’t take my eyes off them.” Now he was a confirmed homosexual, he told me all this with burning eyes. “Paul [Kochanski] told you about all the terrible things which happened to us. I’m happy to tell you that I succeeded in bringing my whole family to Warsaw, where from now on I have to look after them. On several occasions we barely escaped with our lives. The peasants murdered a few landowners in the Ukraine and mutilated Prince Sanguszko, so we can thank God that we are all safe. But, Arthur, you won’t believe it, but in Kiev, right after the flight from Tymoszkówka, I found the greatest happiness—I lived in heaven. I met a young man of the most extraordinary beauty, a poet with a voice that was music, and, Arthur, he loved me. It is only thanks to our love that I could write so much music. I even

7. Samson, *op. cit.*, pp. 149–150.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

9. Chylinska, *op. cit.*, p. 500.

10. Palmer, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

have a third sonata and a third symphony. Since my flight to Warsaw I lost all contact with him, so you can well imagine how I feel now.” I hardly recognized the Karol of old; here was a young man in love for the first time.¹¹

The object of Szymanowski’s love was Boris Kochno, and there is no reason to doubt Rubinstein’s recollection of Szymanowski’s emotional state, but his chronology is faulty. It should be noted that Rubinstein dictated his memoirs at age 90, by memory and with no documentation. Here he has confused the sequence of events. Szymanowski met Kochno, not in Kiev, but two years later in the Ukrainian town of Elisavetgrad, which was near Tymoszwówka.

Szymanowski was lame in his left knee as a result of several operations as a child, and so was not conscripted into the Czarist army during the First World War. Those years were musically very fertile for him, for he spent them in semi-isolation at Tymoszwówka, devoting himself to composing. In addition to the works mentioned by Rubinstein there were, for example, *Mythes*, and *Métopes*, and, reflecting Szymanowski’s interest in Islamic culture, two collections of *Love-songs of Hafiz*, set to verses of the Persian poet, using the German translation of Hans Bethge.¹² As Chylinska wrote, “Almost all of the works written at this time share qualities of ecstasy and fervour, maintaining the utmost intensity of expression.”¹³

This intense period of composing came to an end, however, in 1917, when the manor house at Tymoszwówka was destroyed during the Russian Revolution. Fortunately, the Szymanowski family was in Kiev at the time. In 1918 they moved to Elisavetgrad, where the family owned two houses.¹⁴ In this grim period Szymanowski wrote *Ephesos* as a way of overcoming “days, weeks, and months of the most depressing circumstances” through “the magic of Italian scenes evoked from memory,” as he wrote in his foreword to the novel. Or, as Maciejewski expressed it: “Szymanowski escaped from reality, and wrote a novel *Efebos* [sic] about a beautiful Prince, beautiful Rome, beautiful love.”¹⁵

11. Arthur Rubinstein, *My Many Years* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1980), p. 103.

12. Hans Bethge (1876–1946) also translated the Chinese poems used by Gustav Mahler as text for *Das Lied von der Erde*. In 1903 Bethge published an article on the German painter Fidus in the homosexual journal *Der Eigene*.

13. Chylinska, op. cit., p. 500.

14. After several changes of name, this town became Kirovograd in 1939.

15. B. M. Maciejewski, *Karol Szymanowski: His Life and Music* (London: Poets’ and Painters’ Press, 1967), pp. 61–62.

The novel gained added importance in the spring of 1919 with the arrival in Elisavetgrad of the fifteen-year-old Boris Kochno. Szymanowski fell in love with him, and apparently, as suggested by Rubinstein, the love was returned. A budding poet, Kochno's burning passion was to experience the Ballets Russes in Paris. Szymanowski introduced him to Stravinsky's ballet music, playing four-handed piano arrangements with Henryk Neuhaus, the son of Szymanowski's music teacher. As Wolfgang Jöhling observed, "By his stay in Elisavetgrad, Boris profited richly for the development of his personality, and probably became clear here about his sexual orientation."¹⁶ In December 1919, Szymanowski was able to sell his property in Elisavetgrad, and the family moved to Warsaw, now the capital of a free and independent Poland. In 1920, Szymanowski's "little boy" (Szymanowski used the English phrase in one of the French poems addressed to Kochno) traveled on to Paris with his mother, and Szymanowski lost touch with him. Richard Buckle, Diaghilev's biographer, told how Kochno achieved his goal of meeting the impresario:

Boris and his mother reached Paris on 9 October 1920. Among his friends in exile were the painter Sudeikine and his wife Vera [who later married Stravinsky]. Sudeikine, of course, was an old acquaintance of Diaghilev. . . . To Sudeikine and Vera, Boris spoke continually about Diaghilev . . . whom it was his ambition to meet. While the handsome Kochno sat for his portrait, Sudeikine devised a little plot to satisfy his young friend. Kochno should go to Diaghilev's hotel with a message from Sudeikine. . . .

On 27 February 1921, a Sunday, Boris . . . walked to the Hotel Continental. . . . He asked for Diaghilev. The clerk . . . told him to go straight up. Diaghilev was expecting someone who never came. . . . [Diaghilev] showed no surprise that an unknown young man had called upon him. . . . When he left at one o'clock, Diaghilev escorted him to the door and said, "We shall meet again."

Next morning, when Kochno returned to the Continental, Diaghilev asked him if he would like to be his secretary. The dream began.¹⁷

Boris Kochno gave a condensed version of this meeting in his book about the painter Christian Bérard:

16. Szymanowski, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

17. Richard Buckle, *Diaghilev* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1979), p. 3.

I met [Diaghilev] on February 27, 1921. He asked me my age (I was nearly seventeen)—and about my life in Russia (where he had not been since 1914). I recited my poems to him—in my youth I was a poet—and at the end of our conversation he engaged me as his secretary.¹⁸

Three months later, Szymanowski, who had stopped in Paris on his return from his first trip to the United States, saw his beloved Boris once more. Rubinstein described the poignant occasion:

With the great help of Misia [Sert], who was of Polish origin, we tried to interest Diaghilev in Szymanowski and his music and we succeeded. Diaghilev invited Karol and me for dinner at the Continental.

We arrived punctually, asked the desk to telephone his room and announce our arrival, and sat down and waited in the lobby. After a few minutes we saw the great man appear at the top of the staircase to the second floor and come slowly down toward us, followed by a young man. Szymanowski, who had been waiting indifferently, looked suddenly as if he were about to have a heart attack. He scared me. But in less than a second I saw that his face was composed again, although there was a tragic expression in his eyes. Diaghilev greeted us graciously and introduced the young man as a new collaborator. Karol murmured something and we went to dinner. I suddenly knew what was wrong; when the young man came down the staircase I saw on Szymanowski's face who he was, and the dinner became a game. Diaghilev showed that he had an inkling that something was in the air and the young man, mortally afraid of losing his position, had to play the extremely difficult rôle of someone who had never met Karol before. And Karol was torn between the wild urge to speak out and the knowledge that the young man would immediately be dismissed and that Diaghilev would have nothing more to do with Karol. I had to play the part of moderator and keep the conversation flowing. The arrival of Stravinsky saved the situation. He involved Diaghilev

18. Boris Kochno, *Christian Bérard* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988), p. 12. It should be noted that if Kochno was “nearly seventeen” when he met Diaghilev, then he was born in 1904, not 1903 as given by Jöhling in *Das Gastmahl*. Apparently, Kochno was not consistent in reporting his birth year: some reference works give 1903; *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Ballet* has 3 January 1904. [Added 2003: The obvious solution to this discrepancy is that his birth year was 1904 in the Gregorian calendar, but 1903 in the Julian calendar, which was still in use in Moscow when Kochno was born there.]

immediately in a long discussion about their plans, which allowed the other two actors of the drama to exchange a few short glances of recognition. Two or three furtive meetings were all Karol succeeded in arranging, but I think it was a sad end to their love.¹⁹

Apparently Diaghilev never learned that Kochno had known Szymanowski, for the new relationship continued. Kochno had asked what his duties as secretary were, and Diaghilev's memorable reply was: "A secretary must know how to make himself indispensable."²⁰ Kochno took the initiative and made himself indispensable. Diaghilev took other lovers later, but Kochno remained his friend until Diaghilev died in 1929. Buckle reported:

Boris was never paid, but Diaghilev lodged and fed him at the finest hotels in Europe, and dressed him at the best English tailors. He did not mind asking Diaghilev, from time to time, for a few francs to buy cigarettes. Kochno was not attracted by young men and he was prepared to love Diaghilev: but although he was handsome in a classical way, he was not Diaghilev's type. As friends, however they got on very well and remained inseparable.²¹

Kochno's contributions to the Ballets Russes were considerable, especially his libretti for some of its most successful later ballets. Buckle, who called Kochno "the Shakespeare of the ballet scenario,"²² reported that Diaghilev had begun to refer to Kochno as his successor, but due to internal dissension the company was dissolved after Diaghilev's death. When the representative of the Monte Carlo theater asked Balanchine to form the Ballets de Monte Carlo in 1931, Kochno signed a contract as artistic director. But Balanchine was dismissed in 1932 and Kochno resigned. The following year the two formed Les Ballets 1933, whose name, as Buckle remarked, "hardly guaranteed longevity." It did not last the year, and Kochno returned to life in Paris with his friend, the painter Christian Bérard. The two lay low during the Nazi occupation. After the war, in

19. Rubinstein, op. cit., pp. 104-105. Rubinstein's chronology is again faulty; he placed this meeting before Szymanowski's first trip to the United States.

20. Buckle, op. cit., p. 377.

21. Richard Buckle, *In the Wake of Diaghilev* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983), pp. 21-22.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 41.

1946, they founded the Ballets des Champs-Élysées, which Kochno directed until 1950.²³ Kochno also wrote a book about the Ballets Russes and assisted in several Diaghilev exhibitions, which always included items from Kochno's own collection.

After the fateful meeting with Kochno in 1921, Szymanowski had returned to Warsaw, where his compositions assumed a more nationalistic style. He was director of the Warsaw Conservatory (1927–1932), but this did not stop his sexual interests. He wrote to his friend, the pianist Jan Smeterlin in 1929: “Forgive my type-written letter but a small portable Remington is a newly acquired eccentricity of mine (which does not mean that I have rid myself of my other eccentricities that you know so well, and which are less respectable!).”²⁴ Indeed, Smeterlin knew his “eccentricities”; a year later Smeterlin wrote from London:

Apparently the soldiers, those fine looking Horse-guards are no longer as free as they used to be. Poor chaps, the military police are very strict with them, but I rather think that this state of affairs will not last long.

In Paris, as always, I enjoyed myself very much. Once, I was forced to be of use as a Spanish interpreter in a bar in the rue de Lappe—you are aware of what sort of area that is?! A Spanish client was not able to understand a little French gigolo; then the Frenchman begged me to help him and when I had finally arranged for them both to sleep together, I demanded some payment for my services, but did not get any. I shall, therefore, continue to be a pianist, which is, after all, a slightly more honorable profession than that of a ‘Hotel tout’!²⁵

Szymanowski was in ill health in his last years, probably brought on by his smoking more than forty cigarettes a day. He died in Lausanne, Switzerland, on 29 March 1937. Rubinstein commented on the death of his “dearest friend”:

Karol was the only composer, after Chopin, who could represent Poland proudly all over the world and deserved all the help he needed from this mean government. When he was no more, the authorities trumpeted pompously the tragic loss

23. Edmund White, *Jean Genet: A Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), p. 262. White referred to Kochno as “Bérard’s lover” (*ibid.*, p. 213).

24. *Karol Szymanowski and Jan Smeterlin: Correspondence and Essays*, trans. and ed. B. M. Maciejewski and Felix Aprahamian (London: Allegro Press, 1970), p. 37.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 44–45.

of their great son. They prepared a Warsaw funeral with an unheard-of mass of publicity. A hundred thousand people were tightly massed to watch the funeral. A special train transported his body, accompanied by ministers and the family, to Cracow for the grand burial at the church at Skalla, where only the greatest of the nation were allowed to lie. They put on the catafalque the insignia of the Grand Cross of Polonia Restituta, the nation's highest honor. What a bitter irony! For years they had made my poor Karol suffer through their meanness and now they were willing to spend a fortune on this big show. And what really infuriated me was the fact that they asked Hitler's government to make the train with Karol's body stop in Berlin long enough to receive military honors.²⁶

In his foreword to *Epebos*, Szymanowski challenged the public by avowing that his only concern was "to let the shining light of truth penetrate where only dark shadows and the poisonous viper-hissing of hate-sowing derision reigned."²⁷ More than seventy years later, we smile at these words; the novel could hardly create the sensation today that Szymanowski expected of its publication. This can certainly be said of its central chapter, which is now available in German translation. But it is this chapter that Szymanowski prized the most: "In it I expressed much, perhaps all, that I have to say in this matter, which is for me very important and very beautiful."²⁸

There are six participants in Szymanowski's "Symposium":²⁹

- Alo Lowicki, a Polish prince and the young hero of the novel, is an idealized portrait of Szymanowski as he had been. His age is suggested by the Greek title *Epebos*; on the title page of his manuscript Szymanowski even wrote it in Greek letters.³⁰
- Marek Korab, a Polish composer, is Szymanowski as he would like to be.
- The German Baron von Rellov first took Alo under his protection.

26. Rubinstein, op. cit., p. 411.

27. Szymanowski, op. cit., p. 34.

28. Ibid., p. 122.

29. In his memoir, Iwaszkiewicz listed them from memory (see Szymanowski, op. cit., pp. 18–19), but his list is only partly correct.

30. A photograph of the title page is included in Szymanowski, op. cit., p. 21. In ancient Greece, the term "epebos" was generally used for a youth in his late teens; in Athens it was legally an eighteen-year-old.

- The French Charles de Villiers is Alo's bosom friend.
- Bissoli is an Italian professor and jurist.
- Y..., a German pianist, is perhaps based on Szymanowski's friend, the pianist Henryk Neuhaus.

In the discussion, the last two defend conventional, heterosexual love; Rellov and Villiers advocate the cause of "true", i.e., homosexual love. There is some preliminary sparring, in which de Villiers compares the body of a woman with that of a youth and finds the former wanting: her bosom breaks up the plane of belly and breast, her hips are too wide, etc., while Rellov trots out the standard list of great homosexuals of history: Socrates, Plato, Caesar, Cellini, da Vinci, Michaelangelo, Lorenzo de' Medici, Shakespeare, and Charles XII (of Sweden). It is interesting to note that these were all manly individuals. Conspicuously absent, for example, is Henri III of France, who was briefly king of Poland (1574) and well known as an effeminate homosexual; Szymanowski would surely have known about him. It is unclear to what extent Szymanowski was acquainted with the available literature on the subject. All of these men had been discussed in the early 1900s in Berlin—in Magnus Hirschfeld's *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* as well as in Adolf Brand's journal *Der Eigene*. Szymanowski read German and had visited Berlin, and his views are closer to those often expressed in *Der Eigene*, rather than to the "third sex" views of Hirschfeld.³¹

In response to the argument that homosexual love is not natural, de Villiers argues that the "natural" is reduced to coitus and that from the beginning "true love" is "unnatural." He addresses Bissoli:

31. *Der Eigene* (The Self-Owner) was begun in 1896 as an anarchist journal, in the direction of the individualist philosophy of Max Stirner; its title reflects the meaning Stirner gave the word *eigen*. It was openly homosexual from 1898 and lasted until 1931. Its authors, many of them boy-lovers, "rejected the mounting influence of doctors and psychiatrists in the gay movement, and argued that love and friendship between older and younger males provided the basis for a higher level of social organization (the *Männerbund*) than was afforded by the purely sexual, private bonds characteristic of that most primitive social unit, the family. Yet their belief in bisexuality was genuine and most of the pederast leaders . . . were married." David Thorstad, "For Friendship and Freedom," *Gayme* (Boston), issue 1.2 (1994), p. 5. According to Thorstad, "The modern man-boy love movement can trace its roots to an article from 1899 [in *Der Eigene*] by the painter and poet Elisar von Kupffer (1872–1942): 'The Ethical-Political Significance of *Lieblingminne*'" (op. cit., p. 6).

Have you finally understood, learned professor? Have you grasped what true human love is? It is boundless in its freedom, the freedom of choice; it is based exclusively on the subjective and individual, psychic and physical characteristics of the human being. And no one and nothing, not even the so-called public, will dare to cut it off from the true, the good, and the beautiful, as perhaps old Socrates would have said.³²

When Bissoli replies that “common sense” still holds same-sex love to be “abnormal,” de Villiers notes that, whereas common sense helped the cavemen, it is of little help now, when it serves only as a mask for “public opinion.”

Rellov then continues the argument that true love implies the freedom to choose: this comes first with liberation from the Law of Love in Nature, the sexual difference. In his view, there is no place here for woman, who is destined by nature to be (only) a mother. In addition to his anti-feminism, Rellov is also anti-Semitic: he finds the roots of our false culture in the Old Testament (which was taken over by the Germans through Luther). He contrasts it with the “true culture which grew from the pure Aryan root common to us all, somewhere at the foot of the Acropolis.”³³

Alo is silently grateful for Rellov’s words, which he finds liberating. The evening’s discussion concludes only at the first light of dawn with the musings of Korab, and it ends on a mystical note when he tells of seeing a certain da Vinci portrait of Christ that allowed him to identify Christ with Eros:

I understood how, in the narrow circle of disciples and believers, simple, raw, and naive men, his words had been superficially and falsely interpreted. Only then did I grasp who He in reality was, He, Christ-Eros! . . .

And he loved his neighbor with that mysterious, burning flame of his whole being, in the ardent wish for union with the everlasting creative essence of the world, which in supernatural light shines in the unfathomable eyes of the Lydian god with the ivy and rose crowned, copper-colored locks, with the blossom-clad Thyrsus staff in his hand.³⁴

32. Szymanowski, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 69.

34. *Ibid.*, pp. 86–87.

The Lydian god with the Thyrsus staff is, of course, Dionysus. Thus Jöhling notes that in this Symposium, “not only does Szymanowski develop a theory about the superiority of homoeroticism, on the basis of his own reflections on Plato and Nietzsche, but the dialogue also reflects his ‘private religion,’ the trinity of gods of love and life: Dionysus, Eros, and Christ—a view that in his opera *King Roger* is given an even clearer form musically and scenically.”³⁵

Although one must take exception to the anti-feminism and anti-Semitism—which are discussed by Jöhling³⁶—there is much that is valuable in Szymanowski’s Symposium, especially in his discussion of the natural. The emphasis on our freedom to choose in love is always welcome.

35. Ibid., p. 124.

36. Ibid., pp. 125–126.

In Gay Men and the Sexual History of the Political Left

Ed. Gert Hekma, Harry Oosterhuis, and James Steakley (pp. 69–96). New York: Haworth Press, Harrington Park Press, 1995 [= *Journal of Homosexuality*, 29(2/3)(4)].

Johann Baptist von Schweitzer: The Queer Marx Loved to Hate

Hubert Kennedy

ABSTRACT. Despite his conviction on a morals charge involving a boy, the early German Social Democrat Johann Baptist von Schweitzer went on to have a successful political career. His life furnishes the context to present remarks by his political opponents Marx and Engels, which reveal their deep-seated homophobia. It is pointed out that this has been glossed over by the translations of the recently published Marx/Engels *Collected Works*. Some remarks on boy-love and anarchism are appended.

In an attempt to analyze homosexuality from the viewpoint of dialectical or historical materialism, an effort would of course be made to learn the opinions of Marx and Engels. But the classics of Marxism are remarkably silent on the subject. Marx appears to assert the naturalness of heterosexuality in his statement, “The relation of man to woman is the *most natural* relation of human being to human being,”¹ while Engels twice condemns pederasty in the ancients: “In the course of their migrations the Germans had morally much deteriorated, particularly during their southeasterly wanderings among the nomads of the Black Sea steppes, from whom they acquired not only equestrian skill but also gross, unnatural vices [*arge widernatürliche Laster*], as Ammianus expressly states of the Taifali and Procopius of the Heruli,”² and with regard to the Greeks, “The men, who would have been ashamed to show any love for their wives, amused themselves by all sorts of love affairs with *hetaerai*; but this degradation of the women was avenged on the men and degraded them also till they fell into the abominable practice of boy-love [*widerwärtigkeit der Knabenliebe*] and degraded alike their gods and themselves with the myth of Ganymede.”³

1. Karl Marx, *Early Writings*, trans. and ed. T. B. Bottomore (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), in the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (Third manuscript, section on private property and communism), p. 154.

2. Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (New York: International, 1972), pp. 61–62. That Engels meant pederasty by “unnatural vices” is shown by his references. “Ammianus Marcellinus, writing ca. A.D. 380 and, more ambiguously, Procopius, writing ca. 550, expressed disgust that Germanic tribes, Taifales and Heruls, practiced pederasty.” William A. Percy, “Indo-European Pederasty,” in *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, ed. Wayne R. Dynes (New York: Garland, 1990), pp. 595–97, here p. 596.

3. Engels, p. 57. I have, however, put “boy-love” in place of the translator’s interpretive “sodomy.” But in light of the remarks of Engels to Marx regarding a booklet by Ulrichs (quoted below), sodomy may indeed be what Engels had in mind. The original German in brackets is taken from Friedrich Engels, *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staats* (Stuttgart: J. H. W. Dietz, 1900), pp. 51 and 57, respectively.

It is perhaps this near silence that has encouraged gay Marxists to believe that an analysis sympathetic to homosexuality can be made on the basis of Marxist principles.⁴ This may indeed be possible, but it will have to be done without the personal opinions of Marx and Engels. Not that their opinions cannot be known; they were expressed to one another in their correspondence, and they were distinctly unsympathetic. This will be illustrated here by comments found in a search for references to Johann Baptist von Schweitzer (1833–75), whom they regarded as a boy-lover.⁵

Schweitzer was an important figure in the workers' movement in Germany during most of the 1860s. His political career began in 1859, but was interrupted briefly in 1862 by his conviction on a morals charge. With the help of Ferdinand Lassalle and his own very real abilities, Schweitzer was able to make a political comeback and went on to become in 1867, as a deputy to the North German Reichstag, the first outspoken Social Democrat to be elected to any European parliament.

For various reasons Schweitzer has been forgotten by the movement to which he contributed so much. To rescue him from this unjust silence is one reason for retelling his story. Another reason is to furnish the context for the remarks of Marx and Engels concerning him. Their views are important, for while the name Schweitzer quickly lapsed into obscurity, the mention of Marx and Engels would call on the loyalty of millions throughout the world. This context must also include the great pioneer of homosexual emancipation, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, who personally intervened in the court case of Schweitzer and whose writings were known to Marx and Engels.

4. See, for example: Gay Left Collective (London), *Homosexuality: Power and Politics* (London: Allison and Busby, 1980); Bob McCubbin, *The Gay Question: A Marxist Approach* (New York: World View, 1976).

5. The present article is an elaboration of my "J. B. Schweitzer, the Faggot Marx Loved to Hate," *Fag Rag* (Boston), no. 19 (Spring 1977): 6–8.

MARX, ENGELS, AND ULRICHS

In 1869, Marx sent Engels one of Ulrichs's booklets. Engels replied on June 22:

The *Urning* you sent me is a very curious thing. These are extremely unnatural revelations. The paederasts are beginning to count themselves, and discover that they are a power in the state. Only organisation was lacking, but according to this source it apparently already exists in secret. And since they have such important men in all the old parties and even in the new ones, from Rösing to Schweitzer, they cannot fail to triumph. *Guerre aux cons, paix aus trous-de-cul* [War to the cunts, peace to the assholes] will now be the slogan. It is a bit of luck that we, personally, are too old to have to fear that, when this party wins, we shall have to pay physical tribute to the victors. But the younger generation! Incidentally it is only in Germany that a fellow like this can possibly come forward, convert this smut into a theory, and offer the invitation: *introite* [enter], etc. Unfortunately, he has not yet got up the courage to acknowledge publicly that he is 'that way', and must still operate *coram publico* 'from the front', if not 'going in from the front' as he once said by mistake. But just wait until the new North German Penal Code recognises the *drois du cul* [rights of the asshole]; then he will operate quite differently. Then things will go badly enough for poor frontside people like us, with our childish penchant for females. If Schweitzer could be made useful for anything, it would be to wheedle out of this peculiar honourable gentleman the particulars of the paederasts in high and top places, which would certainly not be difficult

for him as a brother in spirit.⁶

The author of the booklet that Engels so contemptuously dismissed was Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–95), an early theorist of homosexuality and a courageous fighter for the rights of homosexuals, religious and ethnic minorities, and women.⁷ He was also a partisan of the movement of the 1840s that sought to unify Germany—though not by force: by 1869, when Engels wrote the above letter, Ulrichs had twice been imprisoned for publicly protesting the annexation of his homeland, Hannover, by Prussia in 1866.

Grandson of a Lutheran superintendent and son of an architect in the employ of the state (who died when Ulrichs was ten years old), Ulrichs studied law at the universities of Göttingen and Berlin. After only six years of administrative and legal service in the kingdom of Hannover, his homosexual activity came to the attention of the Ministry of Justice. Although such acts were not illegal in Hannover, as a civil servant of the state Ulrichs could be “disciplined,” and would surely have been dismissed from state’s service in disgrace had he not learned of this and quickly resigned in 1854. This act forestalled

6. *Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works*, vols. 42, 43 (New York: International, 1988), 43: 295–96; hereafter cited as MECW. All letters from Marx and Engels are given here in the translations of the MECW: letters dated 1867 or earlier were translated by Christopher Upward; letters dated 1868 or later were translated by John Peet. My exceptions to them will be noted. Here, in the translation from French, I have replaced “arse-hole” with “asshole.”

For another view of this letter from Engels to Marx, see Andrew Parker, “Unthinking Sex: Marx, Engels and the Scene of Writing.” *Social Text*, no. 29 (= 9:4) (1991), pp. 28–45. There Parker finds that when Engels distances Ulrichs from himself and Marx (“poor frontside people like us”), this is “a strategy that allows him the freedom to experience vicariously the anal eroticism he seems to condemn” (p. 39). Similarly, Parker notes that the correspondence of Marx and Engels “is smeared liberally with excremental imagery,” and he points out that “shit can acquire significance only by activating an economy of anal pleasure, desires, and attachments” (p. 40). I am grateful to James Steakley for calling this article to my attention.

7. For Ulrichs, see Hubert Kennedy, *Ulrichs: The Life and Works of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Pioneer of the Modern Gay Movement* (Boston: Alyson, 1988); in German, with additional information, as *Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: Sein Leben und sein Werk*, trans. Menso Folkerts (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1990).

any disciplinary proceeding, but did not prevent vindictive officials from using their information to keep him from earning his living as a lawyer. Ulrichs lived on a small inheritance from his mother and money earned as private secretary and as reporter for the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Augsburg.

By 1862 Ulrichs had begun to formulate a biological theory of homosexuality and in a series of twelve booklets from 1864 to 1879 he set forth his “third sex” view of homosexual men, whom he called “Urnings” (the term “homosexual” was coined later by the Hungarian writer Karl Maria Kertbeny and was never used by Ulrichs), championing their equal legal and civil rights as a distinct minority. Ulrichs saw Urnings as a sort of intermediate sex, which he summed up in the catch phrase “a woman’s soul in a man’s body” (with the opposite true of homosexual women).

Although Ulrichs used a pseudonym (Numa Numantius) at first, he used his real name after he publicly spoke out for his cause at the Congress of German Jurists in Munich on August 29, 1867, an event that made him notorious in the German legal profession. Psychiatrists, too, reported his theory, if only to reject it as the self-justification of a man of dubious mental stability. They preferred to view homosexuality as an illness (as seen in the title of the 1886 best seller *Psychopathia sexualis* of Richard von Krafft-Ebing, who was first interested in the subject by Ulrichs’s writings), an illness in need of *their* treatment of course.

The booklet that Marx sent Engels was identified by the editors of the *Marx Engels Werke* as Ulrichs’s *Argonauticus*,⁸ and this identification has been repeated in the *Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works*, whose translation of Marx’s letter is given here.⁹ But this cannot be correct, since *Argonauticus* was not completed until late September 1869. The reference to “introite,” which Engels wanted to read as an invitation to anal intercourse, instead suggests some knowledge of Ulrichs’s *Memnon* (1868), for it

8. *Marx Engels Werke*, vols. 31, 32 (Berlin: Dietz, 1965), 32: 768; hereafter cited as MEW.

9. MECW, 43: 295.

appears in that booklet's epigraph: "Introite! nam et hoc templum naturae est" ("Enter! for this is also a temple of nature"), which is rather a reference to the edifice of Ulrichs's theory.¹⁰ (This is a variation of a phrase that goes back to Heraclitus and would have been known to Engels through its use as an epigraph to Lessing's play *Nathan der Weise*.)

More probably the booklet that Engels read was *Incubus*, which was completed on May 4, 1869. This is confirmed by several indications, the most important of which is Ulrichs's use of "von vorn hinein" for "von vorn herein," which Engels puns on and which occurs twice in *Incubus*. (The idiomatic phrase "von vorn herein" means "from the beginning.") That Ulrichs admits he is not "from the front" is clear enough in *Memnon*, in which he several times refers to himself as an example of an Urning,¹¹ but is not apparent in *Incubus*. The reference to Johannes Rösing, a merchant in Bremen who was active in the democratic movement in Germany in the 1830s and 1840s, may also be pointed out here, since he was mentioned in *Incubus*, but Engels could well have known about him from other sources. The "personal details" about Schweitzer, of course, were known to all.

That Engels mentioned "introite" does suggest, however, some knowledge, perhaps indirect, of *Memnon*. We know that, as a result of Ulrichs's sending copies of the first

10. Ulrichs also used the phrase earlier in his *Formatrix* (1865), where he notes: "I ask the reader to try to transport himself here to a medical auditorium. Sexual expressions are just as unavoidable here as in an actual medical lecture. Yet I touch on what is to be said only reluctantly and only because it just has to be said." See *Formatrix*, p. 5, in the collected edition, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, *Forschungen über das Räthsel der mann männlichen Liebe*, ed. Hubert Kennedy, 4 vols. (Berlin: Rosa Winkel, 1994); the writings are paginated separately. All references to Ulrichs's writings will be to this edition. It was perhaps this mention of "introite" by Engels that led Manfred Baumgardt to assert that *Memnon* was the booklet that Marx sent Engels. See Manfred Baumgardt, "Berlin, ein Zentrum der entstehenden Sexualwissenschaft und die Vorläufer der Homosexuellen-Bewegung," in *Eldorado. Homosexuelle Frauen und Männer in Berlin 1850–1950. Geschichte, Alltag und Kultur*, ed. Michael Bollé (Berlin: Frölich & Kaufmann, 1984), p. 15.

11. See, for example, Ulrichs, *Memnon*, pp. 54–56, in which he describes the awakening of his own love interest.

part of *Memnon* to private individuals, there was a lecture on the subject in London in early 1868 at the Anthropological Society; that booklet and his five earlier booklets were then added to the group's library. Marx may have heard of *Memnon* as a result of the lecture; he may even have heard the lecture. At any rate, he remembered the booklet he sent Engels and spoke of it to others, for on December 17, 1869, he wrote to Engels: "Strohn will be returning from here to Bradford, and desires you to send him the *Urnings* or whatever the paederast's book is called."¹² Marx was generally more moderate in his remarks than Engels and despite his political opposition to Schweitzer, he several times noted the latter's very real abilities.

SCHWEITZER AND LASSALLE

Schweitzer was born on July 12, 1833, to parents who belonged to the small group of socially prominent Catholics in largely Protestant Frankfurt am Main.¹³ He grew up, however, in the home of his maternal grandparents until age thirteen, when he was sent to a Jesuit boarding school. After completing law studies in Berlin and Heidelberg, he returned to Frankfurt to begin a law career in which he was never very active. This left him time for philosophical, historical, and political studies as well as his own writing. The most important publication of this early period was *Der Zeitgeist und Christentum* (The Spirit of the Times and Christianity, 1861), in which he defended revealed religion, not-

12. MECW, 43: 403. Here, I have replaced the translator's "return" with "send"; the original German is: "Strohn . . . wünscht, daß Du ihm die *Urnings* . . . zuschickst" (MEW, 32: 421). Wilhelm Strohn, a member of the Communist League and a friend of Marx and Engels, may have had a personal interest in Ulrichs's booklet: in the same letter Marx notes that Strohn "looks very poorly and is very peevish. The doctors recommend him to marry" (MECW, 43: 403). I am grateful to Manfred Herzer for pointing out the implications of the doctors' advice "to marry."

13. Biographical information on Schweitzer is taken from Gustav Mayer, *Johann Baptist von Schweitzer und die Sozialdemokratie, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (Jena: Gustav Fisher, 1909).

ing that it was not so much the findings of science as its method that had led to the undermining of belief in dogmatic religion.

As early as 1861, Schweitzer was prominent in several workers' clubs in Frankfurt and was elected president of the Gymnastics Club (Turnverein) as well as of the Workers' Educational Association (Arbeiterbildungsverein), which he founded in November. The Gymnastics Club and the Rifleman's Club (Schützenverein), which he helped to found in 1860, served Schweitzer's political goals. He hoped to unite the many such clubs throughout Germany as a way of strengthening national feeling and developing a genuine people's defense force. The spring of 1862 was a high point of his effectiveness. On May 25, at a Workers' Day gathering, he preached the class struggle in a speech that may be taken as the beginning of Social Democracy in the Frankfurt area. For several reasons, much of the press was opposed to him, but the workers were solidly behind him. A member of the executive committee of the Rifleman's Club, Schweitzer was also corresponding secretary of the central committee of the General German Riflemen's Festival (Allgemeines Deutsches Schützenfest) in Frankfurt in July 1862. Ulrichs, who reported on the festival to the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, almost certainly met him then, if not before. Then in August came the catastrophe, Schweitzer's arrest in a Mannheim park. (Schweitzer's biographer Gustav Mayer gives the date as August 7, 1862, but reports another date in the quotation given below.)

The story of this incident, which is the only hard evidence we have that Schweitzer was a boy-lover, was raked up time and again by his political opponents, no doubt with many embellishments. By the time Mayer wrote his biography, the records of the trial no longer existed. In a brief note he gives a summary of a police report of 1867 that was based on the Mannheim records:

It was stated there that between nine and ten on the morning of August 4, 1862, the accused was arrested in the Mannheim Palace Park for

having there seduced a boy under fourteen years of age into undertaking an indecent act. But since the boy ran away and his age could not therefore be ascertained, the sentence that resulted was not for a crime against morality [*Verbrechen gegen die Sittlichkeit*], but only for the giving of public offense through the public perpetration of an indecent act [*Erregung öffentlichen Ärgernisses durch öffentliche Verübung einer unsittlichen Handlung*].¹⁴

On September 5, Schweitzer was given a sentence of two weeks' confinement, which was served immediately in the jail in Bruchsal. In 1869, Ulrichs recalled the event:

It is notorious that the Lassallean Social Democrat Dr. von Schweitzer of Berlin was given a criminal sentence on September 5, 1862, by the court in Mannheim, because by an unimportant bit of fooling around with a young lad in the Palace Park he gave "public offense" through simple carelessness, i.e., he was overheard by two no longer young women.¹⁵

In 1864, without naming Schweitzer, Ulrichs had mentioned his imprisonment in 1862, adding: "As early as that time I put together a kind of defense for him and sent it to the prisoner in two letters. One letter got through to him—but only by an oversight. The examining magistrate added the other to his file on the case."¹⁶ That appeared to end the matter, for Ulrichs's argument was not used in Schweitzer's defense; indeed Schweitzer denied that the incident with the boy ever happened.

14. Mayer, pp. 432–433. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from the German are mine.

15. Ulrichs, *Incubus*, p. 14. The last phrase was shortly after revised to: "two snooping old maids" (Ulrichs, *Argonauticus*, p. 17).

16. Ulrichs, *Vindicta*, p. xvii.

On returning to Frankfurt, Schweitzer met with almost total ostracism on the part of his fellow citizens and former friends. In the preface to a pamphlet published the following year, he wrote:

When those in my hometown who called themselves my friends believed that the time had finally come when they could let loose their pent-up envy, when so many credulously repeated what a few had invented, I asked myself in astonishment, “How have you deserved this?” But that was only the first quick moment—and it occurred to me that it was always like that and would remain so forever.¹⁷

Schweitzer was briefly in Vienna in the first half of 1863, lecturing on Schopenhauer, with whom he was acquainted sometime before the philosopher’s death in 1860. He first read a brochure by Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–64) shortly before going there. When it seemed that Schweitzer’s political career was ended forever, Lassalle’s appearance on the scene was a godsend.

Lassalle was born in the Silesian city of Breslau of moderately affluent Jewish parents. As a boy he was “keenly conscious of his Jewish descent.”¹⁸ “It was not long, however, before he realized that race oppression is only a phase of the universal condition of social injustice and that the ‘Jewish problem’ can only be solved as part of a larger social problem. At the age of eighteen the insurgent Jewish nationalist became a revolutionary Socialist internationalist.”¹⁹

According to Marx, “After fifteen years of slumber, Lassalle—and this remains his

17. Quoted in Mayer, p. 72.

18. George Brandes, *Ferdinand Lassalle* (New York: Bernard G. Richards, 1925), p. 8.

19. Morris Hillquit, “Introduction,” in Brandes, p. ii.

immortal service—re-awakened the workers’ movement in Germany.”²⁰ Lassalle had great success as an agitator, including a trip to the Frankfurt area in May 1863, and on the 25th of that month he founded in Leipzig the General Association of German Workers (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein, or ADAV). At about this time Schweitzer wrote a novel and asked if he might dedicate it to him. Noting the value of Eugène Sue’s novels in France, Lassalle quickly agreed, and when the first volume of *Lucinde, oder Kapital und Arbeit* (Lucinde, or Capital and Labor) was published in September at Schweitzer’s expense, Lassalle immediately recognized its propaganda value. When the second volume appeared in December, he was even more delighted.

Meanwhile, the Frankfurt branch of the ADAV refused to accept Schweitzer as a member or let him speak, and his appearance at the Gymnastics Club in November was cut short by cries of “Get out!” But at Lassalle’s request he was accepted into the ADAV in Leipzig. In December, Schweitzer announced that he would speak at the next meeting in Frankfurt. This caused Abraham “Fritz” Strauss, who was in charge of the Frankfurt ADAV, to write to Lassalle and ask for a “Caesarean section”: “We cannot use him as a person, even though a large number know how to value his abilities. He is dead here.”²¹ Lassalle was put on the spot, but wrote diplomatically to Schweitzer:

I have to write a very embarrassing request to you today. . . . You are familiar with the facts that lie at the base of the dissension against you. I know only what I read at that time in the newspaper and do not know what is true in it and what not. But if what the newspapers at that time reported about the reason for your conviction is true, I know one thing: the regrettable and to my taste incomprehensible fondness imputed to you belongs to those offenses that have not the least to do with a man’s political char-

20. MECW, 43: 132.

21. Quoted in Mayer, p. 91.

acter. Such behavior, in a political organization, against a man of your character and your intelligence only proves how confused and narrow-minded the political ideas of our people still are. I, for my part at least, whatever the Frankfurt members of our Association may say, will never hide the fact that I have the highest respect for you and set the highest value on yours, and I therefore leave it to you to show this letter to whom-ever you wish. I have written in this vein to Frankfurt, have not kept back my disapproval, and I hope that this letter will have for the future the de-sired result. With all this you realize that for a while and at the moment there is nothing to do but avoid that conflict and a possible split. . . . Hav-ing already brought so great and so essential an offering, you will there-fore also know how to bring the further offering of avoiding . . . this con-flict. You will rightly feel upset by this—but . . . as little as I will you let yourself stray from serving and giving yourself to the common cause.²²

Lassalle wrote Strauss that he had fulfilled the latter's wish, though he scolded him for it, and he added that at his next visit to Frankfurt he would appear in Schweitzer's company at the public session of the ADAV. He also noted:

The abnormality attributed to Dr. von Schweitzer has nothing what-ever to do with his political character. I need only remind you that, how-ever incomprehensible such unnatural tastes appear to us, the tendency of which Dr. von Schweitzer is accused was the general rule among the an-cient Greeks, their statesmen and their philosophers. Ancient Greece saw nothing wrong in it, and I consider the great Greek philosophers and the

22. Ibid.

Greek people knew the meaning of morality. . . . I could understand your not wishing Dr. von Schweitzer to marry your daughter. But why not think, work, and struggle in his company? What has any department of political activity to do with sexual abnormality?²³

Schweitzer also received a copy of the letter to Strauss and he wrote Lassalle on December 11 to thank him, adding: “Besides, I give you my word of honor that I have unjustly acquired the reputation for the fondness in question.”²⁴ Lassalle was probably unconvinced by this, since Bernhard Becker had written him only three days earlier: “It is not just the Mannheim incident that has brought Schweitzer such a bad reputation. A similar incident is said to have occurred earlier in Sachsenhausen and then been hushed up.”²⁵ But true to his word, Lassalle asked Schweitzer to represent him at the first anniversary of the founding of the ADAV in Leipzig, and during the first week of July 1864 they were always together, arm in arm through the busiest streets of Frankfurt.

All of this, however, was not enough to rehabilitate Schweitzer with the Frankfurt ADAV, and when Schweitzer turned to Lassalle for help, it was too late, for Lassalle had left on his fateful trip to Switzerland, already under the spell of Helene von Dönniges. (But Lassalle showed his trust in Schweitzer by appointing him to the board of directors of the ADAV.) Schweitzer next moved to Berlin where, with the financial help of his friend Johann Baptist von Hofstetten and with Lassalle’s approval, he planned to publish a newspaper for the ADAV. Then tragedy struck him a second time; just when he seemed to be making a return to political life, his protector died on August 31, 1864, as a result of

23. Quoted in David Footman, *Ferdinand Lassalle, Romantic Revolutionary* (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1947; reprint, New York: Greenwood, 1969), p. 182.

24. Ferdinand Lassalle, *Nachgelassene Briefe und Schriften*, ed. Gustav Mayer, vol. 5, *Lassalles Briefwechsel aus den Jahren seiner Arbeiteragitation 1862–1864* (Stuttgart and Berlin: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1925; reprint, Osnabrück: Biblio, 1967), p. 265.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 262.

a duel fought over Fräulein Dönniges. Schweitzer now had only his acumen to support him.

MARX, ENGELS, AND SCHWEITZER

Schweitzer knew of and respected Marx, and he had already met Marx's protégé, Wilhelm Liebknecht, in Berlin. On receiving the news of Lassalle's death, he immediately went to Liebknecht to suggest Marx as president of the ADAV. Knowing Marx would not accept, Liebknecht made the counterproposal of doing away with the presidency and having only a board of directors that would also be responsible for the paper. (Neither knew that Lassalle had left a will, naming Bernhard Becker as his successor.) But Schweitzer wanted the paper, the *Social-Demokrat*, to be independent of the organization and asked Liebknecht, Marx, and Engels for their collaboration, writing to Marx on November 11, 1864.

At first Marx did collaborate, but he soon learned that Lassalle had been in contact with Bismarck and of course suspected that Schweitzer knew of this. He warned Schweitzer to break with Bismarck. Then, when Schweitzer wrote a series of articles praising Bismarck, Marx withdrew. Schweitzer, anticipating this, wrote Marx on February 15, 1865:

If you wish to enlighten me, as in your last letter, on theoretical questions, I would gratefully accept such instruction on your part. But as regards the practical questions of immediate tactics I beg you to consider that in order to assess these things one must be in the centre of the movement. You are therefore doing us an injustice if you express your dissatisfaction with our tactics anywhere and anyhow. You should only do this if you were abso-

lutely familiar with conditions.²⁶

Marx wrote Engels on February 18, 1865: “I consider Schweitzer to be incorrigible (probably has a secret arrangement with Bismarck).”²⁷ Engels replied: “Schweitzer’s letter is ‘rotten to the core’. The fellow has the job of compromising us, and the longer we have our dealing with him, the deeper we’ll sink into the mire. So, the sooner the better!”²⁸ On March 10, 1865, Marx wrote to Engels: “The impudence of Mr Schweitzer, who knows perfectly well that all I need to do is publish his own letters, is fantastic. Though what else can the shitty cur do? . . . You must arrange for a few jokes about the fellow to reach Siebel, for him to hawk around to the various papers.”²⁹

Later in the year, in the *Social-Demokrat*, Schweitzer’s attacks on the government led on November 24, 1865, to his conviction for “press crimes, disturbing the peace, lese majesty, and slander of government officers.” Marx laconically remarked to Engels: “Bismarck seems to have realised how powerless they are and therefore to have thrown them out, so at last there’s a trial and Schweitzer has been sentenced to one year of imprisonment.”³⁰ In May 1866, Schweitzer was temporarily released from prison for health reasons, and after the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 he was amnestied.

Although Schweitzer lost his bid for election to the constitutional convention of the new North German Confederation in the spring of 1867, he was elected president of the ADAV, and on September 7, he won election to the new parliament. Engels commented to Marx: “The great Schweitzer has been happily elected with the assistance of the pietists of Elberfeld and Barmen, and will now have the opportunity to bowdlerise various

26. MECW, 42: 608, n. 144.

27. MECW, 42: 95.

28. MECW, 42: 98–99.

29. MECW, 42: 120. Our translator had “the wretched cur” for the German “der beschissene Hund” (MEW, 31: 95), which is rather “the shitty cur.”

30. MECW, 42: 204–5.

points from your book in the ‘Reichstag’. You may wager your life that he will do so.”³¹ (Engels was referring to volume one of Marx’s *Capital*.) He believed his wager won after a long speech by Schweitzer in the North German Reichstag on October 14, 1867, a report of which was published in the *Social-Demokrat*. Engels wrote Marx: “Schweitzer has shown himself to be a vain jackass and phrasemonger. He’s finished now.”³² But on the contrary, Schweitzer was one of the few people in Germany to show real insight into Marx’s writings.

In 1868, Schweitzer published in the *Social-Demokrat* a popular account of Marx’s *Capital* in twelve installments (from January 2 to May 8). In the middle of this Marx wrote to Ludwig Kugelmann on March 17: “Did you see that my personal enemy Schweitzer has heaped eulogies on my head in six numbers of the *Social-Demokrat* on account of my book? Very harrowing for that old harlot Hatzfeldt.”³³ To Engels he wrote: “Whatever secondary motives Schweitzer may have (e.g., to annoy old Hatzfeldt, etc.), one thing must be admitted. Although he makes a mistake here and there, he has studied the stuff really hard, and knows where the centres of gravity lie.”³⁴

Schweitzer had invited Marx as “guest of honor” to the general meeting of the ADAV in August 1868, but Marx declined, giving as his excuse preparations for the September 9 congress in Brussels of the International Working Men’s Association (The “First International,” founded in London on September 28, 1864). On September 15, Schweitzer wrote him: “I consider you to be the head of the European working-class movement—not only through democratic election but by the will of God. You can also be assured that I will promote your intentions as best I can.”³⁵ Marx sent the letter to

31. MECW, 42: 426.

32. MECW, 42: 450.

33. MECW, 42: 553. Sophie, Countess von Hatzfeldt (1805–81), a friend and supporter of Lassalle, supported a splinter group of the ADAV.

34. MECW, 42: 556.

35. MECW, 43: 589.

Engels, asking, “What answer should I give the cunning Schweitzer?”³⁶ Engels returned the letter with the comment: “The man is an idiot to believe that he can bribe you with such a letter.”³⁷ Marx wrote back: “As for the ‘warm fraternal’ letter from Schweitzer to me, this is explained simply by his fear that following the Nuremberg decision I might now publicly speak up for Wilhelm [Liebknecht] and against him.”³⁸

Comment: In all the above quotations I have followed the translations of the letters in *Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works*, even though they tend to gloss over the colorful language of Marx and Engels. But a protest is necessary at this point. Readers with a knowledge of German will have guessed that in describing Schweitzer’s letter Marx used the term “warmbrüderlich,” which, with or without quotation marks, does *not* mean “warm fraternal” in English. It means “queer” (in America, also “faggoty”), and indeed in a pejorative sense.³⁹

The translator has similarly bowdlerized their use of the term “schwül.” For example, in 1868 Marx sent Engels the book of Dr. Karl Boruttau, *Gedanken über Gewissens Freiheit* (Thoughts on Freedom of Conscience), which, although it does not discuss homosexuality, does promote sexual freedom in general. Engels inquired on July 21: “Wer ist dieser Schwüle Dr. Boruttau der ein so empfindliches Organ für die Geschlechtsliebe an den Tag legt?”⁴⁰ Our translator gives this as “Who is this sultry Dr Boruttau, who displays such a sensitive organ for sexual love?”⁴¹ But Engels certainly used “Schwüle” in a

36. MECW, 43: 105.

37. MECW, 43: 107.

38. MECW, 43: 115.

39. MEW, 32: 167. The use of “warmer Bruder” (warm brother) in the sense of “homosexual” is attested as early as 1669, in Grimmelshausen’s *Simplicissimus* (personal communication from James Steakley), and this use continues today. See also the comment of Magnus Hirschfeld in note 44, below.

40. MEW, 32: 123.

41. MECW, 43: 71.

pejorative sense, which is also reflected in Marx's reply: "Von dem Dr. Boruttau, dem Schwanzschwülen, weiß ich weiter nichts, als . . . ,"⁴² which our translator gives as "About Dr Boruttau, the man with the sultry prick, I know nothing except . . ."⁴³ Today a clear distinction is made between "schwul" ("queer"—and not necessarily in a pejorative sense in the current gay movement) and "schwül" ("sultry"), but this distinction was not so clear in the mid-nineteenth century. I believe that Marx and Engels used the term "schwül" with the connotation of "queer"; not that they believed Boruttau to be homosexual, but that "queer" expresses the pejorative way they wished to refer to him.⁴⁴

Returning to the story of Schweitzer: The ADAV had been dissolved by police order,

42. MEW, 32: 124.

43. MECW, 43: 72.

44. The doublet "schwul/schwül" has an interesting etymology: "The adjective was taken over in the form 'schwul' from Low German into High German in the 17th century. . . . The New High German form arose in the 18th century, probably under the influence of 'kühl.' The form 'schwul' has been used since the 19th century as colloquial speech for 'homosexual' (note in this regard 'warmer Bruder,' colloquial for 'a homosexual')." *Der Große Duden*, vol. 7, *Etymologie* (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut, 1963), p. 632.

Magnus Hirschfeld, as usual, has a biological explanation: "In general the skin of the Urning is warmer to the touch than that of persons around him. It appears that the designation 'warmer Bruder,' which is widespread in popular usage, has its physiological foundation in this phenomenon (also the word 'schwul' = 'schwül' has a similar meaning)." Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (Berlin: Louis Marcus, 1914), p. 146.

The use of "schwul" in the sense of "homosexual" is attested as early as 1847. See Heinz Küpper, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Umgangssprache*, 6 vols. (Hamburg: Claasen Verlag, 1963–70), 2: 264, where Küpper also states: "In Austria the spelling *schwül* predominated." That the word "schwül" retained this ambiguity in Germany as late as the first third of the 20th century may be seen in the dissertation *Homosexualität und Strafrecht* (Homosexuality and Penal Law, 1937) of the Nazi lawyer Rudolf Klare. After noting "the pornographic literature on this theme which truly flooded over the regions of Germany" in the Weimar Republic, he singles out the homosexual writings of John Henry Mackay for special mention: "The language presented here is of such a disgusting and *schwül* kind that the reader becomes nauseated" (p. 33). The context makes it clear that "queer" is meant.

but in September 1868 Schweitzer helped found and was elected president of a new General German Workers' Union (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterschaftsverband). He thought that Marx would approve his policies and wrote him on October 8. Marx wrote Engels: "As regards the letter from Schweitzer, it is clear that he does not feel quite happy in his boots. . . . Above all it emerges from the whole letter that Schweitzer still cannot drop his fixed idea that he has 'his own workers' movement'. On the other hand, he is unquestionably the most intelligent and most energetic of all the present workers' leaders in Germany. . . . My plan is not to use diplomacy but to tell Schweitzer the unvarnished truth about my view of his dealings, and make it clear to him that he must choose between the 'sect' and the 'class'."⁴⁵ But Engels, who had long since given up on Schweitzer, replied: "His ambitions exceed his strength, or, as the Italians put it, *vuol pettare più alto del culo* [he wants to fart higher than his asshole], and on this internal contradiction he will work himself to death."⁴⁶

On October 11, 1868, Schweitzer was able to call the ADAV back to life, with headquarters in Berlin and just enough changes to avoid another dissolution by the police. In parliament, he was unable to get a bill passed that would forbid Sunday work, limit the workday to ten hours, and establish a system of factory inspectors, but he was able to bring a vote to have Fritz Mende released from jail, even though Bismarck spoke against it. Besides being a fellow Reichstag member, Mende was president of the splinter group of the ADAV supported by Countess von Hatzfeldt, and on June 18, 1869, Schweitzer and Mende announced the fusion of their two parties. On June 22, Engels commented: "So that is Wilhelm's entire success: that the male-female line and the all-female line of the Lassalleans have united!"⁴⁷ (Mende's group was called the "all-female" line because it was under the influence of Sophie von Hatzfeldt; Schweitzer, of course, was the "male-

45. MECW, 43: 127–28.

46. MECW, 43: 129. My translation of the Italian; the MECW translator has "backside" for "culo."

47. MECW, 43: 295.

female.” This was in the same letter in which Engels commented on Ulrichs’s *Incubus*; thus the play on words here by Engels is probably a reflection of Ulrichs’s terminology.)⁴⁸

Because of the war with France in 1870, Schweitzer again moved further from the views of the party of Liebknecht and August Bebel that had been formed at the congress of August 1869 in Eisenach. Schweitzer was able to accept the idea of a defensive war and voted for the war appropriations bill; Bebel and Liebknecht opposed “Prussia’s war” and were arrested for treason in December. In the Reichstag election on March 3, 1871, only a few days after the preliminary peace of Versailles, Schweitzer and all other Social Democrats lost, and before the end of the month he announced his retirement as president of the ADAV, effective as soon as the next general meeting in May could elect a successor. In the meantime his money was running out.

SCHWEITZER'S FINAL YEARS

Schweitzer’s financial situation was indeed bad; he lived on borrowed money most of his life. Long before his death, Schweitzer’s father had stopped helping him, and Schweitzer got most of his money by anticipating the inheritance from his father, whom he made out to be a millionaire. But when his father died in December 1868 and the inheritance was divided, Schweitzer got only a relatively small amount. The *Social-Demokrat* would probably have folded then, except that the father of the printer of the paper lent him money against the inheritance from his mother. But he charged such a high rate of interest that even though Schweitzer’s later earnings from his plays were considerable, he was never able to get out from under debt.

In January 1871, before his retirement from politics, Schweitzer’s play *Canossa*

48. I am grateful to Manfred Herzer for pointing out this apparent influence of Ulrichs on Engels.

opened in Berlin and had a success in the press and with the public. He had begun writing plays much earlier and already in 1858 had gained recognition for his *Alkibiades oder Bilder aus Hellas* (Alcibiades, or Pictures from Hellas). This play was probably influenced by his experience as a boy-lover and by his acquaintance with Antonie Menschel. Although Alcibiades (who may be identified with Schweitzer) rejects the eloquent Aspasia (Antonie) in favor of a slave who attracts him sexually, Aspasia vows to be faithful to him. The play proved to be prophetic when, fourteen years later, Schweitzer married the faithful Antonie.

During his political career, Schweitzer wrote propaganda pieces (*Der Schlingel* [The Rascal], 1867; *Die Gans* [The Goose], 1869), but now he wrote for money, as he himself said, and he was enormously successful.⁴⁹ In the last four years of his life no less than twenty of his plays were presented on the Berlin stage, and several of them (*Epidemisch* [Epidemic], 1873; *Die Darwinianer* [The Darwinians], 1874; *Großstädtisch* [Metropolitan], 1875) played throughout Germany. During this period his social contacts, too, were mainly with the theatrical crowd.

Although Schweitzer no longer wished to discuss politics, he was naturally still interested in the ADAV, and he attended the general meeting in Berlin in May 1872. There he was attacked by Tölke, the party secretary, who accused him of having hindered the progress of the ADAV by involving it in the trade union movement. He even succeeded in having Schweitzer ousted from the meeting and got a resolution passed declaring that Schweitzer was unworthy of ever being admitted as a member. But there were still those who valued him and asked for his advice, and Schweitzer's last political act was to write an open letter in November 1872 "to my personal friends in the ADAV." In it he declared

49. Schweitzer's propaganda pieces are discussed in Peter von Rügen, "Das Arbeitertheater zwischen politischer Aufklärung und Anpassung an den bürgerlichen Kulturbetrieb," in *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung 1848–1918*, ed. P. von Rügen (Frankfurt a.M.: Büchergilde Gutenberg, 1981), pp. 223–60. I am grateful to James Steakley for this reference.

the union of the ADAV with the Eisenach party to be a necessity that could not be put off. Union finally came at the congress in Gotha, May 22–27, 1875. There, despite Marx’s criticism of the platform drawn up by Liebknecht, the two groups were united in a new party, called Socialist Workers’ Party of Germany (Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands). With the introduction in 1878 of Bismarck’s *Sozialistengesetz*, the law forbidding socialist activity, the party ceased to function in Germany and the executive committee emigrated to Switzerland. When this law was allowed to lapse in 1890, the party was reestablished in Germany as the Social-Democratic Party of Germany (Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands), of which the current SPD is a descendant.

Schweitzer hardly lived to see the union he had urged. He died on July 28, 1875, in Giessbach, Switzerland, of pneumonia, leaving only debts to his wife, whom he had married just three years before. As a result of his insolvency, even the copyrights to his plays were put up for auction, but they were acquired for his widow by the German Schiller Foundation. Schweitzer’s remains were finally laid to rest in Frankfurt, in the same cemetery as Schopenhauer. The burial was attended by Karl Franz von Schweitzer, mayor of Frankfurt, and other relatives. Catholic clergy, whose downfall he had predicted, were there, too. According to Gustav Mayer, his biographer, not one worker was there, not a flower from them for the man who gave the best years of his life to their cause.

Schweitzer’s wife is said to have had the impression that his drive for recognition was stronger than for political activity and that inwardly he held himself above all party struggles. Mayer believed that the one thing directing his life was an ambition increased by a drive for activity and pleasure, and unbridled by any categorical imperative. There seems to be truth in all this. Schweitzer was indeed a remarkable man, who can also be admired for not accepting and internalizing society’s concepts of right and wrong, for not yielding to that self-oppression which is the most successful of all oppressions. Given the time in which he lived, we certainly cannot fault him for not “coming out” as a boy-lover; not even Magnus Hirschfeld ever publicly admitted to being homosexual.

PEDERASTY AND POLITICS

I have more than once referred to Schweitzer as a boy-lover, since he was “arrested in the Mannheim Palace Park for having there seduced a boy under fourteen years of age into undertaking an indecent act.” It is unlikely, however, that Marx and Engels distinguished boy-lovers from adult “pederasts,” the term they both used in referring to Ulrichs’s *Incubus*. In that booklet Ulrichs used the term “pederast” to mean someone attracted to a boy under the age of puberty—and he clearly disapproved of seducing such a child. But in popular speech—and, no doubt, for Marx and Engels as well—the term “pederasty” meant homosexual anal intercourse, the term perhaps also being influenced by the similarity to the word of Latin origin “pedication,” which is precisely anal intercourse and was so used by Ulrichs. Hirschfeld, in a footnote to his edition of Ulrichs’s writings, called attention to this by referring to “pederastic acts in the usual sense,” meaning anal intercourse.⁵⁰ But whereas Hirschfeld insisted that it was rare among homosexuals, Marx and Engels probably shared the common belief that it was their usual activity.⁵¹

By the time of Hirschfeld, the age of the loved one had taken on a new significance. Whereas earlier the age of fourteen had been taken as representative of attaining puberty, so that legal distinctions were made in judging sexual activity with those above and below that age, in his petition for a revision of the sodomy statute § 175 (first presented to the Reichstag in 1897), Hirschfeld suggested the age of sixteen as the new age of consent.

50. For a thorough discussion of terminology on the subject, see Hirschfeld (see note 44), Chapter 1.

51. In a footnote in his 1898 edition of Ulrichs’s writings, Hirschfeld wrote: “The latest medical researchers in this field, particularly Krafft-Ebing, have been able to abundantly confirm this statement, that pederastic acts in the usual sense belong to the greatest rarities and exceptions in contrary-sexual intercourse” (*Formatrix*, p. 27, in Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, *Forschungen über das Rätsel der mannmännlichen Liebe*, ed. Magnus Hirschfeld, 12 vols. in 1, paginated separately [Leipzig: Spohr, 1898; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1975]). Hirschfeld later gave the statistic that eight percent of Germany’s practicing homosexuals carry out anal intercourse. See Hirschfeld, pp. 287–288.

This led to his revision of the Schweitzer incident. In typical propagandistic fashion, Hirschfeld twice mentions Schweitzer's "Mannheim scandal" in his *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (1914), but avoids mentioning the age of the other person and even goes so far as to invent an adult occupation for him, that of brick-layer, which he states twice.⁵² By the time of this publication, homosexuality had been widely discussed, especially as a result of the so-called Eulenburg affair, beginning in 1906, during which all the usual prejudices against homosexuality, including of course the danger for youth, occupied the media for months.⁵³

ANARCHISM

When Hirschfeld mentioned Schweitzer, he noted that the "Mannheim scandal . . . gave Lassalle occasion to show himself very tolerant of the same-sex inclination."⁵⁴ Indeed, Lassalle was head and shoulders above Marx and Engels in this regard; their homophobia is clear enough. Still, Engels and, especially, Marx were able to appreciate Schweitzer's very real abilities, despite their distaste for his sexual inclination. In another situation,

52. Hirschfeld, pp. 522, 983. Hirschfeld cites an article by Hugo Friedländer in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* of January 9, 1910, as quoted in part in the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 11 (1910/1911): 426–27. There Schweitzer's partner is described as a "young man," with no mention of an occupation. Hirschfeld may have been misled by the statement of Ulrichs: "In August [1869] the *Frankfurter Zeitung* again jeered, 'It is not astonishing that von Schweitzer has a hand in the Berlin brick-layers' strike. The Mannheim court records very well know how to tell of his preference for young journeyman brick-layers'" (*Argonauticus*, p. 113).

53. For an excellent presentation of this affair, see James Steakley, "Iconography of a Scandal: Political Cartoons and the Eulenburg Affair," *Studies in Visual Communication* 9:2 (Spring 1983): 20–51. See also the revised and expanded versions of this article in *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, ed. Martin Bauml Duberman et al. (New York: New American Library, 1989), pp. 233–63, and in *History of Homosexuality in Europe and America*, ed. Wayne Dynes (New York: Garland, 1992), pp. 323–85.

54. Hirschfeld, p. 522.

that regarding the anarchist Mikhail (or Michael) Bakunin (1814–76), their attitude may have been similar. Günter Dworek may be near the mark about them when, in his review of the *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality* (1990), he writes:

Sometimes the mixing of the general with the specific descends into the grotesque, homosexualizing history in the process. In this manner the argument between Marxists and liberation anarchists at the First International, essential to the history of the European workers' movement, is reduced in Dynes' encyclopedia to the personal aversion of the notably quite homophobic gentlemen Marx and Engels toward the anarchist leader Bakunin and his alleged love for the dubious young Russian revolutionary Nechaev. Such crude personalizing would no doubt make the two key authors of historical materialism roll over in their graves.⁵⁵

But Dworek has misread the article “Anarchism” by Charley Shively (the only place Nechaev is mentioned in the *Encyclopedia*), which says Marx “used Bakunin’s relationship to Nechaev as an *excuse* for expelling the anarchists from the International in 1872” (my emphasis).⁵⁶ Marx was quite willing to use his knowledge of such relationships to attack his opponents—witness his instruction to Engels regarding Schweitzer: “You must arrange for a few jokes about the fellow to reach Siebel, for him to hawk around to the various papers.”⁵⁷ There can be no doubt about the kind of jokes Marx had in mind.

In the case of Bakunin the jokes were ready at hand. According to E. H. Carr:

55. Günter Dworek, review of the *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality* (see note 56), *Magnus*, 1991, no. 4, p. 56; quoted (and translated) by Les Wright in his review of the same work in *OurStories* (Newsletter of the Gay and Lesbian Historical Society of Northern California) 6:3–4 (Spring/Summer 1991): 16.

56. Charley Shively, “Anarchism” in *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, ed. Wayne Dynes (New York: Garland, 1990), p. 51.

57. MECW, 42: 120.

Bakunin was infatuated at first sight, as others had so often been infatuated with him. He began to call young Nechaev by the tender nickname of “Boy” (for Bakunin had retained a few words of English from his year’s stay in London). The most affectionate relations were established. A queer story afterwards circulated among the Russian *émigrés* in Switzerland that Bakunin had given Nechaev a paper promising his implicit obedience “even to the point of forging bank notes,” and had signed it, in token of complete submission, with a woman’s name, “Matrena.” This declaration is alleged to have been found among Nechaev’s papers after his arrest. But the story is too lightly attested to warrant credence. If any document bearing such a signature existed, “Matrena” was probably an example of Michael’s predilection for the childish mystification of code names, and was not invested with the significance which rumor attached to it.⁵⁸

Nechaev’s biographer Philip Pomper commented on this: “The rumors circulating in the émigré community about Bakunin’s use of the woman’s name ‘Matrena’ in a document given to Nechaev may be more significant than E. H. Carr, for example, believes, although it is virtually certain that no open homosexual relationship existed.”⁵⁹ But their relationship reminded George Woodcock of “other disastrous relationships between men of widely differing ages: Rimbaud and Verlaine, or Lord Alfred Douglas and Oscar Wilde,” and he adds: “There certainly seems to have been a touch of submerged homosexuality; indeed, it is hard to find any other explanation for the temporary submissive-

58. E. H. Carr, *Michael Bakunin* (New York: Vintage, 1961), p. 392.

59. Philip Pomper, *Sergei Nechaev* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1979), p. 231, n. 34.

ness of the usually autocratic Bakunin to this sinister youth.”⁶⁰

Indeed, how else is one to read the statements in Bakunin’s long letter to Nechaev of June 2, 1870, following the break between them: “I loved you deeply and still love you, Nechaev. . . . [German Lopatin] would not have judged me quite so severely had he known how deeply, how passionately, how tenderly I loved you and believed in you!”⁶¹

Marx used two incidents involving Nechaev to have Bakunin expelled from the First International at the 1872 congress in The Hague. Using evidence submitted by Marx, the investigating committee “found that ‘Bakunin has used fraudulent means for the purpose of appropriating all or part of another man’s wealth—which constitutes fraud—and further, in order to avoid fulfilling his engagement, has by himself or through his agents had recourse to menaces’.”⁶² The first finding refers to money from the so-called Bakhmetev fund, for which Nechaev refused to sign a receipt when it was passed on to him by Bakunin, leading to rumors that Bakunin had appropriated the money for himself. The second refers to the fact that Bakunin accepted an advance of 300 rubles for the translation of volume one of Marx’s *Capital*, but never completed the task. Nechaev persuaded him to devote his time instead to the “cause,” saying that he would “settle the matter.”⁶³ This he did by writing a threatening letter to the student Lyubavin, the publisher’s middleman, requiring that Bakunin be freed of all obligations. This letter found its way into the hands of Marx and was used by him as the most incriminating evidence against Bakunin (although it is not at all clear that Bakunin knew how Nechaev intended to “settle the matter”). Thus it was Bakunin’s infatuation with Nechaev—and no doubt the homophobic perception of it—which led to the action of the congress in The Hague: “They voted

60. George Woodcock, *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements*, New Edition (New York: Penguin, 1986), p. 143.

61. Michael Confino, ed., *Daughter of a Revolutionary: Natalie Herzen and the Bakunin-Nechayev Circle*, trans. Hilary Sternberg and Lydia Bott (LaSalle, IL: Library, 1974), pp. 273, 275.

62. Woodcock, p. 150.

63. Confino, p. 400.

heavily for the expulsion of Bakunin.”⁶⁴

Of course Marx and Engels were not alone in using the common prejudice against homosexuality for political purposes; this was common to all political parties. Ulrichs gave several examples of this, including his own case, in *Incubus*, the booklet Marx and Engels read:

How the *Kreuzzeitung* and the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine* slandered the Guelphs when, on taking me away to [prison in] Minden . . . the Prussian police found at my house an extraordinary collection of papers on Urning love! And how the Liberal papers are full of slander since in the circle of precisely those two papers the pious Preuss has suddenly turned out to be an Urning!⁶⁵

But Schweitzer’s past was dredged up constantly. Mayer points out that at the election for the constitutional assembly of the North German Confederation, Schweitzer urged the workers in Düsseldorf to support the Progressive candidate Groote. But for the parliament he urged the election of the Liberal candidate Michaelis—who was in fact elected. The Progressive candidate was Heinrich Bürgers, who then published in his *Rheinische Zeitung* the text of Schweitzer’s verdict in Mannheim. Sweet revenge!⁶⁶

If there was concrete evidence against Schweitzer, rumors about the anarchist Bakunin may have been fueled by a widespread perception that a disproportionately large number of anarchists were homosexual. Indeed, the leading individualist anarchist in Germany at the end of the nineteenth century was the boy-lover John Henry Mackay (1864–1933). Emil Szittyá, who appears to have been the first to disclose in print that

64. Woodcock, p. 150.

65. Ulrichs, *Incubus*, p. 13.

66. Mayer, p. 202.

Mackay was also the pseudonymous Sagitta,⁶⁷ author of the *Books of the Nameless Love*, was of the opinion: “Very many anarchists have this tendency. Thus I found in Paris a Hungarian anarchist, Alexander Sommi, who founded a homosexual anarchist group on the basis of this idea.”⁶⁸ The extravagant Szittyia is not always to be trusted, but here his view is confirmed by Magnus Hirschfeld: “In the ranks of a relatively small party, the anarchist, it seemed to me as if proportionately more homosexuals and effeminate are found than in others.”⁶⁹ But whereas Szittyia reported the reasonable explanation of the Italian anarchist Bertoni (himself homosexual, according to Szittyia)—“Anarchists demand freedom in everything, thus also in sexuality. Homosexuality leads to a healthy sense of egoism, for which every anarchist should strive,”⁷⁰—Hirschfeld had his own arbitrary, even bizarre explanation:

Whether from ideological enthusiasm, or because they generalize the feeling of being unjustly deprived of rights, whether from sexual preference for the lowest social strata, or whether they love the brutal force of others out of passivist masochism is hard to say and will probably only be decided when someone bothers to subject a large series of anarchists to an exact psychoanalysis.⁷¹

Of course, not all anarchists who defended homosexuality were homosexual themselves. Robert Reitzel (1849–98), editor of *Der arme Teufel* (Detroit), was decidedly heterosexual, but: “From the beginning of the 1890s Robert Reitzel was one of the first in

67. Emil Szittyia, *Das Kuriositäten-Kabinett* (Konstanz: See, 1923; reprint, Berlin: Clemens Zerling, 1979), p. 155.

68. *Ibid.*, p. 156.

69. Hirschfeld, p. 522.

70. Szittyia, p. 156.

71. Hirschfeld, p. 522.

America to speak positively of homosexuality,” according to Reitzel’s biographer, who also suggests: “It was probably also Mackay who first drew Reitzel’s attention to the problematic of homosexuality.”⁷² (I think this unlikely, but it is possible; the two became good friends when they met in Europe in 1889, and when Mackay visited the United States in 1893 he traveled to Detroit to see Reitzel.) And Hirschfeld was lavish in his praise of the American anarchist Emma Goldman, whose “open letter” regarding an article on Louise Michel he printed in the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* in 1923. In a preface to it he wrote:

In her periodical, *Mother Earth*, and in countless speeches given over several decades across the breadth of the United States, Goldman has campaigned boldly and steadfastly for individual rights, and especially for those deprived of their rights. Thus it came about that she was the first and only woman, indeed the first and only American, to take up the defense of homosexual love before the general public.⁷³

At the turn of the century individualist anarchists were particularly outspoken in the defense of homosexuality. For example: “A sharply outlined figure of the Berlin individualist anarchist cultural scene around 1900 was also the precocious Johannes Holzmann (pseudonym Senna Hoy). . . . Holzmann, an adherent of free love, celebrated homosexuality as a ‘champion of culture’ and engaged in the struggle against § 175.”⁷⁴ Ewald Tschek, who wrote under the anagram pseudonym St. Ch. Waldecke, may also be

72. Ulrike Heider, *Der arme Teufel: Robert Reitzel—vom Vormärz zum Haymarket* (Bühl-Moos, Germany: Elster, 1986), pp. 79, 101.

73. Quoted in Jonathan Katz, *Gay American History: Lesbians and Gay Men in the U.S.A.* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1976), p. 378; translated by James Steakley.

74. Ulrich Linse, “Individualanarchisten, Syndikalisten, Bohémiens,” in *Berlin um 1900*, ed. Gelsine Asmus (Berlin: Berlinische Galerie, 1984), p. 442. See also the article by Walter Fähnders in this volume.

mentioned in this connection. A frequent contributor to the Berlin homosexual journal *Der Eigene* (The Self-Owner), his 1932 brochure *Gedanken über Anarchie* (Thoughts on Anarchy) is a forceful summary of individualist anarchist thought.⁷⁵

Today much of the socialist left appears to tolerate homosexuality, if not entirely accept it—at least for “consenting adults.” And again it is the anarchists who are in the vanguard of those who accept the rights of people of all ages to determine their own lives.⁷⁶

75. Ewald Tschek, *Gedanken über Anarchie* (1932); reprinted in *Beiträge aus der Reihe: Lernziel Anarchie*, ed. Kurt Zube, no. 16 (Freiburg/Br.: Mackay-Gesellschaft, 1981), pp. 35–46. *Der Eigene*, which was openly homosexual from 1898, began in 1896 as an anarchist journal in the direction of the philosopher of egoism Max Stirner, whose meaning of the word “eigen” is in the journal’s title. For a full explanation of my translation of the journal’s title as “The Self-Owner,” see my note no.10 in *Homosexuality and Male Bonding in Pre-Nazi Germany: The Youth Movement, the Gay Movement, and Male Bonding Before Hitler’s Rise: Original Transcripts from Der Eigene, the First Gay Journal in the World*, ed. Harry Oosterhuis, trans. Hubert Kennedy (Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press, 1991) (published simultaneously as *Journal of Homosexuality* 22.1–2), pp. 22–23.

76. “So long as this society assigns women a second-class status, so long as children are held hostage as the ‘possession’ of nuclear-family tyrants, no one is free.” Jochen Knoblauch, “Warum ich Anarchist bin—Gedanken nachhängend,” in *Anarchie ist Gesetz und Freiheit ohne Gewalt”: Uwe Timm zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin: OPPO-Verlag, 1993), p. 25. See also the special issues “Children’s Sexuality” and “Children & Anarchy” of *Anarchy: A Journal of Desire Armed* (Columbia, MO), no. 26 (Fall 1990) and no. 27 (Winter 1990–91), respectively.