

Johann Baptist von Schweitzer: The Queer Marx Loved to Hate

Hubert Kennedy

San Francisco State University

SUMMARY. 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

Correspondence may be addressed: 3475 16th St., Apt. 12, San Francisco, CA 94114.

[Haworth co-indexing entry note]: "Johann Baptist von Schweitzer: The Queer Marx Loved to Hate." Kennedy, Hubert. Co-published simultaneously in *Journal of Homosexuality* (The Haworth Press, Inc.) Vol. 29, No. 2/3, 1995, pp. 69-96; and: *Gay Men and the Sexual History of the Political Left* (ed: Gert Hekma, Harry Oosterhuis, and James Steakley) The Haworth Press, Inc., 1995, pp. 69-96; and *Gay Men and the Sexual History of the Political Left* (ed: Gert Hekma, Harry Oosterhuis, and James Steakley) Harrington Park Press, an imprint of The Haworth Press, Inc., 1995, pp. 69-96. Multiple copies of this article/chapter may be purchased from The Haworth Document Delivery Center. [1-800-342-9678 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. (EST)].

© 1995 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

69

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

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.

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 homosexu-

als, 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 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 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 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 de-

sires 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, noting 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.

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 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 Lassalle. 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 immedi-

ately 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 character. 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 whomever 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 desired 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. . . . Having already brought so great and so essential an offering, you will therefore also know how to bring the further offering of avoiding . . . this conflict. 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 whatever to do with his political character. I need only remind you that, however incomprehensible such unnatural tastes appear to us, the tendency of which Dr. von Schweitzer is accused was the general rule among the ancient Greeks, their statesmen and their philosophers. Ancient Greece saw nothing wrong in it, and I consider the great Greek philosophers and the 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 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 absolutely 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 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 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 dis-

plays such a sensitive organ for sexual love?”⁴¹ But Engels certainly used “Schwüle” in a 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, 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 petare 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-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* 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 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. 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, that regard-

ing 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 of 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:

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 submissiveness 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 transla-

tion 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 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 Preus 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 was 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 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 Szittyá 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 Szittyá reported the reasonable explanation of the Italian anarchist Bertoni (himself homosexual, according to Szittyá)—"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 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 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

AUTHOR NOTE

Hubert Kennedy is Adjunct Professor, Human Sexuality Studies, and Research Associate, CERES, San Francisco State University. He is grateful to Manfred Herzer and James Steakley, who read a draft of this article and offered valuable suggestions.

NOTES

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 “un-

natural 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.

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.

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): 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).

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

9. MECW, 43: 295.

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 "introte" 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.

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).

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.

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.

20. MECW, 43: 132.

21. Quoted in Mayer, p. 91.

22. *Ibid.*

23. Quoted in David Footman, *Ferdinand Lassalle, Romantic Revolutionary* (New Haven, Yale University 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.

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.

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.

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.

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: Claassen 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.

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.
48. I am grateful to Manfred Herzer for pointing out this apparent influence of Ulrichs on Engels.
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.
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. 287-88.
52. Hirschfeld, pp. 522, 983. Hirschfeld cited 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.
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.

58. E. H. Carr, *Michael Bakunin* (New York: Vintage, 1961), p. 392.
59. Philip Pomper, *Sergei Nechaev* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1979), p. 231, n. 34.
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-Nechaev Circle*, trans. Hilary Sternberg and Lydia Bott (LaSalle, IL: Library, 1974), pp. 273, 275.
62. Woodcock, p. 150.
63. Confino, p. 400.
64. Woodcock, p. 150.
65. Ulrichs, *Incubus*, p. 13.
66. Mayer, p. 202.
67. Emil Szittyá, *Das Kuriositäten-Kabinett* (Konstanz: See, 1923; reprint, Berlin: Clemens Zerkling, 1979), p. 155.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 156.
69. Hirschfeld, p. 522.
70. Szittyá, p. 156.
71. Hirschfeld, p. 522.
72. Ulrike Heider, *Der arme Teufel: Robert Reitzel-vom Vormärz zum Haymarket* (Bühl-Moos: 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 essay by Walter Fähnders in this volume.
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 (New York: 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.