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From 1907 to 1909, Imperial Germany was by turns amused and mortified by a series of journalistic exposés, libel trials, and Reichstag speeches, all of which turned upon the alleged homosexuality of the chancellor and of two distinguished members of the entourage of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Taken together, these discourses constituted the most stunning scandal on the level of domestic politics in the history of the Second Reich (1871–1918). National honor was palpably at stake, and the German people was willing and even eager to judge the kaiser not by the company he kept but by the robustly paternal image he sought to project (see Figure 1). It was defensively asserted from the rostrum of the Reichstag that “no one can doubt the moral earnestness of our kaiser and his consort, whose family life provides the entire country with a fine model.” Yet Philipp Prince zu Eulenburg-Hertefeld—the central figure in the scandal, which thus became known as the Eulenburg Affair—was to all appearances a happily married man, too, and for a time the nation was brought uncomfortably close to having to consider the disturbing implications of the kaiser’s penchant for frequent hunting trips and the annual holiday cruise on the royal yacht in exclusively male company (see Figure 2). The implications were abundantly clear to the initiator of the attacks on Eulenburg, Maximilian Harden, for he possessed documentary evidence that might well have sufficed to expose and depose the kaiser. He chose never to make use of it.
National attention shifted to yet another grave scandal late in 1908, this time affecting the Reich's foreign diplomacy rather than its domestic politics. The kaiser had given a bombastic interview to the *Daily Telegraph* of London in which, typically, he offered unwanted advice and rashly expounded on his peaceable vision of future relations between Germany and its archrival on the seas, Great Britain. Its publication unleashed a storm of outrage in the Reichstag, both from implacable foes of Anglo-German détente and from those who simply expected the kaiser to exercise reasonable discretion when discussing German strategy. Shaken by his obvious blunder and the ensuing furor, Wilhelm was all too happy to flee his duties for the regular November hunt at the Black Forest estate of an aristocratic confidant. It was here that the chief of the Military Secretariat, Dietrich Count von Hülsen-Häseler, donned a ballerina's tutu and was performing a *pas seul* as the after-dinner entertainment when he suddenly dropped to the floor, dead of a heart attack. "The incident with all that it implied was hushed up," but the combination of events proved too much for Wilhelm, who shortly suffered a nervous breakdown. One dinner-party guest who
Figure 2 The kaiser and select members of his entourage on the royal yacht Hohenzollern, 1897. Wilhelm, wearing sunglasses, is seated in the front row; immediately behind him, wearing a white cap, is Philipp zu Eulenburg. Kuno von Moltke, also wearing a white cap, is the third figure to the right of Eulenburg. At the kaiser’s side, wearing a dark cap, is Georg von Hülsen. From P. zu Eulenburg, *Mit dem Kaiser als Staatsmann und Freund auf Nordlandreisen* (Dresden: Carl Reissner, 1931), vol. 2, facing p. 32.

witnessed these events wrote: “In Wilhelm II I saw a man who, for the first time in his life, with horror-stricken eyes, looked upon the world as it really was.”

Like the bizarre death of Hülsen-Häseler, the entire Eulenburg Affair has been discreetly hushed up in all but the most recent historiography. Bound by disciplinary restraints, diplomatic historians have given due attention to the international controversy but have imposed what amounts to a scholarly blackout on its domestic counterpart—a disparity all the more striking in light of Maximilian Harden’s astute observation that the Eulenburg scandal was “the prime cause” of the Daily Telegraph affair. This embarrassed silence has been even more obvious among German than among non-German historians, manifesting an understandable reluctance to wash the nation’s dirty linen in public (see Figure 3).

It is in the nature of scandal, however, to catapult sexual conduct out of the private sphere into the public arena, thus generating discussions on sexual politics that have the potential to alter actual attitudes and actions. In the specific instance of the Eulenburg Affair, the long-range consequences were so severe that the scandal defies dismissal as a mere episode. French, British, and American historians have linked the events of 1907–09 to a far-reaching shift in German policy that heightened military aggressive-
ness and ultimately contributed to the outbreak of World War I. Such insights were by no means unknown to earlier observers. Writing in 1933, for example, Magnus Hirschfeld argued that the outcome of the entire regrettable affair was "no more and no less than a victory for the tendency that ultimately issued in the events of the World War." And in a bitterly racist vein, Wilhelm himself fulminated in 1927 that the scandal had been started by "international Jewry" and marked "the first step" of a conspiracy that led in 1918 to German defeat and his abdication.

Yet these assessments of the long-range effects of the Eulenburg Affair, however apt or grotesque they may be, overlook the vital dimension of the scandal's more immediate, short-term impact on the manners and morals of the German nation. While hindsight can link the scandal with momentous events that occurred years later, such retrospective interpretations were obviously unavailable to contemporary observers struggling to draw their own set of conclusions. In many respects, the Eulenburg Affair represented for Wilhelminian Germany the same sort of "ritual of public condemnation" that the Oscar Wilde trial had been for Victorian England in 1895. Both scandals were labelling events that dramatically accelerated the emergence of the modern homosexual identity by stimulating and structuring public perceptions of sexual normalcy and abnormalcy. Just as E. M. Forster's Maurice could describe himself to a doctor as "an unspeakable of the Oscar Wilde sort," so, too, in Germany the term Eulenburger arose to designate a homosexual.

As the most tumultuous cause célèbre of its era (see Figure 4), the Eulenburg Affair provoked a flood of publications, ranging from brochures and leaflets to complete transcripts of courtroom testimony, plays and romans à clef, even songs and postcards. Virtually every facet of the shocking revelations was discussed in political journals and daily papers—and minutely depicted in political cartoons—as the courtroom drama

![Figure 3](caption above) Dirty Laundry. (caption below) "It's never been this filthy before." From Der wahre Jacob (Stuttgart), no. 570 (May 18, 1908), p. 5819.
Figure 4 (caption above) Justice Without a Blindfold. (caption below) Justice (finally ripping the blindfold from her eyes):
"Hey, with the constant racket about the scandal trials, I’m going to quit playing blind man’s bluff!" From Kladderadatsch (Berlin), vol. 60, no. 44 (December 3, 1907), Beiblatt 1, p. 1.

unfolded.\textsuperscript{14} Drawn from a variety of periodicals ranging from the far left to the far right of the political spectrum,\textsuperscript{15} the cartoons selected for inclusion here provide a unique access point for a sociohistorical analysis of the Eulenburg Affair by illuminating many of the values, anxieties, and cultural norms of Wilhelminian society. Apart from the anti-Semitic interpretation of events (see Figure 5) advanced in reactionary nationalistic circles and
adopted by Wilhelm, the pictorial handling of the scandal reveals a remarkable degree of uniformity. A handful of images appears repeatedly, a phenomenon that cannot adequately be attributed to the possibility of artistic borrowing or the favored use of certain motifs such as the cuirassiers’ uniform (see Figures 12, 19, 24, 32). Among the cartoons’ recurrent themes are the threats to national honor and security posed by the spread of decadence among the ruling class, the corruption of military discipline, and the inversion of traditional sex roles. The common denominator of these concerns was a profound sense of cultural pessimism that transcended party divisions and was only superficially belied by the humor of the caricatures.

**Background Events**

The starting point of the Eulenburg Affair can ultimately be traced back to the rupture between the political visions and programs of Chancellor Otto von Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm II. The “Iron Chancellor” had single-mindedly—some would say brilliantly—shaped Germany’s destiny by founding the Second Reich and for almost two decades guiding the nation to great-power status under Wilhelm I, who was content to serve as a mere figurehead. Shortly after succeeding to the throne in 1888, Wilhelm II dismissed Bismarck and energetically instituted “personal rule,” reclaiming for the crown constitutional powers that had heretofore devolved upon the chancellor. The young kaiser saw himself as the embodiment of the Reich’s historical mission, but he struck seasoned political observers as brash and incompetent, and insiders were alarmed by his precarious mental balance—impressions that were only deepened by the passage of time. In a display of compensatory bravado, Wilhelm dismantled Bismarck’s *Realpolitik*, based on a dense network of treaties designed to guarantee the European balance of power, and replaced it with a confrontational *Weltpolitik*,
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which promised to gain the Reich its rightful “place in the sun” by mounting a naval fleet and aggressively pursuing overseas expansion. But Bismarck’s sophisticated statesmanship was actually supplanted by vacillatory bluster, for Wilhelm surrounded himself with a mixed retinue of military and civilian advisors whose outlooks diverged widely; tugged in competing directions, he proved incapable of synthesizing a consistent stance on foreign affairs.

The preeminent figure in Wilhelm’s civilian entourage during the 1890’s was Eulenburg, a member of the diplomatic corps whose anti-imperialist outlook and willingness to seek an accommodation with the “hereditary enemy,” France, earned him the undying enmity of hawkish Gallophobes in the upper echelons of both the military and the Foreign Office. He seemed unassailable, however, for it was rumored in court circles “that His Majesty loves Philipp Eulenburg more than any other living being.”16 and Wilhelm swiftly promoted his “bosom friend”17 to an ambassadorship. Even prior to his dismissal, Bismarck’s assessment of the relationship between the two was such that it could “not be confided to paper”; therefore, he explained in a letter to his son, “I will not write much that I intend to tell you.”18 In 1892, after his retirement, Bismarck also disclosed his suspicions to Maximilian Harden and elaborated on his concern in acidulous terms: “There are supposed to have been some quite good generals among the cinaedi [a pejorative Greek term for homosexuals], but I have yet to encounter any good diplomats of the sort.”19 Fourteen years would elapse before Harden’s public disclosure of Eulenburg’s homosexuality, but the motive was unaltered and widely shared: breaking his “mesmeric power” over the kaiser’s heart and mind.20 And indeed, his removal from the entourage signaled a decisive and fateful shift from competing civilian and military influences on German foreign policy to the outright dominance of “preventive war” advocates.

Were one to restrict the investigation of the Eulenburg Affair to the cartoons it inspired, it would be easy to arrive at the erroneous conclusion that Eulenburg came under fire solely because of his homosexuality and to lose sight entirely of the political background just outlined. Of some 350 cartoons examined by this writer, only one (Figure 6) sets the scandal in the context of German foreign policy. Its caption refers to the climate of “entente and détente” circulating in Europe and suggests that Germany—symbolized as a “well-known old soldier” with a Wilhelminian mustache—has wearied of its status as a bellicose outsider among nations. The soldier bears flowers and candies intended for the young man peaceably playing a flute, the quill on his lap symbolizing the signing of international accords. The soldier fears, however, that presenting his gifts will cause him to be (mis)labeled a homosexual by Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld, the sexologist whose expert testimony helped shape the verdict in three libel trials during the course of the scandal.

The rarity of this explicit linkage of homosexuality and anti-imperialism is perhaps less surprising when one considers that all the other cartoons originally appeared in journals that dealt simultaneously with a broad range of foreign and domestic affairs. A survey of the political cartoons in
Figure 6 (caption above) Embarrassing. (caption below) Europe has entered an era of entente and détente; a well-known old soldier despairs of his profession and thinks of seeking peace, too. It's just that in these pestilent times, he fears that any approach will lead to scientific-humanitarian slander. (Dr. Hirschfeld, the figure at the right, is asking, “Sweets?”) From Kladderadatsch (Berlin), vol. 60, no. 52 (December 29, 1907), Beiblatt 4, p. 3.

their context would enable one to discern certain ramifications of the Eulenburg Affair that remain largely invisible when they are examined in isolation. Because political cartoons generally comment on or embellish news reports, they document rather than analyze history. They are useful indicators of the public response to new information that is still being digested (a process they stimulate), but their full operational effectiveness relies on a set of cultural and historical assumptions implicit but not necessarily explicit in their imagery. In the case of the Eulenburg Affair, the element left unspoken and unportrayed resides in the quest for power by his adversaries; they mobilized homophobia not as an end in itself, but in the pursuit of a higher goal. Indeed, the Eulenburg Affair was prompted neither by Eulenburg’s homosexuality nor even by his political outlook. As his loyal and courageous wife remarked to Hirschfeld during a court recess, “They are striking at my husband, but their target is the kaiser.”

The All-Highest
Personage appeared only infrequently in the German cartoons, yet he figured prominently in numerous foreign cartoons—trying more or less successfully to distance himself from the stench of scandal (see Figures 7 and 8).

Although Eulenburg had a formidable number of aristocratic opponents, including the kaiser’s sister, these figures preferred to intrigue behind the scenes and to leave the public vendetta to a bourgeois individual, Maximilian Harden (see Figure 9). At the height of the scandal, one homosexual nobleman asked indignantly (and with no little trepidation): “Does this Jew actually rule in Prussia, deposing generals and ambassadors?” Harden was perhaps the most accomplished and, to use his word, “effective” political commentator in an era when German Jews were more strongly represented in journalism than in any other profession. After meeting him, Bismarck blithely remarked that Harden “was not at all like a Jew” and thereby alluded to a current stereotype: at that time the word Jew was synonymous with hack journalist. Harden, a convert to Christianity, edited and largely wrote by himself Die Zukunft (The Future), a fiercely independent Berlin weekly in which he called for progressive domestic reforms and for a coherent foreign policy combining Bismarckian diplomacy and expansionistic Weltpolitik. A relentless gadfly of Wilhelm’s personal rule, Harden was repeatedly jailed and fined for lèse majesté, but he always returned to the thick of the fray.

Harden was equally vitriolic in his published attacks on Eulenburg, which began appearing in 1893 and continued intermittently throughout the decade. He refrained from sexual innuendo because he upheld the
Figure 8 (caption below)  
“It wouldn’t be bad if the imperial cape, which is soiled at the foot of the steps to the throne, were conveniently shortened.”  
From Pasquino (Turin), vol. 52, no. 44 (November 3, 1907), p. 4; original in color.

Figure 9 (caption above)  
The Song Is Over! (caption below) “There we are. I’m glad I’ve finally dumped out my cart.” (The signpost bears an imperial German eagle and the legend: “Dumping manure and garbage is forbidden.” From Der Nebelspaiter (Zurich), November 2, 1907.
classic distinction between public and private spheres, a patrimony of bourgeois liberalism to which he was devoted as a beneficiary of Jewish emancipation. But his patience was wearing thin by 1902, and he quietly issued what amounted to an ultimatum: if Eulenburg did not resign from public life, his secret life would be exposed. Eulenburg capitulated to this blackmail at once, for retirement seemed not too dear a price to pay to avoid disgrace: suffering ill health, mourning the death of his mother, and disheartened by a cooling in his relationship with Wilhelm (who may have feared exposure himself), the fifty-five-year-old prince proved quite willing to yield his ambassadorship in Vienna and to retreat to Liebenberg, his country estate in the tradition-steeped Mark Brandenburg, where he would spend the next years as a virtual recluse. Personally vindicated and genuinely relieved that exposing Eulenburg had not been necessary, Harden shared with his aristocratic allies the fond hope that a new and better day was dawning for the Reich.

It was therefore a rude jolt when, in late 1905 and 1906, Eulenburg ventured to resume contacts with foreign diplomats and the kaiser, whom he invited to shoot at Liebenberg. Moreover, Eulenburg’s cautious rehabilitation coincided with a major foreign policy fiasco, Germany’s yielding hegemony over Morocco to France at the Algeciras Conference, which it was all too easy to pin on Eulenburg’s rising star. Finally, rumors began circulating that Eulenburg coveted the post of chancellor, and Harden renewed his attack in stronger language than ever: two articles published in November of 1906 linked Eulenburg, “this unhealthy late-romantic visionary,” with General Kuno Count von Moltke, military commandant of Berlin. They in fact had a long-standing friendship, and this was by no means Harden’s first attack on Moltke, who had suffered the ignominy of having his sobriquet Tüti revealed in Die Zukunft five years earlier. In the second of the articles, ominously entitled “Dies irae,” the pair was identified only as “the Harpist” (Eulenburg was a widely performed amateur composer) and as “Sweetie” (due to Moltke’s weakness for chocolates (see Figure 6); “sweet” was moreover a vernacular term for homosexual). These encoded figures engaged in a brief dialogue in which they wondered agitatedly whether Harden would dare to reveal “even more” and agonized over the reaction of “the Darling” (Wilhelm II) to their exposure. Eulenburg beat a hasty retreat, withdrawing to Switzerland and dispatching an intermediary to mollify Harden and to avert further revelations.

And there matters remained for the moment. Journalists sensed that an important story was breaking, and newspapers throughout the country reported on Harden’s second article or even reprinted it in full. But Harden’s warning was initially cryptic to all but those immediately involved, and another six months would elapse before the identities of Sweetie and the Harpist became public knowledge and they could appear as heraldic figures flanking a “New Prussian Coat of Arms” (see Figure 10), bedecked not with the traditional apron of oak leaves but with floral garlands, an allusion to Eulenburg’s most famous composition, the “Rosenlied.” With pursed lips, doe-eyed gaze, limp wrists, broad hips, and legs coyly pressed together, the pair presents a stereotype of male effeminacy that vividly
Figure 10 (caption below) New Prussian Coat of Arms (Liebenberg Design). The motto on the scroll reads: My sweetheart, my loverboy, my one and only cuddly-bear.) From Jugend (Munich), vol. 11, no. 45 (October 28, 1907), p. 1028.

violates the proud German escutcheon; the Harpist even threatens to topple the crown with his compromising gesture.

Harden’s decision to breach the barrier between public and private was an agonizing one and was reached due to an ensemble of factors. First, various aristocratic intriguers (notably Friedrich von Holstein) continued to egg him on. Secondly, military circles were embarrassed by a flurry of lesser scandals. They cumulatively convinced Harden that homosexuality was becoming rampant, and he hoped a death-blow to Eulenburg would halt its spread. The figures were indeed alarming: within the preceding three years, courts-martial had convicted some twenty officers of homosexual conduct, and 1906-07 witnessed six suicides by homosexual officers ruined by blackmail. One officer stationed with the elite Garde du Corps regiment in
Potsdam, Major Johannes Count von Lynar (see Figure 11), was charged with molesting his aide-de-camp, while a second officer charged with homosexuality, Lieutenant General Wilhelm Count von Hohenau (see Figure 12), was not only commander of the Garde du Corps but also a blood relative of the Kaiser.

The final factor prompting Harden was Eulenburg’s foolhardy decision to return from Switzerland to be initiated into the High Order of the Black Eagle, the most prestigious honor that could be bestowed upon a Prussian aristocrat. This award appeared all the more inappropriate when, one month later, Friedrich Heinrich, Prince of Prussia, regretfully declined investiture as Grand Master of the Order of the Knights of St. John with the shocking explanation that his homosexual proclivities made him unsuited for the post. Convinced that the body politic was under assault, Harden denounced Eulenburg as a pervert on April 27, 1907, noting acidly that since his “vita sexualis [was] no healthier” than Friedrich Heinrich’s, he should have the

Figure 11 (caption above) The Latest Fashion. (caption below)
Traveling salesman from Berlin: “Here are some lovely soldier’s pants from Potsdam—at a bargain price. Tütü brand. My name is Lynar.” Proprietress: “You pathetic, crazy, lost man. Go back where you came from with your Schweinehund.” (Lynar’s hat has a Paragraph 175 label; the woman is an innkeeper at the Hotel for Political Asylum, i.e., Switzerland.) From Der Nebelspaltter (Zurich). November 16, 1907.
decency to follow the prince into exile. He had been forced to expose this secret, so he argued, because of the political “side-effect of abnormal (even if idealized) friendship among men.” He quoted Moltke as having said “We have formed a ring around the kaiser that no one can break through (see Figure 5). Following reports by Harden on the confidants who regularly assembled at Eulenburg’s Liebenberg estate, this circle of homosexual entered the public imagination as the “round table at Liebenberg,” designation that resonated with a distinctly lubricious undertone. Liebenber,
(literally, "love mountain") could be read as a double-entendre, referring to the mors veneris; the Germans, Wagnerians all, were well aware that it was in the Venusberg that the medieval knight Tannhäuser had yielded to the temptations of the flesh.

As anxious speculation about the homosexual camaramilla scheming against the national interest began to fill the German press, the royal suite realized it would finally have to act. The kaiser was no reader, and it had been easy for his cabinet and entourage to keep him in blissful ignorance of the growing scandal. Now, however, the twenty-five-year-old crown prince—an officer in the Garde du Corps—was selected to break the news to his father. On May 2, he marched in to the appointment armed with back issues of Die Zukunft. He later reported that an expression of utter horror and despair had spread across his father’s features, and charitably attributed this to disgust at the mention of homosexuality. After regaining his composure, Wilhelm hastily conferred with Hülsen-Häseler and the minister of police affairs, who presented him with a carefully edited list of approximately fifteen prominent aristocrats adjudged homosexual by the Berlin vice squad; it had been pared down from several hundred to spare the kaiser’s feelings. Apparently finding their names on the list, the kaiser commanded Hohenau, Lynar, and Moltke to resign their commissions, while Eulenburg was told to either exculpate himself or go into exile. Pleased that the kaiser had acted so decisively, the nation hoped that the camarilla was eliminated (see Figure 13) and hailed Harden as a modern Wilhelm Tell, the liberator of his fatherland (see Figure 14). In a final bid to restore his manly honor while ending the éclat as swiftly as possible, Moltke thereupon challenged Harden to a duel, which the journalist coolly declined as a transparent ruse to sidestep legal proceedings.

Figure 13 The Camaramilla.
Figure 14 (Caption above) Sodom's End. (caption below) It wasn't exactly Tell's shot, but it hit the mark. (The crossbow is labeled Zukunft, the kneeling figure is identified as "Sweetie," and the seated figure is "the Harpist." The standing figure is identified as M. (Moltke), for Harden's cryptic references led many journalist to think that "Sweetie" was Lecomte. The statuary shows Zeus and Ganymede on the left, Europa and the steer on the right.) From Der wahre Jacob (Stuttgart), no. 547 (July 9, 1907), p. 5453; original in color.
The Trials

Moltke and Eulenburg retained lawyers who pursued different tactics. Moltke's attempt to file a suit for criminal libel against Harden was rebuffed by the state prosecutor, who instead advised him to file for civil libel, thus placing him at a considerable procedural disadvantage. Eulenburg's strategy was more clever and avoided direct confrontation with Harden; after denying his culpability, he presented the local district attorney of his home area with a self-accusation of violating § (i.e., Paragraph) 175 of the penal code (see Figures 11 and 39), which punished "unnatural vice" between men with prison sentences of anywhere from one day to five years. By late July, the district attorney had completed his investigation and, predictably, cleared Eulenburg. Harden meanwhile set about preparing his defense for the upcoming civil libel suit brought by Moltke, and Berlin was further shaken by accusations of homosexuality leveled against the manager of the Royal Theater, Georg von Hülsen (see Figure 2), and the crown prince's equerry, von Stückradt. Finally, the imperial chancellor, Bernhard Prince von Bülow, was linked romantically with his secretary (described as his "better half"), Privy Councillor Scheefer, by two different publicists; and against one of them, Adolf Brand, Bülow pressed criminal libel charges (see Figure 15).

Figure 15 (caption below) Bülow: "My little Moor, you'd never be such a misbehaved dog." (The departing figure is labeled Brand.) From Kladdegrad - (Berlin), vol. 60, no. 43 (October 27, 1907), p. 164.
The first of these cases to go to court, Moltke v. Harden, opened on October 23, 1907. The lackluster performance of Moltke's lawyer contrasted sharply with Harden's brilliant defense. Three chief witnesses took the stand: Moltke's former wife, who had divorced him nine years earlier; Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld, a forensic expert on homosexuality; and an enlisted man named Bollhardt (see Figure 12). Lili von Elbe testified that in two years of marriage, conjugal relations had occurred only on the first two nights; on the few other nights they had shared a bed, Moltke had sometimes placed a pan of water between them to discourage her advances (see Figure 16). She reported that her husband had once espied a handkerchief left behind by Eulenburg (see Figure 10) and had warmly pressed it to his lips, murmuring

Figure 16 (caption above) Heroes. (caption below top picture)
In days of yore, the German Siegfried put a naked sword between himself and his spouse. (caption below bottom picture)
Nowadays, it's a little pan of water. From Lustige Blätter (Berlin), vol. 22, no. 45 (November 5, 1907), p. 10.
“Phili, my Phili!” Moltke had variously addressed Eulenburg as “my soulmate, my old boy, my one and only puppy dog” (the motto in the armorial scroll of Figure 10; cf. also Figure 38), and the two had referred to Wilhelm as das Liebchen, their “darling.” They had behaved in such a blatant fashion that her ten-year-old son (by a previous marriage) had taken to imitating their “revolting” mannerisms with the servants. Eulenburg had always vehemently opposed their marriage, she added, and her husband had spent more time with him than with her—including Christmas Eve; but she had not suspected the worst, since the very existence of homosexuality had been unknown to her at the time (Prozesse, pp. 16–36).  

As the trial entered its second day, an “enormous crowd” gathered before the courthouse and police reinforcements had to be summoned to maintain public order. The crowd grew larger day by day, and an “army” of German and foreign reporters encamped at the scene. The soldier Bollhardt offered the shocking testimony that in Potsdam regiments, sexual relations between officers and enlisted men were common knowledge (see Figure 17, which notably appeared prior to the scandal). He went on to describe at length his own participation in champagne orgies at Lnar’s villa (see Figure 18), stating that he had seen both Hohenau and Moltke there. The hushed courtroom was fascinated by Bollhardt’s report on the powerful sex appeal of the white pants and knee-high boots of the cuirassiers’ uniform: any guardsman who ventured to wear it in public was virtually certain to be approached by men soliciting homosexual intercourse (see Figure 19). “But that’s forbidden now, you know,” he remarked, unwittingly provoking an outburst of hilarity. After the mirth had subsided, he explained his meaning: due to importunities, wearing the uniform while off duty had recently been banned (Prozesse, p. 44).

Figure 17 (caption below) Tantalus. From Der wahre Jacob (Stuttgart), no. 525 (September 4, 1906), p. 5156.
Figure 18 (caption above) On the Harden Trial. (In an exclusive Berlin restaurant.) “Well, what do you want, old Diogenes?” “I’m searching for normal people.” “Oh, no, my good man, that’s pointless, for what you might call gentlemen of distinction are all perverse.” From Figaro (Vienna), vol. 51, no. 44 (November 2, 1907), pp. 660–661.

Figure 19 (Caption below) Hero-Warship. From Die Musket (Vienna), Vol. 8, no. 111 (November 14, 1907) p. 49; original in color.
The final witness to take the stand was Hirschfeld, whose very appearance—immediately captured in numerous cartoons (see especially Figure 20)—seemed to exemplify a Jewish stereotype. He had served for the past ten years as chair of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, an organization that campaigned for the repeal of § 175, and his courtroom appearance on Harden's behalf tended to strengthen the association between Jews and the unprecedented publicity being given to homosexuality. (In the following days, handbills publicizing anti-Semitic lectures were distributed in front of his apartment.) Basing his remarks on Lili von Elbe's testimony and on his observation of Moltke in the courtroom, Hirschfeld asserted that

Figure 20 (upper caption) Panic in Weimar. (lower caption) "Wolfgang, let go of my hand! Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld is coming!" From Jugend (Munich), vol. 11, no. 48 (November 19, 1907), p. 1089.
the plaintiff had a "feminine side" that "deviated from the norm; i.e., from the feelings of the majority." In particular, his treatment of his wife, his devotion to Eulenburg, his "sensitivity" for the arts, and his use of make-up (apparently visible in the courtroom) permitted the deduction that Moltke's "unconscious orientation" could "objectively" be labeled "homosexual," even if he had never committed sodomy (Prozesse, pp. 65-68).41

In his closing argument, Harden stressed that he, too, had never charged Moltke with violating the law but only with suffering from a "mawkish, unmanly, sickly condition" and that he had revealed Moltke's orientation not to profit from sensationalism (sales of his journal were up dramatically42) but for political ends.43 No such claim could be made by the political cartoonists, who were shamelessly exploiting the sensational side of the courtroom testimony. One depicted the champagne-drinking bluebloods and military men foragghered in an elite Berlin setting (Figure 18) as bug-eyed, wasp-waisted aliens, at once ominous and pathetically puny.

On October 29, the court handed down its verdict: Moltke's homosexuality had been confirmed and Harden was therefore acquitted of libel, court costs falling to Moltke. According to Hirschfeld, "a storm of moral outrage" swept through the country, but it was curiously two-pronged, directed both at the decadent "upper classes" and at the Jewish bearers of bad tidings.44 A cloud of suspicion settled more firmly then ever over Eulenburg, and Moltke's disgrace seemed irremediable, when an unexpected development took place. The trial was voided due to faulty procedure, and in a reversal of his earlier standpoint, the state prosecutor called for a retrial against Harden, this time on grounds of criminal libel. This announcement came just a few days before the opening of the second major trial, which was to pit Chancellor Bülow against Adolf Brand. It appears that the German judiciary now regarded Harden's acquittal as a serious blunder that tended to undermine public confidence in the regime.45 Convinced that it would be child's play to find Brand guilty of libel in the upcoming case, the judiciary intended to make an example of him, then mount an aggressive prosecution against Harden in the retrial. In its determination to restore respectability to the ruling class, the justice system was henceforth far from impartial.

The Bülow v. Brand case was handled quickly, the entire trial and sentencing occurring on one day, November 6. Once again the courtroom was packed while throngs gathered outside. The first to testify was Brand, whose extensive history of prior convictions was read into the record. This remarkable publicist had founded Der Eigene, the first homosexual periodical in the world, in 1896, and had twice seen its distribution halted by obscenity charges. In 1902, he had founded an organization, the Community of the Special, that, like Hirschfeld's group, aimed at repealing § 175. Yet Hirschfeld and Brand (a former schoolteacher) had a long-standing dispute, for whereas Hirschfeld was a Social Democrat who encouraged the involvement of lesbians and heterosexuals in his organization, Brand was an outspoken anti-Semitic and antifeminist whose organization embraced pedophilia, arrogantly proclaimed the aesthetic and political superiority of male homosexuals over heterosexuals, and employed the anarchistic tactic of direct action.46 Despite their differences, Brand and Hirschfeld—as the
latter noted—were subsequently lumped together or actually confused by the German press.\textsuperscript{47}

Brand was charged with authoring and distributing a libelous leaflet in which he stated that Bülow had been blackmailed because of his homosexuality, alleged that Bülow had embraced and kissed Scheefer at exclusively male gatherings hosted by Eulenburg, and argued that the chancellor was morally obligated as a homosexual to use his influence for the repeal of § 175. On the stand, Brand maintained the truth of his assertions and testified that he had by no means intended to insult Bülow by calling him a homosexual, since he had a positive view of those who shared his own sexual orientation. He had exposed Bülow with the political goal of hastening the repeal of § 175, for he had come to believe that this could only be achieved by creating martyrs—the strategy of “the path over corpses.” Finally, borrowing an argument from Harden’s defense, he claimed that he had only labeled Bülow’s orientation, not accused him of law-breaking.\textsuperscript{48} Bülow took the stand next, airily dismissing Brand’s imputations and demanding an exemplary punishment. He made the gratuitous observation that, while his private life was beyond reproach, the same could not be said of Eulenburg, about whom he had heard unsavory rumors.

The next witness was Eulenburg, who passed over Bülow’s slur in silence and merely asserted that he had never hosted parties such as those described by Brand; he simultaneously used the opportunity to swear, as had Bülow, that he had never violated § 175. He appealed to public sympathy by arguing that Hirschfeld’s sophistic system of sexual “nuances” could turn any innocent friendship into a source of calumny. Brand spoke again, expressing his esteem for Eulenburg’s vision of ideal friendship and inserting a jarring political note: the campaign of vilification against Eulenburg could ultimately be traced to Bülow, who saw in him a rival for the post of chancellor. This assertion, already suggested by Bülow’s disparaging remarks, has been confirmed by diplomatic historians,\textsuperscript{49} but at the moment, Brand was speaking the unspeakable by exposing the chancellor as an intriguer. When Eulenburg was asked whether he gave any credence to Brand’s analysis, the question was instantly ruled out of order by the judge, who claimed to be “determined to keep politics out of this case.”\textsuperscript{50} The proceedings took another unexpected turn when the head of the Berlin vice squad testified that Bülow may indeed have been a blackmail victim, but the prosecution hurriedly dropped this line of inquiry and instead obliged Brand to identify his sources. These were numerous, but the prosecution focused only on one: Brand claimed that Hirschfeld had spoken to a mutual acquaintance about Bülow’s blackmail problem. When Hirschfeld then testified that he had never engaged in such a conversation (and he may well have perjured himself in doing so),\textsuperscript{51} the prosecution closed its case. The judge withdrew briefly and returned with a conviction and an eighteen-month prison sentence for libel.

The Bülow v. Brand trial made a mockery of justice, but the nation was gratified by its outcome and little inclined to scrutinize the procedure. Brand had been railroaded, and he later pointed out that he was the sole individual actually imprisoned as a result of the scandal. He was in any case
convinced that the cause of homosexual emancipation, to which he devoted his life, needed martyrs; and his months in prison served only to strengthen his martyr complex. His fate suggests that public opinion was beginning to rally around the established order and to turn against those Jewish and homosexual publicists who were increasingly perceived not as saviors but as rumormongers and purveyors of filth (see Figures 9 and 15). An element of judicial and media manipulation was at work here, but the public responded eagerly. While the onus fell especially hard on Hirschfeld, Harden was at greater risk because of his upcoming trial on criminal libel charges.

The third trial opened on December 18 and lasted for two weeks, casting a pall over the holiday season. Lili von Elbe was placed back on the stand, and the state prosecutor destroyed the credibility of her earlier testimony by summoning expert medical witnesses who disqualified her as a classical hysterical under the influence of (prescription) drugs. Both Moltke and Eulenburg spoke in defense of the spirit of male friendship and attacked the distinction Harden and Hirschfeld had drawn between homosexual orientation and practices as mere chicanery. Intimidated by the about-face in public opinion and the obvious direction of the proceedings, Hirschfeld was reduced to a national laughing-stock (see Figure 20) when he formally retracted his initial forensic opinion, feebly asserting that it had been predicated on the assumed truth of Elbe’s testimony. Even Harden’s claim to have acted from political motives was now discounted as a red herring, and the verdict handed down on January 4, 1908, became a foregone conclusion: Moltke’s reputation was cleared, while Harden was convicted of libel and sentenced to four months in prison.52

Delighted by this turn of events, the kaiser envisioned a complete rehabilitation of Moltke and Eulenburg, planning for them a greater role than ever in his entourage.53 A semblance of judicial evenhandedness was created later that month when Lynar was convicted and Hohenau acquitted by a court-martial.54 The German press breathed a sanctimonious sigh of relief that public discussion of sexual matters was at an end and braced itself for a decline in sales to its sensation-hungry readership.55 After six months of revelations and two months of trials, most observers prematurely concluded that the Eulenburg Affair was over. To be sure, the scandal had taken its toll: in the winter of 1908, all of the major parties involved—Moltke, Lili von Elbe, Eulenburg, Harden, Hirschfeld, Brand—suffered illnesses brought on by sheer exhaustion, while the kaiser was near a nervous breakdown.56 But the public underestimated the resourcefulness of Harden, who was motivated not just by opposition to the rehabilitated camarilla but now, as well, by vengeance.

By testifying under oath in the second and third trials that he had never violated § 175, Eulenburg had perjured himself.57 Harden faced the challenge of producing incontrovertible evidence so as to force the state prosecutor into action. In an elaborate legal ruse, Harden colluded with an ally, the Bavarian editor Anton Stadele, who published a fraudulent article alleging that Harden had received a million marks in hush money from Eulenburg to desist in his attacks. Harden then sued Stadele for libel and
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turned the court proceedings into a forum for presenting his evidence on Euleenburg. Arranging for a trial outside of Berlin, in anti-Prussian Munich, was also part of the devious strategy.

With little advance fanfare in the press, the Harden-Städele trial was convened and completed on April 21, 1908. Harden had subpoenaed Georg Riedel, a Munich milkman, and Jakob Ernst, a Starnberg farmer and sometime fisherman on the Bavarian lakes where Euleenburg had vacationed in earlier years. Since the statute of limitations had expired, Riedel freely admitted that in 1881, while serving in the military, he had once engaged in sexual relations with Euleenburg, who later made him gifts of money and also introduced him to Moltke. The second witness, Ernst, had more on his conscience and initially denied any wrongdoing. But persuaded by the judge that swearing a false oath would lead to punishments in this world and the hereafter, he haltingly confessed that in 1883, as a nineteen-year-old, he had likewise been seduced by Euleenburg (see Figure 7). Ernst later revealed that this incident initiated a long-term relationship with the Prince that had continued until quite recently (see Figure 21).

Figure 21 (caption above) On Euleenburg’s Track. (caption below) “It was on this spot that the prince first confessed his love to me!” From Simplicissimus (Munich), vol. 13, no. 10 (June 8, 1908), p. 165; original in color.
During these years, Ernst had led a double but apparently charmed life as a respectable family man in Starnberg and as Eulenburg’s intimate companion in Liebenberg, Munich, Berlin and on princely vacations in Garmisch, Meran, Zurich, Rome, the Riviera, and Egypt. The court’s verdict was anticlimactic: Städele was convicted of libel and sentenced to a 100-mark fine (which was covertly reimbursed by Harden).

Harden’s real victory became evident in the stunned public reaction to the Munich trial. Gradually, a welter of opinions began to emerge. To some, Eulenburg seemed disgraced beyond repair; one close friend forthrightly suggested that he commit suicide. Others gave credence to Eulenburg’s claim that Riedel and Ernst must have been paid by unknown enemies to give false testimony; Harden was suspect to many. And finally, public response was characterized by a certain jadedness, a conspicuous lack of interest when compared with the high emotions aroused by the first trials. Nonetheless, the socialists put the judiciary on notice that they would be closely monitoring the state prosecutor’s response for signs of class justice, a legal double standard for aristocrats and commoners.

With considerable reluctance, the state prosecutor moved into action: Eulenburg was arraigned on perjury charges on May 7, 1908, and two weeks later the Imperial Supreme Court overturned Harden’s libel conviction in the Moltke case on procedural and substantive grounds and called for a second retrial.

The fifth major trial of the scandal was convened in Berlin on June 29, after Eulenburg had unsuccessfully sought a postponement due to ill health. The state prosecutor introduced as evidence incriminating books and correspondence confiscated at Liebenberg castle, including one letter to Ernst written by Eulenburg prior to the Munich trial, urging him to reveal nothing. Ernst was, in fact, the prosecution’s star witness, turning at one point to Eulenburg and uttering in Bavarian dialect: “By God Almighty, Your Excellency, you can’t deny that the two of us did it.... Excellency, it’s true. We two haven’t got a chance in the world.” So enfeebled that he had to be carried into the court on a litter, Eulenburg continued to protest his innocence even when confronted with ten witnesses summoned by the prosecution—including three police officers, two former stewards on the royal yacht Hohenzollern, and a court servant who testified to having observed Eulenburg through a keyhole in 1887. The prosecution planned to call another thirty witnesses, but the defendant collapsed during a recess and was declared dangerously ill by medical attendants. Determined to press to a close, the judge resumed the trial on July 17 in Eulenburg’s hospital. When the defendant passed out during the hearing, the judge relented and postponed further hearings until Eulenburg’s health improved. Two months later he was provisionally released from the court’s custody on posting a bond of 100 marks and returned to his Liebenberg estate, where he was warmly received by his loyal tenants and gave interviews protesting his innocence.

Eulenburg’s ailment enabled a broad sector of the German public to accept the fact that the trial was repeatedly postponed—and ultimately never concluded. While they were convinced that his illness was feigned, even the socialists were not entirely displeased, since the Eulenburg case
could serve as an object lesson in class justice only as long as he was not convicted. When he was audacious enough to vacation at a foreign spa, press grumbling led the judge to reconvene the trial on July 7, 1909, almost a year after its postponement. But when Eulenburg fainted one hour into the proceedings, he was given a conditional postponement: he was to undergo a medical examination at six-month intervals to determine whether he was fit to stand trial. This charade continued for a decade, when the trial was indefinitely postponed. He died in 1921.

The final trial of the scandal—the third between Moltke and Harden—received far less media attention than the earlier ones. It was originally scheduled for November of 1908 (the time of the Daily Telegraph affair), but was delayed until the following April. Harden was again convicted of libel and sentenced to a pay a fine of 600 marks plus court costs, which now amounted to 40,000 marks. Unlike Eulenburg, Moltke was thus rehabilitated, and Harden continued to fret over the homosexual influence of Moltke and “the many other affiliates of the same caliber, who are still up there.”64 As litigious as ever, he fully intended to appeal the verdict but allowed himself to be talked out of it by Chancellor Bülow, who argued that they had both achieved their goal by eliminating Eulenburg and that further trials dealing with homosexuality would be detrimental to the national interest. Harden was finally satisfied with a formal acknowledgment that he had acted out of “patriotic considerations” and a full reimbursement for his fines, secretly paid by the Imperial Chancellery. Fifteen years later, Harden admitted to Magnus Hirschfeld that initiating the Eulenburg Affair had been the greatest political mistake of his career.65 He regretfully came to realize that Eulenburg had exercised a moderating influence on the kaiser and that his elimination had set Germany on a war course. And although he never said so, Hirschfeld may well have regarded his involvement in the libel trials as the gravest misstep of his career, too.

Effects on the German Image

Just a few days after the opening of the first trial in the three-year scandal, a leading Berlin daily described it as a “forensic drama claiming universal attention at home and abroad.”66 A month later, one Reichstag delegate asserted that the courtroom revelations quite properly filled “the entire German people with revulsion and loathing” but noted with concern that “these matters, naturally blown up, are entering the foreign press and there producing extremely odd views about German morality and the future of Germany.”67 The Eulenburg Affair was thus a double crisis, damaging both national self-image and the international image of Germany; but while the former was subject to a certain amount of manipulation, the latter seemed
exasperatingly beyond control. This concern was captured in one cartoon, "The Effect Abroad" (Figure 22). Here two English tourists in Venice are struck by the appearance of a group of German women, and one concludes that their egregious homeliness is what drives German men to homosexuality. The thinly veiled misogyny of this cartoon points simultaneously to the thoroughgoing exclusion of women from the discourses of the scandal (the courtroom silencing of Lili von Elbe being the locus classicus) and to the attempt to find a scapegoat (be it Jews, homosexuals, or women) for the nation's image problem.

Figure 22 (caption above) The Effect Abroad. (caption below) "Now I understand why homosexuality is so widespread in Germany!" From Simplicissimus (Munich), vol. 13, no. 8 (May 25, 1908), p. 113; original in color.

Die Wirkung auf das Ausland

"Jetzt verstehe ich, warum sich die Homosexualität in Deutschland so verbreitet!"
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While a comprehensive survey of the international coverage of the scandal is beyond the scope of this essay, its outlines can briefly be limned. Press coverage in the United States was rather limited and ranged from the guarded reportage of the *New York Times* to greater sensationalism in the era’s yellow press. The French response was far more extensive because it dealt with an additional dimension: Raymond Lecomte, a friend of Eulenburg and councillor at the French Embassy in Berlin, was directly implicated in the scandal by Harden (see Figure 14). He claimed that as a result of a meeting between Lecomte and the kaiser at a Liebenberg shoot in 1906, the French went to the Algeciras Conference with the inside knowledge that Germany would not go to war with France over hegemony in Morocco. When Harden published his accusation, Lecomte—dubbed “king of the pederasts”—was hastily recalled to Paris, but only to be rewarded with a post in another embassy. In light of ingrained Franco-Prussian hostility, it is scarcely surprising that the French press gloated over Germany’s embarrassment; homosexuality was in any case already termed “le vice allemand.” Paris cartoonists took special pleasure in lampooning the perverse esprit of the army beyond the Rhine (see Figures 23, 24, 25). Beneath the obvious
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Figure 23 (caption above) The Arny Beyond the Rhine. (caption below) Well, what can you do about it? A poor soldier always has to risk his ass. From *Le Rire rouge* (Paris), vol. 13 (November 23, 1907).
Figure 24 (caption below) Byzantium in Germany. From *Fantasio* (Paris), vol. 2 (November 15, 1907).

Figure 25 (caption below) We don't want no antimilitarists here! We hold the firm seat of our soldiers' order and morality in respect. From *L'Assiette au beurre* (Paris), no. 346 (November 16, 1907).
Schadenfreude lurked the gleam of hope that the foe could be vanquished in the next war and, on a deeper level, the pervasive fear that France itself was suffering from decadence. Overall, the Eulenburg Affair was of such consuming interest to France that it remains the only country to have produced monographs on the subject. Switzerland and Belgium tried to maintain a certain neutrality, but cartoons from these countries (Figures 7, 9, 11) show the opprobrium they attached to homosexuality. In contrast, the Italian treatment tended more clearly to the sensational (see Figure 8).

Because they were yoked by a shared cultural heritage and an alliance that led to the Axis in World War I, Austria and Germany closely converged in their reactions to the scandal (see Figures 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 32, 39, 41). Still, the Austrian cartoonists enjoyed greater freedom in linking the kaiser with the scandal, and pictorial anti-Semitism was more openly aggressive in Vienna than in Berlin (see Figure 5). As indicated by the complete lack of cartoon coverage in Punch, the British response was initially quite restrained and tactful, even if due only to prudishness; but as enmity between the countries grew, various English publicists demonstrated that the scandal was by no means forgotten. In the final year of World War I, the English "libel case of the century" began with the remarkable assertion that Germany was ruled by a homosexual clique whose secret agents had debauched thousands of English men and women who now obeyed orders from Potsdam. The Eulenburg Affair was recalled during the war not just in Britain: cartoonists in both France and Italy revived motifs from the era of the scandal, portraying the German army as perversely effeminate and thus easily defeated. Yet the memory persisted longer at home than abroad: in the early 1930's, antifascist German cartoonists once again used the selfsame images to attack Ernst Röhm's SA, and both Hirschfeld and Hitler himself remarked on the historical parallel. Fascists tended to perpetuate the anti-Semitic interpretation of the Eulenburg Affair and held up Harden and Hirschfeld as prime examples of a supposed Jewish conspiracy against German morals.

Hitler's recollection of the scandal is indicative of the abiding damage it inflicted to the German self-image. Harden's voice was only one in a chorus that harped on the theme of "national disgrace," an outlook that also found frequent pictorial expression. Cartoonists employed a variety of symbolic figures to invoke the nation. The sole female representative was Germania, tellingly portrayed doing women's work—sweeping and washing—to cleanse the homeland (see Figures 3 and 7). The nation's other avatars were all men and included the German Michel in his nightcap (see Figure 13), the hero Siegfried, Germany's legendary dragonslayer (see Figure 16), and the medieval Kaiser Barbarossa (see Figure 26), of whom legend said that he had not died but instead slept in a mountain fastness encircled by ravens that would awaken him to do battle in the hour of Germany's greatest need. In addition to these mythical and allegorical figures, cartoonists also invoked historical figures to represent the nation. An amusing example is the statue of Goethe and Schiller in Weimar (see Figure 20). A Detmold statue of Hermann, the German leader whose warriors defeated three Roman legions in the year 9, figures similarly in
another cartoon. In both cases Hirschfeld is shown questioning the normalcy of these historical giants; and indeed, articles published by Hirschfeld did explore the homosexual aspect of the writings of Goethe and Schiller.80

The most striking feature shared by these male national symbols is their apparent ineffectualness in the face of a moral transformation they can scarcely begin to comprehend. Germania alone rolls up her sleeves and resolutely sets about cleaning up the mess, whereas the men all embody one variant or another of powerlessness. Be it the German Michel timorously examining a dragon that may not be dead, the dragonslayer Siegfried who belongs to an heroic past now irretrievably lost, Barbarossa still recumbent in his cavern, or Goethe and Schiller frozen in their statuesque but compromising embrace: these national symbols evoke a proud cultural heritage now perceived as crumbling under the onslaught of modernity. Not just in Germany but also in France and England, contemporaries experienced the
Figure 27 (caption above) Disappointed.
(caption below) "Oh, Oscar, you’re just an ordinary plebian—not even the least bit homosexual!" From Der wahre Jacob (Stuttgart), no. 560 (January 7, 1908), p. 5683.

Figure 28 (caption above) Sensation in the Café Moderne.
(caption below) A married couple is coming! From Wiener Caricaturen (Vienna), vol. 27, no. 44 (November 3, 1907).
era of the turn of the century as under assault by the accelerating tempo of change, and the rush of time brought in its wake new diseases of civilization: bad nerves, homosexuality, and degeneracy of all sorts. One Viennese cartoon occasioned by the Eulenburg Affair (see Figure 28) features an urban gathering place significantly named “Café Moderne” whose habitués are taken aback by the arrival of a heterosexual couple; the elongated head of the seated figure in the center of the cartoon is akin to the alien physiognomy of the Berlin aristocrats in another Viennese cartoon (Figure 18).

In an article entitled “Who Is to Blame?” Hirschfeld argued that the sensational publicity surrounding the Eulenburg Affair had given rise to three related but distinct misconceptions. First, he rejected the notion that “degeneration, a process of decay” was more advanced in Germany than elsewhere. This welcome assurance was widely echoed, often in a stridently xenophobic tone, by newspaper editorialists, Reichstag speakers, and the like. Secondly, he described as mistaken the impression that homosexuality was more prevalent among the aristocracy than among commoners. While upper- and middle-class apologists for the status quo accepted and repeated the assertion, it did not find universal acceptance. Some members of the educated middle class suggested that centuries of intermarriage among German bluebloods had resulted in hereditary degeneracy, of which homosexuality was one manifestation, while others—including various middle- and working-class cartoonists—saw it simply as the latest variation on an age-old theme: the aristocracy’s sexual license, at once despised and envied (see Figures 18 and 27). And thirdly, Hirschfeld claimed that contrary to popular belief, homosexuality was no more widespread at present than it had been in the past. With this thesis he stood virtually alone.

A disturbing increase in the occurrence of “unnatural crimes” had been noted by cultural critics shortly after the founding of the Second Reich, and by 1908 one alarmed editorialist asserted that the logical consequence of repealing antisodomy statutes would be the extinction of the human race. The Eulenburg Affair prompted Adolf Stöcker, court chaplain under Kaiser Wilhelm I and the foremost anti-Semitic politician in the Reichstag, to argue that the growth of homosexuality was of a piece with the rise of the women’s emancipation movement (see Figure 37) and the spread of pornography. From a conservative viewpoint, burgeoning moral depravity seemed to imperil the very foundations of society: enclaves of sexual deviates were perceived as a symptom of the ills of modernity (see Figures 18, 28, 35). This outlook found expression in cartoons hearkening back to a healthier past with a “Then and Now” schema (Figure 29; see also Figure 5). In a remarkable number of instances, General Kuno von Moltke was derisively contrasted with military heroes of the nation’s glorious past: Siegfried (Figure 16); Field Marshal C. L. von Blücher, who had vanquished Napoleon (Figure 30); and his namesake, General Helmuth von Moltke, the victorious commander in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 (Figure 31).

The overwhelming prevalence of military themes in the cartoons mirrors both the imperial preoccupations of the era and the concern that the army was extremely susceptible to corruption. Officers quite routinely subjected
enlisted men to corporal abuse of various sorts. Extended into the sexual sphere, however, abuse not only undermined the status of rank but also sexualized the military, thus violating a major taboo (see Figures 32 and 33). Soldiers functioned as a particular variant of the national symbol, and although their uniforms were actually designed with aesthetic criteria in mind—and thus fostered fetishization as disembodied male power—the stereotype of the soldier was supposed to transcend sexuality by submitting.
Figure 32 (caption below) As we hear, the Prussian medal pour le mérite is to be worn thus in the future. From Neue Glühlichter (Vienna), vol. 10, no. 304.24 (November 20, 1907), p. [4].

Figure 31 Postcard from the scandal era, with a caption in doggerel. 1870: Moltke lived then, a truly brave man; he always attacked head-on. 1907: Today's Moltke, from what we hear, always attacks—from the “rear”! From Richard Linsert, Kabale und Liebe (Berlin: Man, [1931]), facing p. 474.
aggressiveness to discipline, reshaping it to serve the national interest. In this respect soldiers were not unlike criminals, and the army and the prison were perhaps the two paramount institutions for controlling and regulating the lives of the lower class.

The years immediately prior to the Eulenburg Affair had witnessed a proliferation of discourses—journalistic exposés, novels, plays, autobiographies—suggesting that decay of the officers’ code of honor and demoralization of troop discipline were undermining military preparedness. Still, none of this had adequately prepared the nation for Harden’s assertion that “entire cavalry regiments [were] infested with homosexuality.” Various Reichstag speakers rose to defend the spirit of Potsdam, but their confidence in the army was badly shaken by Harden’s disclosure that uniformed soldiers were flagrantly prostituting themselves in certain promenades of Berlin, including the prestigious Victory Boulevard (clearly discernable in
Figure 19. The magnitude of the problem became apparent only after Harden revealed that the minister of police himself had been accosted while taking an evening stroll (see Figure 34).97

The barrage of charges reached such intensity that the minister of war, General Karl von Einem, was compelled to deliver a rambling report to the Reichstag in which he variously asserted that there was no problem, that a problem did exist but was entirely attributable to civilian “rascals” (see Figure 19), and that the problem would be resolved by heightening disciplinary control of the soldiers. Any officer guilty of homosexual conduct, he argued, dishonored himself and thereby forfeited the respect of his troops; the resulting contempt for one’s superior undermined the authority of the officer corps:

Figure 34 (caption above) Nightlife in Potsdam. (caption below) “Say, big fellow, want to come along?” From Der wahre Jacob (Stuttgart), no. 557 (November 26, 1907), p. 5616; original in color.

Nachtleben in Potsdam.
That cannot and must not be. If such a man with such feelings should be lurking in the army, I command him: Resign your commission, get out, for you do not belong in our ranks! [Bravo!] If, however, he should be caught, then, gentlemen, regardless of who he may be, regardless of his post, he must be destroyed. [Bravo!]92

The trials of the Eulenburg Affair were indeed conducted against a somber tattoo of resignations, suicides, and courts-martial. Ironically, as Hirschfeld noted,93 the publicity given these cases may have done more to erode than to restore the honor code and discipline for which the officer corps had traditionally been respected—and feared.

**Sexual Practices and Identities**

Just what sort of men did the minister of war want removed from the officer corps? The answer was not nearly so straightforward as it might at first seem, for a satisfactory definition of sexual normalcy and abnormalcy was still evolving.94 Harden might thunder in court, “Let us draw a clear line between men like Eulenburg, Hohenau, Moltke, and the men of Germany!” but the precise border seemed elusive to many.95 The scandal contributed significantly to publicizing and legitimating the embryonic discipline of sexology, which accounts for the grudging respect accorded Dr. Hirschfeld; not coincidentally, he founded the *Journal of Sexology (Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft)* in 1908. As he noted, the very word “homosexuality” was either lacking in standard dictionaries or was hastily included in the latest editions; it had been coined in 1869 and, until the Eulenburg Affair, belonged exclusively to the parlance of forensic medicine. Throughout the trials, he complained, the term was continually confused with “pederasty” (which entailed two taboos, same-sex practices with minors), “unnatural vice” (the specific practices criminalized by §175), and a host of pungent colloquialisms.96

In the first trial of the scandal, it will be recalled, Hirschfeld had argued—and the court had agreed—that Moltke was neither a pederast nor a felon but instead a homosexual, i.e., an effeminate man, a person who confounded sex-role stereotypes by virtue of his emotionality, passivity, artistic temperament, emotional attachment to men, and so on. By demonstrating the existence of a psychological deviance which did not necessarily find expression in sexual behavior, Hirschfeld naively hoped to advance the cause of enlightened tolerance; but the court’s verdict had precisely the opposite effect. While the distinction between homosexuality and heterosexuality was new and arcane, a clear boundary between masculinity and femininity had been established in the nineteenth century,97 and public consternation over the violation of the latter norm was far more severe than Hirschfeld had anticipated. In an era that was obsessed with the imperialist projection of such masculine traits as strength, valor, hardness, and military might, the violation or nonviolation of §175 became a secondary concern while homosexuality—understood as male effeminacy—became a potent
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metaphor in political discourse.\textsuperscript{96} This, of course, is why Harden had been able to exploit the issue in the first place, and why he produced evidence of Eulenburg's misconduct only when his hand was forced. Harden's final revelations rendered moot the distinction, so painstakingly constructed by Hirschfeld, between sexual orientation and conduct.

The dispassionate discourse of a sexological expert was drowned out by the saber-rattling rhetoric of sexual politics on a grander scale than Hirschfeld had imagined possible, but this does not mean that his standpoint was flawed or illogical—simply that more was at stake than an academic question.\textsuperscript{97} In the rather abstruse sense intended by Hirschfeld, Moltke and Eulenburg undoubtedly were homosexual and would have been so even if they had been totally sexually abstinent. In private correspondence, Eulenburg described himself as combining "feminine feeling with masculine activity"; he was proud, perhaps inordinately so, of his artistic "sensibility and finer organization," precisely the traits that appealed to Kaiser Wilhelm.\textsuperscript{100} Moltke, too, was characterized by a close friend as deficient in the "dash," "masculinity," and "toughness" of the Kaiser's other military advisors,\textsuperscript{101} but neither he nor Eulenburg thought of himself as a homosexual. In a remarkably candid and revealing letter to Moltke written prior to the first trial, Eulenburg struggled to defend his admittedly old-fashioned conception of their affinity against the new-fangled label:

At the moment when the most impudent example of the modern age, a Harden, criticized our nature, demeaned our ideal friendship, stripped naked the form of our thinking and feeling—which for so many years of our lives, recognized by our contemporaries, we had scarcely given any thought to because we quite properly regarded it as something obvious and natural—at that moment, the modern age, laughing cold-bloodedly, broke our necks.... The new concepts of sensuality and love stamped our nature as weak, even unhealthily weak. And yet we were also sensual; certainly no less than the moderns. But this area lay strictly segregated, did not push forward as an end in itself. Family, art, friendship, and all our ideals were completely detached from sensuality and from that which we regarded only as dirt, even if it might have ruled us here or there in that unconscious reciprocity which constitutes "mankind."\textsuperscript{102}

It would be all too pat to interpret the terms "ideal friendship" or "art" as mere euphemisms for homosexuality; in fact, the code word here is "dirt." This letter suggests that these two aristocrats—and others of their estate—made a clean break between homosexual and what might be termed homosocial relations, strictly confining the former to contacts with social inferiors and cultivating the latter with like-minded peers. They did not identify themselves as homosexuals because their occasional sexual escapades played at most a subordinate role in their lives.
When Eulenburg, trained as a lawyer, knowingly perjured himself by swearing that he had never violated § 175, he may have assuaged his conscience by reasoning that only relations in high society were at issue, and here he was no more and no less than a devoted father, husband, and friend. He was not dissembling when he swore in court:

In my youth I was an enthusiastic friend. I am proud of having had good friends.... The best thing we Germans have is friendship, and loyal friendship has always stood in high regard. I have had enthusiastic friendships, I have written letters that overflow with enthusiastic feelings, and I don't reproach myself for it at all. Surely we know the letters of great heroes, Goethe and so on, which are effusive. I have written such letters, too, but there was never anything wicked, evil, filthy in them.  

When Hirschfeld remarked that the language of Goethe's era was no longer appropriate "in our technological and military age," Eulenburg once again defended his ideal vision of friendship against sexual inferences in emphatic terms: "This is a slam at German friendship, it's a poison that's being trickled into friendship, no one is safe, this is a betrayal of Germany!" And indeed, Hirschfeld may have underestimated the extent to which forms of expression regarded as outmoded by the middle class were perpetuated within the aristocracy, whose very station in life derived from and was legitimated by tradition.

If class distinctions were so central in Eulenburg's life that they allowed him to trivialize his felonies as mere peccadillos and to resist the homosexual label, they likewise allowed Jakob Ernst to regard his extramarital intimacies as a separate sphere that did not impinge on his identity as a God-fearing Bavarian family man—blessed with good fortune, thanks to the generous prince. Harden's researches revealed that Ernst's liaison with Eulenburg was common knowledge in the village of Starnberg. Ernst had long been so proud of his association with the prince that he bragged of it to his neighbors, who appear to have been more awed than outraged: no one had ever brought the affair to the attention of the district attorney. Ernst's court confession was highly revealing:

If I have to say it: what people say is true. What it's called I don't know. He taught it to me. Having fun. Fooling around. I don't know of no real name for it. When we went rowing we just did it in the boat. He started it. How would I have ever dared? With such a fine gentleman. And I didn't know anything about it. First he asked me if I had a girlfriend. Then it went on from there.

It proved easier to extract a confession from Ernst than from Eulenburg, for the simple farmer was eager to oblige the court—just as he had proved
willing to oblige "a fine gentleman." And unlike the prince, he had never cultivated a secret life.

Homosexual relations with the lower orders may have been regarded by the noblemen involved as an "obvious and natural" prerogative, but this outlook was anathema to the middle class, which—as Foucault noted—supplanted the aristocratic focus on blood with the bourgeois focus on sex (in German, one type of Geschlecht with another type of Geschlecht), genealogy with morality. The German bourgeoisie had touted its moral superiority to the frivolity and cavalier licentiousness of the aristocracy beginning in the eighteenth century, and during the nineteenth it extended its condemnation to the moral turpitude of the proletariat. By exposing sexual liaisons between officers and enlisted men, a prince and a farmer, middle-class journalists suggested that two of the three pillars of society were shot through with moral rot and could precipitate national ruin. One liberal, middle-class delegate to the Reichstag proclaimed the scandal a portent of a relapse into barbarism; homosexuality was a contagion that could attain epidemic proportions and wipe out culture. His relatively enlightened standpoint was evident in his use of the medical model, describing homosexuality as a sickness rather than a sin.

If homosexuality came to be regarded as perilous because it crossed class lines, it also came to be seen as traitorous because it crossed national frontiers. Eulenburg’s French connection confirmed for Harden Bismarck’s dire warning that the cinaedi constituted an international association in much the same way as the socialists—those “fellows without a fatherland.” The homosexuals’ secret “lodge,” Harden asserted, was stronger than freemasonry and leaped over “the walls of creed, nation, and class” to create a “fraternity” that sneeringly regarded “normals as a lower form of life. . . . It is a different world than ours, with a different moral code, a different set of values.” Since homosexuals regarded heterosexuals as the “common enemy” and were seeking “gradually [to] emasculate our courageous master race before the nation notices what is happening,” Harden called for a “fight to the death” with this “powerful group.” Eulenburg seemed to personify the danger: he was “the amoureux who has toyed with scepters and thrashed in lustful ecstasy on the sweaty sheets of his coachman.”

Harden’s mordant attacks on Eulenburg are particularly noteworthy because they signalled a complete about-face. In 1898, Harden had become the first German editor to support the campaign for homosexual emancipation led by Hirschfeld. Articles by Harden, Hirschfeld, and others in Die Zukunft had called for the repeal of § 175 and for greater tolerance toward these “martyrs of a misguided sexual drive” who deserved “neither punishment nor contempt.” He claimed that the flood of hate mail he received during the Eulenburg Affair from homosexuals in all walks of life convinced him that this tolerance was entirely misplaced, and his change of outlook matched a broader shift in middle-class attitudes toward homosexuality and sexuality in general. At the beginning of the scandal, Hirschfeld noted with dismay that the most vehement spokesmen of “the antihomosexual movement” came precisely from “the educated middle class,” and he thanked the German working class and socialist delegates.
in the Reichstag for their continued support in the campaign to repeal § 175. By the scandal’s end, however, the “psychic epidemic” of homophobia had spread even to the far left.\textsuperscript{115} It remained for the right-wing fanatic Dr. Willibald Hentschel to proclaim that the Eulenburg Affair had been beneficial if it had driven homosexuals to poverty and to suicide, and to describe the extermination of all homosexuals a desideratum of German society.\textsuperscript{116}

The scandal not only scuttled the campaign to repeal § 175 but led to far harsher enforcement of the law and efforts to strengthen and extend it.\textsuperscript{117} Whereas the existing statute punished homosexual acts only between men, a motion introduced by the Catholic-oriented Center Party sought to align § 175 with the corresponding Austrian law, which included lesbians (see Figure 35).\textsuperscript{118} With the imprisonment of Adolf Brand and the discreditizing of Hirschfeld as a “monomaniac” who was lucky “not to be tarred and feathered,”\textsuperscript{119} the homosexual emancipation movement entered a period of enforced quiescence from which it would not recover until after the kaiser’s abdication in 1918. The women’s movement was also profoundly affected by the moral purity campaign advanced with evangelical fervor in the wake of the Eulenburg Affair. In 1908, a change of leadership in the League of German Women’s Organizations replaced its progressive program of sexual self-determination with a racist and nationalist interpretation of women’s sexuality that sought to increase the German birthrate.\textsuperscript{120} Those few homo-

\textbf{Figure 35} (caption above) Spring Excursion of a Berlin Ladies’ Club. (caption below) “Never, my sweet, will a man break up our love.” “Never, dearheart!—Unless it’s a policeman.” From \textit{Simplicissimus} (Munich), vol. 14, no. 7 (May 17, 1909), p. 106; original in color.
sexuals and feminists who continued to agitate for sexual emancipation were regarded as threats to the social order and mocked in strikingly similar imagery (see Figures 36 and 37).

Repugnance at the inversion of traditional sex roles was particularly evident in the frequent use of animal and excremental metaphors for homosexuality in both the discourses and the cartoons occasioned by the scandal. This radically dehumanizing rhetoric reached a high point when one liberal Reichstag delegate, Dr. Siegfried Heckscher, declared that "homosexuality is dog morality," a slogan that was universally quoted and elaborated upon in the German press. Eulenburg himself added ammunition to the antihomosexual arsenal when he swore that he had never engaged in "swinish" or "filthy" conduct, but the impetus had actually

Figure 36 (caption above) Berlin Election Campaign. (caption below) A hotly contested race is taking shape in the red-light district around Tauentzienstrasse, where the woman candidate is being challenged by agitators in the cocaine-infested homosexual bars. From Simplicissimus; here reproduced from Richard Linsert, Kabale und Liebe (Berlin: Man, 1931) facing p. 152.
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Figure 37 (caption above) New Goals in the Women’s Movement. (caption below) “Ladies! We can struggle effectively and successfully against the emancipation of men in one way only: by simply gunning the bastards down.” From Simplicissimus (Munich), vol. 15, no. 46 (February 3, 1911), p. 765; original in color.

been given on the first day of the first trial, when Lili von Elbe offered the shocking testimony that her ex-husband had called women “toilets” and termed marriage “a swinish institution” (“eine Schweinerei”) (Prozesse, pp. 29–30). Outraged, the virtually universal defenders of womanhood and family life responded in kind, and even the restrained Vossische Zeitung, the Berlin newspaper of record, rose to the occasion by coining the epithet “cloaca maxima” for Hirschfeld, slyly parodying the sexologist’s Latinate neologisms.123

Dozens of cartoons employed dogs (see Figure 15), pigs (see Figures 8, 26), and excrement (see Figures 3, 8, 9, 15), and an unusual degree of inventiveness must be granted to the Swiss artist who actually depicted a Schweinehund (pig-dog), that mythical beast often invoked but never seen in
German-speaking lands (see Figure 11). Such a monster would obviously have to be the offspring of an unnatural pairing, and this too was portrayed (see Figure 38). The use of animal and excremental motifs was by no means limited to German cartoons: one from France (see Figure 25) featured a pig-faced man, effectively completing the transformation of human into subhuman. While well-known in the history of racism, this phenomenon has an additional dimension in connection with homosexuality: the term “sodomy” has comprised both bestiality and homosexuality throughout the history of Christian Europe (see Figure 14). During the Middle Ages and Renaissance, sodomy was further so closely linked with heresy and witchcraft that at times the terms were virtually synonymous; by equating homosexuality with treason, Harden was merely updating this legacy. The cartoons’ animal images are invested with a profoundly atavistic quality that may disclose a psychological fear of magical destruction of the body image; if so, such anxieties could only have been aggravated by Harden’s revelation that Eulenburg dabbled in the occult.

By describing and depicting homosexuality as unnatural, subhuman, animalistic—in short, as the radical Other—defenders of the status quo were striving to counteract the scandal’s deleterious effects, not merely on the national image, but also on the sexual awareness and potential conduct of the German people. Commentators repeatedly lamented the loss of innocence precipitated by unprecedented discussion of sexual matters. The cartoons themselves offered something qualitatively new: the first depictions in public circulation of homosexuals. Lili von Elbe spoke for many when she testified that she had not suspected her then husband of homosexuality because its very existence had been unknown to her, and one editorialist contrasted the small “circle of cognoscenti” with “the vast majority of people who heretofore knew nothing of all this.” Even Ernst confessed that he knew “no real name” for “it.” With the courtroom extraction of sexual truths and the virtually unimpeded flow of journalistic reportage (see Figure 21), newspapers began to take on a pornographic

Figure 38 (caption above) Head to Head. (caption below) “My soulmate, my old boy, my one and only puppy.” From Lustige Blätter (Berlin), vol. 22, no. 45 (November 5, 1907), p. 9.
quality. Smut had been defined by a Reichstag commission in 1904 as a psychic danger to the community certain to confuse the hearts and minds of young people and thus lead to a loss of idealism and to moral decay. In a remarkable anticipation of one Reichstag delegate’s complaint that newspapers could not longer be left lying where they could be found by children, one editor protested that he was sadly compelled to print the news and helpfully suggested that family fathers simply remove the offending pages.

It is fair to say that for at least a few months, the Eulenburg Affair brought homo sexuality to the forefront of national discussion, prompting individuals to reflect on themselves and others in light of new knowledge. In one of his numerous case studies, Hirschfeld reported on a woman who correctly surmised her husband’s homosexual orientation after reading about Moltke’s marriage, and this sort of family crisis also found its way into cartoons (see Figure 39). Attitudes and forms of behavior that had heretofore been

Figure 39 (caption above) Paragraph 175. (caption below) “I’m afraid that my wife, whom I’ve been neglecting for years, may now regard me as a homosexual…” “Come, come, old chap, in a man of your age it will be attributed to natural causes.”

From Wiener Caricaturen (Vienna), vol. 27, no. 44 (November 3, 1907), p. 8.

Paragraph 175.
quite acceptable now became suspect (see Figure 40), and parents were reluctant to allow their sons to enter the military or even to move from the country to the city (see Figure 41). One Reichstag delegate expressed the most deep-seated fear when he argued:

There can be no doubt that many hundreds and thousands of people who earlier hadn't the foggiest notion of the things now being discussed in public will, after having been enlightened about these things, be tempted to try them out with their own bodies.\footnote{132}

With rare directness, this politician's remark points to what Foucault described as the nub of sexual politics: "the fact that sex is located at the point of intersection of the discipline of the body and the control of the population."\footnote{133}

Figure 40 (caption above) Stimulus. (caption below) Father: "The beauty of the male figure far surpasses that of the female." Daughter: "What, papa, you, too?" From Schalk (Leipzig), November 1907.
Figure 41 (caption above) In the country. (caption below) Mother (weeping): “Farewell, Leni, nothing can happen to you, just be well. But you, Franz, watch out that you withstand temptation in the big city.” From Der Flesh (Vienna), undated special issue on § 175 (ca. November 1907), p. 8.

The biopolitical aim of the cartoons—as of the discourses that linked homosexuality with treason and the heightened enforcement of § 175—was the total suppression of homosexuality. But paradoxically, these images, discourses, and practices may well have incited many individuals to follow through on desires they had heretofore ignored or suppressed; indeed, desire itself may have been created. And for others who had led double lives up to this point, the scandal led to a new possibility for conceptualizing their secret vices and arriving at a fundamentally new identity. If this be true, then Hirschfeld was simply wrong when he claimed that homosexuality was no more widespread in the present than in the past. Thus the effect of the Eulenburg Affair was not exclusively repressive: despite its role in the outbreak of World War I, despite the campaign for moral rearmament, the anti-Semitic undertones, the heightening of military discipline, the concern about decadence, and the exhortations to middle-class morality, a subtle dialectic was at work tending to proliferate sexual practices and identities.
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