

Chapter 8

CLASS, YOUTH, AND SEXUALITY IN THE
CONSTRUCTION OF THE *LUSTMÖRDER*

The 1928 Murder Trial of Karl Hussmann

Eva Bischoff and Daniel Siemens



In the early morning of 23 March 1928, two workers who were on their way to their shift discovered a body in front of the house at Schultenstrasse 11 in Gladbeck, a small town in the northern part of the industrial district of the Ruhr.¹ The men woke the physician Dr. Lutter, who lived close by. Dr. Lutter, after realizing that the person in question was beyond his help, went to his friend Adolf Daube, headmaster [*Rektor*] of the local *Lutherschule*, a protestant primary school, who lived at Schultenstrasse 11, and called the police. When Lutter and Daube stepped out to have a look at the body, Adolf Daube suddenly exclaimed, “But, this is my boy!”² The corpse was indeed that of Helmut Daube, Adolf Daube’s nineteen-year-old son. Police from Gladbeck’s criminal investigation department arrived twenty minutes later.³ Daube’s father knew that the night before his son had been out drinking with Karl Hussmann, a friend and former classmate. They had attended a recruiting evening [*Keilabend*] of the local branch of the right-wing student fraternity *Alte Burschenschaftler* in Buer, an hour’s walk from Gladbeck. After Lutter found out that Hussmann and Daube had left the pub and headed back home together, he called Hussmann.

Karl Hussmann answered the call rather quickly, given that he had been drinking the night before. Born in Guatemala in 1908, he was a half-orphan: his father had died on a journey from Guatemala to Germany in 1921. Therefore, Hussmann lived with foster parents, the family of the headmaster of a protestant school in Gladbeck-Rentfort, the Kleiböhmers. Hussmann considered himself Daube’s closest friend.⁴ Both young men had participated in a bible-reading

Notes from this chapter begin on page 219.

circle for several years, together with Ilse Kleiböhmer, the daughter of Hussmann's foster parents. About a year before the events discussed here, Daube had fallen in love with Ilse, but their relationship had remained platonic and did not last long. Just a few weeks before the crime took place, Daube and Hussmann had graduated from high school together.

When Hussmann arrived at the crime scene, everyone who was present recognized that he reacted to Helmut's death in a surprisingly "cold" and indifferent manner.⁵ Detective superintendent Klingelhöller of Gladbeck's criminal investigation department discovered small drops of blood on Hussmann's shoes and questioned the young man about them.⁶ Hussmann replied that he had killed a cat a few days earlier and that the cat's blood must have soiled his shoes.⁷ But this explanation did not satisfy Klingelhöller, who decided to keep the shoes as potential evidence against Hussmann.⁸

By 7:30 A.M., Gladbeck's investigating judge, Dr. Meyer, arrived. When he examined the corpse, he discovered that someone had cut the victim's throat and removed his genitals. Up to this point, the police had assumed that Daube had committed suicide, although no knife was found near him.⁹ Klingelhöller had asked Hussmann whether he had witnessed Daube's suicide and run away in panic. When the mutilation was discovered, however, it was thought most likely that a murder had occurred, and Hussmann became the primary suspect. Detective Klingelhöller searched Hussmann's rooms and found bloodstained clothes and a coat that definitely had been cleaned very recently to remove some sort of spot. The police also discovered a sheath from which the knife was missing.¹⁰

When Dr. Neef, the public prosecutor, arrived, he decided that the shoes should be sent to a chemical institute in Recklinghausen and ordered an examination to determine whether the blood was of human or animal origin.¹¹ Hussmann was taken into custody for interrogation. At 5:00 P.M., he was to be questioned by the investigating judge, Dr. Meyer. Prior to the interrogation, all investigating personnel—Public Prosecutor Neef, Judge Meyer, and the police officers Klingelhöller and Pest gathered for a meeting. When Klingelhöller informed Neef of the circumstantial evidence that made him believe that Karl Hussmann had killed Daube, Prosecutor Neef replied:

If a worker would be under such suspicion, he would be arrested on the basis of these suspicious facts. However, as Hussmann is well-known around here. . . . Well, Mr. Meyer, it is up to you to decide on the warrant of arrest.¹²

Hussmann was released after the interrogation. A few days later, the results of the chemical test came in and showed that the blood on Hussmann's shoes belonged to a human being. Moreover, a second laboratory test, which verified this result, proved that the blood belonged to Daube's blood group, not Hussmann's.¹³ As soon as the first result became known, the local press called for the

investigation to be taken over by the Berlin homicide department, which had a strong reputation, thanks at least in part to successful public relations efforts.¹⁴ On 30 March, the prosecutor's office of the district of Essen-Ruhr gave in to this public pressure and asked for help from the Berlin specialists.¹⁵ The Berlin criminal police quickly discovered that the local police forces had done a poor job.¹⁶ Nevertheless, they shared Detective Klingelhöller's initial assumption that Helmut Daube had most likely been murdered by Hussmann. The investigating detectives learned from several witnesses that Hussmann might have engaged in mutual masturbation with classmates. They also found letters written by Hussmann that could be interpreted as evidence of a homosexual attraction to Daube. According to the Berlin police, all this suggested that Hussmann was a *Lustmörder* (sexual murderer).¹⁷ The prosecutor's office shared this assessment and formally charged Hussmann with Daube's murder.¹⁸ Hussmann's trial, which was based exclusively on circumstantial evidence, took place from 16 to 30 October 1928. The prosecution summoned 110 witnesses and six experts, which were interrogated during the eleven days allotted to the trial.¹⁹ In the end, the judges were not convinced of the innocence of the defendant, but because his guilt could not be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, their verdict was not guilty.²⁰

Although this outcome suggests that one could frame the story of the Hussmann trial as a success story demonstrating that the German legal system could operate quite effectively even under great political and public pressure, we intend to pursue a different line of argument. By examining how the judges' nagging doubts came into existence, we will tell a story of converging strategies and interests, class prejudice, and homophobic anxieties. We will analyze the practices and discourses that unfolded in the context of the Hussmann case to reconstruct the role of intersecting categories of difference such as class, sexuality, and age in the construction of criminality in general and of the *Lustmörder* in Weimar Germany in particular. From this perspective, the main question becomes: Why was Karl Hussmann *not* considered to be a homosexual psychopath?

Of Trials and Rituals: On the Performativity of Criminality

To Hussmann's contemporaries, criminal trials were much more than legal procedures of reconstructing a chain of events and determining a sentence for unlawful behavior. As the famous Berlin court reporter Gabriele Tergit put it, criminal trials were increasingly regarded as "sources for the understanding of our times."²¹ Taking up this notion, we consider trials to be performances, confined to a particular point in time and space, yet reiterable, in which "social relations are displayed and renewed and the hierarchical forms underlying social relations [are] confirmed and strengthened."²² In other words, we will treat criminal trials as social rituals.

The performative character of human activities has been the focus of growing attention in the field of German cultural studies. This includes all sorts of activities, such as the “performance of identity, gender, a social or theatrical role, ethnicity, religious belief, a text or a film script.”²³ Performances are not restricted to an enactment of what existed before but are considered to be productive: As “performative acts” they continuously create social categories and meaning.²⁴ Yet these acts and the resulting identities are not arbitrary, but structured along existing “axes of differentiation such as class, race, ethnicity, gender, age.”²⁵ Therefore, recent work in Gender and Queer Studies has emphasized the intersectionality of all identities as performative, social constructions.²⁶ Relying on this conceptual framework, we will consider criminal trials as social rituals and performative acts in which interdependent categories such as sexuality, class, and criminality are (re)produced.²⁷

To answer the question why Karl Hussmann was not considered a *Lustmörder*, we will focus our analysis on three central characteristics of criminal trials as social rituals. First, as social rituals, trials are enacted by a group of people that includes not only the persons in court but also the audience. As anthropologists have demonstrated, the audience plays a constitutive role in the performance of rituals, which have to be enacted in front of the social group to which they convey social meaning. In fact, by witnessing a performance, the audience literally participates in it.²⁸ In modern, complex societies, audience participation is not necessarily restricted to physical participation in the ritual event, but can take place in a mediated form, that is, through mass media.²⁹ Second, all social rituals follow a fixed set of rules; in the case of criminal trials, the most important rules specify how the truth of what happened is to be determined. After all, reconstructing the chain of events and determining an appropriate sentence for the person identified as the perpetrator is considered to be the most important task of a criminal trial. This goal, however, is continuously undermined by the conflicting interests and strategies of the persons involved. The truth is of delicate nature.³⁰ Moreover, as Michel Foucault has demonstrated, every process of determining the truth is structured along the lines of power: each society has its own “regime of truth.”³¹ In the Hussmann trial, scientific knowledge in the form of medico-psychiatric expert opinions played a key role in this “regime of truth” as they were considered to reveal the true nature of the defendant.³² Third, social rituals have an ambivalent character: They operate simultaneously in an affirmative and a subversive manner.³³ Every time a ritual is performed, it is interpreted by different actors, often with conflicting interests and interpretations of their role.

On the basis of these general considerations, we will focus our analysis on the role of the audience (the press coverage of the trial) and of expert knowledge (the psychiatric evaluations of Hussmann) to reconstruct the strategies and interests involved in the Hussmann trial. As we shall see, it was precisely these interests

that prevented Hussmann from being seen as a sexual psychopath who had killed and mutilated his schoolmate to satisfy his deviant sexuality.

The Malady of Youth: The Hussmann Trial and the Media

The trial against Karl Hussmann received great attention in the local as well as in the national press. Throughout the 1920s, criminal trials were closely followed in the press and seen to represent society's moral condition.³⁴ As the philosopher Theodor Lessing wrote after the Hussmann trial, beyond the legal problems, such trials “highlight[ed] education and soul, economy and society.”³⁵ Journalists examined Hussmann's case with great enthusiasm. One topic was of special interest to them: the “malady of youth.” This expression, which was borrowed from Ferdinand Bruckner's play *Krankheit der Jugend*, performed with great success in the spring of 1928,³⁶ became a slogan denoting a general distrust in middle-class youth.

This point of view was especially popular after the public had extensively discussed the famous Krantz trial, which took place in Berlin in February 1928. Teenage sexual experimentation and jealousy, mixed with alcohol and adolescent melancholia, led to a catastrophe for a group of youngsters in Berlin-Steglitz. The morning after a *nuit blanche*, two of them, Günther Scheller and Hans Stephan, were found in the bedroom of Scheller's parents, killed by bullets fired from a gun belonging to Krantz, who owned the weapon illegally. Like Hussmann, the nineteen-year-old Paul Krantz was accused of murder. According to the prosecution, he had—just after his first sexual experiences with Günther's sister Hilde—shot to death Hans Stephan, his rival for the affection of the young girl.³⁷

The subsequent trial was a sensation. Here was a capital crime among young middle-class high-school graduates from a respectable Berlin neighborhood, and—what made it even more attractive to the press—the opportunity to discuss juvenile sexuality in public. To boost sales figures, reporters published as many details as possible about the sexual life of these urban teenagers, aged from fifteen to eighteen years at the time of the incident. Class also played a role, although a comparatively minor one: in contrast to the Scheller family and most of his classmates, the defendant Paul Krantz was of proletarian background and only had access to the *Gymnasium* thanks to the fact that the obligatory school fees were waived in his case. Some of the contemporary commentators established a link between his social background and the fact that he was accused of murder. In contrast to the well-to-do parents of Günther and Hilde Scheller, who lobbied for a harsh punishment of the alleged murderer, Krantz' parents were not in a position to influence the authorities or to agitate for public support.³⁸

The extensive press coverage, which lasted for several weeks, was also of great interest to teachers and other “experts of youth,” who used the trial as a starting

point for discussing “dangerous tendencies” among German youth.³⁹ This topic was very much *en vogue*: not only was it the major concern of the new field of adolescent psychology, which had been established about a decade earlier,⁴⁰ but it was also addressed in contemporary theater and art—the most famous example being Frank Wedekind’s drama *Frühlings Erwachen*, first performed in 1906. In the spring of 1928, this play was seen as the fictional model of the “tragedy of Steglitz” that gave rise to the Krantz trial.⁴¹ In Gladbeck, the Krantz trial had been a topic of intense debate as well. Hussmann, Daube, and their peers had discussed it more than once.⁴² During his police interrogation, Hussmann said:

We [Daube and Hussmann] talked about sexual perversions and homosexual intercourse. I remember that we mentioned diverse problems in this respect in our conversations on the occasion of the Krantz trial.⁴³

Considering this context, it is not surprising that the press saw the opportunity to tell the story of a “new Krantz.” Major analogies between the two cases made such an approach look promising. In both cases, a recent high-school graduate was accused of murder, probably driven by sexual motives. Likewise, both cases featured homosexuality as one of the central issues, with a *ménage à trois* lurking in the background.⁴⁴ Journalists reported extensively on a daily basis from the courthouse in Essen; some of them were specially assigned to the trial.

There was, however, one important difference in the press coverage between the two trials: the press reports on the Hussmann trial were much more cautious than those on the Krantz trial had been and spoke less openly about sensational details. In the light of recent debates on the Krantz trial in the German Reichstag, which had examined the conflict between the freedom of the press and the need to safeguard public morality,⁴⁵ the court in Gladbeck and the journalists opted for a cooperative strategy. Their collaboration was designed to effectively balance the economic interests of the press with the interests of the state, which disapproved of the widespread criticism of its judiciary. On the day before the trial started, the court’s newly established press bureau invited journalists, lawyers, and judges to an improvised press conference, at which it explained the central legal proceedings and the special problems of the trial, and in return for this service asked for moderate and decent coverage.⁴⁶ The authorities’ carrot-and-stick policy proved highly successful: whereas on other occasions, the press and the judiciary had bitterly confronted and even insulted one another—contemporary liberal and socialist writers spoke of a fundamental “crisis of confidence” in the Weimar legal system⁴⁷—in Gladbeck, press and court cooperated quite well with each other. One can argue that both sides were willing to learn: the judiciary started to understand that great media interest in a particular trial was not necessarily a sign of sensationalism, but also reflected broader, legitimate concerns on behalf of the general public, while the journalists realized that certain forms of

sensationalist press coverage cast doubt on their self-declared role of informing and educating the public for the benefit of all.

The results of this cooperation clearly did not satisfy all sections of civil society. The catholic youth organization in Groß-Essen, for example, wrote to the presiding judge in October 1928 to demand stricter censorship:

Thanks to the way the press is reporting, the attention of all parts of the population is focused on the trial. It has to be recognized that our youth is highly interested. Hence a large percentage of them became aware of the true nature of the accusation, the perverted sexuality, for the first time. It would be disastrous if an unpedagogical coverage spread harmful information on these matters in all parts of the population. Because of the way the Hussmann trial has been presented so far, we do not trust all journalists to report in a pedagogically [*volkserziehlich*] faultless manner.⁴⁸

Despite this criticism, the cooperative strategy with which the legal system handled the delicate case was generally successful. Although the representatives of the press were excluded from the courtroom from time to time, especially when sexual matters were at stake, this practice did not result in negative press reports. On the contrary, the journalists displayed unusual sympathy with the judges and the prosecutor. They even wrote positively about the Prussian legal system itself, a rarity in the troubled Weimar years. Thus Moritz Goldstein, the correspondent for Berlin's liberal *Vossische Zeitung*, for instance, noted:

[The court] can be certified to have worked on solving the mystery of Gladbeck with relentless assiduity and admirable patience. . . . One could notice a gentleman-like, amicable understanding between the prosecutor and the defense lawyer, and because the defendant knew how to behave himself, the whole trial reflected the best conventional proprieties.⁴⁹

Instead of criticizing the court, the press picked mostly on Gladbeck's criminal police. More importantly, many reporters demonstrated remarkable sympathy with the defendant, mostly for two reasons. First, the press, especially the liberal press, generally regarded criminals not as callous perpetrators but as "victims of society."⁵⁰ Second, in this particular case, journalists sympathized with a defendant who had been subjected not only to an investigation filled with absurdities, but also to gossip and prejudices circulating in Gladbeck that created a stifling atmosphere of suspicion. A typical critique, such as that offered by August Hermann Zeiz in the liberal *Berliner Tageblatt*, read:

In this nest of overheated brains of [Gladbeck's] Philistines, the suspicion against the defendant became a fact and everybody "came clean." The detectives wrote down everything they had been informed of, embroidered it, and in Essen prosecutors were found who built an impossible accusation on the basis of impossible evidence.⁵¹

The newspapers rarely mentioned that Hussmann himself belonged to the protestant middle class in Gladbeck, a town predominantly inhabited by Catholics, and that he was connected to a right-wing student fraternity. Only the communist press claimed that his foster father served as president of the local branch of the right-wing *Stahlhelm*.⁵² During his pretrial detention Hussmann wrote letters to his friends in which he spoke pejoratively about *Republikaner* (supporters of the Weimar Republic) and *Reichsbannerhelden* (members of the Social-Democratic paramilitary organization), thus sharing a common attitude among middle-class schoolboys and university students of that time, who often cultivated an “anti-bourgeois” habitus and were easily attracted by illiberal, “revolutionary” political parties.⁵³ Only communist newspapers explicitly made the connection between the conduct of the trial and class differences. Thus the *Rote Fahne* wrote:

[E]stablished bourgeois society, and with it the investigating judge, are of the same opinion that a high-school graduate, . . . member of the *Stahlhelm* and of a right-wing student fraternity, cannot commit a sexual murder of his friend. During the first days following the murder, these circles even launched a relief attack for Hussmann in the press.⁵⁴

An analysis of the trial’s press coverage reveals that two main factors protected Hussmann against conviction. First, he was defended by a middle-class milieu that marked criminal behavior as “alien.” Consequently, the well-established Hussmann, who was from a “good family,” simply *could not* be guilty. Second, the newspapers prevented a possible demonization of the defendant both because of their general skepticism towards Weimar’s police and legal system and because of their temporary sensitivity regarding juvenile sexual deviance and its public representation.

“Nothing More than the Normal Phenomenon”: The Medical Expert Opinions

As the local police physician, Dr. Marcks, noted in his autopsy report, the removal of Helmut Daube’s genitals and his cut throat indicated a “murder because of sadistic tendencies, a so-called *Lustmord*.” Yet, to be certain, he elaborated, a confession and a “psychiatric exploration” of the offender were necessary.⁵⁵ Hussmann, however, never confessed. Nevertheless, three medico-psychiatric expert opinions were prepared. In contrast to other spectacular *Lustmord* cases of the Weimar Republic, in which the delinquents (Carl Grossmann,⁵⁶ Friedrich Haarmann,⁵⁷ and Peter Kürten⁵⁸) had confessed after their arrest, in the Hussmann case the experts did not try to determine the suspect’s mental condition at the time of the crime, but his general psychiatric profile to answer the question whether or not Hussmann could possibly have murdered for sexual reasons.⁵⁹ To

clarify this point, the experts discussed two questions: Was Hussmann a sadist? And was he a homosexual?

In the scientific literature of the 1920s, *Lustmord* was defined as a murder for the satisfaction of deviant sexual desires. Legal and medical experts distinguished four major deviations of the sexual drive: sadism, masochism, fetishism, and homosexuality.⁶⁰ Sadism was thought to be the expression of pathologically enhanced aggression, which was otherwise considered a natural part of male sexuality. The physician and psychiatrist Richard von Krafft-Ebing was the first to describe this pattern under this label, referring to the writings of Donatien Alphonse François de Sade, better known as Marquis de Sade.⁶¹ According to Krafft-Ebing, sadism was caused by an “inherited diseased condition of the central nervous system (functional signs of degeneration),”⁶² which, according to the opinions of leading sexologists, were hereditary and resulted in a neurological weakness, also called neurasthenia.⁶³ This weakness destroyed the willpower of the afflicted, who followed their aggressive instincts instead of restraining them as so-called healthy men would do. *Health*, in this context, was used synonymously with *civilization* by Krafft-Ebing and his fellow scientists. To them, civilization was the final stage of an evolutionary process in which male aggressive impulses were restrained and restructured, resulting in modern, that is, bourgeois moral norms and attitudes.⁶⁴ Krafft-Ebing and his colleagues thus endorsed the notion of a linear evolutionary process, in which so-called natives as well as members of the lower classes embodied earlier stages of human evolution.⁶⁵

In this context, it should be noted that the prosecutor as well as the medical experts knew that Hussmann’s mother and one of her brothers were considered mentally inferior (*geistig minderwertig*) by the authorities.⁶⁶ Netty Hussmann was thought to be a “singularly simple-minded” person, and her brother had been placed in an asylum for “heredity imbecility” and “harmless insanity with delusions.”⁶⁷ Hussmann himself stressed his birth in Guatemala and suggested that his parental line might have included indigenous ancestors. According to racist theories of descent, this implied that Hussmann could have inherited the strong sexual desires of his alleged native relatives as well as their weaker willpower, which made it almost impossible for him to withstand his bodily instincts.⁶⁸

However, the medical experts were unprepared to envision the possibility that a member of their own social group could be prone to heredity degenerative defects. As the medical expert witness Dr. Teudt wrote:

The hereditary material which is incorporated in Husmann [sic] is not totally immaculate, because there is proof of cases of mental disorder within the mother’s family. . . . However, often too much emphasis is placed on such hereditary factors, as if an offspring of such a family necessarily had to be impaired.⁶⁹

Ignoring the possibility of a racial degeneration by heredity, the medical experts stressed the variation in the heritability of degenerative signs.⁷⁰ Strikingly, this

was a line of argument that does not appear in any of the medical expert opinions on the prominent *Lustmörder* who were found guilty during the Weimar Republic, which, in fact, were partially written by the same experts.⁷¹ Peter Kürten, for example, known as the Vampire of Düsseldorf, was depicted as a “psychopath with a distinctly sadistic sexual drive, incriminated by heredity and impaired by his milieu from childhood on,” who had been “unrestrained in the choice of the means to satisfy his sadistic desire.”⁷² Carl Grossmann was described as “burdened by serious hereditary defects” (*erblich stark belastet*), “completely degenerated,”⁷³ and having “strong sexual urges with pronounced sadistic elements.”⁷⁴ Friedrich Haarmann, nicknamed the Werewolf of Hannover, was simply classified as a “pathological personality.”⁷⁵ All of them came from a proletarian milieu in which petty criminality was commonplace. This focus on members of the *classes dangereuses* concurred with the descriptions in scientific literature. Here, too, men who were presented as typical *Lustmörder* came from the lower classes and often had an extensive criminal background. They most definitely were not high-school graduates on their way to pursuing university studies.⁷⁶

The medical expert opinions also invalidated those elements of Hussmann’s behavior that, according to criminological authorities such as Erich Wulffen, should have been interpreted as indicators of sadistic tendencies:⁷⁷ most prominently, Hussmann’s killing, exhibiting, and photographing a cat or the violence he exerted on his schoolmates. Instead, all the medical expert opinions stressed that cruelties and fisticuffs were part of the normal development of young males and that Hussmann only killed the cat by order of his foster parents who wanted to protect the singing birds (ignoring the fact that the parents surely never said a word about exhibiting the cat’s corpse or taking photographs of it).⁷⁸

Declaring Hussmann’s attitudes and behavior to be part of normal male juvenile behavior was also central to the medico-psychiatric experts’ arguments on the question whether or not he was to be considered a homosexual. They emphasized that Hussmann was still an adolescent and that, therefore, it would not be reasonable to measure his acts by the standards of adult sexuality:

Experience teaches us that because of the capriciousness of the activity during puberty youngsters often have homosexual emotions and act upon them, yet find the right and normal path by the end of the crisis. Therefore, such an activity is only a transitional phenomenon.⁷⁹

Instead of claiming that Hussmann’s homosexual practices were an expression of a so-called degenerative hereditary predisposition, which was one of the prevalent contemporary theories on homosexuality,⁸⁰ the experts interpreted his behavior against the background of Eduard Spranger’s study on the psychology of adolescents (*Psychologie des Jugendalters*).⁸¹ Spranger distinguished between *eroticism* and *sexuality* and claimed that boys (as well as girls) had little or to no interest in

physical sexuality. Instead, he argued, they practiced a “predominantly spiritual form of love,” which aimed at “empathy and becoming a unity with the other soul.”⁸² In Spranger’s model, homosexual acts were not necessarily excluded, but they were seen as harmless aberrations and derailments into the realm of the physical.⁸³ Finally, the medical experts concluded that in their examinations as well as in their studies of his schoolmates’ testimonies, they could find “nothing more than the normal phenomenon”⁸⁴ among male adolescents. This assessment reflected one of the two psychiatric models on the development of homosexuality prevailing in the 1920s. Whereas other suspects, such as Fritz Haarmann, were considered hereditarily tainted and their homosexuality explained as a result of their degeneracy, Hussmann was described in the terms of a model that emphasized the dynamic character of the development of sexual identities from a psychological point of view.

Conclusion: The Impossible *Lustmörder*

Our analysis of the trial of Karl Hussmann has demonstrated a central ambiguity. On the one hand, the press and the investigating authorities pursued the established strategies in dealing with delinquents who were considered abnormal. Thus the murder and the subsequent trial were embedded in the context of contemporary discussions on the relationship between the press and the legal system, scientific models of deviance, and debates on the “malady of the youth.” On the other hand, despite the circumstantial evidence indicating a sadistic sexual murder, Hussmann was not constructed as a *Lustmörder* either in the press or in the medical expert opinions. This is all the more remarkable because it would not have been difficult to label him a degenerate other, by reference either to his birth in Guatemala or to degeneration theory.

The medical experts’ and the court’s emphasis on the impact of Hussmann’s socialization and juvenile development, instead of interpreting his ancestry from a racist and hereditarian perspective, was only possible in a unique situation in which three mutually reinforcing elements came together. The first factor was the cooperation of the local legal authorities and the press, which was a reaction to the public backlash against the voyeuristic press coverage of the trial of Paul Krantz eight months earlier. In the Hussmann case, the court provided the press with a continuous flow of information in exchange for the press’s promise of moderation in its reporting of the trial. Although the parallels to the Krantz trial would have made a similarly sensationalist coverage financially attractive, the journalists kept speculation on the murderer’s sexual motives to a minimum. The second factor in the trial’s unique constellation was that Hussmann was middle class and a member of the local educational elite, most prominently indicated by his participation in the bible movement and his contacts to a right-wing

student fraternity. The third and final factor that prevented his being viewed as a *Lustmörder* was his youth. By referring to his age, the psychiatric experts could render the accusations of homosexuality and sadism harmless, thus normalizing behavior generally marked as perverse and criminal. All three elements created a situation that was exceptional, especially compared with the cases of Haarmann, Grossmann, and Kürten, all middle-aged men from the lower classes. Considering this exception on a more general level indicates that most historical analyses of the construction of criminality and of the *Lustmörder* in particular have disregarded the role of two major, intersecting categories: class and age.

Epilogue

Daube's murderer was never apprehended. Unsolved spectacular cases such as the one at hand pique the curiosity of contemporaries and historians alike. Nevertheless, we have deliberately not considered the question whether or not the defendant was rightfully acquitted.

Hussmann, however, commented on this very question a few years later, at least indirectly. After having studied law at the universities of Göttingen, Munich, Berlin, Hamburg, and Kiel, he received his Ph.D. from the University of Bonn in 1935. His advisor was Hans von Hentig, a well-known law professor and an expert in criminology, who advocated a "biologistic crime policy."⁸⁵ In the concluding chapter of his thesis, titled "The False Confession," Hussman wrote:

There is no doubt that many crimes can only be solved by a confession from the perpetrator. The more his psychic structure is revealed, the more clearly the crime will be understood. In this respect, the confession seems to be indispensable for legal reasoning.⁸⁶

Given Hussmann's own experiences with the German legal system, it is difficult to interpret such a statement as anything other than a deliberation on his own case. Yet, it is ambiguous. On the one hand, Hussmann gives a possible explanation of why Daube's case was never solved: it lacked the confession of the perpetrator. That a man who had been the prime suspect of a spectacular murder trial could exploit his personal insights for an academic career underlines the importance of class in post-World War I Germany. On the other hand, Hussmann's commentary raises the question whether he perceived his own trial as a telling example of a lack of confession. Either way, Hussmann's remark serves as an unusual punch line to one of the most spectacular murder trials of the Weimar Republic—a trial that left the case unsolved but allows historians to reconstruct the paradigmatic way class, youth, and sexuality were interconnected in modern Germany.

Notes

1. "Hussmann, Karl, Abiturient, wegen Ermordung des Abiturienten Helmut Daube in Gladbeck (Sexualmord) 11 Js 312/28," Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, Abteilung Rheinland, Standort Düsseldorf, formerly Hauptstaatsarchiv Düsseldorf (hereafter, HSA Düsseldorf) 299/822–833; "Zeitungsveröffentlichungen über den Mordprozeß gegen den Abiturienten Karl Hußmann (Angeklagt des Sexualmordes an seinem Mitabiturienten Helmut Daube in Gladbeck)," HSA Düsseldorf 6/755; "Lustmord in Gladbeck, Opfer: Helmut Daube, Abiturient, 22 March 1928," Landesarchiv Berlin (hereafter LAB) A Pr. Br. 030 Berlin C Tit. 198 B/1755.
2. Interrogation of Adolf Daube, 10 April 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/825, 35–36.
3. For more detail, see the popular but sensationalist book on the murder of Helmut Daube by Sabine Kettler, Eva-Maria Stuckel, and Franz Wegener, *Wer tötete Helmut Daube? Der bestialische Sexualmord an dem Schüler Helmut Daube im Ruhrgebiet 1928* (Gladbeck, 2001).
4. HSA Düsseldorf 299/822, 8–11.
5. HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 155.
6. HSA Düsseldorf 299/822, 4–5.
7. Ibid.; Report of the Gladbeck criminal police officer Pest, 5 November 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 6/755, 89–97, here, 91.
8. As Klingelhöller remarked in his report, the shoes were quite wet—more than they should have been, considering that the night before only light rain had fallen. HSA Düsseldorf 299/822, 80–82; LAB A Pr. Br. 030 Berlin C Tit. 198 B/1755, 25.
9. HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 155; Report Pest, 5 November 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 6/755, 89–97, here, 90.
10. Report Pest, 5 November 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 6/755, 89–97, here, 91.
11. On the importance of this trial in context of the forensic establishment of blood group serology in the 1920s, see Myriam Spörr, *Reines und gemischtes Blut: Zur Kulturgeschichte der Blutgruppenforschung*, chapter 7 (Bielefeld, 2013).
12. Ibid. A similar quotation is cited in "Bindungen in Gladbeck," *Vossische Zeitung* 14 November 1928 (also in HSA Düsseldorf 6/755 [newspaper clippings]: 99).
13. LAB A Pr. Br. 030 Berlin C Tit. 198 B/1755, 80–81; Ludwig Werneburg, "Die praktische Bedeutung der Blutgruppenuntersuchung. Im Anschluß an den Gladbecker Mordfall Daube," in: *Kriminalistische Monatshefte. Zeitschrift für die gesamte kriminalistische Wissenschaft und Praxis* 2, 9 (1928), 180–181, esp. 181.
14. The Berlin criminal police enjoyed a good reputation since the Kaiserreich and was regularly sent to other cities for special investigations. See, for instance, Helmut Walser Smith, *The Butcher's Tale: Murder and Anti-Semitism in a German Town* (New York, 2002), and Philipp Müller, *Auf der Suche nach dem Täter: Die öffentliche Dramatisierung von Verbrechen im Berlin des Kaiserreichs* (Frankfurt a. M., 2005).
15. LAB A Pr. Br.030 Berlin C Tit. 198 B/1755, 21–26.
16. LAB A Pr. Br. 030 Berlin C Tit. 198 B/1755. The public criticism became so intense that the head of the police department in the Prussian ministry of Justice felt obliged to counter them in detail, see Erich Klausener, "Der Fall Hußmann und die Kriminalpolizei," *Kriminalistische Monatshefte: Zeitschrift für die gesamte kriminalistische Wissenschaft und Praxis* 2, 12 (1928), 265–269.
17. LAB A Pr. Br. 030 Berlin C Tit. 198 B/1755, 21–26.
18. Bill of indictment against Hussmann, 3 September 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 1–18.
19. Ibid., 2–3.
20. HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 164–165.

21. Gabriele Tergit, "Gestalten aus dem Femeprozeß. Gespenster," *Berliner Tageblatt*, 25 March 1927.
22. Nicholas B. Dirks, "Ritual and Resistance: Subversion as a Social Fact," in *Cultural Power/History. A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, Nicholas B. Dirks and Geoff Eley et al., eds. (Princeton, NJ, 1992), 483–503, here, 483.
23. Carolin Duttlinger and Lucia Ruprecht, "Introduction," in *Performance and Performativity in German Cultural Studies*, Carolin Duttlinger and Lucia Ruprecht et al., eds. (Oxford, 2003), 9–19, here, 11. See also Jürgen Martschukat and Steffen Patzold, "Geschichtswissenschaft und 'performative turn'. Eine Einführung in Fragestellung, Konzepte und Literatur," in *Geschichtswissenschaft und "performative turn": Ritual, Inszenierung und Performanz vom Mittelalter bis zur Neuzeit*, ed. Jürgen Martschukat and Steffen Patzold (Köln, 2003), 1–31, here, 8.
24. This perspective has been strongly influenced by Gender Studies, most prominently by the work of Judith Butler; see Duttlinger and Ruprecht, "Introduction," 12; as well as Martschukat and Patzold, "Geschichtswissenschaft und 'performative turn,'" 8. For an application of the concept of performativity in masculinity studies see Olaf Stieglitz and Jürgen Martschukat, *Es ist ein Junge! Einführung in die Geschichte der Männlichkeiten in der Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 2005), 67–93.
25. Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects. Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory* (New York, 1994), 4.
26. See, for instance, Katharina Walgenbach and Gabriele Dietze et al., eds., *Gender als interdependente Kategorie: Neue Perspektiven auf Intersektionalität Diversität und Heterogenität* (Opladen, 2007); Cornelia Klinger and Gudrun-Axeli Knapp, eds., *Über-Kreuzungen. Fremdheit, Ungleichheit, Differenz* (Münster, 2008); Gabriele Winker and Nina Degele, *Intersektionalität: Zur Analyse sozialer Ungleichheiten* (Bielefeld, 2009).
27. For recent appropriations of theories on the performativity of categories of identity in the context of criminology, see, for instance, Susanne Krasmann, *Die Kriminalität der Gesellschaft: Zur Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart* (Konstanz, 2003), 153–155.
28. Erika Fischer-Lichte, "Performance, Inszenierung, Ritual. Zur Klärung kulturwissenschaftlicher Schlüsselbegriffe," in *Geschichtswissenschaft und "performative turn": Ritual, Inszenierung und Performanz vom Mittelalter bis zur Neuzeit*, ed. Jürgen Martschukat and Steffen Patzold (Köln, 2003), 33–54, here, 34–35, and 47–52. On the performativity of trials, see Henning Grunwald, "Justice as Performance? The Historiography of Legal Procedure and Political Criminal Justice in Weimar Germany," *InterDisciplines. Journal of History and Sociology* 3 (2012), 2, 46–78.
29. On the interaction between criminal justice and mass media, see Peter Fritzsche, "Talk of the Town. The Murder of Lucie Berlin and the Production of Local Knowledge," in *Criminals and their Scientists. The History of Criminology in International Perspective*, Peter Becker and Richard F. Wetzell, eds. (Cambridge, 2005), 377–398; Harald Kania Michael and Hans-Jörg Albrecht, eds., *Alltagsvorstellungen von Kriminalität: Individuelle und gesellschaftliche Bedeutung von Kriminalitätsbildern für die Lebensgestaltung* (Münster, 2004); Müller, *Auf der Suche nach dem Täter*, 73–91.
30. See Ludger Hoffmann, "Vom Ereignis zum Fall. Sprachliche Muster zur Darstellung und Überprüfung von Sachverhalten vor Gericht," in *Erzählte Kriminalität: Zur Typologie und Funktion von narrativen Darstellungen in Strafrechtspflege, Publizistik und Literatur zwischen 1770 und 1920. Vorträge zu einem interdisziplinären Kolloquium, Hamburg, 10–12. April 1985*, ed., Jörg Schönert (Tübingen, 1991), 87–113.
31. Michel Foucault, "Truth and Power," in *The Foucault Reader*, ed., Paul Rabinow (New York, 1984), 51–75, here, 73.

32. For a broader perspective, see Michel Foucault, "Lecture on 8 January 1975," in *Abnormal. Lectures at the Collège de France 1974–1975*, eds. Valerio Marchetti and Antonella Salomoni, trans. by Graham Burchell (London, 2003), 1–30.
33. See Dirks, "Ritual and Resistance," 488.
34. For a transnational perspective, see Daniel Siemens, *Metropole und Verbrechen. Die Gerichtsreportage in Berlin, Paris und Chicago 1919–1933* (Stuttgart, 2007).
35. Theodor Lessing, "Die Schüler und ihre Lehrer," *Prager Tageblatt*, 1 November 1928, in: Theodor Lessing, *Haarmann. Die Geschichte eines Werwolfs*, ed. Rainer Warwedel (Frankfurt a. M., 1989), 240–244, here, 244.
36. Ferdinand Bruckner, *Krankheit der Jugend. Schauspiel in drei Akten* (Berlin, 1928). See also Doris Engelhardt, "Ferdinand Bruckner als Kritiker seiner Zeit. Standortsuche eines Autors" (Ph.D. dissertation, RHTW Aachen, 1984), 56–86.
37. This theory was invalidated during the trial, which revealed that Günther Scheller had shot Hans and afterward killed himself.
38. For further details, see Siemens, *Metropole und Verbrechen*, 269–290; Heidi Sack, "'Wir werden lächelnd aus dem Leben scheiden.' Faszination Selbstmord in der Steglitzer Schülertragödie und in Diskursen der Weimarer Zeit," in: *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung* 34 (2009), 4, 259–272; Wolfgang Schild, "Berühmte Berliner Kriminalprozesse der Zwanziger Jahre," in *Rechtentwicklungen in Berlin. Acht Vorträge, gehalten anlässlich der 750-Jahrfeier Berlins*, Friedrich Ebel and Albrecht Randelzhofer, eds. (Berlin, 1988), 163–187; Thomas Lange, "Der Steglitzer Schülermordprozess 1928," in "Mit uns zieht die neue Zeit"—*Der Mythos Jugend*, Thomas Koebner and Rolf-Peter Janz et al., eds. (Frankfurt a. M., 1985), 412–437; Ernst Erich Noth, *Erinnerungen eines Deutschen* (Hamburg, 1971), 93–111.
39. Siemens, *Metropole und Verbrechen*, 272–282.
40. See, for example, Eduard Spranger, *Die Psychologie des Jugendalters* (Leipzig, 1924); Charlotte Bühler, *Über das Seelenleben der Jugendlichen. Versuch einer Analyse und Theorie der psychischen Pubertät* (Jena, 1922); Walter Hoffmann, *Die Reifezeit. Probleme der Entwicklungspsychologie und Sozialpädagogik* (Leipzig, 1921).
41. "Mordprozess gegen den Primaner Krantz. Erotik und Revolverschüsse," *Berliner Gerichts-Zeitung*, 2 December 1927.
42. Statement of Hussmann's schoolmate Erich Quaden, HSA Düsseldorf 299/822, 83.
43. Hearing of Karl Ernst August Hussmann, 23 February 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/822, 8–11.
44. Even more analogies could be found, which were seen and discussed by the contemporaries. See, e.g., the great number of letters written to the court included in HSA Düsseldorf 299/831.
45. Verhandlungen des Reichstages, III. Wahlperiode 1924, vol. 395, Stenographische Berichte (Berlin 1928), 12737, 12779–12780.
46. HSA Düsseldorf 6/755, 2–4.
47. See Robert Kuhn, *Die Vertrauenskrise der Justiz (1926–1928). Der Kampf um die "Republikanisierung" der Rechtspflege in der Weimarer Republik* (Köln, 1983); Daniel Siemens, "Die 'Vertrauenskrise' der Justiz," in *Die "Krise" der Weimarer Republik. Zur Kritik eines Deutungsmusters*, Moritz Föllmer and Rüdiger Graf, eds. (Frankfurt a. M., 2005), 139–163.
48. HSA Düsseldorf 299/831, 166–167.
49. Moritz Goldstein, "Vor dem Urteilsspruch," *Vossische Zeitung*, 28 October 1928 (HSA Düsseldorf 6/755 [newspaper clippings]).
50. See Daniel Siemens, "Explaining Crime. Berlin Newspapers and the Construction of the Criminal in Weimar Germany," *Journal of European Studies* 39 (2009), 336–352.
51. August Hermann Zeiz, "Belastungszeugen widerrufen," *Berliner Tageblatt*, 26 October 1928 (HSA Düsseldorf 6/755 [newspaper clippings]).

52. "Mordprozeß Hussmann," *Ruhr-Echo*, 16 October 1928 (HSA Düsseldorf 6/755, 29). For details concerning the *Stahlhelm*, see Volker R. Berghahn, *Der Stahlhelm. Bund der Frontsoldaten, 1918–1935* (Düsseldorf, 1966).
53. Report from police district superintendent Mikfeld, HSA Düsseldorf 6/755, 87–89, here, 87. On the attitudes and political standpoints of Weimar juveniles, see the contributions in Wolfgang R. Krabbe (Ed.), *Politische Jugend in der Weimarer Republik* (Bochum, 1993); on the habitus of young right-wing activists see Peter Fritzsche, "On Being the Subjects of History: Nazis as Twentieth-Century Revolutionaries," in *Language and Revolution. Making Modern Political Identities*, ed., Igal Halpin (London, 2002), 161–183.
54. "Der Bibelkreis," *Rote Fahne*, 23 October 1928 (HSA Düsseldorf 6/755 [newspaper clippings]).
55. Report on the autopsy of the corpse of Helmut Daube by Dr. Marcks, 23 March 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 38–45, here, 41. The German term *Lustmord* stresses a murderer's alleged sexual motive, whereas the English term usually used for this category of crime—"serial killer"—refers to the repetitive character of the criminal acts. The German term as such cannot be rendered in English without a significant loss of meaning. (See Maria Tatar, *Lustmord: Sexual Murder in Weimar Germany*. 2nd ed. [Princeton, 1997], 7–8). Therefore, *Lustmord* will not be translated in this text.
56. Carl Grossmann, born in 1863 in Neuruppin, was arrested on 21 August 1921 in Berlin and was suspected of having killed several women who came to Berlin looking for jobs to support themselves in the economically difficult years after World War I. He committed suicide just before the end of the trial on 5 June 1922. For further details, see Sace Elder's chapter in this volume as well as Matthias Blazek, *Karl Großmann und Friedrich Schumann. Zwei Serienmörder in den zwanziger Jahren* (Stuttgart, 2009).
57. Friedrich (Fritz) Haarmann, who was born in Hannover in 1879, was found guilty of murdering twenty-four young men in a homosexual frenzy and sentenced to death on 19 December 1924. The death penalty was carried out on 16 April 1925. For further details, see Kathrin Kompisch, "Der Fall Fritz Haarmann (1924)," *Hannoversche Geschichtsblätter* 55/56 (2001/02), 97–116, and Thomas Kailer, "Werwölfe, Triebtäter, minderwertige Psychopathen. Bedingungen der Wissenspopularisierung: Der Fall Haarmann," in *Wissenspopularisierung. Konzepte der Wissensverbreitung im Wandel*, ed., Carsten Kretschmann (Berlin, 2003), 323–359.
58. Kürten was born in 1883 in Mühlheim (today a municipal district of Cologne) and was arrested in Düsseldorf on 24 May 1930. He was sentenced to death for murder in nine and of attempted murder in seven cases (women, girls, and one man) on 22 April 1931 and was executed on 2 July 1931. The case of Peter Kürten inspired Fritz Lang's famous film *M—Eine Stadt sucht einen Mörder* (Germany 1931, English title: *M. (Murderer Among Us)*). For further details, see Karl Berg, *Der Sadist. Gerichtsärztliches und Kriminalpsychologisches zu den Taten des Düsseldorfer Mörders Peter Kürten. Mit zwei Artikelserien des Kriminal-Polizeirats Ernst Gennat und der Verteidigungsrede von Dr. Alex Wehner*, ed. Michael Farin (München, 2004); Elisabeth Lenk and Roswitha Kaever, eds., *Leben und Wirken des Peter Kürten, genannt der Vampir von Düsseldorf* (München, 1974).
59. The German penal code (*Reichsstrafgesetzbuch*, 1871) exempted the accused from full legal responsibility under the condition that he or she had been unable to exert his or her free will by mental disturbances (§ 51). The court could rely on expert opinions to determine the mental state of the person in question. See Ernst Traugott Rubo, *Kommentar über das Strafgesetz für das deutsche Reich und das Einführungsgesetz vom 31. Mai 1870 sowie die Ergänzungsgesetze vom 10. Dezember 1871 und 26. Februar 1876. Nach amtlichen Quellen*. Berlin 1879, reprint, ed., and intro., Werner Schubert [Frankfurt a.M., 1991], 114). The expert statements were prepared by the local forensic physician Dr. Teudt and dated 31 June 1928 (HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 58–74), Prof. Hübner, director of the mental asylum in Bonn and professor of psychiatric medicine at the University of Bonn and Prof. Müller-Heß, member of the Committee

- of Forensic Medicine of the Rhine Province (“Gerichtsärztliche Ausschuß der Rheinprovinz”). The written opinions of Hübner and Müller-Heß unfortunately are not included in the archival materials. Yet, their statements are extensively quoted in the verdict against Hussmann, which enabled us to reconstruct their positions (Verdict against Karl Hussmann, 30 October 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 130–165).
60. See, for instance, Erich Wulffen’s seminal work on the sexual criminal (*Der Sexualverbrecher: Ein Handbuch für Juristen, Polizei- und Verwaltungsbeamte, Mediziner und Pädagogen. Mit zahlreichen kriminalistischen Originalaufnahmen*. 11th ed. [Berlin 1928], 305 and 454). According to the report of officer Pest, the criminal police in Gladbeck had an edition of Wulffen’s manual at hand (5 November 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 6/755, 89–97, here, 96). For the influence of the *Lustmord* cases on the construction of an aggressive and potentially dangerous male sexuality, see Hania Siebenpfeiffer, “Kreatur und Kalter Killer. Der Lustmörder als Paradigma männlicher Gewalt in der Moderne,” in *Gewalt und Geschlecht. Bilder, Literatur und Diskurse im 20. Jahrhundert*, Hanno Ehrlicher and Hania Siebenpfeiffer, eds. (Köln, 2002), 109–130; Michael Schetsche, “Der Wille, der Trieb und das Deutungsmuster vom Lustmord,” in *Serienmord. Kriminologische und kulturwissenschaftliche Skizzierungen eines ungeheuerlichen Phänomens*, Frank J. Robertz and Alexandra Thomas, eds. (München, 2004), 346–364.
 61. Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis. With Especial Reference to the Antipathic Sexual Instinct. A Medico-Forensic Study*. trans. Franklin S. Klaf (New York, 1998), 53. In contemporary scientific literature, Krafft-Ebing’s explanatory model and terminology was not undisputed. Iwan Bloch and Caspar von Schreck-Notzing, for example, promoted the term “active algolagny” in contrast to “passive algolagny” (masochism) to emphasize that they believed the infliction and the experience of intense pain to be the motive of these activities, not, as suggested by Krafft-Ebing, the exertion of unlimited power (Iwan Bloch, *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit in seinen Beziehungen zur modernen Kultur*, 2nd and 3rd expanded ed. [Berlin, 1907], 616, and Caspar von Schrenck-Notzing, “Beiträge zur forensischen Beurtheilung von Sittlichkeitsvergehen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Pathogenese psychosexueller Anomalien,” *Archiv für Kriminologie und Anthropologie* 1 [1889], 5–25, here, 25).
 62. Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 32.
 63. See, e.g., Schrenck-Notzing, “Beiträge zur forensischen Beurtheilung,” 18–19.
 64. Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 1–3, 56–57.
 65. See Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather. Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (London, 1995), 36–41, and Sander L. Gilman, “Sexology, Psychoanalysis, and Degeneration: From a Theory of Race to a Race to Theory,” in *Degeneration. The Dark Side of Progress*, Edward J. Chamberlain and Sander L. Gilman, eds. (New York, 1985), 72–100, here, 73–75. For the influence of colonial racist thinking on the construction of the *Lustmörder*, see Eva Bischoff *Kannibale-Werden. Eine postkoloniale Geschichte deutscher Männlichkeit um 1900* (Bielefeld, 2011), 186–194, 200–210.
 66. See the correspondence between the inquisitor and the police in Baden (HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 53–54) and Teudt’s medical opinion on Hussmann, 31 June 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 58–74, here, 58.
 67. Medical opinion of Dr. Teudt, 31 June 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 58–74, here, 58.
 68. As referred to by the prosecution in its bill of indictment against Hussmann, HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 1–18, here, 17. For the interdependency of nationalist and racist thinking, see Christian Geulen, *Wahlverwandte. Rassendiskurs und Nationalismus im späten 19. Jahrhundert* (Hamburg, 2004), and for the discussion on the degenerative effect of “inter-racial” marriages in Germany, see Fatima El-Tayeb, *Schwarze Deutsche. Der Diskurs um “Rasse” und nationale Identität 1890–1933* (Frankfurt a. M./New York, 2001).
 69. Medical opinion of Dr. Teudt, 31 June 1928 [sic], HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 58–74, here, 67.
 70. *Ibid.*, 67–68.

71. Hübner's expertise for example is called upon not only in the trial against Hussmann but also in that against Peter Kürten. (See Hübner's medical opinion on Kürten, 26 March 1931, HSA Düsseldorf 17/730). Prof. Strauch (Berlin), who prepared a psychiatric expertise on Carl Grossmann (see Medical opinion on Carl Grossmann by Prof. Strauch, 26 April 1922, LAB A 358-01/1522, vol. 4, 210–245), was involved in the Hussmann trial as well: the Berlin homicide squad asked his opinion on the question of how much blood would have been spilled on the murderer of Helmut Daube. In his answer, Störmer included speculations on the possible motive of the murderer. According to him, it most likely was jealousy, homosexual desire, or sadism. (HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 49–52).
72. Medical opinion on Peter Kürten by Dr. Raether, 2 January 1931, HSA Düsseldorf 17/731, 269.
73. Medical opinion on Carl Grossmann by Dr. Störmer, 20 May 1922, LAB A 358-01/1522, vol. 4, 246–266, here, 261–262.
74. Medical opinion on Carl Grossmann by Prof. Strauch, 26 April 1922, LAB A 358-01/1522, vol. 4, 210–245, here, 230.
75. Medical opinion on Friedrich Haarmann by Dr. Schultze, 1 October 1924, HSA Hannover Hann 155 Göttingen 864a: 106–130, here, 130.
76. See the description Wulffen gives of the “typical” *Lustmörder* “J.” (*Der Sexualverbrecher*, 478–482).
77. Wulffen, *Der Sexualverbrecher*, 341–342, 348–349. In medical opinions on convicted *Lustmörder*, however, these juvenile acts of aggression are explicitly stressed. See, e.g., the expert opinion on Peter Kürten by Prof. Sioli, in which Kürten's questionable accounts of his cruelties to dogs and his murder of a playmate at an early age were taken at face value. Moreover, Sioli referred to them to demonstrate that Kürten's perversion was already developed at an early age (14 November 1930, HSA Düsseldorf 17/728, 11 and 277).
78. See the expertise by Hübner and Müller-Heß as included in the verdict against Hussmann, 30 October 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 130–165, here, 143.
79. Medical opinion on Hussmann by Dr. Teudt, 31 June 1928 [sic], HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 58–74, here, 70. Müller-Heß concurred with this assessment (see the verdict against Hussmann, 30 October 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 130–165, here, 144) whereas Hübner distinguished between “normal” behavior and some single acts, which were unusual for pubertal sexuality (*ibid.*, 143).
80. For the construction of the “homosexual body,” see John C. Fout, “Sexual Politics in Wilhelmine Germany: The Male Gender Crisis, Moral Purity, and Homophobia,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 2, 3 (1992), 388–421; Siobhan Somerville, “Scientific Racism and the Emergence of the Homosexual Body,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5, 2 (1994), 243–266; Jennifer Terry, “Anxious Slippages Between ‘Us’ and ‘Them.’ A Brief History of the Scientific Search for Homosexual Bodies,” in *Deviant Bodies. Critical Perspectives on Difference in Science and Popular Culture*, Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urla, eds. (Bloomington 1995), 129–169. For views of homosexual male prostitution in the 1920s, see Martin Lücke, *Männlichkeit in Unordnung. Homosexualität und männliche Prostitution in Kaiserreich und Weimarer Republik* (Frankfurt a.M., 2008).
81. Eduard Spranger, *Psychologie des Jugendalters* (Leipzig, 1924, here quoted according to the 28th edition 1966). Spranger's book was considered the seminal study on the topic of adolescent psychology until the 1970s.
82. Medical opinion of Dr. Teudt, 31 June 1928 [sic], HSA Düsseldorf 299/826, 58–74, here, 69. See also Spranger, *Psychologie des Jugendalters*, 90–92, 94–97.
83. For Spranger, the “sound development of the soul” was at risk predominantly by the “repression of the sexual instinct” (*Psychologie des Jugendalters*, 128). Concerning male homosexuality,

he considered “enthusiastic and idealistic tendencies among young men to be a necessary phenomenon of growing up” (ibid., 115).

84. Verdict against Hussmann, 30 October 1928, HSA Düsseldorf 299/829, 130–165, here, 145.
85. See Christian Müller, *Verbrechensbekämpfung im Anstaltsstaat. Psychiatrie, Kriminologie und Strafrechtsreform in Deutschland 1871–1933* (Göttingen, 2004), 156–158.
86. Karl Hussmann, *Das falsche Geständnis* (Kiel, 1935), 63.