

VIENNA AS A LABORATORY FOR SEXUAL KNOWLEDGE



Prelude

For much of the year 1900, eighteen-year-old Ida Bauer spent an hour a day with her doctor, Sigmund Freud. Freud had been hired by Bauer's father, whom he had already treated for syphilis several years earlier. Freud's task in treating Ida Bauer, however, was to discover the source of the hysteria she suffered from, which left her with a dry cough, a limp, and occasional vaginal discharge. She was also entertaining suicidal thoughts. Bauer explained to Freud her relationships with Herr and Frau K., family friends who, Bauer maintained, had acted inappropriately towards her. In the course of their conversations, Bauer spoke openly to Freud about the sexual issues that seemed to undergird her relationship to the Ks. Herr K., she claimed, had made sexual advances towards her while both families were vacationing in the *Sudtirof*. Frau K., on the other hand, had befriended her, perhaps, Ida thought now, in order to better obtain access to Ida's father, with whom Ida believed she was having an affair.

Ida Bauer's father had his own ideas about what was causing his daughter's mental distress. Frau K. had warned him that his daughter was preoccupied with sexual knowledge and had spent her vacation days reading sexologist Paolo Mantegazza's *Physiology of Love* and other "books of that sort."¹ Ida's imagination, her father postulated, had become over-excited by such reading material and had fabricated a seduction scene with Herr K. out of the thin mountain air. Using dream analysis, the concept of sexual sublimation, and his new theory of repression, Freud came to similar, if more complex, conclusions. Ida, still maintaining her version of the story, left Freud's care abruptly on New Year's Eve, 1900.

Five years later, Freud published Ida Bauer's case history (renaming her "Dora"), which became a pillar of psychoanalytic theory.

Both Freud and the Bauers have great significance for the history explored in this book. Freud's role as the leader of a psychoanalytic movement that revolutionized mental health care and the ways in which the western world thinks about sex makes him both an historical actor in the history of Vienna and a methodological model for the history of sexuality. The Bauer family also played a further role in the history of Vienna. Ida Bauer experienced depression as an adult and sought psychoanalytic treatment again in the interwar years. During that time her brother, Otto Bauer, led the Austrian Social Democratic Workers' Party (henceforth SDAP) through the tumultuous political changes of Austria's First Republic, 1918 to 1934. His party held the majority on Vienna's city council and was able to remake wide swaths of the city's geography and cultural landscape in radical and innovative ways. Aside from pockets of support in Austria's provincial capitals, however, the SDAP's power was isolated. The Austrian countryside during the First Republic voted overwhelmingly in favor for the Christian Social Party (CSP), which engaged in a *Kulturkampf* with the SDAP that eventually resulted in the brief Civil War of 1934, after which Otto Bauer and the rest of his party's leadership fled to Brno, in the new state of Czechoslovakia. Four years later, Sigmund Freud left Vienna at the insistence of the National Socialists, who controlled Austria from 1938 to 1945.

The remarkably turbulent political events that are encompassed within this story, from the demise of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, through World War I and the founding of the Austrian Republic, and finally to the violent regime changes of the 1930s, have the ability to overshadow Vienna's rich cultural history. In this book, however, these events serve as the political background to an examination of sexual knowledge in Vienna. I will argue that the production and distribution of sexual knowledge in Vienna underwent a dramatic shift during the years 1900 to 1934: from a form of scientific inquiry practiced largely by medical specialists to a social reform issue engaged by and intended for a wide audience.

Let us return for a moment to Ida Bauer in 1900. It is clear that whatever went wrong for her that summer in the Alps, it revolved around questions about sexual knowledge and behavior. In his conversations with Ida Bauer that fall, Freud repeatedly questioned the extent of sexual knowledge she possessed and the nature of the sexual behavior she believed was taking place around her. What had she been reading that summer? What did Herr K. want from her? Was the relationship between her father and Frau K. sexual? How did her father's history of venereal infection and professed impotence affect his ability to conduct a romantic affair? When Freud published these inquiries five years later, he was very aware that fellow physicians would react with "astonishment and horror" to the plain ways in which he had discussed sexual matters with an eighteen-year-old girl from a middle-class family.² Freud defended himself from would-be critics by making

the bold assertion that it was “possible for a man to talk to girls and women upon sexual matters of every kind without doing them harm and without bringing suspicion upon himself;” so long as one did so in a dry and direct manner and could “make them feel convinced that it [was] unavoidable.”³ Indeed, Freud predicated his treatment of Ida Bauer on the belief that hysteria could not be cured without discussing sexual matters. Bringing sexual matters into the open disarmed them, according to Freud. Any injury sexual topics caused on a conscious level was preferable to the far greater damage they could have as unconscious ideas or fantasies. Talking about sex was necessary for psychoanalytic treatment. Rather than tip-toe around the subject, Freud recommended a different tack: “The right attitude is: ‘pour faire une omelette il faut casser des oeufs.’”⁴

The social pretense of respectable women’s ignorance of sexual matters was one of the eggs that Freud cracked while constructing his theories of sexuality and the unconscious. Feminist critics of Freud have further suggested that Ida Bauer herself was “cracked” by Freud, a casualty of his assumptions about women.⁵ This book will not engage in those controversies. The questions that surrounded Ida Bauer’s treatment, however, invite us to think about the history of sexual knowledge in Vienna and its importance to the city’s larger history. Both contemporary social critics and modern historians of *fin-de-siècle* Vienna have described it as a city suffused with sex.⁶ However, this description disappears in the post-Imperial historiography of the city. Certainly sex was at the heart of the conversations in which Freud engaged Ida Bauer: what she knew, where she had received her knowledge, and why she believed certain sexual behavior to be improper. This book is at base an attempt to apply these questions to a wider range of historical actors in Vienna, including those who inherited the former Imperial capital: the citizens of the First Republic.

The Problem

The history of sexual knowledge in Vienna established in this book is the result of a series of inquiries into both urban and epistemological cultural changes. Its story is concerned with the ways knowledge about sex was made and shared in Vienna, beginning with the explosion of sexual science in the late Imperial period and ending with the incomplete cultural revolution wrought by the SDAP, which ended in 1934. First, I have focused on the shift in the purpose of sexual knowledge in Vienna, as understood by those who created and disseminated it. Whereas *fin-de-siècle* sexology sought to classify and heal individuals as a medical science, sexual knowledge in the interwar years was employed to heal the social body: the truncated, diseased, and impoverished population of the newly created Republic of Austria. This shift refocused sexual knowledge away from sexological taxonomies of aberrant sexual behaviors and towards advising heterosexual,

reproductive couples, whom numerous social reform movements targeted as central to the regeneration of society. Imagining and implementing national regeneration through such citizens meant that bodies, hygiene, families, and reproduction would need to be redefined and restructured to fit the needs of the new state. Much as Freud had done in his treatment of Ida Bauer, the young Republic would have to talk about sex in radically new ways. Second, I have sought to explain how the discourse of sexual danger, especially regarding venereal infection, intensified in Vienna during the first third of the twentieth century. I argue that this intensification was the direct result of World War I and the ensuing concern that women and children would be infected with venereal disease (VD) carried by returning soldiers. Particular kinds of narratives were used to express sexual danger to both medical and popular audiences. I will also call attention to the employment of emotional testimonies and melodrama by those who wished to illustrate sexual danger in disease, reproduction, or ignorance. Throughout the story told here, I emphasize the politically and culturally specific context of sexual knowledge in Vienna. Unlike other European capitals, Vienna did not produce a body of pronatalist legislation or ideology during the years 1900 to 1934.⁷ Likewise, despite Austria's overwhelmingly Roman Catholic population and the strength of political Catholicism on a national level, contraception advice, distribution, and research were both legal and widespread during the First Republic. I will argue that developments such as these were made possible by Vienna's position as the successive capital of two very unusual countries; the Austro-Hungarian Empire, a supra-national and polyglot entity, and the Republic of Austria, a nation that no native political party supported. In both cases, Vienna stood apart as a state within a state, with a politics and culture distinct from the larger political body.

Methodology

The most significant methodological choice I have made in this work is to limit the range of inquiry to a city, rather than a nation. Although my research is inspired by the growing literature that links sexuality to nationalism, I have not found this approach to be useful in thinking about either the Austro-Hungarian Empire or the First Austrian Republic.⁸ Instead, I have treated Vienna as the most politically and culturally contested space within both regimes. The primary political opponents in the struggle to produce and control sexual knowledge in Vienna, from 1900 to 1934, were those of social democracy and political Catholicism. Neither political party could be described as nationalistic.⁹ Both developed out of nineteenth-century, multi-national Imperial conditions; when the Empire was dismantled after World War I, both parties favored union with Germany over the creation of an independent Austria. Yet lack of native nationalism did not lead any of Austria's politicians to doubt Vienna's position as a world capital.¹⁰

Before the World War I, Vienna was governed by the Christian Social Party and was the jewel of the Empire's "golden triangle" of capitals. After the war, the city was recognized as a province of Austria, granted the right to self-taxation, and controlled by the SDAP. Unlike any other European capital, interwar Vienna was socialist-run through and through, a kind of exhibition piece for what could be achieved in the name of the working class. Throughout the First Republic, however, armed militias representing socialists, Catholics, communists, and monarchists clashed in street skirmishes, culminating in a civil war whose last battles were fought in Vienna's municipal housing complexes. The extraordinary position of Vienna during the years 1900 to 1934 makes a study circumscribed by nationalist concepts irrelevant.

My methodological approach to the problem of sexual knowledge in Vienna has been shaped by my sources, the bulk of which have been published. These include hundreds of sex manuals, advice columns, Catholic theological texts, medical journals, children's sexual education pamphlets, and municipal reports. Where possible, I have sought out the records of the associations that produced this body of literature, which has allowed me to look at the way that sex became a reform movement. These associational records provide me with a picture of how people performed the act of organization: what their meetings were like, where their money came from, what rules they created for themselves. Finally, I have used documents from city, state, and political party archives. These include city administration records, personnel records, clinic forms, and propaganda materials.¹¹

I approach sexual knowledge from the position of cultural history. Rather than define a "sexuality" for early twentieth-century Vienna, I have sought to understand how people in Vienna thought about sex, what they did with that knowledge, and how that knowledge changed over time. To do so, I have employed three major analytical tools. The first is an analysis of contemporary discourses of sexual knowledge.¹² Discursive analysis, most famously employed by Michel Foucault, forces the historian to suspend temporarily all the points of view of a given debate, making them momentarily equal and divorcing them from any eventual "truth" or outcome. This exercise allows the historian to study the components of a past debate, the relationships between ideas, the format of information, and any attempts to control or limit discussion. Discursive analysis is especially useful for my project because it breaks down the distinctions between hard sciences, like biology, and soft or "pseudo" sciences, such as eugenics.¹³ These distinctions among sexual knowledge, perhaps clear to modern historians, were extremely fluid in the early twentieth century. By taking seriously the multiplicity of beliefs about sexual behavior and the moral and hygienic consequences thereof, I am better able to recreate the cultural context of sexual knowledge in Vienna as it was understood by the historical actors who shaped it.

My approach to sexual discourse employs two further analytical tools. The first is the concept of a “horizon of possibility,” originally used by Lucien Febvre to investigate the mental life of historical subjects.¹⁴ Carlo Ginzburg has invoked a “horizon of possibility in culture,” to defend historical investigations of individuals who might not be representative of the dominant culture, but nevertheless help historians to think about the limits of what was possible to think in a given era.¹⁵ I have adapted this concept to think about the significance of some of the unusual sources I have uncovered and the often-marginalized authors or sex reform groups that produced them. Using a horizon of possibility has helped me work with many kinds of published sexual knowledge, particularly those texts without edition histories. Without such evidence, it is difficult to construct an argument about the popular reception of some of the most innovative sexual information produced in Vienna. I have approached these texts as delineators of what was possible when people wrote and reasoned about sex. The second analytical addition to discursive analysis employed in this work is the concept of “emotional regimes,” which has been most fully defined by William Reddy.¹⁶ This method of analysis identifies the systems within a society that govern the ways its citizens are asked to feel. I chose to use the methods of emotional history because my sources revolve around emotion: seduction and betrayal, romantic and familial love, fear of childbirth, and so on. Much of the sexual information available in early twentieth-century Vienna was conveyed in melodramatic language that appealed to the individual’s sense of justice and responsibility. I have used the concept of emotional regimes to identify which emotions were discussed in relation to sex, as well as the social attitudes and personal attributes that combined to make possible desired (or undesired) emotions about sex and sex knowledge. My methodology is designed to illuminate the possibilities open to Viennese historical actors as they thought, felt, and communicated sexual knowledge.

Historiography

Modern Austrian history has been written to explain failure: the failure of Liberalism in the late nineteenth century and Social Democracy in the interwar years; the decline of empirical thought and the rise of irrationalism among intellectual elites; the loss of World War I and the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire; the failure of Jewish assimilation and the rise of anti-Semitism; and the inability to create a culture of nationalism that might have prevented the *Anschluss* with Germany in 1938. This approach has usefully exploited the numerous failures of Austrian history and used them as entry points of political and cultural explanation.

Carl Schorske transformed the explanatory model of failure into one of crisis and cultural innovation in *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*, which argues that the Liberal bourgeoisie of late Imperial Vienna retreated into aesthetics

and intellectual life in response to an increasingly frozen parliamentary system and the rise of the CSP in Vienna.¹⁷ Schorske drew upon the increase of political irrationalism and the cultural legacy of Roman Catholicism to explain Viennese cultural modernism as struggle between *Sein und Schein*: “reality and illusion,” or “being and appearing.” This has been an enormously profitable avenue for historians, and a great deal of the recent historiography of Vienna has been written in dialogue with or as a critique of Schorske’s work. Schorske’s use of cultural figures to illuminate political and intellectual shifts has been appropriated by historians and extended to studies of Ludwig Wittgenstein, Karl Kraus, Richard von Krafft-Ebing, and Otto Weininger.¹⁸ John Boyer has worked to clarify the voting patterns of the Viennese Liberal bourgeoisie, and has shown that in many cases the class base identified by Schorske actually voted against Liberalism and for CSP politicians like Karl Lueger, who won his first election in 1895 and served as Vienna’s mayor from 1897 to 1910.¹⁹ Wolfgang Maderthaler and Lutz Musner have studied the social, cultural, and economic ruptures that separated Vienna’s elite inner city from the working-class *Vorstadt*.²⁰ Harriet Anderson questioned the paucity of women in the cultural historiography of late Imperial Vienna, and has used her study of Viennese women’s movements to suggest that some contemporary political drives transcended a Liberal/Catholic split.²¹ Finally, historians Ivar Oxaal and Michael Pollack have criticized Schorske for his reluctance to credit Vienna’s Jewish presence (10 percent of the population in 1900) with meaning other than as the victims of antisemitism.²² This critique is carried out most fully by Steven Beller, who has used the *Gymnasium* records of late Imperial Vienna to establish that over 50 percent of graduates from a liberal bourgeois background who qualified to enter university, and thus practice culture-shaping professions, were Jewish.²³

Historians of anti-Semitism in Austria have led the process of extending cultural histories of Vienna into the interwar years. Austrian and American historians have explored the culture of interwar Vienna, which was dominated by a deepening political polarization, by emphasizing political theory, crisis, and violence.²⁴ Anton Pelinka has explained political culture in the First Republic as a *Lager System*, in which the SDAP, CSP, and Pan-German Party functioned as camps that socialized members through youth groups, educational programs, and cultural organizations, binding individuals into deep patterns of membership that, on a national level, resulted in a “centrifugal democracy” in which consensus was impossible.²⁵ In this sense, interwar Austria was very similar to Weimar Germany. Many historians have worked to define this political camp system and establish its effects on city life in Vienna. Josef Weidenholzer has argued that the education innovations and worker festivities sponsored by the SDAP were conscious efforts to uproot and replace Catholic patterns of culture in Vienna.²⁶ Conversely, Melanie A. Sully has interpreted the SDAP’s focus on socio-cultural reform as a sign of the party’s inability to effect political change

on a national level.²⁷ This criticism is implicit in Helmut Gruber's work, which shows that the translation of Austromarxist ideals into social reform in interwar Austria was marked by an oftentimes clumsy, top-down approach by the SDAP to its working-class constituency.²⁸ The persistence of religious belief in the daily life of socialist-controlled Vienna in the interwar period has been explored by historians, as have the limits of socialist reform vis-à-vis women.²⁹ This literature has been central to helping me frame sexual reform within the volatile political context of interwar Austria.

As will become clear in the following chapters, a wide range of actors were drawn to the project of making public basic information about sex. Catholics, socialists, and others worked to improve the health of the people, mental and physical, by creating and disseminating sexual knowledge. But particularly in the First Republic, sex information became politicized. Catholics emphasized purity and chastity (for the glory of God) when explaining sex to their audiences; socialists largely echoed these messages while appealing to the health of the greater population and the importance of upright, clean living. So while both sides may have justified their actions differently, the end goal was very similar. Like many of their Weimar colleagues, sex reformers in Vienna were committed to creating a viable *Volk* through hygiene and education. Unlike many Berlin progressives, however, the Viennese showed a grudging appreciation for the power of the Roman Catholic Church to structure sexual forms of knowledge in terms of confession and revelation. This uneasy cohabitation between a Catholic heritage and a socialist future in interwar Vienna gave a different nuance to the discourse of sex reform than was found in Weimar Germany, particularly when it came to the issue of abortion, as we shall see. The bi-polar politics of interwar Austria left deep marks in what could be achieved in the realm of sexual knowledge.

Because the Austrian Republic was so fragile and so bitterly contested, historians have been largely unable to approach interwar history in a non-partisan way: that is, without setting up political winners and losers to be championed or reviled. The composite result has been a doomsday-narrative of the Republic for all parties involved: the fall of socialist Vienna in 1934, the betrayal of Christian Social ideals by the clerico-fascist wing that led the *Christliche Ständestaat* ("Christian Corporate State") of 1934 to 1938, the mutinous putsch attempts against the *Ständestaat* led by Austrian National Socialists, and the *Anschluss* invasion of Austria by Nazi Germany in 1938. This narrative divides interwar Austrian culture between political enemies and makes it very difficult to uncover shared concerns or discussions. This book tries to mitigate the weight of interwar Austria's doomsday narrative in two ways. First, I have approached sexual knowledge in Vienna as a process that spans the late Imperial and Republican periods, producing a heterogeneous corpus of research and reform that was still very fluid in 1934. Second, I have chosen a very political topic—sex—and attempted to show how it transcended traditional political boundaries in interwar Vienna. Sex research and reform in the period my

book covers was an international undertaking, avidly followed by scientists and activists eager to apply new methods in Vienna. Within Austria, sexual knowledge production and distribution divided opinion within parties and occasionally drew erstwhile political enemies together. Clearly, this is not a book that seeks to explain the failure of Austrian liberalism in the *fin-de-siècle* or even the eventual ecstatic reception of Adolf Hitler in 1938. Rather, it underlines some of the cultural continuities between these events and suggests an alternate sphere of work and activism that expanded in this time frame.

Because the larger argument of this book posits a shift in sexual knowledge that has not been addressed in the historiography, I want to use fuller historical narratives to introduce my understanding of sex as a science and as a social reform movement. In the next two sections, I wish to set up the key issues and historiography surrounding these problems.

Sex as Science

Nineteenth-century medical authorities and specialists who theorized about sex were known as sexologists. Working from anatomical, hormonal, and inheritable models of human wellness and abnormality, sexologists attempted to map out the entire range of human sexual preference and behavior. They did so with very little recourse to individual psychic drives, resting their findings instead on the physiological information that was being produced in centers of medical learning across Europe. Many sexologists, including Havelock Ellis in England and Magnus Hirschfeld in Germany, argued for the normalization of non-procreative desires and the abolition of anti-homosexual legislation. However, sexology also drew from the ground-breaking work of Bénédict Augustin Morel (*Theory of Degeneration*, 1857) and Cesare Lombroso (*Criminal Man*, 1876) to argue that non-procreative sexual activities were not (merely) immoral choices but rather symptoms of degeneration: inherited tendencies that played out in the sexual lives of abnormal or atavistic human beings.³⁰ This approach to sexual behavior transformed sexual activities, such as same-sex penetration, into sexual identities, such as homosexuality. Sexology suggested that sexual activity, including perverse activity (defined as that which did not have coitus as its goal) was determined by natural laws. In doing so, sexology challenged the authority of Church and state to define sexual issues. Rather than require penance or legal penalty from individuals who engaged in abnormal sexual practices, sexology argued that they deserved scientific study and, in some cases, medical treatment.

As literary critic Rita Felski has pointed out, the world of sexual science created in the nineteenth century “brings to mind sepia-tinted images of earnest Victorian scholars laboring over lists of sexual perversions with the taxonomical zeal of an entomologist examining insects.”³¹ Indeed, perhaps the most fa-

mous sexological study produced in this period was a taxonomy. University of Vienna Professor of Psychiatry Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia sexualis*, first published in 1886, detailed a world of sexual perversion and abnormality. *Psychopathia sexualis* began as a slim, 110-page thinking-through of the relationship between legal structures and medical authorities in criminal cases involving sexual activity. Krafft-Ebing revised the text eleven times before his death in 1902, adding new definitions and case studies to each addition and expanding the tome to 437 pages, including illustrations.³² The categories of homosexuality, masochism, pedophilia, and fetishism were either coined or given their modern definition by Krafft-Ebing. His taxonomy of sexual behavior made Vienna a capital of sexology.

At the close of the nineteenth century, the University of Vienna Medical School where Krafft-Ebing taught was one of the most prestigious in the world. Its departments of physiology, psychiatry, and dermatology and venereal disease played important roles in the development of sexual science. In the physiology department, luminaries including Ernst Fleischel, Sigmund Exner, and Josef Breuer collaborated with Ernst Mach (from the physics department) to develop new theories of cerebral localization, perception, and memory. These researches, inspired by Charles Darwin's theses, attempted to reconstruct the history of evolution via the brain layouts of organisms. Exner's work, in particular, anticipated what would today be called evolutionary psychology. His physiological explanations of psychic phenomena claimed that man's moral behaviors were outgrowths of instinct, as he argued in a famous 1891 lecture to his colleagues, "Morality as a Weapon in the Struggle for Existence."³³ In the psychiatry department, led by the internationally acclaimed neuroanatomy expert Thomas Meynert, mental behaviors were explained through physiological findings. Krafft-Ebing, when he joined the department in 1889, built direct links between asylum and university psychiatry and succeeded in making psychiatry-neuropathology an independent medical specialty in 1903.³⁴ Finally, the dermatology and venereal disease department helped to create the new science of bacteriology, which under the name mycology had previously been the domain of botanists. Here, Ernest Finger pioneered modern research on gonorrhea, while his colleague Edward Lang (working at the Second Department of Venereal Disease at Vienna's General Hospital) used bacteriology to argue successfully that syphilis, gonorrhea, and soft chancre were clinically and etiologically different diseases.

In Vienna, as in the rest of Europe, sexual knowledge produced by the university medical faculty was combined with insights from psychiatry, criminal anthropology, and biology. The largest schism within the resulting interdisciplinary realm of sexology was rooted in the competing biological theories of Lamarck and Darwin and the ways these theories were used to explain social processes. Understanding how traits were passed through successive generations of human beings was critical to sexology because many of its conclusions about sexual de-

viance were based upon ideas of inherited weaknesses. Lamarckian models of reproduction argued that the environment and acquired characteristics of each generation could have immediate effects upon the genetic make-up of its offspring. Degeneration worked as cause and symptom of the same illnesses in this school of thought; the human embryo adapted to the environment of the womb, modifying to survive the poisons and behaviors of its mother. As the practices and environments of human beings changed, Neo-Lamarckians argued, so would humans themselves. Urbanization and industrialization thus threatened to produce ever-weaker and more degenerate cohorts. Darwinian theory, on the other hand, posited that generational change happened at a glacial rate. Sexual selection in each generation favored the strongest and thus most capable of reproduction, slowly modifying each species according to the traits selected and amplified by thousands of generations. We have already seen that the Vienna Medical School's physiology department, in particular, was animated by Darwin's work. Yet Viennese sexual science in the late nineteenth century drew liberally from both Darwinian and Neo-Lamarckian thought. The latter survived at the University of Vienna well into the interwar period, most famously in the hereditary experiments of Paul Kammerer.³⁵ Both Darwinian and Neo-Lamarckian theories of hereditary transmission of traits were used extensively to construct social reform movements in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. I will take up this discussion below, after introducing a final development in Viennese sexual science: the psychoanalytic revolution.

Psychoanalysis, as developed by Freud and modified by his students in the early twentieth century, shared important roots with sexual science.³⁶ Neo-Lamarckian scientists would have recognized in Freud's work a modified version of their own environmental theories, now extended into child development. However, psychoanalysis's approach to sexual functions was fundamentally different from that of sexology; rather than look for objective, physiological causes of sexual deviance, psychoanalysis explored a subjective world of motivations and drives that determined action on an individual level. Yet sexological and psychoanalytical practices developed as theories about and answers to the same kinds of medical ailments, including hysteria, impotence, and homosexuality. Furthermore, in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna these practices developed side by side. As historian William McGrath has shown, Freud was convinced that physiological and psychological processes were identical and that the disorders of his patients could be best illuminated using both psychoanalytical and biochemical explanations.³⁷ The methods of dream analysis and free association Freud developed in his psychoanalytic practice allowed him to expose phenomena hidden by biological medicine, but were not intended to replace it. In the case-study produced by Freud's work with Ida Bauer, for instance, Freud reframed the either psychical or somatic question of the roots of hysteria by arguing for both, claiming that hysterical physical symptoms repeated themselves only when they had psychical significance.³⁸

Thus, according to Freud, Ida Bauer's recurring cough had a psychological meaning welded onto it: the belief (gleaned from reading sexological textbooks) that her otherwise impotent father and Frau K. were engaging in oral sex.³⁹

Unlike sexology, psychoanalysis was not interested in insisting upon a unity of meaning for sexual behaviors and abnormalities. On the contrary, as his analysis of Ida Bauer shows, Freud argued that single symptoms could correspond to and express multiple meanings, according to the nature of the suppressed thoughts that were struggling to express themselves through physical signs.⁴⁰ The therapeutic technique Freud developed—the “talking cure”—was purely psychological, but he maintained that it also revealed the organic bases of neuroses. In this way, Freud combined and transformed the current medical and sexological traditions in Vienna to create a new way of thinking about sex as “not simply interven[ing], like a *deus ex machina*, on one single occasion” in an individual's life, but rather as “the key to the problem of psychoneuroses and of the neuroses in general.”⁴¹ In particular, Freud's 1905 *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* reframed the central questions of sexology. In it, he constructed a theory of infantile sexuality and child development that explained homosexuality, masturbation, fetishism, and sadomasochism as symptoms not of degeneration, but rather as signs of an incomplete or abnormal development of an individual's natural sexual drives. Freud's ideas, like those of many sexual researchers before him, were dismissed as “Jewish science” in Vienna. The anti-Semitic reception of these ideas remains an untold story in Central European history. As the following chapters unfold, we will see that several of Vienna's most polarizing figures in the realm of public sexual knowledge production were Jewish, as well. The uncomfortable position of being a religious outsider speaking to a deeply Catholic culture about sex is explored more fully in chapter 5.

Although Freud is not a major character in the narrative this book creates, two early “defectors” from Freud's psychoanalytic circle, Alfred Adler and Wilhelm Reich, deserve special introduction.⁴² On the cusp of World War I, Alfred Adler broke with Freud over the supremacy of sexual matters in individual development. Social and cultural factors, he argued, played far greater roles in the formation of individual subjectivity. Adler developed his own brand of personality analysis that stressed the ability to work with others as the most important human characteristic. His emphasis on cooperation, as well as his critique of the prevailing social hierarchy as causing “inferiority-complexes,” made Adler's theories very popular with the Social Democratic ideologues that envisioned the interwar period's *neue Menschen*. In 1919, he was invited by the city of Vienna to direct an experimental teaching college.⁴³ Wilhelm Reich, on the other hand, produced psychoanalytic theories that were less agreeable to Vienna's city council. In 1922, when the Vienna Psychoanalytic Dispensary was opened, Reich worked with Freud to bring individualistic private practice to a larger public. His experiences in the free clinic led him to argue that, among its lower-class

patients, the “release of sexual tensions through genital satisfaction immediately reduced the breaking through of pathological drives.”⁴⁴ Reich’s “Theory of the Orgasm,” which claimed that all neuroses (as well as social problems such as rape and prostitution) could be cured through regular sexual satisfaction, was formulated between 1922 and 1926. In 1929, Reich broke with Freud and founded the Socialistic Society for Sexual Advice and Research, which operated several sex counseling clinics in Vienna beginning in 1930. In these centers, Reich taught that abstinence, the prohibition of masturbation, and the compulsion to marry were injurious attempts by parental and state authorities to suppress sexuality in young people and thus create more submissive subjects. Reich’s Society used experimental psychoanalytic science to free the Viennese of what he considered to be unhealthy social-sexual constraints.

Both Alfred Adler and Wilhelm Reich modified Freudian psychoanalytic theory in ways that allowed psychoanalytic insights to be applied on a social, rather than an individual level. They refocused their diagnoses onto a social body that required healing, and participated in the massive, heterogeneous project of social renewal through medical and scientific intervention that dominated the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. This project used sexual science in its arguments for social reform.

Sex as a Social Reform Movement

The sexual knowledge produced by sexology and psychoanalysis in the *fin-de-siècle* was interpreted by a wide variety of social reform groups in the early twentieth century. In the German-speaking world, the movements involved in appropriating and spreading sexual knowledge included social purity campaigns against prostitution, Neo-Malthusian birth-control supporters, feminists, anti-feminists, Monists, and proponents of eugenics.⁴⁵ In Vienna, as elsewhere, the science of sex was interpreted in highly contested ways.

Two of the most popular authors to interpret the science of sex at the turn of the century were Ernst Haeckel and Otto Weininger. Haeckel’s 1899 best-seller, *The Riddle of the Universe*, popularized Darwin for German audiences and argued for a spirituality-based unity of matter in the universe. Alfred H. Kelly has demonstrated the popularity of this belief system, which Haeckel called Monism, among the German working classes before World War I.⁴⁶ Monism deified the workings of nature, redefining processes including sexual intercourse and reproduction as holy. We know that pre-war Vienna also supported a Monist League, which held meetings and led Sunday hiking expeditions through the Vienna Woods.⁴⁷ Vienna’s Monist League was led by sociologist Rudolf Goldscheid, whose theories of *Menschenökonomie* (“economy of humanity”) called for quality over quantity in the production of citizens. As Edward Ross Dickenson has

shown, Monism offered a lighter version of the Darwinian evolutionary theory that was very attractive to feminists and socialists.⁴⁸ In Vienna, Monism in general (and Goldscheid's ideas in particular) was used by Neo-Malthusian socialists and feminists who supported family limitation through birth control. Otto Weininger's spectacular *Sex and Character*, in contrast, inspired feminist outrage when it appeared in 1903.⁴⁹ *Sex and Character* employed a Neo-Lamarckian reading of sexual characteristics on a cellular level to argue for moral and sexual purity. Weininger had attended a wide range of lectures by the medical faculty at the University of Vienna, including those of Krafft-Ebing and Exner.⁵⁰ His philosophical inquiry into male and female differences rested upon the biological boundaries of gender that Weininger established, using his scientific training at the University of Vienna, in the first part of *Sex and Character*. In the second, philosophical section of the text, Weininger identified sexuality and reproduction as inherently feminine and thus something to be overcome. Jews, too, were infected with femininity, and linked with a crassly scientific worldview in Weininger's attack on the emptiness of modernity.⁵¹

Weininger's anti-Semitism has been contextualized from a number of angles.⁵² His descriptions of women as potentially disease-bearing and immoral, however, must be understood in the context of contemporary Viennese debates on venereal disease and prostitution. Prostitution was a visible part of life in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna's city center, from the ancient *Graben* to the edges of the newly installed *Ringstrasse*. Historian Karin Jusek has analyzed the tremendous social debate over prostitution during this period.⁵³ Socialists, Catholic action groups, feminists, and medical experts argued for greater purity and/or venereal disease prophylaxis in Vienna, attacking both prostitutes and their clientele as agents of racial and moral degeneration via syphilitic infection. During this time, the city sidewalks were divided into sexual commerce zones, "marked off by the police with an invisible line where [prostitutes] might carry on their trade."⁵⁴ These "line girls" formed the least expensive and most obvious legion of prostitutes, and registered with the police at the rate of roughly 2,000 a year.⁵⁵ Beginning in 1873, Vienna struggled under a system of semi-regulated prostitution that strove to sanitize (through compulsory health inspections of any woman on the street) the lowest ranks of venal sex workers and turned a blind eye to less accessible brothels and clubs. The specter of syphilis prompted civil hygiene administrators to demand municipal registration and observation of prostitutes, yet Vienna, capital of Catholicism in central Europe, never officially legalized the sale of sex. Caught between these mandates were the bourgeois city fathers, who allowed the charade to limp along as best it could. For critics of the system, the hypocrisy of prostitution was merely a synecdoche for Viennese Liberalism.

The most dangerous aspect of venal sex according to the medical experts participating in *fin-de-siècle* prostitution debates was the risk of syphilitic infection. During this period, syphilis was understood as a multi-stage disease that began

with sores on the genitals or swollen lymph nodes near the groin. These primary symptoms would quickly dissipate, but the microorganisms that caused the disease, identified in 1905 by Berlin microbiologists Schaudinn and Hoffmann, remained in the bloodstream, and could invade the spinal cord and lining of the brain within a year. If the body's immune system did not conquer the *T. pallidum* organism, the patient could begin showing signs of neurosyphilis—speech problems, inability to raise the eyelids, mania, dementia, and paralysis—sometimes a full decade after the original infection. In 1906, German pathologist August Paul von Wassermann developed a blood test for syphilis that could identify the disease at all stages. Syphilis research, treatment development, and moral sermonizing were major discourses within the Viennese medical community. For the year 1901, the index of the prestigious *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift*, the empire's oldest medical journal, listed syphilis as the most frequent subject for articles and book reviews. Recommended treatments ranged from simple courses of mercury massaged into the body and scalp to complex contraptions that blew hot air on the genitals of comfortably seated, still-clothed patients.⁵⁶ In 1909, Berlin physician Paul Ehrlich announced that the chemical preparation salversan blocked the development of primary and secondary syphilis, if used immediately after infection.⁵⁷ In the face of this incurable disease, hygiene became the watchword of concerned doctors, who increasingly advised the state in their roles as *Obersanitätsrath*, *Sanitätsberichter*, and even *Sectionschef und Sanitätsreferent* of the Imperial Ministry of Interior. The overarching message of the medical community vis-à-vis syphilis is reflected in a succinct aphorism from *Obersanitätsrath* Dr. Rudolf von Jaksch: “The future of medicine lies in prophylaxis. The best prophylaxis is purity.”⁵⁸

Purity was also the maxim favored by Catholic women's associations in late Imperial Vienna. The women's movement in Vienna demanded the abolition of prostitution but was divided in its approach to the problem. The *Christlicher Wiener Frauenbund* (Christian League of Viennese Women), an anti-Semitic and anti-emancipation political league, campaigned for abolition in combination with the promotion of chastity and religious feeling. The anticlerical *Allgemeine Österreichischen Frauenvereins* (Austrian Women's Association), a much smaller organization primarily dedicated to enlarging women's educational opportunities, favored abolition on the grounds that prostitution represented an institutionalized method of class and gender exploitation.⁵⁹ The *AöF* argued that only love could make a sexual relationship moral. Both groups formulated their opposition to hygiene regulation in ways modeled on Josephine Butler's campaign against the British Contagious Diseases Acts.⁶⁰ Wrongful detention of women suspected of prostitution was decried, as was the hypocrisy of hygienic surveillance of prostitutes but not their clients. In addition, both groups argued that feminine sexuality should be returned to its “natural” sphere of marriage and motherhood. Beginning in 1907, the *Österreichischer Bund für Mutterschutz* (Austrian League for

the Protection of Mothers) offered a more radical interpretation of sexuality for women. Free union, supported by the German *BfM* president Helene Stöcker, was vigorously debated by the *BfM* in Vienna.⁶¹ Stöcker called for a *neue Ethik* (“new morality”) that recognized human sexuality as natural and life affirming. Prostitution, defined by the *BfM* as any sexual relationship (including marriage) entered into for financial gain, was described as the inevitable result of moral corruption and inequality between the sexes. The Austrian *BfM*, like its German counterpart, supported equal rights and state support for mothers regardless of their marital status. In the working-class district of Ottakring, the *BfM* opened a charitable home to care for unmarried pregnant women before and after the birth of their children in 1908. Many of the *BfM*’s members went on to participate in the Viennese sex reform movement documented by this book.

German-speaking feminists of the late Imperial period used a range of arguments in their campaigns for free union and mothers’ rights, including eugenic proposals. The *Bund für Mutterschutz* demanded state care for illegitimate children on the grounds that they, as products of freely chosen sexual relations, represented an untapped resource of genetic strength available to the *Volk*.⁶² To better insure the health of children, the *BfM* also petitioned state authorities to institute mandatory medical examinations for prospective marriage partners. Viennese feminist Grete Meisel-Hess, a supporter of the *Allgemeine Österreichischen Frauenvereins* and the *BfM*, criticized capitalist culture as thwarting racial improvement by presenting monetary obstacles to “true” sexual selection. Because property was inherited under capitalism, it was possible for biologically inferior offspring to prosper and reproduce simply because they had been born into rich families. Meisel-Hess argued that only socialism would provide equal rights, for women and for the poor, and thus restore the proper conditions for sexual selection and survival of the fittest.⁶³ In the meantime, she suggested that the mothers and children should form the primary units of society, with the state replacing the father as their protector and means of support. Historian Ellinor Melander has shown that Meisel-Hess’s philosophy was deeply influenced by Ernst Haeckel’s Monism and the eugenic proposals of Alfred Ploetz.⁶⁴ Recent scholarship suggests similar stimuli for the *Bund für Mutterschutz*, presenting overwhelming evidence that democratic, socialist, and eugenic principles coexisted in German and Austrian feminism.⁶⁵

Eugenics was a pan-European approach to racial improvement whose novelty as a social movement lay in its concentrated focus on human reproduction. The neologism was created in 1883 by Francis Galton, a statistician and scientist whose work on the inheritability of talent suggested that, using selective sexual partnership, the human race could improve itself through collective breeding habits. Eugenics was based on Darwinian principals of evolutionary progress and on modifications of Darwinian theory known as “social Darwinism.” The later movement, spearheaded by Herbert Spencer, drew a strong analogy between

the competitive processes at work in nature within and between the species and the competitive processes at work within the social order. Eugenics and social Darwinism were popularized in Germany and Austria by Alfred Ploetz, whose 1895 book *The Efficiency of Our Race and the Protection of the Weak* coined the term *Rassenhygiene* (“racial hygiene”). Ploetz argued for a pure Germanic race that purged itself of weak members, rather than protecting them through social welfare policy. He suggested that reproduction be planned to maximize positive qualities in offspring, that sickly children be mercifully destroyed, and that the most inferior males of society be sent to the front line during wartime.⁶⁶ Ploetz described human beings as deposits of “positive” and “negative” biological materials. These poles were in turn used by a wide range of eugenic thinkers, in Germany and elsewhere, to describe eugenic policy itself. Positive eugenics, to this day, refers to state-directed programs intended to create a strong population, including maternity benefits, family health care, municipal housing, hygiene education programs, and selective access to contraception. Negative eugenics refers to attempts to eliminate racial imperfection in a given population, such as immigration quotas, sterilization of the unfit, limitation of marriage rights, and elimination of unwanted members of society.

Although both Ploetz and Haeckel’s work assumed a hierarchy of racial worthiness that placed Germanic people above all others, it is important to stress that their ideas were embraced and interpreted by people of all political persuasions. Eugenics, *Rassenhygiene*, and social Darwinism were not exclusively associated with fascist politics until 1935, when biological racism was institutionalized in National Socialist Germany through the Nuremberg laws. The period under discussion in this book supported a spectrum of eugenic thought, ranging from the strictly hereditarian, to policies of interventionist social medicine, and finally to more loosely environmentalist arguments. As my research shows, many proponents of social democracy in Vienna were also supporters of eugenics. For socialists, state planners, feminists, and birth control advocates, eugenics was a means of making talk about sex scientific. In both the late Imperial and Republican years, scientific sexual discourse was a powerful tool for those who sought to undermine the authority of the Roman Catholic Church and its representatives in Viennese government, the Christian Social Party. Eugenics helped a variety of people to make arguments about sex and sexual morality that were not dependant on Christian concepts of marriage, fidelity, and chastity.

Eugenics was concerned first and foremost with the production of healthy children through careful control over heterosexual coupling. This is also true for the majority of the sources I have used in this book; be they conservative or progressive, most authors in this period concerned themselves with heterosexual, reproductive knowledge for the people of Vienna. The silence regarding homosexuality in these sources is almost total. Although there are brief mentions of same-sex desire, homosexual knowledge production in this period seems beyond

the project of most sex reformers in Vienna. Certainly young men in *Gymnasium* might be familiar with same-sex love from the classical texts they studied, and there was a flourishing homosexual culture in Imperial Vienna, replete with clubs, cafés, and committees that continued into the interwar period.⁶⁷ While public knowledge and concern over homosexuality played an important part of crafting and policing heterosexuality in other European contexts, this was not the case in early twentieth-century Vienna.⁶⁸ Knowledge production in the interwar years in particular focuses almost exclusively on heterosexuality. Homosexuality, like other “deviant” or non-reproductive subjects such as masturbation and abortion, is an important adumbration on this material rather than a subject in its own right. Where possible, I comment on its presence, yet this book is about the construction of heterosexual knowledge.

The Book

Each of the six chapters of this book is intended to open up major avenues of sexual inquiry and knowledge in Vienna. They illustrate an expansion of sexual *Aufklärung* (literally, “enlightenment”) in all sectors of urban society, including workers, women, and children. In each chapter, sexual discussions like those Freud had with Ida Bauer in 1900 are replayed and reworked for ever-wider audiences. Although centered around disparate events and historical characters, each chapter returns to the issues I found to be central in my research: sexual hygiene and education, sex advice and birth control information, and romantic and familial love.

Chapter 1, entitled “City Hall and Sexual Hygiene in Red Vienna,” focuses on the discussion of sex throughout the creation of Vienna’s socialist municipal health and hygiene system. I argue that Social Democratic sexual doctrine created a new form of *Verantwortlichkeit*, or responsibility, which served as a secular argument for the previously Catholic imperative of sexual continence. I also contextualize the eugenic arguments that Vienna’s Director of Welfare, Dr. Julius Tandler, used to convey the importance of *Verantwortlichkeit* to medical professionals, civil servants, and the citizens of Vienna. Tandler turned traditional eugenics on its head by insisting that social welfare programs, far from diluting the process of “survival of the fittest,” actually accelerated constitutional improvements within the *Volk*.

The following two chapters focus on the radical redirection of sexual knowledge that took place in the First Republic: away from the realm of educated professionals and towards women and children of all classes. Chapter 2 is called “Sexual Education Debates in Late Imperial and Republican Vienna.” The question of sexual knowledge for children was highly contested in the early twentieth century. All of the Austrian parties involved in this debate, from conservative

Catholics to fringe socialists, viewed sexual education as a major tool in the construction of a child's view of their gender role and thus their role in society. Shaping children's ideas about sex was an integral part of sex reform in Vienna. Chapter 3, "Popular Sexual Knowledge for and about Women," follows the explosion in the public sphere of sexual information intended for adults, and particularly women. I analyze the sexual knowledge published in advice books and newspaper columns intended for female audiences, and suggest that the popular press helped to both create and advertise the ideal of companionate marriage. This new understanding of sexual partnership, I show, was vehemently countered by the Roman Catholic Church. However, a deliberately Catholic tone of confession was cultivated even in socialist and woman-centered publications, which created an opportunity for women to testify to their sexual distress and demand new roles for themselves in the family and society.

Chapter 4 is called "Clinic Culture." It highlights the introduction of clinical sexual advice and care open to all Viennese citizens following World War I. A municipal Marriage Advice Center, an independent constellation of reproductive rights clinics, and a series of communist sexual advice offices all offered *Sprechstunden* ("office hours") consultations intended for workers but open to the general public. Clinic culture in Vienna, shaped by post-war material poverty and women's increasing demands for birth control, encouraged a new moral interpretation of sexual activity, marriage, and reproduction. I also suggest the limits of official Social Democratic policy regarding *Sexualnot* ("sexual misery" or "sexual emergency"), a popular term used to justify a variety of sexual reforms. Chapter 5, "Emotional Responses: Hugo Bettauer's Vienna Weeklies," revisits the sensational case of a Viennese journalist and publisher who was censored by the municipal government, charged for the corruption of youth, and ultimately assassinated for producing sexual information. In the pages of his Viennese weeklies, I argue, Bettauer created an emotional regime of pleasure and compassion at odds with Catholic concepts of purity and socialist calls for sexual responsibility.

My final chapter is "Local Reform on an International Stage: The World League for Sexual Reform in Vienna." This seven-day event was open to the public, as was a special hygiene exhibit on loan from the Vienna Museum of Sociological and Economic Sciences. Over 2,000 participants and guests listened to Viennese representatives interact with their international colleagues. Using the debates from the WLSR's Vienna conference, in which many of the sex reform advocates from my chapters squared off against each other, I frame the particularities of Viennese sexual knowledge within international scientific and social reform movements.

The story told in this book thus does not establish a sexuality for the city of Vienna, but rather provides a close look at the ways in which sexual knowledge was shared publicly. A break occurred following World War I that emphasized new models of heterosexual love and behavior. Of course, we may never know

how precisely lives were impacted by this new discourse in the early twentieth century. However, as the chapters of this book will illustrate, it is clear that the voices that joined this fraught conversation were full of emotion. Fear, confusion, and shame are present, but so is hope. The sea change that occurred in the types of sexual knowledge produced made possible a new attitude towards the body and its attendant pleasures, even as it emphasized the dangers of desire. In many cases we are left to imagine for ourselves what individual Viennese citizens did with this knowledge; we may hope that it gave them courage to live and love.

Notes

1. Sigmund Freud, *Dora: An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997) 19.
2. Freud, *Dora*, 41.
3. Freud, *Dora*, 41.
4. Freud, *Dora*, 42.
5. The literature of feminist responses to Freud and Freudian theory is enormous. With regards to Freud's treatment of Dora, *In Dora's Case: Freud—Hysteria—Feminism*, edited by Charles Bernheimer and Claire Kahane (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), offers a comprehensive, chronological overview of psychoanalytic readings of the case, beginning with Jacques Lacan's 1951 essay "Intervention on Transference." The most sustained, historically contextualized feminist analysis of *Dora* is made by Hannah S. Decker in *Freud, Dora, and Vienna 1900* (New York: The Free Press, 1991).
6. Karl Kraus and Otto Weininger are two of the most famous critics of turn-of-the-century Vienna's sexual culture and hypocrisies. These and other sexual critiques emphasize regulated prostitution, venereal disease, and multiple political sexual scandals. See Franz X. Eder, "Erotisierendes Wissen. Zur Geschichte der 'Sexualisierung' im Wiener Fin de Siècle," in *Erotik, Versuch einer Annäherung. Ausstellungskatalog des Historisches Museums der Stadt Wien* (Wien: Historisches Museum, 1990), 20–28.
7. Perhaps the most pronatalist capitals of interwar Europe were Paris and Rome. In both countries, motherhood was understood as the corresponding female sacrifice to male sacrifice in war. Pronatalist laws in these cities included the severe limitation of contraception devices and information, financial support to large families, the legislation of tax breaks, the development of a science of infant health and care (*puériculture*), social assistance for mothers, and, famously, medals for the mothers of especially large families. See Mary Louise Roberts, *Civilization Without Sexes: Reconstructing Gender in Postwar France, 1917–1927* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Marie-Monique Huss, "Pronatalism in the Inter-War Period in France," in *Journal of Contemporary History* 25:1 (January 1990), 39–68; Victoria de Grazia, *How Fascism Ruled Women: Italy, 1922–1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); David G. Horn, "Constructing the Sterile City: Pronatalism and Social Sciences in Interwar Italy," in *American Ethnologist* 18:3 (August 1991), 581–601; Lauren E. Forcucci, "Battle for Births: The Fascist Pronatalist Campaign in Italy 1925 to 1938," in *Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Europe* 10:1 (2010), 4–13.
8. See George Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle-Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985); Isabel V. Hull, *Sexuality, State, and Civil Society in Germany, 1700–1815* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996); Miranda Pol-

- lard, *Reign of Virtue: Mobilizing Gender in Vichy France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); and Eric Naiman, *Sex in Public: The Incarnation of Early Soviet Ideology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).
9. This study does not take into account the stance of the German nationalists of interwar Austria on sex and public sexual information. I did not find enough materials in my research to support a sustained comparison between German nationalism, Catholicism, and socialism.
 10. Post-World War I plans for a combined Germany and Austria called for the creation of two capitals, Berlin and Vienna, and a government that could rotate between them on a yearly basis.
 11. My project has also been shaped by a lack of certain sources, particularly the treatment records of interwar Vienna's marriage and birth control advice clinics and the investigations sponsored by Vienna's Socialistic Society for Sexual Consultation and Sexual Research. Both of these bodies of information seem to have been destroyed during the 1930s, either by the clerico-fascist forces that took control of Austria in 1934 or the National Socialists who ruled after 1938.
 12. This approach was pioneered by Michel Foucault, who used it to show how institutions such as asylums, prisons, and clinics created hierarchies of knowledge and thus augmented their own power. Since then, Foucault's theses on sexuality, agency, and self-hood have been challenged by historians in fruitful ways. See especially Lynn Hunt, "Foucault's Subject in *The History of Sexuality*," in Domna C. Stanton (ed.), *Discourses of Sexuality from Aristotle to Freud* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 78–93; John E. Toews, "Foucault and the Freudian Subject: Archeology, Genealogy, and the Historicization of Psychoanalysis," in Jan Goldstein (ed.), *Foucault and the Writing of History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994); Jeffery Weeks, *Sex, Politics, and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800* (London: Longman, 1989); Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990). My own use of Foucault is very limited: rather than establish a hierarchy of knowledge or a history of bio-power and its deployment, I use discursive analysis to emphasize the plurality of sexual knowledge.
 13. Jan Goldstein makes this point eloquently in her introduction to *Foucault and the Writing of History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 2–15.
 14. Lucien Febvre, *The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century*, translated by Beatrice Gottlieb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).
 15. Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, translated by John and Anne Tedeschi (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1976).
 16. William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feelings: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). The concept of "emotionology" first outlined by Peter and Carol Stearns has also been useful to this project, especially as it requires that historians distinguish between an official emotional regime and records of individual emotional expression. See Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions," *American Historical Review* 90 (October 1985), 813–836. For a review of the historiography of emotions, see Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Worrying about Emotions in History," *American Historical Review* 107 (June 2002), 821–845.
 17. Carl Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1981).
 18. See Allen Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein's Vienna* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973); Edward Timm, *Karl Kraus, Apocalyptic Satirist: Cultural Catastrophe in Habsburg Vienna* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986); Jacques Le Rider, *Modernity and Crises of Identity: Culture and Society in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*, translated by Rosemary Morris (New York: Continuum, 1993); Harry Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Chandak Sengoopta, *Otto Weininger: Sex, Science, and the Self in Imperial Vienna* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

19. John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848–1887* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981) and *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna: Christian Socialism in Power, 1907–1918* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).
20. Wolfgang Maderthaner and Lutz Musner, *Die Anarchie der Vorstadt: Das andere Wien um 1900* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1999).
21. Harriet Anderson, *Utopian Feminism: Women's Movements in fin-de-siècle Vienna* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
22. Ivar Oxaal, "Editor's Introduction: Perspectives and Problems," in Ivar Oxaal (ed.), *Jews, Anti-Semitism, and Culture in Vienna* (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1987), 2–11; Michael Pollok, "Cultural Innovation and Social Identity in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna," in Ivar Oxaal (ed.), *Jews, Anti-Semitism, and Culture in Vienna* (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1987), 59–74.
23. Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews, 1867–1938: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). See also Bruce F. Pauley, *From Prejudice to Persecution: A History of Austrian Anti-Semitism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992) and Evan Burr Bukey, *Hitler's Austria: Popular Sentiment in the Nazi Era, 1938–1945* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).
24. Gerhard Botz, *Gewalt in der Politik: Attentate, Zusammenstöße, Putschversuche, Unruhen in Österreich, 1918–1938* (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1983); Anson Rabinbach, *The Crisis of Austrian Socialism: From Red Vienna to Civil War, 1927–1934* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); Rolf Steininger, "12 November 1918 bis 13 März 1938: Stationen auf dem Weg zum 'Anschluß,'" in Rolf Steininger und Michael Gehler (Hg.), *Österreich im 20. Jahrhundert: Von der Monarchie bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Wien: Böhlau, 1997), 99–152; Fritz Weber, "Hauptprobleme der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Entwicklung Österreichs in der Zwischenkriegszeit," in Franz Kadrnoska (Hrsg.) *Aufbruch und Untergang: Österreichische Kultur Zwischen 1918 und 1938* (Wien: Europaverlag, 1981), 593–622.
25. Anton Pelinka, *Austria: Out of the Shadow of the Past* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998), 30 and 15, respectively. See also Detlef Lehnert, "Politisch-kulturelle Integrationsmilieus und Orientierungslager in einer polarisierten Massengesellschaft," in Emmerich Tólos, Herbert Dachs et al. (Hg.), *Handbuch des politischen Systems Österreich* (Wien: Manzsche Verlags- und Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1995), 431–443. The *Handbuch* also features a helpful set of essays on the six largest political parties of the First Republic.
26. Josef Weidenholzer, *Auf dem Weg zum 'Neuen Menschen': Bildungs- und Kulturarbeiter österreichischer Sozialdemokratie in der Ersten Republik* (Wien: Europaverlag, 1981).
27. Melanie A. Sully, *Continuity and Change in Austrian Socialism: The Eternal Quest for the Third Way* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1982), and Sully, "Social Democracy and the Political Culture of the First Republic," in Anson Rabinbach (ed.), *The Austrian Socialist Experiment: Social Democracy and Austromarxism, 1918–1934* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1985).
28. Helmut Gruber, *Red Vienna: Experiment in Working-Class Culture, 1919–1934* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991). See also Helmut Gruber, "Reflections on the Problematique of Socialist Party Culture and the Realities of Working-Class Life in Red Vienna," in Helmut Konrad (Hg.), *Die deutsche und die österreichische Arbeiterbewegung zur Zeit der Zweiten Internationale* (Wien: Europaverlag, 1982), 647–661.
29. On Catholicism, see Wolfgang Maderthaner, "Kirche und Sozialdemokratie. Aspekte des Verhältnisses von politischem Klerikalismus und sozialistischer Arbeiterschaft bis zum Jahre 1938" in Helmut Konrad und Wolfgang Maderthaner, *Neuere Studien zur Arbeitergeschichte*, Band III (Wien: Europaverlag, 1984), 527–558; Ernst Hainisch, "Das System und die Lebenswelt des Katholizismus," in Emmerich Tólos, Herbert Dachs et al. (Hg.), *Handbuch des politischen Systems Österreich* (Wien: Manzsche Verlags- und Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1995), 444–453.

- On the limits of socialist reform, see Helmut Gruber, "The 'New Woman': Realities and Illusions of Gender Equality in Red Vienna," in Helmut Gruber and Pamela Graves (eds.), *Women and Socialism, Socialism and Women: Europe between the Two World Wars* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998), 57–94, and Karin Lehner, *Verpönte Eingriffe: sozialdemokratische Reformbestrebungen zu den Abtreibungsbestimmungen in der Zwischenkriegszeit* (Wien: Picus Verlag, 1989).
30. The best historical analysis of these key texts remains Daniel Pick's *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, 1948–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
 31. Rita Felski, "Introduction," in Lucy Bland and Laura Doan (eds.), *Sexology in Culture: Labeling Bodies and Desires* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 1.
 32. Harry Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Modern Sexual Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 47. For a reading of Krafft-Ebing as a psychologist, rather than a sexologist, see Renate Hauser, "Krafft-Ebing's Psychological Understanding of Sexual Behavior," in Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich (eds.), *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 210–227.
 33. Erna Lesky, *The Vienna Medical School of the 19th Century* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 494.
 34. Lesky, *Vienna Medical School*, 345.
 35. As a university-trained scientist who was also a member of the Monist League, Kammerer illustrates well the fluidity between hard and soft sciences. See his attempt to combine both in *Lebensbeherrschung: Grundsteinlegung zur organischen Technik* (München: Geschäftsstelle des Deutschen Monistenbundes, 1919).
 36. An excellent guide to these affinities is Sander Gilman, "Sigmund Freud and the Sexologists: A Second Reading," in Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich (eds.), *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: A History of Attitudes to Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 323–347.
 37. William J. McGrath, *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis: The Politics of Hysteria* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), 18.
 38. Freud, *Dora*, 33.
 39. Freud maintained that the unconscious sexual fantasies that caused such suffering in hysterics like Ida Bauer were not the result of precocious sexual knowledge gleaned from sexology books. Rather, these unconscious fantasies were the same ones that perverts made real and acted out in the pages of books like *Psychopathia Sexualis*. Freud, *Dora*, 43.
 40. Freud, *Dora*, 46.
 41. Freud, *Dora*, 105.
 42. A third early "defector" of Freud's circle, Otto Gross, was committed to sexual liberation through free love, a fascinating avant-garde cause that, although popular in some circles, did little to educate the wider public on sexual knowledge.
 43. Malachi Hacohen, *Karl Popper – The Formative Years, 1902–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 92. Popper was a member of the league before World War I.
 44. Wilhelm Reich, *The Function of the Orgasm: Sex-Economic Problems of Biological Energy*, translated by Theodore P. Wolfe (New York: Noonday Press, 1942), 58.
 45. A great deal of research has been done on the sex reform movement in Germany. Some of the findings most useful to this work have been: Atina Grossman, *Reforming Sex: The German Movement for Birth Control and Abortion Reform, 1920–1950* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Cornelia Usborne, *The Politics of the Body in Weimar Germany: Women's Reproductive Rights and Duties* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1992); Anne Taylor Allen, *Motherhood and Feminism in Germany, 1870–1914* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991); Reinhard Mocek, "The Program of Proletarian *Rassenhygiene*," *Science in Context* 11:3–4 (1998), 609–617; Lutz D.H. Sauerteig, "Sex, Medicine, and Morality During the First

- World War,” in Roger Cooter, Mark Harrison et al. (eds.), *War, Medicine, and Modernity* (London: Sutton Publishing, 1998), 167–188.
46. Alfred H. Kelly, “Darwinism and the Working Class in Wilhelmine Germany,” in Seymour Drescher, David Sabean, and Allan Sharlin (eds.), *Political Symbolism in Modern Europe* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1982), 146–167. See also Paul Ziche (Hg.), *Monismus um 1900: Wissenschaftskultur und Weltanschauung* (Berlin: Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung, 2000) and Daniel Gasman, *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism and the German Monist League* (London: MacDonald & Co., 1971) for later applications of Monism.
 47. Hacohen, *Karl Popper*, 67.
 48. Edward Ross Dickinson, “Reflections on Feminism and Monism in the Kaiserreich,” *Central European History* 34:2 (June 2001), 191–230.
 49. Two of Vienna’s most prominent first-wave feminists, Rosa Mayreder and Grete Meisel-Hess, first entered political debate while responding to *Sex and Character*.
 50. Otto Weininger, “Curriculum Vitae,” reprinted in Hannah Rodlauer (Hg.) *Otto Weininger: Eros und Psyche. Studien und Briefe, 1899–1902* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990), 210–211.
 51. Two excellent guides to Weininger’s complicated arguments are David S. Luft, *Eros and Inwardness in Vienna: Weininger, Musil, Doderer* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003) and Chandak Sengoopta, *Otto Weininger: Sex, Science, and Self in Imperial Vienna* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
 52. These range from investigations of the Imperial educational system to psychoanalytic hypotheses of Jewish self-hatred. See Barbara Hyams and Nancy A. Harrowitz, “A Critical Introduction to the History of Weininger Reception,” in Nancy A. Harrowitz and Barbara Hyams (eds.), *Jews and Gender: Responses to Otto Weininger* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995), 3–20; Jacques Le Rider, *Le cas Otto Weininger* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982); on Weininger’s education: Hannelore Rodlauer, “Fragments from Weininger’s Education (1895–1902),” in Nancy A. Harrowitz and Barbara Hyams (eds.), *Jews and Gender: Responses to Otto Weininger* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995), 35–58; on the theory of Jewish self-hatred: Theodor Lessing, *Der jüdische Selbsthaß* (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1930).
 53. Karin J. Jusek, *Auf der Suche nach der Verlorenen: Die Prostitutionsdebatten im Wien der Jahrhundertwende* (Wien: Löcker Verlag, 1994).
 54. Stephan Zweig, *The World of Yesterday* (New York: Viking Press, 1943), 85.
 55. Jusek, *Verlorenen*, 116. This number obviously does not reflect the amount of unregistered or “illegal” prostitutes practicing in Vienna. Police estimates in the 1870s judged that registered prostitutes made up only 10 percent of the population of working women on the street. Jusek, *Verlorenen*, 114.
 56. Dr. Karl Ullmann, “Referate,” *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift* (Jg. 49, 11 August 1900), 1592.
 57. Salversan was ineffective for cases in which neurosyphilis had already presented itself. Syphilis was not cured until 1944, when penicillin (discovered in 1929) proved successful in treating all stages of the disease. See Edward Shorter, *A History of Psychiatry from the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1997), 195.
 58. “Aphorisms,” *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift* (Jg. 50, 29 December 1900), 15. This special fiftieth anniversary issue of the *WmW* featured aphorisms from its readers all over Europe and provides an excellent portrait of the state of medicine in 1900. Jaksch was stationed in Prague.
 59. For 1905, the *AöF* counted just over 300 members, compared to the *CWFs* 14,000. See Anderson, *Utopian Feminism*, 42. However, the *AöF*’s members were much more prolific speechmakers and theoreticians. Many of their members became politicians during the interwar years, once women were given the vote.

60. For analysis of Josephine Butler, see Judith R. Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
61. In a review article celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary, the Austrian *BfM* obliquely referred to its inability to unanimously support free union by calling itself “the quieter sister” of the German *BfM*. Hans Paradeiser, “25 Jahre ‘Bund für Mutterschutz,’” *Blätter für das Wohlfahrts-wesen*, (Jg. 31, Jänner/Februar 1932), 6–9.
62. See Anne Taylor Allen, “Feminism, Venereal Disease, and the State in Germany, 1890–1918,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 4:1 (July 1993), 27–50.
63. Ideas summarized from Grete Meisel-Hess, *Der Sexuelle Krise* (Jena: 1909), 288–314.
64. Ellinor Melander, “Toward the Sexual and Economic Emancipation of Women: The Philosophy of Grete Meisel-Hess,” *History of European Ideas* 14:5 (1992), 695–713.
65. See Kristin McGuire, “Helene Stöcker’s ‘neue Ethik’ from 1905–1915,” Paper presented at the German Historical Institute Conference *Sexuality in Modern German History* (October 2002); Dickinson, “Reflections on Feminism and Monism,” 203; Allen, “Feminism,” 34–35.
66. See Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Wippermann, *The Racial State: Germany 1933–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 32.
67. On the use of classical texts to discuss same-sex desire, see Peter Singer, *Pushing Time Away: My Grandfather and the Tragedy of Jewish Vienna* (New York: Harper Collins, 2003). For a reading of Vienna’s homosexual cultures, see Neda Bei, Wolfgang Förster, Hanna Hacker, and Manfred Lang (eds.), *Das Lila Wien um 1900: Zur Ästhetik der Homosexualitäten* (Wien: promedia, 1986) and Hanna Hacker, *Frauen und Freundinnen: Studien zur weiblichen Homosexualität am Beispiel Österreich 1870–1938* (Weinheim: Beltz Verlag, 1987).
68. For French and German contexts, see Carolyn J. Dean, *The Frail Social Body: Pornography, Homosexuality, and Other Fantasies in Interwar France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000) and Tracie Matysik, *Reforming the Moral Subject: Ethics and Sexuality in Central Europe, 1890–1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), respectively.