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ABSTRACT

The Nazis’ persecution of LGBTQ individuals is an often-overlooked topic in the wider study of the Second World War. This paper synthesises recent research on this subject to provide an introduction to queer life in Germany between 1920 and 1945; it deals largely with the lives and experiences of gay men, particularly their fight for legal equality in the interwar years and their mistreatment during the Nazi period. Although not aiming to break new ground in this field, this paper aims to raise awareness of and generate interest in this topic among a general, interdisciplinary audience, and also to remind readers that the struggles faced by the worldwide queer community neither began nor ended with the Third Reich.

Introduction: Breaking the Silence

When the Second World War, the Third Reich, or the Holocaust are mentioned, the issue which might naturally come to mind is the Nazi Party’s vehement and genocidal persecution of the Jews – and this association is certainly not unfounded, unusual, or incorrect. One might also remember the victimisation and mass murder of other marginalised groups, such as disabled people, the Roma, the Slavs, or political prisoners such as the Communists. Even today, however, many would not immediately think to class homosexuals among the main victims of the Nazi regime. This is due in part to wilful overlooking by both German and Allied governments of the suffering of the queer community under Hitler’s dictatorship both before and during the war. This intentional silencing has caused a significant gap in gay European history that has only begun to be filled in the last few decades, and has further prolonged the struggles of LGBTQ individuals persecuted under the Third Reich. The vast majority of this group are now dead, many at the hands of the Nazis during the twelve years of their terrible reign, and have gone to their graves without sharing their experiences. However, those few who were able to leave memoirs and other personal accounts behind have provided an extraordinary insight into this dark period of history, and many skilled historians in the decades
since 1945 have analysed and synthesised these first-hand accounts into useful, eye-opening, and often emotionally overwhelming narratives. This paper does not aim to contribute new or original research to the existing literature on this topic, but rather to provide a concise introduction to it and thus make more broadly known the stories, and the sufferings, of this oft-forgotten group of victims.

Before the War: The Weimar Republic, Paragraph 175, and the Röhm Purge

The Weimar Republic is often regarded (and depicted in film and literature) as a period of unprecedented and dizzying sexual freedom, a petri dish for the development of the modern queer identity. (Although the word “queer” may not have been used to describe this community at the time, it is used here to primarily mean “gay, lesbian, transgender, and transvestite,” thus aiming to encompass those identities which appeared most prominently in the Weimar underground scene.) While this vision of the Weimar era as a “golden age” of homosexual freedom may be slightly exaggerated, it does have some basis in fact; it was, indeed, “a relatively tolerant, open society that was home to left-leaning innovations and intellectual and artistic achievement,” which generally allowed for greater acceptance of sexual differences, especially in larger cities. Gay and lesbian clubs, friendship societies, human rights organisations, and publications abounded in populous centres such as Berlin and Hamburg, and were even found in smaller, and more conservative, cities such as Dresden and Munich. Magazines like Die Freundschaft, Der Eigene, Garçonne, and Die Freundin helped gays, lesbians, transvestites (many, but not all, of whom belonged to the previous categories), and transgender people to find a social scene, a political outlet, entertainment, and even love. They offered queer-themed short stories and poetry, guides to local gay bars, clubs, balls, and parties, and personal-ad sections, through which same-sex couples often met. Although the publications themselves were not always political, their owners and editors were sometimes involved with homosexual rights organisations, such as Magnus Hirschfeld’s pioneering Scientific-Humanitarian Committee (Wissenschaft-humanitäres Komitee, or WhK). However, despite reform-minded individuals’ best efforts, conservative censorship laws and societal expectations of “respectability” still limited homosexuals’ freedom of expression and their status as citizens. For example, the passing of the “Filth and Trash Law” in 1926 focussed its censorship on print media dealing with any content related to sexuality, spanning from niche sexual practices to benign sexual health information, and including homosexual-rights activism. Censorship of this kind was concerned, above all else, with maintaining “respectability” via the separation of public and private spheres of life. Weimar Germany was, generally speaking, content to let homosexuals live as they pleased – provided they didn’t “seduce” anyone, particularly minors, to their way of life; didn’t flaunt their identities too loudly (queer subcultures and venues being the exception); or disrupt public life in any way, including by participating in sex work, in the interest of maintaining harmony within the German people, or Volk. A major way in which these guidelines of respectability and morality were enforced was through a draconian piece of legislation that would haunt German homosexuals for decades: Paragraph 175 of the criminal code.

The persecution of homosexuals was not a practise proprietary to the Nazi party, or even new to German law by the time they came to power. Although in the early nineteenth century homosexuality was decriminalised, or else its legal repercussions were lessened, throughout many of the still-independent German states, the unification of Germany under Prussia in 1871 applied the Prussian penal code to the whole of the newly-formed nation, and Paragraph 175 of this code explicitly criminalised sexual (“criminally indecent”) acts between men. However, by the time of the November Revolution
of 1918-19 and the establishment of the Weimar Republic, calls for legal reform were gaining an audience. Even those scientists who viewed homosexuality as a “psychopathy” wanted Paragraph 175 to be repealed (albeit for reasons very different from the reformers’), understanding that the law was ineffective in actually combating the issue. As Clayton Whisnant says in his comprehensive study, Queer Identities and Politics in Germany: A History 1880-1945, “the inconstancy and arbitrariness of Paragraph 175’s enforcement was the only thing that allowed the law even to function.” This is especially true in the case of the Berlin police force. While many larger German cities had “homosexual squads” (Homodezernate) within the force, specifically assigned to police the gay scenes, and while this policing had grown more vigilant by the 1920s, Berlin’s police especially were often reluctant to enforce Paragraph 175 when violations were discovered. Indeed, this section of the criminal code even excluded an entire gender of homosexuals. The increased visibility of lesbian subcultures during the Weimar years led many conservatives to claim that lesbianism itself, as well as male homosexuality, was actually increasing. Some supporters of Paragraph 175, such as the antifeminist author Ehrhard F. W. Eberhard, therefore wished prosecution to be extended to female homosexuality; however, this never came to pass. The arguments preventing the criminalisation of lesbianism were sexist in a way that worked, ironically, in homosexual women’s favour: A woman’s “natural” – and, under the Nazis, practically sacred – role as a mother, tasked with promulgating the Aryan race, was also seen as threatened by lesbian activity. According to the SS-affiliated and rampant anti-homosexual lawyer Rudolf Klare, lesbians were racial degenerates who seduced heterosexual women away from playing their part in the development of the Reich, namely, giving birth to as many purebred Aryan children as possible. This perceived threat to Germany’s future provided another compelling reason to criminalise lesbianism, and thus preserve traditional womanhood and all its accompanying genetic glory. There were also political motivations for anti-lesbian discrimination. The women’s movement in Germany, concerned with such issues as the admittance of women into universities (achieved in 1908) and equality of pay and employment opportunities (achieved under the Weimar Constitution in 1919), was decreed by the Nazis to have been “infiltrated by lesbians” and was eventually “forced into line” and essentially dismantled, beginning in 1933. But this repression ended up having positive consequences for Germany’s lesbians; with the women’s movement now a non-issue, the Nazis also moved on from persecuting female homosexuality, which was viewed as far less of a threat to the Reich than its male counterpart. Lesbians were never formally prosecuted under Paragraph 175.

Prior to the reign of the Nazis, penal code reform efforts were led by a number of homosexual-friendly or -led organisations, including Hirschfeld’s WhK. The WhK had friends in the parliament (Reichstag), notably the lawyer and Social Democrat Gustav Radbruch. Once appointed minister of justice in 1921, Radbruch became interested in reforming the country’s penal code in “the spirit of modern criminological thinking.” As early as 1898, the WhK had begun petitioning for the repeal of Paragraph 175; by the 1920s, Radbruch was one of its nine-hundred-plus signatories. He drafted a new code, receiving input from a WhK delegation, and hopes seemed high for its implementation and
the subsequent reform of the law. But Radbruch lost his post in 1922 when the chancellor who had appointed him resigned, and when he returned to office the following year, his progressive legal reforms fell by the wayside. The next draft of the constitution, called E1925, was unfortunately even more conservative than that which had preceded it, and carried forth with the criminalisation of male homosexuality and male prostitution. A major step forward for the homosexual rights movement had been thwarted – and more opposition loomed on the horizon. In 1927, Nazi lawyer and eventual Minister of the Interior Wilhelm Frick made clear his party’s views by attacking the Social Democrats’ efforts to do away with Paragraph 175: “You seem to believe that [the repeal of all laws concerning adultery and homosexuality] will contribute to a moral regeneration of the German nation. We National Socialists are convinced, on the contrary, that men practising unnatural lechery between men must be persecuted with utmost severity. Such vices will lead to the disintegration of the German people.” However, despite such fierce opposition, in 1929 the Reichstag committee voted to legalise sex between two consenting males over twenty-one years old. (It is worth noting that the day after this vote, Paragraph 297 of the criminal code was approved, making homosexual sex still punishable by law in three relatively reasonable instances: if one partner was under twenty-one and the other was not; if one partner used an authority position to coerce the other into sex; or if payment was exchanged for sexual services.) The decriminalisation, even partial, of homosexual sex was a major step forward for the homosexual rights movement – but the Nazis’ rise to power the following year rendered “[their] cause to eliminate Paragraph 175...almost useless.” Although in March 1933 the Nazis banned all homosexual magazines, and although Hirschfeld’s Institute for Sexual Research in Berlin was stormed by a gang of angry students on the sixth of May that same year, the first major anti-homosexual act of the Nazi regime did not take place until 1934. Even this event, commonly known as the Röhm Purge or the Night of the Long Knives, was not primarily anti-homosexual in sentiment, but rather used homosexuality as a justification for atrocities committed. Ernst Röhm was a high-ranking Nazi and close friend of Hitler’s, the Chief of Staff of the nascent SA – and was also gay. He was relatively open about his sexuality; Hitler, certainly, was aware of it. But even his position in Hitler’s elite did not protect him from the law, and between 1931 and 1932, Röhm was brought to trial five times for breaking Paragraph 175. In 1934, rumours began to swirl of a proposed putsch planned by Röhm, to be undertaken with the help of his loyal SA. This putsch, however, was a fabrication: one that provided Hitler with the necessary excuse to dispose of his wayward subordinate. He had apparently recognised that having a known homosexual – and one who, with his faithful militia, could potentially turn against Hitler himself if ever he wished – among the party’s highest echelon was hypocritical and potentially damaging to their goals. On June 30th, 1934, at Bad Wiessee resort, Ernst Röhm and several of his inner circle were arrested by Hitler, personally – including one SA leader caught in bed with an eighteen-year-old boy. These two, along with several others incriminated, were killed that same day. Röhm was imprisoned in Munich, where on the first of July he demanded that if he were to be killed, Hitler do it himself. He was granted leave to wait for his erstwhile friend, but when Hitler did not come that day, Röhm was shot. Thus the party’s most visible homosexual was eliminated, and its anti-gay campaign was given a strong forward push. In the months after the purge, crackdowns on homosexual activity progressed in earnest. In October 1934, the Gestapo instructed the police departments of major cities to write up and send in lists of “somehow homosexually active persons”; later on, these lists would provide the starting point for mass arrests of gay men. In December, the Ministry of Justice declared that one did not even need to commit a homosexual act in order to be punished for it – even intent was enough. This
had the eerie effect of turning into law a 1928
declaration by the Party that, “Whoever so much as
thinks of male-male or female-female love is our
enemy.” Almost exactly one year after the Röhm
murders, in June 1935, revisions to Paragraph 175
broadened the definition of “criminal indecency.”
However, due to its basis in older sodomy laws
dealing with penetrative intercourse, and to the
way it was worded, even the revised law still did
not address lesbians. As a result, they continued
to be largely spared from persecution even under
the Nazis, assuming they were not targeted for
other reasons (political, racial, etc.), and that they
kept their identities quiet and private (in essence,
maintaining Weimar respectability, only with much
higher stakes). But between 1934 and the start
of the war in 1939, homosexual life on the whole
became increasingly difficult, as police vigilance
increased dramatically, gay clubs and other
meeting places were shut down, and intolerance
abounded. Even the SS – an organisation,
ironically, that was founded on and functioned via
the perceived power of male bonding – was not
immune. In November 1941 the Führer’s Decree
Relating to Purity in the SS and Police was issued
by Heinrich Himmler, and from that point forward,
“any SS or police officer engaging in indecent
behaviour with another man or allowing himself
to be abused by him for indecent purposes
was to be condemned to death.” From 1937
onwards, gay men arrested for their sexuality
were thrown in prison, and then taken to the
newly-established concentration camps. While
the conditions there were frightful and inhumane
to begin with, from 1939 until the end of the
war, the lives of homosexuals in concentration
camps would become an unimaginable hell.

During the War: The “Insoluble
Predicament” of Concentration
Camp Life

Not all homosexuals were sent to concentration
camps. Indeed, it was never the goal of the Nazis to
eliminate all homosexuals. Rather, according to the
convoluted theory of sexuality devised by Heinrich
Himmler (with help from the anti-homosexual
works of Rudolf Klare, Hans Wegener, and even
thirteenth-century friar Albertus Magnus), “the
large majority of homosexuals had been ‘seduced’
and were thus considered ‘educable.’” The
proportion of those whose homosexuality was
‘innate’ and were therefore to be ‘eradicated’ was
estimated at about 2 percent. However, that
two percent (or, likely, more) of homosexuals who
were prosecuted for their crimes suffered terribly.
The aforementioned and notorious “pink lists”
compiled by the police provided the easiest way
for homosexuals to be rounded up, denounced
(by one another, under torture), and then sent to
concentration camps. The Alsatian homosexual
Pierre Seel, whose name was put on one of these
lists by the police (after he reported the theft
of his watch, stolen in an area known for gay
cruising), remembered the following from his own
interrogation in 1940, when he was seventeen:

Each time, the grilling started from
scratch: last name, first name, date of
birth, names and addresses of homosexual
acquaintances. One after another the
interrogators yelled, threatened, brutalized.
They tried to corner us, exhaust us, quell
any resistance. After reiterating the same
words, the same denials twenty times over,
for ten hours in a row, we saw lists emerging
from files. We had to sign. Kneeling on a
ruler, we had to confirm that these names
made up the roster of homosexuals
in [his hometown of] Mulhouse.

After his own arrest, in Vienna in March 1939,
Heinz Heger (real name Josef Kohout) was
imprisoned locally for months. Held with him were two criminals, a robber and a swindler, who, when the presiding police officer informed them ("gleefully") of Heger’s reason for imprisonment, immediately propositioned him for sex. When he refused, the two other men, with apparently no sense of irony, went on a tirade against him and "the whole brood of queers." Heger remarked drily on their reasoning: "Even if they had come into conflict with the law, they were at least normal men and not moral degenerates. They were on a quite different level from homos, who should be classed as animals." Heger was brought to Sachsenhausen camp in January 1940. Upon his arrival, when commanded to state his offence, Heger told the truth – that he had been arrested under the terms of Paragraph 175 – and was promptly kicked and beaten by the SS sergeant in charge, who called him a “filthy queer” and a “Viennese swine.” Such treatment was the norm for all prisoners in concentration camps, but perhaps even more for gays.

Gay prisoners were in some cases isolated in a separate barracks from other, "normal" prisoners, for fear that their supposed illness would spread. While bonds of solidarity were often formed between prisoners in the same “category” – green triangles for professional criminals, red for political prisoners, black for “anti-socials,” including the Roma and the mentally ill – these connections never extended to homosexual prisoners (or other sexual deviants, including paedophiles), marked by pink triangles within Germany proper and blue bars in Reich-occupied territory. In the camps, prisoners’ backgrounds were erased but for their crimes; thus, people who would perhaps never have met in normal life did meet, and often formed friendships or alliances of sorts. However, a homosexual’s perceived sin was so great as to deter others from befriending, comforting, or protecting them. Gay prisoners were forced to attend camp brothels, seen by the SS as a way to cure them of their alleged sickness or degeneracy, and thus prevent them from infecting others. But there was little room for insidious “seduction,” or indeed any kind of love, in the nightmarish everyday life of the camps. However, relationships between male prisoners did still form, more often out of convenience and a desire for protection than anything else. Younger men were frequently taken as lovers by Kapos (prisoners put in charge of their fellows, wielding influence over their treatment, rations, etc.), and these "dolly-boys" were rewarded for their services with extra food, protection from the SS’s abuses, and even, in cases such as Heinz Heger’s, easier, safer work assignments. Heger, after becoming the lover of a green-triangle Kapo, was transferred from his deadly work in the camp’s stone quarry to a desk job, and eventually became a Kapo himself, with his own younger male lover under his protection. This entrusting of a homosexual with others’ well-being was unusual; as Heger reports, "In Sachsenhausen, at least, a homosexual was never permitted to have any position of responsibility," no doubt for fear of their using their influence to corrupt other prisoners to their ways. However, those without the protection of powerful lovers suffered unimaginably. The most dangerous and back-breaking work, such as labour in the stone quarry or the Klinker brick-works (the “death-pit”) at Sachsenhausen camp, was reserved for homosexuals and Jews. The SS took great pleasure in torturing prisoners as they worked, making conditions direr still. Also at Sachsenhausen, those same groups of prisoners were enlisted to build butts for a firing range, and used as target practice by the SS as they did so: pointless work, ending in senseless, sportive killing. These “level 3” work assignments, in the quarry and brick-works, were expressly designed to reduce prisoners’ life spans to a matter of months – quite literally, to work them to death. However, later in the war, as German straits grew increasingly desperate, homosexuals were suddenly elevated from “a low – if not the lowest – class of prisoner” to being seen as useful for the war effort – even if, as it would sadly turn out, they
were only to be used as cannon fodder. As Heger recounts, beginning in 1942 the Sachsenhausen camp shifted focus from granite quarrying to the production of munitions, which in turn brought a change in homosexual prisoners’ status: “We ‘queers’, too, were now brought in as assistant foremen, and, despite being ‘degenerates from the German nation,’ we now had the ‘great honour’ of being permitted to work on arms production and so help lengthen the war.” German prisoners (not including Jews) were now permitted to let their previously-shaved hair grow back, and Himmler ordered that they could no longer be corporally punished; the men were also promised liberation from the camps at the end of the war. But despite their suddenly-increased importance to the war effort, homosexuals were still on the same pitifully low level as Jews in the eyes of the SS and even their fellow prisoners, and continued to be treated “with contempt, as queers and ‘degenerates,’ still the human refuse that anyone could insult and tread upon.” In the effort to eradicate these “degenerates,” Himmler in 1943 began to promise liberation to any queer prisoner who behaved well – and who would subject himself to castration. But, unsurprisingly, this promise soon proved misleading and deadly: those prisoners who were released, after this mutilation, were sent directly to a penal division on the Eastern Front headed by the infamously sadistic Oskar Dirlewanger, where they often perished quickly anyway. In addition, for those who remained in the camps, medical experiments began to be carried out on homosexual prisoners, first at Buchenwald in October of 1944. (Although many other groups, such as twins, the Roma, and Jews, were also used as test subjects, homosexuals seemed to be disproportionately chosen as victims.) These experiments were mostly aimed at changing queer prisoners’ sexual orientation, and included castration and injection with sex hormones. Understandably, they failed, often killing their victims.

The time spent in concentration camps was a hellish experience for any prisoner, but perhaps even more so for gay or allegedly gay individuals. Although there were no specifically-designed extermination camps for homosexuals, as there were for Jews, most of those imprisoned between 1939 and 1940 were dead by 1942, and Plant estimates that, in total, “somewhere between 5,000 and 15,000 homosexuals perished behind barbed-wire fences.” Even for survivors, though, the struggle was not yet over.

Conclusion: After the War and Remembrance

Germany’s surrender on the eighth of May, 1945, did not relieve the suffering of those persecuted by the Nazis, including – or especially – homosexuals. In the words of Pierre Seel, “liberation was only for others.” And indeed, although those who survived the camps until the end of the war were freed, imprisoned homosexuals were released into a world which still considered them criminals, and would, legally, for decades to come. Despite revisions to the criminal codes of both East and West Germany throughout the 1950s and 60s, Paragraph 175 was only overturned in 1994, just after German reunification – and nearly fifty years after the end of the war. In the past few decades, however, and especially since the turn of the twenty-first century, memorials to gay victims of Nazi atrocities have sprung up in places as diverse as Amsterdam (1987), Frankfurt (1994), Sydney (2001), San Francisco (2003), Berlin (2008), and Tel Aviv (2014). After decades of oppression, injustice, and forced silence, the suffering of homosexuals under the Nazis is finally being given a voice…just as the last known gay survivors are dying: Rudolf Brazda, in 2011, at age ninety-eight, and Gad Beck, in 2012, at age eighty-eight. The overwhelming silence and ignorance surrounding the plight of homosexuals under the Third Reich being addressed and rectified by memorials nearly seventy years after the fact is a prime, and tragic, case of “too little too late.”
This paper has been a limited study of this vast and complex topic, and cannot aim to cover every aspect of the Nazis' persecution of queer individuals in Germany and the Reich. Nor can it fully address the relevance of this historical moment in our present day, where violence is still perpetrated on a wide and horrifying scale against the LGBTQ communities in countries all over the world. See, for example, the mass shooting at Pulse gay nightclub in Florida in the summer of 2016; the detainment and torture of gay men in Chechnya, Russia, in the spring of 2017; or Israel’s plans to deport gay asylum seekers to the homophobic nations of Uganda and Rwanda, proposed as recently as March of 2018. These appalling events – and the thousands more instances, from overt to subtle, of harassment, aggression, and discrimination that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and other queer individuals all around the world face every day – should serve as a reminder that the struggle for LGBTQ equality and freedom is very far from over. The new wave of violence creeping its way through the worldwide queer community is perhaps not always as systematically sanctioned as that instituted by the Nazis, but it is present, and insidious, nonetheless. It is on us – that is to say, on scholars, on students, on those who care for the rights of our fellow human beings – to remember the “lost generation” of European homosexuals, and to ensure that they are never forgotten again, and are not followed into history by others.
Notes

2. See, for example, the film *Cabaret* (1972), or Christopher Isherwood's Berlin novels (1945), which inspired it.
4. Marhoefer, 55, 57.
5. Marhoefer, 32.
8. Ibid., 103, and Marhoefer, Weimar Republic, 158. Berlin’s police were slightly more tolerant than most large cities' forces, even being persuaded (by Hirschfeld, as early as 1909) to issue “transvestite passes” to allow cross-dressing citizens to appear in public unmolested. See Whisnant, Queer Identities, 4, 30.
10. Schoppmann, 17.
32. Heger, 87.
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