


THE RIDDLE OF
"MAN-MANLY" LOVE

THE PIONEERING WORK ON
MALE HOMOSEXUALITY

VOLUME I

KARL HEINRICH ULRICH

TRANSLATED BY MICHAEL A. LOMBARDI-NASH
FOREWORD BY DEAN L. BULLOUGH

 Prometheus Books

59 John Glenn Drive
Buffalo, New York 14228-2197

Introduction

I

O! If only for just one moment it were possible for me to plant you into the depths of our being so that you might experience what we experience when we set our eyes upon a maturing young man, as Phrynichus says when he celebrates the youthful cheeks of Troilus (Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistarum lib. XIII*, p. 566 [lib. XIII, Ch. 17]):

The light of Eros shines on his rosy cheeks.

Then it doubtless would not be necessary for you to find a justification of our love. We surely would have your sympathy.

However, this is impossible; and it is just as impossible that we should ever experience what occurs inside of you upon the sight of a maturing feminine being.

Your experiences, therefore, are not at my disposal. We do not have your sympathy. On the contrary, unbridled antipathy burns inside you against us, and you are not even capable of having the slightest idea of the magical power or divine splendor of our love.

For that reason there remains nothing for me to do but to follow your line of reasoning, to approach your cold, naked intellect with cold, naked, subtle reasoning. Your intellect is at my disposal. Intellect and subtle reasoning are a common ground for you and me. On these grounds you owe me an explanation and an answer.

That passionate antipathy of yours which I mentioned is an essential obstacle to a correct, purely objective concept of man-manly love. In this matter you are lacking, to use Arthur Schopenhauer's words, "the will not to be prejudiced," which one must rightly desire for any understanding. Your understanding is put in chains by the sympathy for the love of women and by immeasurable antipathy to man-manly love.

32 The Riddle of "Man-Manly" Love

You are biased as I am biased. I could not anticipate a nonpartisan judgment free of partiality from any of you with any surety.

I would not turn to you at all with my justification of man-manly love if I were not forced to do it. I want to make you shake with terror as one makes a biased judge shudder. There are no aspiring judges among you anywhere on earth with whom I might consult. You govern science and the institution of human society. For that reason, as I turn to you with my justification anyway, you become judge and faction in one personal. Consider that when you are testing my words, I would expect totally impartial judgment only from the totally asexual, the angels in heaven. Also from the aged, in whom the sexual love drive is already extinguished, and from children, in which it is not yet awakened.

Scientifically educated women presumably would take an entirely different position on man-manly love than you men; of course, only after my explanations had been made to them. First of all, because they also have a delayed antipathy. However, I would then have their total sympathy. For I believe they are capable, because of their feminine nature, of understanding our love with the same perceptive facility, i.e., to sympathize; this is unthinkable for you.

Of unbiased men who have decided sincerely to examine my words I ask two things: (1) to make the final decision to examine only with the cold light of the intellect and at least to make the attempt to emancipate their reason from all antipathy; (2) if possible, to become aware of the voices of educated women who are capable of judging.

In no way do I doubt your unemotional and correct judgment. For I have already given some of you proof of such unbiased judgments by Heinse and Arthur Schopenhauer (see the second book [*Inclusa*], §§75 and 86), where the latter makes a statement on man-manly love which deserves repeating (*The World as Will and Idea* [*Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*], 3 ed., 1859, vol. II, p. 644):

My inherent profession is to research thoroughly the facts to reach the truth. True to this profession, I recognize the obvious phenomenon [that is, the undeniable existence of man-manly love among all peoples and in every century, and its resistance to extermination—Ulrichs], including the inescapable conclusion.

Further, he says (p. 643):

We cannot simply evade these deductions [that man-manly love—Ulrichs] in some way arises from human nature itself if we wish to deal honestly.

According to these words, if he were still among the living, I hope he would deal honestly with me, as I would expect.

II

The established governing opinion seems to declare that absolutely no allusion may be made to my subject: and I, do I venture to subjugate it to my own scientific conclusions?

Two reasons justify me.

To my knowledge, nothing is excluded from science. This reason already suffices, I believe, to justify me. I also would be justified even if Socrates and Plato long ago, and recently, M. H. E. Meier and Arthur Schopenhauer, among others, had not already devoted their research and studies to this subject to which no one may allude.

Yet still another reason emerges. For us it is a matter of existing or not existing. It is a matter of the question:

Are we to continue to tolerate your intentional and systematic destruction of thousands of your contemporaries' honor and your treading upon their happiness solely on the grounds of a scientific error, when they are just as good as you are, and in truth have committed no crime at all?

But when it becomes a matter of rescuing the highest good in life, this in all truth means: I shatter the chains! Away with tacitful considerations. Strike the face of the established opinion that you cannot make allusions; then it would be all too criminal for me to use one of Paulus* expressions—"Because of the fear of this danger, rashly to leave one's own right unprotected" (Paul, lib. 20 *ad edictum*. Contained in lex. 40, prime, in fine, *Digestorum, de hereditatis petitione*, lib. V, tit. 3.)

III

I wish to grieve or offend no one in the following. I forgive all those who have trespassed against me, everyone who was hard and unloving to me. I forgive my traitors. However, I will speak candidly. My vigor is intensified because I have been personally persecuted.

IV

I would rather step forth fearlessly in the face of the world. Yielding, I subjugate myself to the wish of those most dear to me on earth, and to the chain of pseudonymity, which however, I will break at the earliest possible moment.

* Julius Paulus (fl. c. A.D. 200). A prominent Roman jurist and writer on law. (Ed.)

then there is Virgil's second Eclogue, the "Alexis"; the writings by Suetonius, Petronius, the *Scriptores historiae Augustae*, etc.; Persian and Arabic poets of the Middle Ages, etc.; the Bible; the body of legal documents, etc. Among the recent literature I would like to mention the comprehensive 1837 essay by Meier in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopaedia* (vol. Pac.-Pal., pp. 149-189).

§4. According to one source, there are 20,000 adult Urnings in Germany; another reports more than 30,000. We will use 25,000 as an average, and an average of 50 million males of whom 12,500,000 are adults. Thus, the ratio of adult Urnings to adult males is 25,000 in 12,500,000, or 1 in 500. That is, for every 500 adult males in Germany there is an average of one Urning. These figures may be applied to some German cities. Thus, Berlin, whose population is 500,000, most certainly has more than 250 adult Urnings. Several cities of approximately 100,000 have at least 50 adult Urnings.

These rather important statistics should not be ignored.

According to some reports, in relation to Dionings, the number of Urnings is constantly increasing. No father is sure if the germ of this orientation is latent in one of his sons and if it will break through at puberty.

§5. In the following, expressions of sexual acts may be unavoidable at times; however, when the same have to be expressed in the greater interest of the battle against fatal errors, in my opinion, it would be wrong of me to keep silent out of a false sense of shame, as it would be wrong of the reader to be offended by them.

There are some people who well know how to hermetically seal themselves against proof. I wrote for unprejudiced readers only. I request that they carefully test and take my statements seriously.

II. THE INBORN NATURE OF MAN-MANLY LOVE

§6. Dionings unceremoniously start from the hypothesis that:

in our species no class of *born* Urnings exists nor could exist,

in other words:

no class of individuals exists nor could exist that is born with the *sexual drive* of women and has the *body of a male*, i.e., whose sexual drive is toward men and who abhor any sexual contact with women;

that *all* individuals who are male are born with the sexual drive of males, i.e., a sexual drive toward women, who abhor any sexual contact with men.

§7. This hypothesis is completely incorrect. There is a class of born Urnings, a class of individuals who are born with the sexual drive of women and who have male bodies. They are a variety of men whose Uranian love is congenital.

In the second book (*Inclusa*) I will illustrate more fully with scientific proof.

First Section

The Injustice of Previous Punishments of Man-Manly Love Resulting from Congenital Factors

I. THE ACTUAL DISSEMINATION OF MAN-MANLY LOVE

§1. It is a fact that there are individuals among us whose body is built like a male, and, at the same time, whose sexual drive is directed toward men, who are sexually not aroused by women, i.e., are horrified by any sexual contact with women.

§2. I have termed these individuals *Urnings*, while I have used the term *Dionings* for those individuals whom one usually terms "men," i.e., those whose sexual drive is toward women, feeling horrified by any sexual contact with men.

I have termed the love of Urnings *Uranian* love or *man-manly* love; of Dionings, *Dionian*.

I believe I had to create a new expression because the word *Knabenliebe* [literally, "boy love"], which has been widely used, leads to the misinterpretation that Urnings are really attracted to boys, when actually they are attracted to young men (*puberes*). Even in ancient Greece, Urnings did not fall in love with boys. *Pais* meant "boy" as well as "young man." My terminology is derived from the names of the gods Uranus and Dione. A poetical piece of fiction by Plato traced the origins of man-manly love to Uranus, the love for women to Dione. (Plato's *Symposium*, chapters 8 and 9.)

§3. Several thousands of Urnings are living in the cities and in the countryside of the lands called "Germany." They comprise the upper and lower classes, are in every occupation. There are millions all over the world. Urnings have existed in all areas, in antiquity, among uncivilized nomads, indeed, actually among animals.

Evidence is given in recent publications as well as older literature by Xenophon; Athenaeus; the existing fragments of poetry by Pindar, Ibycus, Anacreon; Plutarch's *Erotes*; Lucian's *Erotes*; and, most importantly, Plato's writings on the Greeks;

§8. By "congenital" is meant sexual, organic, and mental inheritance, not an inherited disease and not such inheritances as pyromania, kleptomania, and alcoholism, but rather an inheritance such as Dionings receive in their sexual drives toward women and vice versa.

§9. The inheritance of man-manly love is such that the individual who is affected, the Urning, is not a complete man but rather should be called a "would-be man" (*Quasi-Manly*), or "half-man."

The Urning is not a man, but rather a kind of feminine being when it concerns not only his entire organism, but also his sexual feelings of love, his entire natural temperament, and his talents.

The dominant characteristics are of femininity both in his behavior and in his body movements. These are the obvious manifestations of the feminine element that resided in him. (See the second book [*Inclusa*].)

§10. We Urnings, who are a special sexual species, are *similar to hermaphrodites*. As a *third sex*, we are on the same level as the male or female sex, but we are independent of the male or female sex, fully separate from both. We are not fully men or women, but by nature we are different. Yet it is true that we are similar to men because we assume the masculine role in society and because our capacity for work is the same.

§11. The hitherto existing ignorance of the presence of Urnings must no longer be tolerated. The question of the Urning's right to life demands a solution, indeed, one that is conciliatory. This demand is not to be made in favor of any one individual but rather in the interest of the general welfare. The Urnian class must now surely be powerful enough to demand equal rights. The process obviously demands some intelligence. Demanding equality in this matter means taking courage to overcoming hitherto existing hesitation and coming bravely forward. I believe I have herewith broken the ice!

III. NATURAL AND UNNATURAL

§12. When I love the person I am naturally attracted to, I am not acting contrary to nature. When I, as an Urning, fall in love with a mature and handsome young man, I am not behaving contrary to nature.

You could consider the Urning, who loves a man, as behaving unnaturally only if you start from the wrong assumption:

All individuals built as males, as he is, are born with the love for women and a horror for men; therefore, he, too, is born with the *nature of the Dioning*.

The Urning, who is born to love men and horrified by women, consequently is acting naturally when he, following his natural inclinations, flees from sexual contact with women and satisfies his sexual drive in the embrace and in sexual contact with some young man.

§13. He is acting according to his own nature, namely, the nature of the Urning, which is in conformity with the third sex, following not only his nature but the nature of his own kind.

He is behaving just as appropriately as the Dionings, as the latter is behaving according to his nature and the nature of his own kind when he, following the qualities of his inborn drive, satisfies his sexual drive in the embrace of a woman; or as some types of hermaphrodites fall in love with men, which is in conformity with their nature (see the three examples of male hermaphrodites mentioned in *Inclusa*), or the other types, who fall in love with women.

§14. The *standards of the sex life of Dionings* cannot apply to hermaphrodites who love men and to us *Urnings*.

And, on the other hand, the standards of the sex life of women, hermaphrodites, and Urnings do not apply to you [men].

Considering the question what is natural and what is unnatural, one would not apply a standard that is not in conformity with one's *own* nature. All people must act according to their own nature and their sexual orientation, i.e., their own nature and the nature of their own kind, no matter if one be a Dioning, a woman or an Urning. When it is a question of their sexuality, all persons are to be judged solely according to their nature and the nature of their own kind.

You cannot study fish by comparing them to birds or vice versa, because they belong to different species. You cannot study pikes by comparing them to eels, hens to ducks, Dionings to women, and women to Dionings.

Likewise, in this matter, you have to judge us Urnings solely by *our own* standards, not by those of *Dionings*, whose *sexual desires are for women*.

§15. If your nature, in itself, cannot be a standard for us, then it also cannot be either (a) because of your *great number*, or (b) because the manner of gratification of our sexual drive does not lead to reproduction of the species, as is the case for Dionings.

§16. On (a). In numbers, you form a greater majority. Except that it is not a question of a simple majority when the issue is about the nature or the morality or the appropriateness of Urnian love.

§17. On (b). Most hermaphrodites, if not all of them, are unable to reproduce. Nevertheless, hermaphrodites have been created by nature; and you will have to agree that hermaphrodites must be judged by their own standards and not, for example, by yours, which you force on us. We are not responsible, but nature is, both for the incapability of reproduction and for the inner invisible force that drives us to such unfruitful acts of love instead of fruitful ones. We completely fulfill our obligations when we follow, not resist, our orientation, which was planted in our hearts by a higher being, be it God or nature. We have no other obligations. If you are unsatisfied with the fruitlessness of our sexual acts, and if you want to know where the responsibility lies, then demand this of that higher being, *not of us*.

Sexual contact with the body of blossoming young men is our natural desire. For *that reason*, these, our acts of love, are natural, in spite of their absolute inability to procreate.

That which is natural is not made unnatural by infertility.

§18. For us Urnings, our nature alone is the standard, not yours.

And now we desire to be judged only by standards that apply to us. We protest against every attempt forcefully to apply rules that are formulated as consequences of your nature to love women.

IV. THE PRACTICE OF INBORN MAN-MANLY LOVE IS NEITHER CRIMINAL NOR IMMORAL. THEREFORE, IT IS CRUEL, UNJUST, AND SENSELESS TO PROSECUTE. PROPOSED LAW

§19. Today, an Urning who follows his inborn sexual orientation by pursuing physical contact with a beloved blossoming young man to satisfy his natural sexual drive is prosecuted regardless of moral or legal considerations, namely as a disgraceful criminal by the laws instituted in every German state, with the single exception of Bavaria. (Other exceptions are Württemberg, Hanover, and Brunswick. However, Bavaria alone sees man-manly love as entirely proper. It goes unpunished just as Dionian love when no laws have been violated, i.e., when no excess occurred, no force was used, when no minors were involved, and where marital laws were not violated, etc.) Prosecution occurs because he satisfies his sexual desires in a different fashion than Dionings. It occurs because the majority, which is composed of Dionings, does not judge him according to his own nature, but to theirs, because the majority, like Procrustes, forces him into a Dionian bed that is foreign to his nature.

§20. The infamy of the prosecution of Urnings is cruel, unjust, and senseless. And if it were in his power, it would be just as senseless for some Urning to punish Dionings because they find sexual satisfaction in the embrace of young women.

This persecution is as senseless as—if you will allow the comparison—punishing hens for laying eggs instead of chicks, or cows for bearing calves instead of laying eggs.

The present-day persecution of man-manly love is just as foolish as the persecution of heresy and witchcraft. It, too, was unsuccessful. "You can drive nature out with a pitchfork, but it will always return!" Horace says.

21. Man-manly love is a riddle of nature. Any unprejudiced person would recognize it as such after giving it some thought. However, riddles of nature can be solved by, if anything, science. Not by blindly declaring something infamous or by blindly taking up the so-called sword of justice, which has all too often been shown as the sword of injustice to heretics, Jews, and witches.

§22. To be sure, it is probably difficult for science to solve the following riddle of man-manly love:

How does nature awaken the love for men in individuals whose sexual organs are developed in the womb to form a male and not a female?

On the other hand, it is probably not as difficult for science, after a thorough investigation, to yield the following:

that nature awakens the love for men in a certain class of these individuals.

The solution to these riddles is, perhaps, no less difficult than the ones that follow:

How does nature awaken the love for women in men?

and:

How does it awaken the love for men in women?

Should such a mortal exist who could solve both these miracles of nature, then, perhaps, such a mortal would also be able to answer the other question.

As you know, both these wonders have as yet been unexplained. I just wanted to state these facts in case you expect me to solve them.

§23. We Urnings form a small minority. But, by God, we have the same rights as you, who are a powerful majority. You have no authority to take away or encroach upon our equal rights.

§24. *Who, I ask, gave you the right to force us into your mode of satisfying the sexual drive, of gratification in the embrace of a woman that is in direct opposition to our sexual orientation; a mode we deplore, one that does not allow us to find satisfaction filled with magnetic force, i.e., one of true gratification of our sexual desires, in short, one which is unnatural to us—namely, to label us infamous and criminal when we practice our natural tendencies which clearly distinguish us—i.e., finding satisfaction in making physical contact with a blossoming and beloved man?*

Who, I ask, gave you the right to prohibit us for the rest of our lives from participating in our natural tendencies and unceremoniously to scorn that which nature delegated to us and to leave us no other choice than a satisfaction unsuited to our nature, one we utterly deplore?

§25. Each act of love performed outside marriage, particularly our own, is considered more often than not as lewdness. This viewpoint of extramarital relationships is thoroughly uncalled-for.

It is conceivable that although church or state may command that each one of us pray before every meal, many do not follow this commandment for some reason or other. In other words, they take their meals without any ritual. In this case would it not be senseless to call people such as these gluttons? Indeed, they may be gluttons. But then they may also be persons who, apart from their not observing any ritual, are doing nothing but satisfying their hunger drive. They may be considered just like those who do observe the prayers.

This is similar to extramarital relationships. Truly, they may be lewd, but then they may also be nothing more than the satisfaction of the sex drive. Finally, they may be just as fulfilling as marital sex. Your viewpoint of lewdness is, therefore, placed in opposition to the viewpoint of the satisfaction of natural behavior.

§26. Our sexual drive is one that demands periodical satisfaction, be it complete, be it incomplete. The latter consists of petting and absorbing that magnetic current that flows from the body of a young man, which is transmitted to us through physical contact with him.

§27. The legal institution of *marriage* is not the institution for us. There is no priest or justice of the peace who would bind in marriage one of us and our beloved. Therefore, the natural state of the species exists for us, as it does for the birds in the sky and the animals in the field; i.e., marriage *cannot* be the prerequisite of a moral license for gratification in any relationship, at least as long as priests and justices of the peace are lacking.

§28. We are not eunuchs. Nature gave us, like you, a sexual drive, which needs to be gratified. Also, we have taken no vows of chastity. Who, I ask, gave you the right to order us not to love or to live the rest of our lives as eunuchs or take a vow of chastity? What would you say if some reigning tyrannical Urring were to order the same for you as a reprisal for the treatment you have given us, namely, either to love men or to spend the rest of your lives as eunuchs?

§29. We, too, have a right to enjoy the pleasures of love; we, too, have the right to satisfy our sexual drives; we, too, have the right to do this in the manner that is natural for us, not in any other way.

§30. In short, we protest against the abuse that has been heaped upon us by the Dionian majority.

This majority has poisoned the happiness of many by countless acts of abuse and persecution and by its lack of respect. It has trod upon the beds of roses where we might have found happiness.

§31. From your point of view, which is based on a scientific error and which is a subjective one, you believe the majority has acted justly and in the only way it knows how. The majority is caught up in the error that we are men as Dionians are men and therefore have the same drives that Dionians have.

But, taken objectively, you can see the gross error of the viewpoint of the majority. Those who burned Hus,* who beheaded Servetof† for his teachings on the Trinity, and who burned witches obviously acted to produce the best results.

§32. Yet, even taken subjectively, you may be reproached with something I cannot refrain from saying. You are guilty of negligence, because long ago you should have made some scientific investigations into our nature to discover whether or not we are like other men and whether or not it was justified to persecute us. Never has the majority initiated such an investigation.

You have seen that some males unyieldingly love other males and persistently avoid sex with females. Is it not too simplistic to conclude that they are behaving unnaturally? Would it not be more reasonable to conclude that their sexual drive

*Jan Hus (1373-1415). Czech religious leader and reformist, tried and condemned by the Church for heresy. (Ed.)

†Miguel Serveto (1511-1553). A Spanish theologian and physician tried and executed by the Inquisition for his heretical views on the Trinity and infant baptism. (Ed.)

is by nature different than the one of males who love women? Could one even say that they are totally different beings than men who love women?

§33. I strongly urge the following bodies to make a study of the above:

- (1) the legislature, before it takes one step further to sanction laws for sexual acts contrary to nature; you are very well aware that judges are used to considering man-manly love as unnatural without further ado;
- (2) criminal court judges who would punish those persons for a man-manly act as those who have committed a crime against nature;
- (3) blood relatives who would judge and reject their kin because of their man-manly love;
- (4) indeed, everyone in society who would scorn a person for man-manly love.

You are all responsible for carrying out these obligations, but especially blood relatives, because they are especially close to those concerned.

§34. When you have mended your errors, the consequences will be positive. We can no longer abide in double standards. You have to acknowledge this necessity. Only after making a comprehensive and unbiased study of man-manly love, a study which is truly taken seriously, which is devoted only to the facts, will the irrational persecution of this kind of love cease in the courts, in the police stations, and in society. (Also in the civil service. It is my opinion that the state has no right to persecute the practice of Uranian love. The Catholic church demands that the clergy practice celibacy. It is strongly argued whether this practice is justified by the church. However, the state has no right to make such a strict demand on its employees. No one doubts that the state could function without this demand. But since Dionian civil servants are not required to meet this demand, then it cannot be required of Urrings. But more importantly, the state has no right to take disciplinary action against Urrings, because no such stipulation of celibacy appears in their contract with the state.)

The last two centuries saw efforts to abolish the persecution of heresy and witchcraft. In our century, indeed, in our decade, efforts will be made to abolish the persecution of man-manly love.

You Dionings who are friends of progress and the search for truth and for justice are welcome to help us reach our goals.

The battle in which I am a warrior is a battle for the freedom of expression. My enemies are both clergy and lay people, Christians and atheists, democrats as well as conservatives. Except that it is not a question of faith or party, but of eliminating one error alone. This can be accomplished by the bare facts and by a true sense of justice. Bigots will shut me out, and justice will be avoided by the unjust.