f"r Sexuelle Zwischenstufen," for the year 1900, under
the signature "Max Kühn"—a pseudonym. It shows the
effects of a blackmailer's operations on a man of high
education and excellent social position, but of timid
strength, betrayed by sexual accident. After describing how he
had been obliged to break off an intimacy with a friend
of his own class and type, because the latter could not
satisfy high psychic ideals, the history continues thus:

"... I was again orphaned. And yet, after all the decep-
tion and disappointment which I had passed through, my heart
was bound by some noble-minded human being, who would under-
stand me as a psychic as well as my intellectual aspirations.
But before I found any such person, I had an experience worse than
any one before it. For I fell into the hands of a blackmailer of a type
that I had never known anything about, and who could hardly have been
more abominable and dangerous than he was."

"At a social gathering, in the organization which I have men-
tioned, one evening when a theatrical performance was given, I met
a young assistant in a frissons' shop, with whom I arranged a
"meeting" for the following day. I admitted that this was not the right
sort of thing to do. But what do the heterosexual men do? Do they
not often make acquaintances with girls with whom they are will-
ing to keep up very intimate relations without being willing to
marry them? My inner self was solitary and lonely, and sought
some more substitute for the sort of love really longed-for...

When next day we were together, I recognized all the outward
traits of my new companion that he was not suited for me. He
was trivial and lacking in conscience, as was plain from what he
himself told me of his former relations with a tailor whom he
had known. We talked of another meeting, but I wrote him and broke
the appointment. Thereupon the young man tried to find out my
name, condition in life, and place of residence, which I had not given
to him: a thing however he could easily do, by applying to the dire-
tional of the social club above mentioned. After that, he came to
my rooms, in company with another young man whom he called
his brother, but who was not so; and asked me to help him, with
money, as he had lost his employment. I replied that I could not
do so. He answered that he did not intend to be put off in that sort
of way; and made a reference to our previous rendezvous. Just
at that moment my charwoman came into my room to put it in order,
and further dispute was an unpleasing idea to me, so under the
pretext that I had to go forth, I left my lodgings; but accompanied
by my two companions, with whom I strolled along several streets.
I asked the frissons once more what I really wanted, and
when I declined again to give him the assistance he desired on any
ground of our previous relations, then he declared that if I would
not send him his wishes, he would attack my character socially,
and also denounced me to the police as having been guilty of a crim-
inal offence. Therewith I demanded that the companion of the frissons
who up to that minute had not quitted us should leave us, unmask-
and if I had in any case nothing to do with him and did not know him.
He accordingly left us, for awhile, but soon he came back. The
frissons then plainly said to me that unless I would give him some
money, he would "make a circus" for me, then met there—in the
public street. Finally, on my further request, the third party to this
dialogue left us again; and then I told the frissons that he had not
any right to demand money from me and that his conduct was
blackmail. He replied that it might be so or not, that was all one to him;
I would be punished as a criminal, if I made revelations.
for even if not, since I insisted that what had passed between us,
mutual confidence only, was not criminal, then at least I would
be disgraced socially though he could manage to slip out of the affair.
So after he had further threatened me thus, I gave him, to get rid of
him, five Marks. He said that he must have more, and he followed
me along the street, trying to hurry me off. Till at last I gave him two
Marks more. Then he left me."

"With what emotions I went home, who can guess? It was
not the money, but the consciousness of having fallen plump into
the hands of a shameless and abandoned creature, and of having
had anything to do with him—if only once! To my parents and
fears crowded through my mind, and for weeks I went about de-
pressed and dreary to meet my enemy again. And in fact he did
not wait two months. The second time he came with another
companion who behaved with unexampled impudence and vulgar-
ity. I shall speak of him as the "Cologene"; for by his accent he was
from Cologne. They rang my bell, I opened the door, they fairly
squeezed themselves in, with the "Cologene" first. On my asking
what they wanted, the frissons answered: "Money!" On my re-
plying that I was not in circumstances to give him any, just
as I had told him before, then the "Cologene" spoke up: "Oh, that's
just all rubbish!" and added a very vulgar accusation. When
I repudiated this, earnestly yet calmly, then the frissons remark-

ed that "For all that, it was true!". With this the "Golegger", who from this point monopolized the conversation, declared that it would be much better for me not to refuse. The frisear wanted to go to Cologne to hunt up a job. I ought to give him money for the journey and then I would not be "beholder" anymore. When I continued to refuse, the "Golegger" threatened me with denunciation to the police, through the frisear, and with public disgrace. I returned that they were both guilty of blackmailing, on which the Golegger retorted that while it was true that in case of the denunciation he would be imprisoned, nevertheless the burden of blame would come on me. Would I not therefore better be sensible, and just pay out the money for the journey—twentyseven and a half Marks—and that then they would both promise in writing to give me no further trouble. The written memorandum was bad really. Theracent the "Golegger" demanded 66 marks, in view of the frisear's living expenses "in the meantime". I consented. With the written promise, which the "Golegger" refused to sign, I paid over the sum mentioned. With that the "Golegger" demanded twenty Marks more, just on his own account. I replied that I owed him nothing; he said that was nonsense, and threatened to make a regular uproar in the house if I would not give him the twenty Marks. So in order to keep such an ugly episode out of the house, I yielded. But as I held my purse in my hand, the "Golegger" said that he "wanted to see how much money he would give me his word of honour not to take anything from it". That I refused, gave umlaut. But he seized it; I held fast. I was now furious; I struggled with the resolution to make an end of the whole shameful and nerve-shattering business for me. But I heumed—fear of public disgrace kept me back. The "Golegger" and I had already began to pull the purse in two between us, and with the second observation from the "Golegger" that he "would only look inside it", which I did not believe, I let it go. The "Golegger" took out all that was left of larger money forty Marks. I had been to the bank that day, and had taken out one hundred Marks, for my living expenses, as I keep very little money in my belongings, living alone as I do. I let the money go. They took themselves off after that. The "Golegger" assured me that that he would never come again, but at the same time he remarked that if I told the police what had happened "something" would "happen" to me.

When they were gone, I sunk into a chair and burst into tears. Must I have dealings with such base creatures?—I who still felt my heart a-draw with youthful ideals, who felt the breath of that same great love of humanity which Christ so purely and perfectly has embodied? But I collected myself; I hurried in my despair to a confidential hetero-sexual friend whom I have mentioned, that he might give me sympathy, and calm me. From another quarter, however, later I received the advice to enable me to get rid of the two blackmailers by going to the police and a law-court, or otherwise I would have been simply a permanent victim.

"I took that advice; but not till after two whole months, when the "Golegger", and this time quite by himself, came to my lodgings. Before he opened the door, I had put on the chain. But he put his foot forward so that I could not shut the door after I had recognized him. He also tried to force the door open by throwing himself against it, which he could not succeed in doing as I held myself against it. Three times I ordered him away, refused, and struck me with his cane as I pushed off his hand. Wounding me on the cheek and using the most vulgar language, and uttering fresh threats. As I warned him that I would call the police, he answered that he would be able to arrest me then go away. I stepped back from the door quickly, seized a garden-stick, and struck him through the open door. He sprang back, I shut the door. But he threw himself against it several times, so that I had to press steadily against it to hold it in place. He rang the bell again, demanding entrance, used more abusive language, and finally when he saw that he was not able to succeed in his attack, then he asked for one Mark,—to go home—....... if he did not get that, then he would charge me before the police with bodily injuries to him. So in order to finish the scene, I threw him the money through the post-slot in the door; and then he really went away."

After describing his agitation and despair, now meditating suicide as his only relief from above disgrace, the narrator did at last what he ought to have done first. He went to police, disclosed himself as the subject of extortion under the acts, and demanded aid. His tormentors were arrested and tried. The "Frisear" received six months imprisonment at hard labor, and the "Golegger" two years. The victim's charge was so managed by the authorities that he did not incriminate himself. In fact, this accent is manageable in such processes; if the police-justice and jury are intelligent as to the philosophy of homosexuality. Many high-germanic authorities, both medical
and legal, are so. But this cannot always be depended on.
In the foregoing, one must confess that the victim seems very weak-nerved and feeble-hearted. He should have promptly withstood the impudent _friseur_. Such rascals are nearly always routed the moment they meet bold negatives and counter-threats. But many homosexuals are not good at such “bluff.”

**Other Instances**  
Let us review a series of every-day
of Blackmailing: blackmailing histories, drawn from printed reports in various Continental newspapers, especially those of Austria and Germany. The procession is edifying in human suffering. These instances are cited largely from the admirable “Jahrbuch für Sexuelle Zwischenstufen,” so carefully edited by Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld, the eminent consulting psychiatrist of Berlin:

“A waiter named X— was arrested in Berlin yesterday on account of attempt at blackmail. He belongs to that dangerous class of persons who attach themselves to gentlemen that walk in the _Thiäergarten_ to extort money from such strollers. This particular affair became known to the police because of X—’s conduct in a well-known resort for criminals, where he spoke of having “come into a big legacy” on the night before. A friend of his was with an American gentleman in the park, X— therewith came to them, declared himself to be a policeman in plain clothes, and threatened to arrest the American gentleman. The American was willing to give over 200 Marks, to get away, but X— and his accomplice were not satisfied, and demanded more. X— wore a badge like that of the criminal police. The victim of the attempt proved to be travelling from Warsaw, and a guest in one of the best hotels in town, X— declared that the stranger had “given him the money,” which included Russian and English pieces. He also made the gentleman hand over his ring, etc.”

This blackmailer, too, received six months imprisonment.

**The Case of Captain D. V. Tz—** (a case of blackmailing a certain young barber of the town, was tried yesterday in a private session of the Criminal Court. The only witness was the plaintiff, sixteen years of age, who asserted that the defendant had twice misused himself with him when alone in the Captain’s rooms, where he came to shave him. The Criminal Court acquitted the Captain. The story told seemed to the judges too strongly as a made-up narrative, carefully learned by heart, and in too close likeness to the filled complaint of the young barber. There appeared to be grounds for supposing that the complaint was all a scheme of blackmail, aided by some outside parties, using the young man as a cat’s paw.”

“A raid on blackmailing gentility of this city was made last night, in the _Thiäergarten_ Berlin alleys and esquinas, near the railway-station, on the part of the local police of Charlottenburg. Repeatedly has it been stated lately that unknown persons attack masculine visitors to the gardens, with accusations of immoral offenses of a special sort, and have done so by pretending themselves to be secret police on duty, who will let the victims off if money is forthcoming! In one instance lately, a large sum was handed over. Three individuals were captured on this kind of charge. They were the brothers G— of Charlottenburg, and they are now in the hands of the authorities.”
"As we reported yesterday, two non-commissioned officers of the Gräfisch Guards, named Elbert and Rother, have been put under arrest on account of what seems to be a disgraceful case of conspiracy toward blackmail; both being also, it is thought, concerned in a previous case of the same sort. The facts as to the present charge are these. The accused, on April 14, made their appearance in the apartments of a very distinguished gentleman of this city, a member of the higher aristocracy, and after charging him with an unnatural offence according to the text of Paragraph 175, they demanded several hundred marks as hush-money. The victim, much terrified, yielded to the demand; but having less than the sum exacted at hand, he asked the two rascals to wait till he could obtain it from a friend. In his absence, the two accused parties drank his liquors, became very noisy and violent, smashed mirrors, glass and porcelain in his dining-room, cut pictures out of the frames, and otherwise played the ruffians. Their victim returned and gave them the sum agreed on. A week later they wrote him, demanding a larger amount, and saying that if it were not forthcoming he would receive "another call," which "would not leave a chair on its legs." The intervention of the police being asked, the matter is now in the hands of the military court concerned."

These audacious rascals were imprisoned and degraded from their military service. Their case is interesting (and admonitory) to strathophilic homosexuals, as an example of blackmailing by soldiers. Within a few years, this sort of trouble, once uncommon for civilians has perceptibly increased in frequency.

Here is an example of how can be utilized a bit of family-history; or its counterfeit:

"A bold attempt at extortion of money by blackmail was made lately against Herr G.—a merchant, over in K.—strasse. A young man came into his shop and handed over a letter, the contents of which made Herr G.—not a little angry. The writer (who signed himself 'N. N.') informed Herr G.—that his father-in-law had committed a certain sort of criminal act. Unless Herr G.—would send at once 300 Marks, then the writer of the letter would immediately communicate the affair to a newspaper, with the full name of the gentleman, and all details needed to bring the affair to publicity. But Herr G.—did not fall into so clumsy a plot. As 'N. N.' was
the advent of a *feigned* policeman, to take the two parties into arrest unless a round bribe be paid over. Foreign boaters, especially if homosexuals, should avoid public urinals and retired parts of public gardens, when the hour is favourable to this highway-blackmail. The motto must not be "Siste viator!". Exactly this sort of attack, made on a gentleman in Paris — where it is far too rare — is described in a Paris newspaper, as the writer ends this page. In Germany and Austria-Hungary it is much in vogue among the dregs of male prostitutes and pseudo-prostitutes. In one of Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld's many and valuable local studies, "Berlin Drifters Geschlecht", he cites such a case, in a letter from a provincial official: an elderly man, not in the least homosexual. He was followed in the street one evening by a young prostitute, demanding money. The inexperienced stranger did the most unwise thing: he turned presently into an urinal, thinking that his whining persecutor would respect privacy, and would quit him. Instead the rascal followed him into the retreat, and stood in the door. When the official was about to come out, the blackmailer, with his dress disordered, stood in front of him, and said: "If you do not give me sixteen Marks at once, I will have you arrested, and get you into prison, for an outrage to public morals in this place, with me! So be quick! Out with the money!" The terrified stranger managed to hurry to a cab, in the middle of an increasing street-scandal; fortunately before a policeman appeared to make inquiries. By throwing a piece of gold at the rogue, and having the coachman start off at a gallop he succeeded in getting away. A similar example was communicated some weeks ago to the present writer. In Rome, in the spring of 1907, a young Englishman, who was homosexual, coming home one evening to his hotel from a music-hall, stopped in a latrine off the Corso. He was at once followed by a young boy-prostitute, who at once began pestering and disgusting the Englishman by exhibiting himself. Finding that there

would not result any tangible consequences, the young rascal accused the Englishman of violating public decency and with a minor. He would not be shaken off. He ran after the carriage, sprang into it, and only at the door of the traveller's hotel leaped down and ran away, not daring to face the concierge. The Englishman (who could not speak a word of Italian) was greatly disturbed at the prospect of a scandal. Fortunately there was none.

Another specimen of this kind of vulgar night-assault is as follows. The instance is reported in the Vienna "Neue Freie Presse", for June 14, 1901: It was much talked of in the capital at the time, as can be supposed.

"The secretary of a distinguished person here—the latter being an Ardelbaker—on the night of May 6th, after a late supper, happened to stroll along the edge of the Rathaus Park. He had been taking considerable beer at the Spatenbauer and in the Café Scheikle. He is a man in the thirties. He had wanted a little fresh air, and had been also taking a turn in a cab. At the place named, he alighted and walked along, till he reached a certain urinal. He entered it, and found two young men there, the defendants Karl Horak and Karl Mühler. The statement of the gentleman was this: 'When I was leaving the latrine mentioned, one of the two defendants came to me and asked for some money. I would not give him any. Then he accused me of an offense. I said that that was not the fact. He repeated his demands, with the remark that if I would not give him money, then I could not get away from there so easily.' I wished to put an end to the situation; so I put my hand in my pocket and gave him a couple of Kieners.—'You'll have to give us more than that, or we don't let you off! We want a 'Tanner'—then we will let you go.' I wanted to stop such a scene, so I took out my purse. He seized it out of my hand, it had some thirty florins in it and ran off. I wished to pursue him, when the second fellow came up and demanded my watch. Just to get rid of him, I gave it him. I had to borrow money of a café-waiter to get home. ....

But this was not the end. Decidedly serious consequences that brought victim and blackmailers in court, were to ensue. These developed as follows:

"In the purse, or card-case, was the visiting-card of the victim, with his name and address, also the coat-of-arms of his royal em-
ployer, a photograph of the children of the latter, and other personality. The two blackmailers actually dared to come to the palace the next day, and asked to speak with the secretary. They were admitted, and demanded two hundred florins life-money. If they got it, no further " fuss;" if not—a great deal. The noble secretary, wisely had them arrested, though he had every reason to dislike any public notice of the adventure. The young men were well-dressed, had a certain degree of education, and one of them was decidedly good-looking. Both were quite of the regular Vienna male prostitute sort—and investigations showed that Hornak already had a similar charge of blackmailing, referring to the same locality, against him. The Secretary mentioned that when they threatened him with public proceedings for an offense, he had said "But you will be punished too, if I am," to which young Hornak had coolly replied "That's so! But you will be ruined, and we haven't anything much to lose." Each offender was given eighteen months imprisonment, at hard labour.

The Court conducted the complainant's case carefully. He was not incriminated.

Instance. In Italy, as in France or Germany, the conditions of publicity are useful to such crude blackmailers. About two years ago, an American officer of the army, while in Naples, happened into the rhapsodique close by the San Carlo Opera. That latrine is notorious for the number of men more or less homosexual, who turn into it, not so much for urination as for those exhibitions which make it locally quite unique. Two young reprobates were also there. After libelously exposing their persons to what seemed to be his interest (an interest not admitted by the foreigner) they followed him, and threatened him with blackmail because of improper behaviour "in a public place." One of the two declared himself a minor; a statement that would have made him a circus-marvel—had it been true. The foreigner had much trouble to get rid of them, not knowing that a resistance on his part would probably put them to flight. Finally, the stranger, in round language, declared he would call an officer patrolling near. They fled.

Groundless. The reader probably has made up his mind that in some cases foregoing (as he may make it up in regard to some that will follow) there was more or less ground for a charge against the unhappy victim; even if the blackmailer deserves less our execration. We can well admit that when a blackmailer tries such a game, usually there is a basis of fact for it. But this does not alter the aspect of the need of suppressing the oppressor. Furthermore, the blackmailer is not rare who has not a shred of reason for his attack, especially in large cities. Some years ago, a distinguished musical artist, the violinist B—, was arrested and imprisoned in Brunswick, on the charge of having violated a young tailor's apprentice. The affair made a great scandal. But on examination, it proved to be made out of, not whole cloth from the shop of the young tailor's employer but—entirely from a romance in print; with some sexual and other changes. Awhile ago, two tourists were arrested by a blackmailer's impudence, and were confined in a Berlin prison nearly a fortnight, until the fact was clear that the rascal had invented the case, with clumsy impudence.

Be it observed here with regret—as to Germany, that during the earlier years of the existence of the Paragraph 175, of the German Code, there was much blackmailing by arresting, etc., from the city-police, as trumpers-up of charges, for the sake of seeming to be vigilant, or for money. This was one of the reasons why the late Herr Meerscheidt-Hüllesem, of the Berlin Police, so strongly urged the removal of the Paragraph mentioned. He found it encouraged crime and regency in men of his squads, not all of whom were proof against such despicable but infectious temptation.

Other Examples. To blackmail is instinctive in those parts of Europe where the law is severe, where the homosexual
(especially of means) is widely met, and where the avocation of prostitution is a side-industry among young fellows of humble life. They form such associations with cynical designs of fleecing all clients unlucky enough to give them the least leverage. Here is a Vienna affair; along with two Munich incidents:

"The butcher's assistant, Maximilian Strauss, a very good-looking young fellow, was brought to the bar today, on a charge of blackmail. Lately Strauss sent to Herr Theodor Reichmann, the eminent baritone of our opera, a most importunite letter, accusing the distinguished singer of a certain offence coming under Paragraph 129 of our Statute Book, and threatening Herr Reichmann with publicity if a considerable sum of hush-money was not to be forthcoming. The letter was not signed, but Herr Reichmann knew whence it came, and at once put the matter into the hands of the police. In spite of the defence from Dr. Chersch, the young blackmailer was sentenced to four months, with hard labour. Such cases are constantly increasing in our city."

"Georg P.—, calling himself a baker by trade, lately became a dangerous sort of character for the artist, Herr A.—, of our city, for whom said Georg P. had posed as a studio-model. Systematic attempt at blackmail resulted. The said P. appeared one day at the painter's residence in company with a certain Ludwig A.— and Albert B.—, bakers, and Albert M.—, a pork-shop clerk, and conducted themselves so impudently that the painter gave them, first, twenty Marks and then fifty, as hush-money. That however was not sufficient for presently the artist received the usual threatening letter, demanding 100 Marks, stating that otherwise the accusation would be made in a police-court. It is worth noting that the three companions in misanthropy did not accuse themselves of being partners in the offence, but spoke of a fourth person, who was in a hospital, on account of the "physical injury," he had "suffered" from the relations with the artist. The painter paid over the 100 Marks more, but as the demand for a like sum was repeated, he did what he should have done in the first place—went to the police with the correspondence."

These blackmailers were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment that ranged between two years and one-and-a-half years, at hard labour. The complainant suffered no legal inconvenience. The second Munich Case:

"On account of an offense against the public morality, as well as an attempt at blackmail, the case involving Johann Erhard, of Bayreuth, 25 years old, and also Albert Schmidler, of Nuremberg, 20 years old, was brought before the Court. According to the complaint, Herr August F.—, thirty-seven years old, a merchant of Wetz-heim, was involved, the said F. being charged with conducting himself improperly, under Paragraph 155 of the Code, with young Erhard, in the Hofbräuhaus, one evening; also taking Erhard to his lodgings, to pass the night—for similar practices, Erhard confided these matters to his friend Schmidler, and prompted Schmidler to write Herr F.— a threatening letter, demanding 50 Marks if there was to be no more "trouble" about the story. The merchant sought aid from the police. But neither he nor Erhard appeared in Court. The proceedings turned on Schmidler, and the evidence determined his share. He was sentenced to five months."

Notable Examples: The inattentive have little idea to what systematic heights of success blackmailing mounts; of Blackmail: the Bürkl-Wöll Case, how rapacious and successful are blackmailers who systematize their terrifying.

What large sums are "bled away" by them are shown somewhat in such instances as the famous case of an official of the Rehrmann Bank, Berlin; and a similar recent one—of a distinguished European professor. Both these were heavily mutilated. But in January, 1908, there came before the Assizes of Munich, a case known as the "Bürkl-Wöll Case" which is almost unparalleled in the records of its class. It is also interesting as an example of what may be called blackmail by second-hand mechanism—a frequent device. In outline it is as follows. As far back as 1886, an attorney of Munich named August Bürkl, had an intimacy of equivocal colouring with a youth named Götz—beginning when Götz was about fifteen or sixteen years old. Bürkl denied this explicitly—of course—on his oath, during his testimony, and it was tactfully kept from incriminating him. It lasted some years, Bürkl (unmarried) was very rich and very timid. He dreaded any sort of scandal, because of his profession, his social station, and his great affection for his mother and his other families connection.
Young Götz easily blackmailed Bürkli out of many small sums, during several years. Then Götz died. But unfortunately the intimacy was known, or strongly suspected, by a barber named Wölfli. After Götz was dead, Wölfli and his wife began the most elaborate, audacious, and prolonged series of extortions which can be conceived, against the unlucky and frightened Bürkli. First, Wölfli claimed to have letters from Bürkli to the dead boy, Götz. He claimed that a whole set of his—Wölfli's—acquaintances "knew all about" what had passed between Bürkli and young Götz, and meant to make trouble. These parties Wölfli kindly undertook to "keep quiet"; to "buy off," and so on—at the plundered Bürkli's expense. Such persons were fictions—the "Mrs. Harris" sort of creations of Wölfli and wife. The parties were said to live in America and elsewhere; to be on the point of coming to Munich to prosecute Bürkli. Their letters were concocted by Wölfli and his wife, and the timorous Bürkli never saw any post-marked envelopes for these precious communications. The Wölfli's grew rich. Their unmedicated wastefulness was talked of, in their quarter of Munich. Their wealth was all at the cost of the miserable Bürkli! Automobiles, jewels and fine clothes, bank-interests, prodigal and foolish squanderings, transatlantic journeys—all entered into the mystery of the "patrænum" Wölfli mēnage. The sums demanded and received from Bürkli ranged upward and upward; from first a few dozen Marks, to hundreds—and to thousands and tens of thousands. Josephine Sarvi, a pseudo-betrothed for the dead Götz, was presented. She also received a large sum, as hush-money for "what Götz had told her"—a complete fiction. At last the despairing Bürkli who—in spite of his large wealth—saw ruin facing him if the matter did not end, with a belated courage put it before the court. The two Wölfli were arrested and tried. (See, the "Münchener Nachrichten" and other journals, for January 23, et seq., 1908.) The amount that the blackmailers had "got out of" Bürkli approximated the almost fantastic... 

hundred and forty-five thousand Marks: all between the time when young Götz died (1893) and the date of the weak-hearted Bürkli's final recourse to law-protection. Wölfli and his wife were sentenced (after preposterously impudent efforts to maintain a defense) to the maximum penalties for such doings, under German law—long terms of imprisonment at hard-labour, and to fines as heavy as could be set, though trivial in comparison with what sums the pair had extorted from Bürkli. The latter was not inculminated homosexually before the law, by his case.

In like category may be mentioned the Schultze Case, in Hamburg, in January, 1909; the "Genster Case" before the Elling Criminal Court, in the same month of 1909; and several other cases, (in which greater or lesser sums were systematically obtained by the accused) brought to trial in Germany in 1907, 1908, 1909. They were typical. A few pages later here, will be found notes of a recent French blackmailing case, as of an Italian one, each involving a large extortion from the victim.

The Parisian male prostitutes, of attractive externals, such as haunt the boulevards, are nowadays extremely dangerous as blackmailers on social and criminal levies, according to circumstances. These French-speaking pests invade in their annual overflow the smart summer-resorts and Riviera centers, according to season. Rich guests of hotels there often suffer from them.

As another example of systematic extortion, in which affair we again meet with soldiers as blackmailers, here is an instance that occurred in Oldenburg, as cited from a local journal:

"A notable blackmailing affair, which has victimized several persons a good while, has at last been brought before our criminal Court. The matter in question as to its operations has "died" the victim for as high a sum as 28,000 Marks, and has been carried
along against a well-to-do citizen in private life here, viz. Herr von Seegern, on the charge of unnatural offences (Aug. 155, Rev.). Two of the seven blackmailers (a chimney-sweeps in Oldenburg) were the first arrested, but the main conspirator against Herr von S. was a chimney-sweep, who was easy to catch. He was prudent enough to go over to England, and sent through his threatening letters to his victim, demanding the money; or else he wrote his confederates, directing the ‘campaign’ against Herr von S. through these agents. The active participants exerted some that varied between 500 Marks and 10. The sentences ranged from one year and six months, to six months. Two soldiers have been sent to prison for this same conspiracy, and have been tried in the Military Court, and sentenced to degradation from service. Since the proceedings began, the absent leader of the affair, Kirschbock, has committed suicide, to avoid extradition.

The blackmail is often right, in spite of all the law’s judiciousness, when he warns his writing victim that even if he, the blackmail, will be punished as an offender—or co-offender—so will the victim be punished. The law cannot always distinguish. Sometimes it will not do so—whether falling into cruelty or stupidity. The famous Hasse Case, in 1903, is an example. In December, 1903, Herr Hasse, a high-standing jurist of Breslau—in fact, the president of one of the most important of the Breslau tribunals—was shot down in Berlin, and wounded a young blackmailer who had maltreated Herr Hasse of his money through their having had homosexual relationships. The sums extorted reached to the thousands. The unlucky Hasse went to the nearest police-court, laid down his revolver, surrendered himself, and was duly tried for attempt at murder. He had wounded the blackmailer only slightly. The affair made a great local sensation. Hasse was highly respected. But in this case, when the matter was raised of a reason for the shooting, the court regarded both the blackmailer (a youth named Leechel) and blackmailed as equally to be punished for homosexuality. Hasse, as well as Leechel, was sentenced to several months of prison. Such an outcome raised a violent outcry against judges and law. But the sexual case was clear as to both parties; and it was not handled so as to favour the unlucky Herr Hasse.

In the current year, a bold German blackmailer named Otto Schianger made attempts against no lower grade of victim than Prince Heinrich of Prussia (the son of the late Prince Albrecht), and by means of letters demanded five-hundred Marks, and threats to inform the Emperor of sexual facts in the life of Prince Heinrich that would gravely compromise him in the rumoured and interminable Enders, Hohenau and Lyman scandals. This blackmailer also threatened to expose Prince Joachim Albrecht of Prussia with, exposure as an habitual homosexual. The affair was brought to trial, and Schianger was given a sentence of two years penal servitude.

The notable “W— and Jirgl Case,” occurring in Munich, in the latter years of the nineties just past, presented on its surface an outcome that was perhaps too severe for the blackmailer; not a common aspect. The plaintiff had recourse, most unwillingly, to the law; dreading a scandal. He was of the aristocracy, and a member of the royal household. The defendant was a young man named Jirgl, who was trying to extort money. The facts were that Herr von W— had met the young man in the Pinakothek, had fallen in love with him; and presently Jirgl (who was exceptionally good-looking) though he was a poor youth and a theological student, had become the “mistress” of the rich admiral. They lived together, travelled together, and so on. But Jirgl’s health and beauty declined. He grew ill. His protectors tired of him, and cast him aside, Jirgl for revenge, and in full appreciation of his hold, blackmailed the deserter. The aristocrat won his case. The ruined Jirgl was sentenced to eighteen months of imprisonment. The high-born complainant was not incriminated legally (the latter adjective is important) in the case, being considered guiltless of technically homosexual-
ual rapproches with his deserted ephebius. This decision was loudly commented on as personally biased, and influenced by Court intrigues against impartiality of justice. We had undoubtedly been guilty not only of seductasy but of seduction, and of ruining a youth's whole life.

Fear as the Chief Reliance of Blackmailers. Ily upon fear on the part of the victims. To terrify is the first necessity. A man otherwise brave too often cannot cow such an assailant by bold denunciation or by calm ridicule. He fears more than the attack the "talk" over the remedy! True is it that a good kicking from one's doors is generally enough to send a common type of Expresser flying, for good. But Uranians are too often not muscular nor valiant. The victim's ignorance of the legal dispositions for his aid is general in the countries where he needs most such aid. Physical strength, moral resolution, legal knowledge, are all too universally practised in any troublesome affairs. The victim is likely to be unaware that he has the good-will of law and police-court, rather than has the rascal. Unless he be examined by pedants of morality, the victim has enough chances to avoid direct compromisses by his own recital: at least that is now a tendency, in many countries. But the social whispers that will inevitably fly about hold the victim back. People will comment; they will believe more or less, will be scandalized, even if the Uranian predicament be all a tissue of persecution. Hence the struggle against some vampire, or pack of vampires, can go on for years! Immediate recourse to legal help, to betake oneself to the nearest police-court to call the nearest police-officer, to face down the blackmailers with rudest or calmest contempt and with counter-threats and action—these are not only the first defenses but often perfectly efficient ones.

Instance: Here is an example of English blackmail:

English, cited from the London press:

"Behind closed doors yesterday in the Court last named, before Sir James Smith, was tried the blackmailing case against William Belton, nominally an agent for a patent medicine, but of no present occupation; the suit brought by Mr. Albert H. of Birmingham, Mr. H. charged that one evening, six months ago (April), while walking in a secluded part of Hyde Park the defendant accused him, and walked some distance with him chatting. He finally asked the complainant for some pecuniary help, which the complainant gave him—a mere trifle at the time. The defendant managed however to ascertain the name, residence and position in society of the defendant. He presently wrote plaintiff threatening letters, and also twice visited him, against the will of the complainant, at his London lodgings; demanding money, and continuing to threaten the defendant with loss of character and with a felonious charge. He declared that the offence in question had occurred on the evening mentioned. Mr. H. wholly denied the charge, but was however timorous enough to give the defendant considerable sums as hush-money, to avoid any chances of public defamation. The defendant has continued his demands and his visits, and has greatly annoyed and terrified Mr. H. by his threats and exactions. He has received from Mr. H. not less than sixty pounds on one occasion, on another thirty, on another fifty, and so on. The whole amount that Mr. H. has paid over, in a mistaken course toward such scandalous extortion, amounts to four hundred and eleven pounds; and the complainant's estate is seriously injured as well as his peace of mind much impaired. The defendant told a circumstantial story, which the Court concluded was manufactured out of few real incidents. The defendant was sentenced to one year's imprisonment; taking his sentence with a burst of obscenity against the complainant."

In such instance, the victim seems to have succeeded in keeping clear of humiliating himself sexually, while proving the blackmail: an important, troublesome often impossible—aspect of such a case in England, where the plaintiff in the blackmailing suit may be visited by the law for homosexual offenses. In libel-suits, divorce-suits and the like, this point is grave. It was, as we have seen earlier in this book, the ruin of Oscar Wilde.
Discomforts and
Risks of Legal
Resistance: Legal
Tendency to Help
the Victim.

"Evidently," remarks the thoughtful
reader, "to be courageous against the black-
mailer is obviously the first policy! But
one also sees that the victim may get
himself into great trouble; coming out of the court a
blackened kettle than seems the pot, or fully as black! In
cases like one of the foregoing, "The sword of justice
cuts the hand that grasps it!"

Blackmailing cases do take that turn. The victim
can suffer shameful imprisonment, as well as can his
enemy. But the sound principle of legal resort is not
invalidated by this fact. The tendency now, in many Con-
tinental courts, is tactfully to "manage" the victim's
case so that he does not incriminate himself. What is
yet more significant, in the French, the German, the Aus-
trian-Hungarian and other Courts of law, in some Con-
tinental countries where most homosexuality acts still are a felony
and an abomination, there has come within a few years
an important detail of procedure and sentiment. If the
person necessarily incriminating himself in the complaint
against his blackmailer, when arrested and on trial on
homosexual charges, can prove medically, psychopathologically,
that he is homosexual by inborn, incurable nature, then
his case is often materially made light or even dismissed.
This is especially helpful when a respectable homosexual
has to combat a charge against him begun not by extor-
tion but made in the "interests of public morality". Of
course there should be no offenses to public decrees, nor
rape, nor corruption of minors impairing the force of this
defense. If it be accepted, the homosexual is turned over
to a specialist doctor who decides in course of some
weeks, whether his "patient" is to be reported to the
Court as homosexual by incurable natural proclivities or not.
Sometimes this examination obliges the defendant
to pass months in prison, till the doctor be ready to
pronounce on his "nature". But if his status be so settled,
he finally is absolved from felony, and is free.

Inborn Homosexualism as
Defense.

In such cases, sometimes previous psychoso-
mental data are already at hand. The
term of examination usually in subtracted from the term
of imprisonment under sentence, for a homosexual patient.
This attitude of law of course is not shown to homosexual
blackmailers; but simply to those respectable ho-
mossexuals under arrest for sexual misconduct. Sometimes
comes no further penalty. But in Germanic territories,
be it noted that when a homosexual offender of good
moral character, has been pronounced naturally, " incurably"
 homosexual, and is discharged (having his detention for
examination as his only punishment) it is decidedly ad-
visable that he leave the place where his case has oc-
curred; as soon as possible should arrange to live out of
Germany or Austria. He will naturally nearly always
do this, but sometimes it is inconvenient enough. He is
lucky to escape with only exile.

A few years ago, as a simulisexual he would not have
"got off" so lightly. Continental law had not then endured,
even vaguely and unwillingly as now, the idea that some-
thing quite other than vice underlies much homosexualism;
that the uranian Intersex has excesses, has demands, even
has rights, however abnormal they have seemed. Medico-
psychic research herein has affected the jurisprudence of
Continental Europe importantly; though much is yet to do.

An Improved
Legal Sentence
Especially in
Germany and
Austria; not in
Great Britain or
America.

The reader may observe that while in
Europe (even apart the tolerance of Latin
races) scientific excuse for homosexuality is
making way, old standards hold in English
and North American law-courts. Ignorance
and indeed vehement hostility against any excuses for homo-
sexualism obtain in England and the United States. Outside
of the most reflective and learned class of lawyers, nothing is needed of recent Continental theories as to simuliality, by medical-legal specialists even of first rank. Indeed little is known of them. They are yet much outside of Anglo-Saxon medical-psychological jurisprudence.

The unlucky fact been observed that legal proceedings necessary for the rescue of some victim of blackmail on homosexual grounds (even cases in which blackmailers are punished) seem to do more harm than good toward obstructing the vile business. They suggest the mod the case with which timid victims can be bloct and they teach the technique of blackmail. It has been well said that “one blackmail suit creates a dozen blackmailers.” Rascals are willing to take their chances, immediately in consequence of this fact, as well as in view of the agonizing histories of victims, and of the inducements to robbery and murder, has come—with questions of moral aspects of homosexuality—the movement in Germany and Austria-Hungary toward the abolition of any penalty for private and adult simulial sexual relations, voluntary. To tolerate “decent homosexuality” as in Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Belgium, parts of Switzerland and so on, puts the blackmailers out of combat to a great and wholly beneficent extent.

Blackmailing not unknown in France, Italy, Belgium, Spain and Italy, etc., though instances. The blackmailers considered the crude, vulgar blackmailers can frighten a stranger by pointing out that to commit sexual acts in a latrine or in a park, or in inn more public premises, however retired and deserted, makes the victim a statutory offender. We have seen above how he sometimes will dog the traveller to his hotel, threatening his disclosures to the nearest policeman. Where the Latin blackmailer has not the leverage of law or of public decorum, he will threaten public social opinion; especially if the stranger be English or American. The victim’s name will be printed—will be telegraphed to his native town. In all such cases, the victim’s stout personal resistance, or threats of calling up the nearest policeman, will nearly always get rid promptly of the blackmailer. A favorite trick of this blackmailer is an accusation to the victim of pederasty with an “innocent” minor youth. This is not always easy to rout off-hand.

In France and Italy, be it noted, if on a charge of debauching a minor the minor has proved an habitual offender, the case breaks up. To scandals, whether with or without blackmailing aspects (usually with such) in in countries where the liberal Code-Napoléon is the basis of legislation as to simuliality, many criminal cases are based on the perversion of minor youth. To these processes belong many of Krupp Affair already referred to here, along with the “Allers Case,” which it rather eclipsed, in Capri and Germany, in 1902. Its actual legal territory was Italian. The “Krupp Case,” in which the victim was accused of pederasty offences with innocent minor lads, ultimately resolved itself, in essential aspects, to a carefully-planned scheme for extortion: the matter of “innocence” being more than vague when the youth typically concerned came into question. In the concurrent “Allers Case,” the plan of concerted blackmail was discernible. The distinguished Munich painter was warned by one of his young models—it is said, by the son of the Capriote who brought the attack into form: and the artist fled Capri, in time to escape arrest. He was sentenced (as an absent defendant) in the Naples court, to imprisonment and a fine.

The same leverage against homosexuals has lately shown itself in the affair in Rome, of the well-known