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This article focuses on the situation of abolitionism in Germany under the leadership of Anna Pappritz. The history of abolitionism in Germany is not yet written but it is possible to indicate some rough outlines. The main question is: why did abolitionism make its way to Germany so late? Hitherto the following answer has been given: the German women’s movement was too conservative for these ideas. This article shows the specific situation of abolitionism in Germany, where the Protestant church, as well as the socialist movement—both partners for abolitionism on the international scene—did not support abolitionism. Thus the German women’s movement—after Anna Pappritz had established abolitionistic views there after 1900—had to agitate for abolitionism in isolation.

Nowadays the word abolitionism is incomprehensible to German people—and also very hard to pronounce. Maybe this linguistic discrepancy creates a distance from its meaning and its history. Little research on the Wilhelmine and Weimar eras discusses the topic, and there are virtually no publications concerning either the most famous activists or the movement as a whole. But the situation in Germany in 1900 was very different. In this period abolitionism was synonymous with a liberal view on prostitution and the issue of ‘Sittlichkeit’. Abolitionism was in fact part of a progressive discourse and a 1908 article linked it—I think very typically—with liberal Protestantism, socialism, vegetarianism, traditional healing and the women’s movement.


Correspondence to: Kerstin Wolff, Stiftung Archiv der deutschen Frauenbewegung, Gottschalkstr. 57, 34127 Kassel, Germany. Email: wolff@addf-kassel.de
My focus and interest in abolitionism emerged from searching for documents about Josephine Butler, during which I came across the name of a German abolitionist who had tried to establish Butler’s ideas in Germany—Anna Pappritz. In fact, Pappritz was already known to me as a figure from the history of the German women’s movement. But the ideas and the political path of abolitionism in Germany between 1900 and 1933 were quite unfamiliar. I therefore started to read Pappritz’s writings: first her novels, then her political and social statements. Even though a personal archive of Anna Pappritz does exist, no modern biography has been published. So, I asked, who was Anna Pappritz and how was it possible for her to promote abolitionist ideas? Where did she come in contact with these ideas and why was she successful?

In this article I will describe the situation of abolitionism in Germany between 1895 and 1914. The first part will be a short description of the situation in Germany around 1900 and the significance of discussions about purity. Then follows a short summary of Anna Pappritz’s life before she came in contact with the women’s movement and abolitionist ideas in Britain in 1895. The second part will show how she promoted the ideas of abolitionism in Germany. Finally, I will try to make clear where these ideas found their place in German society before the First World War.

The Situation in Germany

When Anna Pappritz began her work for abolitionism in Germany the Protestant purity movement had been active since the middle of the nineteenth century. John C. Foult describes this as a ‘male movement’, because the members of the different Protestant purity movements declared that this was work for men (especially husbands), not for women; and most members were men. A strongly Christian, marriage-focused point of view dominated. Prostitution was regarded as ‘illness’ and the prostitute defined as an immoral, dishonest subject, a ‘plague-spot’ of bourgeois society. The regulation of prostitution finally established in the Preußisches Allgemeines Landrecht (Prussian Common Law) in 1794 was generally accepted and championed by these movements. Regulation was seen as the only way to control both evils—prostitution and the prostitute.

Alongside the Protestant movement, a medical discourse and a new ‘science’—sexology—began to reflect the situation of prostitution in the large cities. First, a heated debate about venereal diseases arose. Prostitution was regarded as the main source of infection. Prostitution as an occupation for underclass or working women increased in the late nineteenth century and was considered an urgent matter for the rest of society. This general background must be taken into consideration when discussing Anna Pappritz and her fight against regulation. Hitherto it has been thought that the German women’s movement was too conservative to discuss these problems earlier and that for this reason a first abolitionist attempt in the 1880s broke down. I believe that activism alone cannot arouse interest in a political or social theme if society as a whole is not yet able to absorb the problem. New discussions and a search for new answers to an ‘old’ question were needed before the women’s movement could recommence the abolitionist debate.
Anna Pappritz’s Life and Her First Contact with Abolitionist Ideas

Anna Pappritz was born at Radach in Mark Brandenburg (Prussia, today Poland) in 1861. After her father’s death she moved to Berlin, which then became her living and working place. Pappritz says of herself that until she turned thirty-four she had neither known anything about a women’s movement in Germany nor made contact with it. In the end, her experience of enlightenment did not take place in Germany but in Britain, where she had travelled for health reasons in 1895. An autobiographical manuscript relates how for the first time she visited a women’s club in London and women’s colleges in Oxford, Cambridge and Edinburgh. She was positively and pleasantly surprised by the friendly tone of relations she witnessed between young women and men. Finally, she met Mrs Thripthrop, or Thripthorp, who was a theosophist. This lady’s questions about the campaign against regulation in Germany prodded Anna Pappritz to consider a problem that would become her later field of work. Pappritz wrote about this experience:

\[\text{I didn’t understand this question at all and told her that I didn’t know what she meant by regulation of prostitution. So she informed me and this explanation affected me like a crushing blow. I can’t describe the feelings overwhelming me. I didn’t know anything about these circumstances.}\]

Thus it was an Englishwoman—about whom, unfortunately, nothing more is presently known—who introduced Anna Pappritz to the ideas of abolitionism.

After this incident Pappritz managed within a short time to get in contact with the German women’s movement. However, she soon came to realise that abolitionist views were not dominant within the bourgeois women’s movement and that questions concerning prostitution were instead answered with restrictive policies. The Bund deutscher Frauenvereine (BDF) (Federation of German Women’s Associations) under the leadership of Hanna Bieber-Böhm demanded the criminal prosecution of prostitutes. The social and economic contexts of prostitution were not taken into consideration.

This moderate—perhaps ‘unmodern’—response may have been a reaction against the politics of the 1880s. This was the time of the anti-socialist law, when Gertrud Guillaume-Schack tried to establish the ideas of Josephine Butler within the German Empire. In 1880 Guillaume-Schack founded the Deutscher Kulturbund (German Association for Culture), the first association to be concerned with questions of purity and abolitionism. It seems that it was too early for these new ideas because Guillaume-Schack’s association did not grow. Disappointed by the lack of interest within bourgeois society, she tried to establish her ideas within the socialist movement. This was a fatal step, because the ideas of abolitionism were now linked with an illegal movement. In this hopeless situation Gertrud Guillaume-Schack decided to emigrate in 1885 to England, where she died in 1903. This first episode shows very clearly that a new idea does not only need a voice, it also needs a place to be effective. And this place could not yet be found.

Five years later—at this point it was clear that the anti-socialist Law would not be renewed—Hanna Bieber-Böhm, a member of the bourgeois women’s movement,
founded a new society in Berlin: the Jugendschutz (Child-Protection) association.\(^{13}\)

This new association did not represent the ideas of abolitionism—even though Hanna Bieber-Böhm declared that there was a connection. I think this was more a ‘third way’ on the issue of purity. The main difference between the ideas of Jugendschutz and abolitionism was the question of the punishment of both the vendors and clients of prostitution. Hanna Bieber-Böhm propagated this point of view and with this principle stood against the deeply liberal ideas of abolitionism.

Her political concept seems at best moderate, or traditional—but compared with the ideas and ideological background of the Protestantische Sittlichkeitsbewegung (Protestant Moral Purity Movement) Hanna Bieber-Böhm was relatively liberal. Most members of the Moral Purity Movement were active in the Protestant church and this group was—as Foult has shown—dominated by activists around Adolf Stöcker, a raving anti-Semite. Stöcker’s ideology was also based on Christian marriage and family life: the battle against immorality—like homosexuality, prostitution or girl-trafficking—was to be fought with the Bible and within the Protestant church.\(^{14}\) It is very interesting to see that the Moral Purity Movement was dominated by well-educated men. This was a movement of and for men. Foult concludes his article with the statement: ‘The battle over vice was really a battle of the sexes over gender roles in public and private life’. And it was a battle dominated by men.\(^{15}\)

Anna Pappritz determined to change these rigid views within the women’s movement. Her decision to devote herself to the struggle against prostitution became even stronger when she met Josephine Butler at the International Conference for the Suppression of Traffic in Girls, which took place in London from 21 to 23 June 1899. She wrote about the meeting:

Mrs Butler … [invited me] to speak at the big Purity Council, which was going to hold a meeting in the London Easthall on the 3rd of July. [There] I had the honour and pleasure to sit next to Mrs Butler and Susan Anthony on the panel. I gave a short presentation about Federation work in Germany and was lucky that Mrs Butler and Miss Susan B. Anthony said very warm words to me afterwards: I felt as if I had been knighted that evening, as if my weapons were hallowed for the fight, and I inwardly vowed not to let these weapons out of my hands as long as my strength would suffice to guide them and I especially vowed to keep my shield and my weapons always clean.\(^{16}\)

Pappritz made her first concrete step when she founded one of the first branches of the International Abolitionist Federation in Berlin in 1899. This step became possible because the structure of the women’s movement had changed during the previous fifteen years. Now an umbrella organisation existed which was very important for the promotion of new ideas. In this period Pappritz worked with women like Minna Cauer, Lida Gustava Heymann and Anita Augspurg, all members of the ‘left-wing’ women’s movement. In her autobiographical text of 1908, Pappritz described the unstable balance between the left and the right wing of the bourgeois women’s movement between 1899 and 1908 and characterised the different protagonists. She wrote that it was an accident that she started her life-work by the side of the left-wing members. It was surely more than just an accident: in this period the theme of prostitution was taken up on the left rather than on the right. But after Anna Pappritz’s activities in the
first decade of the twentieth century, the situation was reversed. Now the ‘leftist’ themes of prostitution and abolitionism were adopted by the BDF, which was the supposedly right-wing organisation. What does this mean?

Richard Evans has defined this situation as a far-right swing and argues that Anna Pappritz as well as the ideas of abolitionism in Germany exchanged their positions. I don’t agree: neither the publications nor the politics of Anna Pappritz changed in this period. I believe that the ‘left’ women’s movement never provided the power base for abolitionism which Pappritz needed for her political work. The members of this movement—especially Anita Augspurg—adopted this area of work because it was a public international question and was spotted as an up-and-coming field of activity. But at no time was it really fundamental to the operations of the left wing. At the high point of purity discussions in Germany around 1900, the left wing used the theme only to illustrate the male-dominated structure of German society.17

My assessment emerges more clearly from a consideration of a new strand in the women’s movement—the ‘new ethics’ (neue Ethik) of Helene Stöcker. In this political and social concept, the left wing—mainly Anita Augspurg and Lida Gustava Heymann—found its place. In her autobiographical text Anna Pappritz remembers a moment in 1899 when she tried to convince Anita Augspurg to lead the new abolitionist movement in Germany. Augspurg confessed to her that she supported ‘free love’ and she was worried about this inclination in the event of her becoming the leader of German abolitionism. Pappritz accepted her position.18 Maybe these circumstances explain why Anna Pappritz turned to the BDF and found her place there and not within the left wing. Her decision was—in my opinion—more a search for new partners than a far-right swing.

After the foundation of the first local branches of the Federation in Germany (Hamburg and Berlin, both in 1899) Anna Pappritz began to change the official politics of the BDF on issues of purity. So she became active in the BDF purity committee. This had since 1896 been led by Hanna Bieber-Böhm who, standing for a restrictive politics of prostitution, thus became Pappritz’s direct opponent.19 One can still follow their sparring matches, which were articulated in various periodicals of the women’s movement. On the basis of these articles it is possible to trace the essential arguments, counter-arguments, suggestions and corrections maintained by the protagonists until one position could—slowly—prevail.20

The ultimate success of Anna Pappritz’s strategy can be ascribed principally to two causes. In the first place, the circumstances of prostitution had changed over time and so had the answers given to the question of prostitution. After decades of regulation, it was increasingly clear that there was no answer to what was considered the main problem—venereal infection. German society, as well as the German medical profession, was still looking for a solution. So the abolitionist position (a fight against the regulation of prostitution, not a fight against prostitution itself) could now conceivably be taken up by other sectors of society; though—as will be seen—German medical opinion never provided wholehearted support for abolitionism.

In the second place, Pappritz used the structure of the German women’s movement in a very intelligent way. She published in the main papers, organised many meetings and speeches, became the chair of the BDF purity committee and was, after a few years,
the best expert on abolitionism in the country. But Pappritz did not just work within the structure of the women’s movement. She also used the movement as a place where new ideas could be positioned. Doing this she created a place and—we will see later—a voice and a structure for the new idea. With this procedure she was in fact following the successful pattern of the women’s movement’s development since 1865.21

In 1902 the change away from restrictive purity politics towards abolitionism was finally achieved. In this year Anna Pappritz was appointed as a member of the board at the general meeting of the BDF and her work in the purity committee extended gradually as well. Within just a couple of years Pappritz had accomplished a major swing over prostitution and the bourgeois wing of the women’s movement took the abolitionist line from 1902 onwards.22

However, for Pappritz, changing the politics of the BDF was not sufficient in itself. After the foundation of the first local branches of the Federation in Hamburg and Berlin in 1899, she motivated more and more women and sometimes men to found branches in other cities. This was so effective that it became possible to found an umbrella organisation, the German section of the International Abolitionist Federation, which became operational in 1904.23 The chairwoman of the Dresden branch, Katharina Scheven, led the organisation and also edited its periodical, The Abolitionist, published from 1902. Within only five years, abolitionism had copied the organisational structure that had been typical for the women’s movement in Germany since the middle of the nineteenth century: one based on local branches, an umbrella organisation and a periodical designed for an inner circle—the members of the organisation—as well as for an outer circle—the wider society.24

This first stage of development came to a head between 22 and 24 September 1904, when the Congress of the International Abolitionist Federation took place in Germany for the first time. By holding this Congress at Dresden, the Federation officially welcomed the young movement within the circle of the established abolitionist campaigners, and at the same time showed the German people that the abolitionist movement had finally started to work in their country.

![Figure 1. Members of the purity movement in Germany: Katharina Scheven, Hanna Bieber-Böhm and Anna Pappritz.](image-url)
Where did the ideas of abolitionism insert themselves in the German social context? The programme of this international meeting in 1904 gives us the chance to situate them with some precision. The occasion does not mark the beginning of purity campaigning in Germany. It was rather a case of the ideas represented by abolitionism becoming part of a widely discussed purity discourse and this becomes clear on looking at the list of guest speakers. Apart from the different members of various national abolitionist organisations, the following associations welcomed the participants of the Congress: the Society of German Princesses for a Higher Standard of Purity; the Dresden Association for a Higher Standard of Purity; the Central Office for Youth Welfare; the German National Committee for the Suppression of Traffic in Girls; and the German Association against the Abuse of Alcohol. Following these greetings, participants were welcomed by the representatives of the German women’s movement. Speakers were Marie Stritt, chair of the BDF; Lida Gustava Heymann, member of the Union of Progressive Women’s Associations; and Paula Müller of the German Protestant Women’s Union.

Thus this ceremony demonstrates where abolitionism had established its position in Germany or—in other words—which place it had been allotted. This was among three movements: confessionally dominated purity associations (mostly Protestant); the women’s movement; and a medical discourse that began around 1900 and was current particularly within the German Society for the Campaign against Venereal Diseases. None of these movements had had an abolitionist orientation initially or represented mainly abolitionist viewpoints. On questions of prostitution the confessional purity associations proposed supposedly deterrent, draconian punishments and an old-fashioned purity education propagating chastity. The bourgeois women’s movement did not adopt abolitionist viewpoints before Pappritz’s intervention; and the German Society for the Campaign against Venereal Diseases—founded in 1902—oscillated between abolitionist and regulationist positions. All these groups were represented at the Congress and discussed the new ideas of abolitionism with the exception of the Society for the Campaign against Venereal Diseases.

After its ‘false start’ with Guillaume-Schack, German abolitionism had established itself rather later than in other countries. In her speech to the Congress, the chair of the German organisation, Katharina Scheven, gave four reasons for this delay: firstly the ‘indifference of the educated public’; secondly, the ‘resistance of the medical profession tending towards regulation’; thirdly, the development of an uninfluenceable ‘administrative bureaucracy’; and fourthly, ‘unfavourable general political and social circumstances’.

The first and second issues, in particular, illustrate the difficulty that German abolitionism had from the beginning onwards: a lack of men. In Germany abolitionism never succeeded in winning men over to its cause. Almost all the social groupings open to discussion of this topic adopted the position of the—overwhelmingly male—confessional purity associations. The Liberals, who might have been convinced by the deeply egalitarian aspects of abolitionism, continued to make traditional assumptions on gender difference. Therefore, a statement such as ‘there is only one sexual morality and
this is the same for men and women’ could not develop its enlightening potential among them.

The assumption of gender difference explains as well why almost all German doctors took a regulatory view. They argued on the basis of a biologically existing difference producing different needs. This argumentation created the rhetorical figure of a medically necessary sexuality for men and the modest sexual needs of women. Against this background the campaign against prostitution seemed like a campaign against male sexuality. Arguments resulting from gender difference, and decades of habitual legal and medical practice, had led to the perception of regulation as normality and abolitionism as utopia.

Is this statement also true for the socialist movement? It seems that the socialist movement in Germany was never a strong partner for abolitionism, which could therefore be defined as a bourgeois issue. But there existed points of contact and go-betweens. One was Henriette Fürth, a member of the socialist movement in Frankfurt am Main. She was a member of the socialist as well as of the bourgeois women’s movement and a very active partner in the German Society for the Campaign against Venereal Diseases. A more celebrated point of contact was the very famous book written by August Bebel—*Woman under Socialism*. First published in 1879, Bebel revised and enlarged it in the following decades. Under the heading ‘Prostitution—a necessary social institution in bourgeois society’, he described the situation of prostitution between 1870 and 1910. He characterized prostitution as a ‘normal’ phenomenon of bourgeois society, showing the bourgeois man as the seducer and the female worker as a victim of seduction. Bebel referred to Josephine Butler’s movement but did not use the word abolitionism. His text neither presented the abolitionist movement in Germany nor named famous members. In his opinion prostitution was only an aspect of capitalist society and the only solution could be the change from capitalism to socialism. Around 1900, the Socialist Women’s Movement did organise protests against the regulation of prostitution. Nevertheless, there was never any official cooperation between the socialist and bourgeois women’s movements. Lutz Sauerteig believes that the socialists only took over parts of the abolitionist ideas and did not fight for purity or a new morality. I think that this is a very good demonstration of how the socialist or social-democratic concept of the secondary contradictions of capitalism played out in the actual political circumstances of the Kaiserreich.

Back to Katharina Scheven’s speech in 1904. What she meant by ‘administrative bureaucracy’ and ‘unfavourable general political and social circumstances’ is not clear. But in my opinion it was her aim to describe the situation of the German women’s movement in a very careful way. Until 1908 the Prussian Association Law forbade women to participate in any political association. Therefore women’s corporate activities had all to be—officially—social or welfare orientated. Under this pressure it was not easy to act politically or to discuss political themes. Between 1900 and 1908 women and their organisations fought against this prohibition and in 1908 the Association Law was finally abolished. Henceforward it was possible for women to become members of political parties and women’s organisations were—officially—free to discuss political themes.
Questions of prostitution and abolitionism were fundamental political concerns, but the participants at the 1904 Congress still had to discuss political issues—under the eyes of the police—in an unpolitical way. This situation was unknown to the international guests and the German journal *The Abolitionist* wrote: ‘So trafen denn unsere zahlreichen ausländischen Delegierten in zuversichtlicher Stimmung ein, wenn auch einige von ihnen sich eines leisen Grusels bei dem Gedanken, unter den Augen der strengen deutschen Polizei raten und tagen zu müssen, sich nicht erwehren konnten’. (Paraphrase: The international guests arrived in a confident and positive mood even though some of them felt a little uneasy having to hold their meeting watched by the grim eyes of the German police.)

In order to carry abolitionist ideas further into society many (female) abolitionists got involved in other organisations as well. This was certainly Anna Pappritz’s approach. She was the only woman represented in the twelve-member executive committee of the German Society for the Campaign against Venereal Diseases. Despite decades of discussions and journalistic sparring matches this society never actually joined forces with abolitionism, although abolitionist positions became more influential. Therefore one could say that abolitionism never became a gender mixed movement in Germany. It was always the bourgeois women’s movement alone which campaigned for abolitionism and tried to introduce its principles into male-dominated discussions.

Anna Pappritz always remained loyal to her inner promise of 1899 when she had met Josephine Butler in person. Even during the First World War she tried to keep her picture of the good abolitionist movement alive. In her publications she created a dichotomous Britain: the good—the abolitionist movement and its members—and the bad one—the bellicose British society. During wartime she opposed brothels for combatant troops and worked hard for her ideas of purity and abolitionism. But the years between 1914 and 1918 were very hard for her personally. She became seriously ill and lost all her financial resources. After the war she had to earn money—for the first time in her life—and found employment in a print office. New times—in a political but also in a private sense—had begun. However, Pappritz pursued abolitionist ideals throughout the period of the Weimar Republic. After the death of Katharina Scheven in 1922 she carried on editing *The Abolitionist* and combating regulatory tendencies. In 1927 the Weimar government enacted the law against venereal diseases—the most liberal law that had ever existed in Germany. The regulation and punishment of prostitution were abolished. Brothels and ‘brothelstreets’ were forbidden. This great success for abolitionism encouraged Pappritz even more. In March 1927 she wrote: ‘The motto is now: to continue to work for our aims with fresh courage and tough energy, to pursue the campaign against the “double standard” of morality so that later generations can profit from our endeavours’.

But in 1933 the National Socialists abruptly ended her lifework. The abolitionist organisation was dissolved. Pappritz resigned from all her positions. She died at her family’s manor at Radach in 1939. Gertrud Bäumer, one of the most important representatives of the bourgeois women’s movement, composed the obituary for Anna Pappritz.
Figure 2. The author at Anna Papritz’s grave at Radach (now in Poland; formerly in Germany). The inscription is the motto of the International Abolitionist Federation: ‘There is only one morality for both sexes’. Many thanks to Henriette Storch who took the picture.
She wrote:

Unfortunately, there is no female counterpart to the meaning of: he is a gentleman. So, there is no other choice than to apply this word itself to Anna Pappritz. Because she was one: in the straightness and pureness of her nature, in the brave and knightly form of struggle, in the absolute freedom from every personal addiction to success … in the justice of her judgement. As representative of a task, in the loyalty to her convictions, as leader and comrade—you can’t find a better one. 

In my opinion the political life of Anna Pappritz shows very clearly that personal contacts and international meetings were necessary for international communication of ideas. But it also shows that these contacts were not the main work. A deep understanding of national circumstances, and a capacity to link the new idea to national pressure groups, were essential. Anna Pappritz found the pressure group which could situate German abolitionism within the bourgeois women’s movement. But this was not enough. She was able to understand how this pressure group was working and thinking. Because of this background knowledge she found a way to integrate the new idea of abolitionism within an old movement. Only a combination of these two elements could make her work for abolitionism in Germany so successful.

Notes

[1] This article presents preliminary theses and questions developed during my ongoing research project on Anna Pappritz and the situation of abolitionism in Germany between 1899 and 1933. I cannot yet give definitive answers. But I would like to indicate some rough outlines. Herrenmoral (the morality of man) in my title is the title of Pappritz’s first publication describing her abolitionistic views: A. Pappritz (1903) Herrenmoral (Leipzig: Verlag der Frauen-Rundschau). I wish to acknowledge the help of my friend Cordula Patzig with writing my first article in English.


[3] It is not easy to find a perfect translation for the word ‘Sittlichkeit’, because it had a very wide meaning in nineteenth-century Germany. ‘Sittlichkeit’ is not simply morality, purity or chastity, it is more a combination of these meanings. In the following text I will use different terms, mostly purity. See G. Bauer (2006) Kulturprotestantismus und frühe bürgerliche Frauenbewegung in Deutschland. Agnes von Zahn-Harnack (1884–1950) (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt), p. 65.

[5] Anna Pappritz tried to establish herself as an author in the 1880s and 1890s. She did not start her career in the bourgeois women’s movement until 1900. Her well-known novel is: A. Pappritz (1894) Vorurteile. Ein Zeitroman aus dem märkischen Gesellschaftsleben, (Berlin: Rüger).


[12] The Federation of German Women’s Associations was founded in 1894 and was the first umbrella organisation of the bourgeois women’s movement. It was affiliated to the International Council of Women.


[18] The original quotation: ‘Ich stehe innerlich im Grunde meines Herzens auf der Seite der freien Liebe. Ich kann in meiner jetzigen Arbeit über diesen Punkt schweigen, aber als Vorsitzende eines Föderationszweiges müßte ich doch früher oder später Farbe bekennen. Heucheln kann ich nicht und mit dieser Ansicht würde ich die Arbeit der Föderation von vornherein in Mißkredit bringen.’ (Paraphrase: In my innermost heart I am on the side of free love. I can keep silent on the issue in my present work, but as chair of a branch of the Federation, sooner or later I would have to reveal my true colours. I can’t be a hypocrite, and my point of view would discredit the Federation from the start.) This passage poses some problems. Pappritz’s autobiographical text was written in 1908. Helene Stöcker had begun her work for her new ideas in 1901 when she returned from England to Berlin. It seems hardly possible that Anita Augspurg told Anna Pappritz that she stood on the side of ‘free love’ as early as 1899. It may be a case of ‘misremembering’, but it is very interesting to see that abolitionism and ‘free love’ were described as two antipodal concepts.


[21] In 1865 the first women’s club was founded in Leipzig.


[26] Ibid., p. 94.

[27] A ‘radical’ grouping set up by the left wing.


[29] Ibid., p. 29.

[30] At this stage it is not possible to answer these questions in detail. So far all I can do is to show a tendency of possible issues. There has been virtually no research on the relationship between abolitionism and socialism in Germany.


[33] We have to visualise the Congress meeting in the presence of a policeman: a situation described as very abnormal and alarming for the international guests.

[34] This makes clear why all women’s associations in Germany described themselves as social or welfare orientated.


