The problem of dealing with Prostitution and Venereal Disease should be approached with science and sympathy and not with moral disapproval.

—Resolution of the Third Congress of the WLSR, 1929

Prostitution is above all the daughter of poverty and cannot be cured with a cup of tea, a piece of cake, and some moral statements.

—Federica Montseny, 1927

To many contemporaries, the resolutions on prostitution and other matters associated with sexuality adopted by the World League for Sexual Reform (WLSR) seemed bold, but some political radicals—Marxists and anarchists alike—criticized the WLSR for what they saw as a timorous approach and an inability to effect real change in the sphere of sexual relations. These radicals, including some who were actually involved in the WLSR, believed that sexual change could occur only as part of a broader endeavor to alter the social and political conditions in which the general population lived. The involvement of the revolutionary Left in the various national chapters of the WLSR is an ongoing subject for research. Some work has been done on the Communist Party’s possible connections to


2La prostitución es sobre todo hija de la miseria y no puede curarse con una taza de te, un pastelillo y unas sentencias morales.” See Federica Montseny, “Una jornada de las Prostitutas,” Revista Blanca 100 (1927): 111.
the German chapter but almost none on the involvement of the radical Left in the WLSR in Spain; indeed, all research on the Spanish chapter of the WLSR is very much in its early stages. In this essay I explore the extent to which Spanish anarchists were engaged with both the international body and the Spanish chapter of the WLSR. My chief sources are anarchist periodicals published in eastern Spain, in Catalonia and Valencia, where the “cultural” expression of anarchism was most advanced. Such engagement with the WLSR, which straight away should be qualified as minimal, must be considered in the context of a much broader sexual reform movement, which had been promoted by some sectors of Spanish anarchism since the late nineteenth century and reached its height in the 1920s and 1930s.

The WLSR was essentially a progressive liberal organization devoted to implementing a number of proposals, some far-reaching for the time, to alter the contours of lived sexual experience and morality. Composed of many national chapters or sections and open to different political viewpoints, the WLSR was ill at ease with itself. A constant tension existed among its members between a desire for scientific respectability (something that sexology had sought since its mid- to late-nineteenth-century inception) and a commitment to the radical reform of sexual morality. The WLSR was caught between a respect for institutionalized scientific process and a more demanding radical agenda; some adherents within and many others without (e.g., Wilhelm Reich) sought nothing less than the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism as a necessary pre- or cocondition for lasting and profound sex reform. This much can be seen from the diverse contributors to the WLSR congresses and the tone of their interventions. According to one participant in the WLSR from 1928 onward, “Valuable material was presented in the papers and discussions at its four congresses . . . but at the same time strong currents of divergent opinion became manifest in its membership.”

Despite these divergences, the WLSR was able to assemble an international group of people to pursue a number of common projects, such as ending sexual hypocrisy, securing equal rights for women and men, providing sex education, and liberalizing the treatment of homosexuals. In some countries, such as Spain, the WLSR became the principal institutional forum for the relatively new sciences of sexology and “eugenics.”

3On Germany, see Ralf Dose. On Spain, in addition to references cited below, see Alison Sinclair’s article in this issue and Pilar Pérez Sanz and Carmen Bru Ripoll, “La sexología en la España de los años 30. Tomo II: Hildegart o la historia de Aurora Rodríguez Carballeira, su madre,” Revista de Sexología 32 (1987): 1–119, 53, where it is stated that Hildegart, the secretary of the Spanish chapter of the WLSR, destroyed all the chapter’s records shortly before being murdered by her mother.

The small but vociferous groups that criticized the WLSR's activities were often allied to Marxist or anarchist political ideologies, were sometimes informed by radical neo-Malthusianism, and may have been part of trade union organizations. One could easily exaggerate the interconnectivity between the discourse of the WLSR and that of its radical counterparts elsewhere as well as the influence that the latter may have had. However, in Spain it does seem to be the case that other organizations outstripped the League both in the degree of their radicalism and in their claims to ownership of the field of sex reform. Given their history of agitating for sexual reform, the anarchists may well have contributed to the WLSR's failure in Spain, either by detachment or by opposition.

In Spain, particularly in the eastern regions of Catalonia and Valencia, anarchists had long been concerned about marriage, sexual or gender inequalities, children's rights, and sex education, issues that in the early twentieth century were expressed under the banner of "neo-Malthusianism," "sex reform," and, later, proletarian "eugenics." The anarchist form of eugenics combined, at times with much conflict, the precepts of hereditarians, Lamarckians, and social and biological perfectionists. The anarchists spread their message on sexuality in their many reviews, including Generación Consciente/Estudios and Ética/Iniciales. These reviews, which usually appeared monthly, discussed avidly issues such as free love, sexual differences between men and women, birth control, homosexuality, masturbation, nudism, and the dangers or benefits of promiscuity and monogamy.

To some degree, the publication of tracts and reviews differentiated anarchism in Spain from socialism. Anarchists placed a great deal of emphasis on cultural change and libertarian values, including sexual liberation, which were seen as at least partly obtainable under capitalism. More than Marxists, anarchists viewed change under capitalism as part of the process in which the state and capitalism itself would be destroyed. This process of destruction need not be postponed to an indefinite future, when the proletarian dictatorship withered away. Even now one could become emancipated through education, through the acquisition of culture, a revolutionary tool. This cultural message permeated anarchist and syndicalist

---

5See the letter by Haire and Leunbach cited in Wilhelm Reich, The Sexual Revolution (London, 1972), 60–61, where divisions between revolutionary and reformist sex reform are discussed. Reich's rather self-aggrandizing claims must be treated with caution.
organizations such as the Iberian Anarchist Federation (Federación Anarquista Ibérica, FAI) and the National Confederation of Labor (Confederación Nacional del Trabajo, CNT); for many of their members, cultural battles surpassed all others, even the economic.

In 1936 anarchists from one of the poorest regions, Andalusia, enshrined such an objective, declaring that the anarchist school, based on scientific and rationalist methods, would allow the “light of knowledge” to reach all minds, an essential element in the new libertarian communist society. In the new society, culture would be paramount, and the Culture Commission would be the most valued. On this commission would depend the progressive impetus that would bring about the future anarchic society that would introduce new customs with respect to love and human fraternity. How was this to be done? Although they never provided blueprints for a “new society,” anarchists believed that the preparation carried out in capitalist times would culminate in anarchist society: “Anarchist schools, cultural centers, and revolutionary cinema and theater would be the prime tools enabling this development.”

While not an important issue in every region where anarchists were strong, sexuality was a major topic in the journals published in Catalonia and Valencia. For a number of years several anarchist reviews in these regions devoted many of their pages to sexuality. The first neo-Malthusian publication in Spain, Salud y Fuerza, was established by anarchists in Barcelona in 1904 and was edited by Lluis Bulffí until 1914. Other reviews, citing Salud y Fuerza as their inspiration, were established in the early 1920s. The most influential and long-lasting of these was the Alcoy- and later Valencia-based Generación Consciente (1923–29), edited by J. Juan Pastor, which later seamlessly became Estudios (1929–37). According to some sources, the circulation of Generación Consciente numbered only about 2,000 copies, but that of its successor, Estudios, ranged between 25,000–75,000 copies.

In its time, Estudios was considered by members of the anarchist movement to be forward thinking. It was also eclectic, thereby justifying its masthead subtitle, Revista Ecléctica (Eclectic review). In the October 1932 issue, for example, which ran to the usual sixty or so pages, appeared a
variety of articles on sexuality. The sexologist Dr. Santiago Valentí Camp wrote on psychic dynamics and social harmony; the Italian anarchist Camillo Berneri, on the Church and prostitution; Isaac Puente (who signed with his nom de plume, “Un Médico Rural”), on the dangers of masturbation; and the Belgian anarchist Hem Day, on youth and sexuality. Among other themes, the question-and-answer section that followed included a question on homosexuality.

Like Estudios, the review Iniciales had a previous incarnation, in its case as Etica. Etica (1927–29) and Iniciales (1929–37) were “anarchist individualist” publications that drew upon the philosophy of figures such as Stirner. Rather dismissive of the workers movement and of syndicalism, Etica and Iniciales were apparently not a great success among their desired working-class audience. Iniciales was critical of the libertarian movement and its members on two main counts. First, individualists showed a certain amount of disdain for those anarchosyndicalist and libertarian communist militants because, in many cases, they continued to smoke, drink, and eat meat as well as harbor certain prejudices. Second, individualists opposed the insurrectionist tactics of the FAI and the CNT in the early 1930s, favoring instead pacifism and nonviolence. Both reviews promoted vegetarianism and nudism, and Iniciales gave its support to the WLSR.

These publications provide evidence that in Spain, the anarchists, along with progressives and a small number of Catholic sexologists, advocated not only socioeconomic change but also opening up sexual questions for serious examination. In doing so, anarchists often relied on the work and ideas of sexologists who were politically much less radical than themselves. Anarchists embraced new theories on sexuality as part of their overall claim to apply the insights of knowledge and culture—scientia—in the service of the proletariat. But in the process they placed their antiauthoritarian ideas under considerable strain. The medical and eugenic ideas that originated outside of their movement often contained messages or suggested modes of practice that contradicted anarchist fundamentals. In the sterilization debates that swept across eugenics in the first three decades of the twentieth century, for example, anarchists were deeply divided on the question of voluntary and even compulsory sterilization.

Any discussion of the WLSR by Spanish anarchists would most likely have appeared in the Catalan and Valencian reviews referred to above, but

10 The passage in Diez is as follows: “manifestaran un cert menyspreu per tots aquells militants, anarcosindicalistes i comunistes llibertaris, pel fet que, en molts casos, aquests siguin carnivors, fumin, beguin, estiguin carregats de prejudicis.”

11 Xavier Diez, Utopia sexual a la premsa anarquista de Catalunya: La revista Ética-Iniciales (1927–1937) (Lleida, 2001), 40–41. Diez notes that after José Elizalde, the editor of Etica, was arrested in 1929 along with other members of the editorial group, his public impact was minimal. His last article for the review appeared in Iniciales in 1929 (Diez, 32–33). After the Civil War he went into exile in Mexico.

12 On this point, see Cleminson, Anarchism, 159–226.
Generación Consciente/Estudios and Ética/Iniciales devoted little space to the organization. Although one cannot affirm that the anarchists engaged wholeheartedly with what the WLSR had to offer, there were a number of articles, often from foreign correspondents (of whom this kind of press had many), that touched upon it and some that provided detailed descriptions of its aims and activities. Among these were general appraisals and reports on WLSR congresses, drawn mostly from French sources, which appeared in Generación Consciente and Estudios; an assessment and endorsement of the WLSR’s principles, which appeared in the pages of Iniciales; and Isaac Puente’s “Open Letter” to the organizers of the Spanish chapter of the WLSR, published in Estudios in July 1932, which criticized the organization.

The first article on the WLSR to appear in Generación Consciente was a report by the congress secretary, a Dr. Handtmann, four months after the WLSR’s 1928 meeting in Copenhagen. The report, upbeat in its appraisal, noted that delegates had come from several countries and heard an address given by Magnus Hirschfeld. In this address Hirschfeld explained that the objective of the WLSR was “la liberación de la Humanidad de sus miserias, ignorancias e hipocresías sexuales” [the freeing of Humanity from sexual misery, ignorance, and hypocrisy]. In considerations of sexuality, Hirschfeld proposed, two great contradictory themes came together: the theological and the biological—a view then commonly held by sex reformers and progressives. The rest of Handtmann’s report noted the many areas on which the World League would concentrate its efforts. There was no mention of Spain.

Some months later, in the pages of Estudios, Jeanne Humbert, a member of the French section of the WLSR, responded to requests for further information about the World League from readers of La Voix des Femmes, in which she had previously published an article. Her response introduced key sexual reform figures such as Haire, Hirschfeld, and Hodann and noted that the French section of the WLSR was called “Pro Amore. Liga de la Regeneración Humana.” It was not uncommon for a French person to write in a Spanish anarchist review; indeed, much of the impetus...

There may be discussion of the WLSR in anarchist sources from other regions of Spain; however, an extensive survey of the anarchist press in Spain has not, to my knowledge, been undertaken with this objective in mind.

"Il congreso internacional de sexología y reforma sexual," in Generación Consciente 63 (1928): 418–23. I have been unable to trace any other references to Dr. Handtmann in the World League’s official published reports.

According to an editorial note, the original report was published in Medicina Ibera. To date, I have been unable to consult this review.

Jeanne Humbert, “La reforma sexual,” Estudios 72 (1929): 28–29. Less than a year later, Humbert published a general article in Iniciales on sex-reform campaigns, some of which she saw as being articulated under the banner of the WLSR. However, she did not specifically discuss the Spanish situation in this article. See Juana Humbert, “El problema sexual es un problema social,” Iniciales 2 (1930): 21–23.
of sex reform in the libertarian movement came from France, and many pages of anarchist reviews were given over to figures such as Dr. Madeleine Pelletier, Dr. G. Hardy, and Víctor Margueritte. But it does show that the idea of the World League was still foreign to Spain. Indeed, even after a Spanish chapter of the WLSR was actually formed in 1932, it drew heavily on foreign correspondents, as the contents of the two issues of its journal, Sexus, indicate.

In her Estudios article of 1929, Jeanne Humbert asserted that Dr. Isaac Puente had become the WLSR’s “correspondent” for Spain, just as Norman Haire was the correspondent for England, Dr. F. Mascaux (whose contraceptive devices were famous) for Belgium, and R. D. Karvé for India. If what she reported is true, it would indicate that Puente was initially in favor of involvement in the WLSR. Unfortunately, her statement cannot be corroborated, and Puente’s relationship with other Spaniards involved in the WLSR remains unclear.

What is certain is that some Spanish anarchists were involved with the World League from at least 1930. In December of that year Iniciales reprinted a declaration presented to the 1930 congress by the French section of the WLSR on the subject of sex reform. Iniciales not only published this declaration and a program for its achievement but publicly endorsed it.

It is worth pausing a moment to reflect on the significance of this declaration and its underwriting by Iniciales. Eduard Masjuan has written that the editors of Iniciales accepted an invitation to form a Spanish chapter of the WLSR, that the review’s editorial board became the Spanish delegation to the WLSR, and that the headquarters were located at 44 Premià in Barcelona, which was Iniciales’s registered address. While Masjuan provides no source for such a claim, a general article on the WLSR written by the French sex reformer Víctor Margueritte and published in


118Spain’s involvement with the WLSR, such as it was, seems to date from the Copenhagen congress of 1928, when a Dr. Juan Fernán Pérez from Spain was a member of the International Committee. Fernán Pérez also served on the committee for the London congress of 1929 and was one of three representatives from Spain at the Vienna congress of 1930 and on the International Committee for the Brno congress of 1932 (Dr. J. Sánchez Gómez and Gregorio Marañón were the other two representatives from Spain).

Francisco Navarro Navarro’s claim that both Puente and José Juan Pastor, the editor of Generación Consciente, were on the WLSR’s founding committee in 1928 is dubious. See Francisco Javier Navarro Navarro, “El Paraíso de la Razón”: La revista Estudios (1928–1937) y el mundo cultural anarquista (Valencia, 1997), 102.


20The article states that “[l]a sección francesa de la Liga, Proamor, presentó a la aprobación del Congreso las siguientes conclusiones, a las que se adhirió Iniciales . . . ,” suggesting that there was a degree of precongress communication between the two entities.

21Eduard Masjuan, La ecología humana en el anarquismo ibérico: Urbanismo “orgánico” o ecológico, neomalthusianismo y naturismo social (Barcelona, 2000), 412–15. According to
the August 1932 issue of Estudios does help substantiate it. In a note at the end of the article, Margueritte states that all those interested in the World League could go to the Spanish delegation located in Premià.22

There are several points worth noting in the declaration prepared by the French section of the WLSR. It asked for the provision of clinics where women could go in search of sex advice literature; demanded that women take control of their own bodies and decide when and if they should have children—an idea expressed at the time as “freedom of maternity”; and advocated an end to sexual inequality and the double standard. While parallels with the anarchist stance on sexuality during these years are striking, these are most likely explained by the fact that much of anarchist neo-Malthusianism came originally from early-twentieth-century French sources. Where the French and the Spanish may have diverged (even though Iniciales did underwrite the program) was in the French group’s demand that “governments of all countries concern themselves with the teaching of sexual hygiene” and facilitate the distribution of contraceptives.23 After briefly mentioning some of the papers read at the WLSR congress, the unnamed author of the article in Iniciales expressed the hope for “a transformation of the popular morality by eugenics and conscious maternity in order to remove the causes of so many sexual and moral misfortunes,” a fairly common anarchist exhortation of the times.24

In July 1932 Estudios published an “Open Letter” from the anarchist doctor Isaac Puente to the WLSR’s Spanish chapter, the Liga española para la reforma sexual sobre bases cientificas (Spanish League for Sexual Reform on a Scientific Basis).25 Puente, involved in sex reform for many years, had been invited to join the Liga but refused to do so. In his letter, written in all probability just before the publication of the first issue of the Liga’s review, Sexus, Puente justified his decision with particular vehemence and criticized the Liga as “bourgeois” and ineffectual. According to Puente, in sex reform the anarchists were already far ahead of the WLSR.26

---

Diez, 35, from August 1929 the office of Iniciales was located in Premià, and the review was administered by Leandro Vargas.

22Margueritte.
23“IV Congreso,” 49.
24Ibid., 50.
25Isaac Puente, “Carta abierta a la Liga española para la reforma sexual sobre bases científicas,” Estudios 107 (1932): 21–22. Dr. Isaac Puente Amestoy was one of the mainstays of the anarchist review Generación Consciente and later of Estudios. He had a long history of writing about health subjects and sexuality for the anarchist movement and was the author of Libertarian Communism, written in 1932 and adopted as the anarchosyndicalist CNT’s program in the last congress held before the civil war in May 1936. He was actively involved in the CNT’s revolutionary activities, was imprisoned by Nationalists early on in the civil war in Vitoria, and was summarily executed.
26In his letter Puente refers rather vaguely to “la invitación recibida para formar parte de esa Agrupación.” Masjuan, 412–13, has proposed that the invitation was from the World
Puente’s letter opens with a paragraph about his own involvement in sex reform during the military dictatorship of Gen. Miguel Primo de Rivera (1923–30). He discusses his contributions to Generación Consciente and Estudios, which were constantly threatened by Rivera’s censorship,27 and refers to his free surgery, to which he had dedicated “every day, for nine years, one or several hours . . . trying to remedy illnesses and conflicts which were, for the most part, sexual in nature.” These statements were not merely self-promotions; they were proclamations about the very real efforts that anarchists like Puente had made since the beginning of the century to expand the use of contraceptives as a means of reducing births and eliminating disease.

But Puente’s main point was that such activities were not merely “sex reform.” They were, instead, an attempt to generate a revolutionary sexual morality, contingent upon a broader change in social and economic relations and a prelude to a “libertarian communist” society. It was this, among other considerations, that induced Puente to reject the Liga’s invitation. Had he been asked to provide a suitable name for the Liga, Puente declared, he would have suggested “The Spanish League for Sexual Subversion on a Human Basis,” not what was actually adopted.

The Liga española para la reforma sexual sobre bases científicas was composed of high-standing people and possessed some very fine statutes, Puente observed; but many such leagues existed in bourgeois society: against prostitution, tuberculosis, cancer—organizations that aired their statutes opportunistically and did not solve problems but merely lived at their expense. In his argument Puente relied upon a common strategy in anarchist discourse: the “maximalist” dismissal of political or reformist endeavors as inherently doomed to fail.

The word “Reforma” (Reform) in the Liga’s name was too impoverished, too timorous: “With regard to a problem such as that of sexuality, which has become so poisoned, sullied, and stagnated, I cannot be content but by subverting it.” It was no use, Puente declared, “to darn a piece of clothing that was past its best and out of fashion”; one must resolve social problems first. With regard to prostitution, Puente asked, what reform

27This was a frequent complaint in the pages of Estudios after the collapse of the dictatorship.
could there be without the complete economic emancipation of women and a full program of sex education? As for marriage reform, why bother when so many people had side-stepped marriage and established relationships requiring neither Church nor state approval?

History, in Puente’s view, had marched on and left elite intellectuals and reformists behind. The former were locked into a “medieval timescape”; there was no culture worse than “the false culture with which the majority of intellectuals dressed themselves.” Members of the medical profession were also culpable. Doctors, he wrote, rather than making contraceptives available, allowed people to wallow in ignorance at the mercy of any information they could pick up secretively. In fact, the “mentality of doctors is what really needs reforming. Doctors, with their obscurantism, their passivity, and their prudery, are responsible for the profound ignorance that surrounds sex as well as for most of the avoidable suffering that this produces.”

In addition to critiquing the Liga’s reformist basis, Puente questioned its supposed scientific underpinning. Throughout this period anarchists held a somewhat ambivalent stance toward “science,” on the one hand, extolling its virtues as a great redeemer and solution to human suffering (in concert with social change), and on the other, warning against its elitist possession of knowledge. As a form of knowledge, science was pure and untarnished, but bourgeois society had perverted its uses, had harnessed it to reformist aims and praxis, and had emptied it of the potential to emancipate. It was in order to distinguish between the practical bourgeois monopoly on science and the progressive stance of the revolutionary workers movement that Puente advocated substituting the word “Human” for “Scientific” in the Liga’s name. Against the timorous, self-satisfied Liga, which sought scientific and social respectability, Puente argued for the destruction of the state, the achievement of human economic emancipation, an end to the private monopoly of knowledge, the dissemination of information about sexuality, and sexual freedom. Puente believed that intellectuals like himself had to learn from the proletariat. Workers had already gone beyond the conservative program of the scientific sex reformers by practicing nudism, neo-Malthusianism, sex education, and free love long before writers, thinkers, and bourgeois lawmakers had suggested them. Herein lay the solution to the sexual problem.

Bearing in mind the strong French influence among Spanish anarchists and Iniciales’s earlier adoption of the WLSR’s program, we can only wonder at the nature of the debates among Catalan and Valencian anarchists that

28 This was a common anarchist understanding of “science.” Knowledge and science were neutral; the problem arose when they fell into the “wrong” hands, that is, those of reformist doctors, the state, or religion. Most anarchists who wrote about science in Spain did not have the sophistication of many Marxists on this point or of fellow travelers such as Malatesta. See José Álvarez Junco, La ideología política del anarquismo español, 65–92; and Cleminson, Anarchism, throughout.
preceded and followed Puente’s critique. It is, of course, possible that no formal discussion occurred among anarchists and that the matter of the WLSR was taken up by relatively independent individuals or groups. That may be why one month after it published Puente’s letter *Estudios* published Margueritte’s invitation to contact the Liga at the Premià address. It may also explain why in the same year the director of the anarchist review *Orto* not only published the ten planks of the WLSR’s platform but was listed as a member of the section of the Liga located in Valencia.\textsuperscript{29} It is possible, of course, that such differences illustrated real political disagreements with respect to the WLSR amongst anarchists at the time.

**CONCLUSION**

From the evidence gathered and presented here, it appears that the engagement of Spanish anarchists with the World League for Sexual Reform at both the national and international levels was limited and that neither movement decisively affected the other. The reasons for this, I believe, must be sought in conditions in Spain at the time.

First, Spain’s anarchist movement was strong and had decades of experience in agitating for a wide-ranging sex-reform program and in resisting the state repression that such agitation brought. Consequently, Spanish anarchists were not likely to jump at an opportunity to join up with a new group like the Liga that was mainly professional in its composition. Such a stance may well reflect class antagonisms or a mistrust of progressive intellectuals, whose projects anarchists steadily rejected in favor of social revolution as the 1920s and 1930s advanced. Even the Liga’s international aura could not tempt most Spanish anarchists, who were already affiliated for political and social agitation with the International Working Men’s Association and had solid links with French and other neo-Malthusian radicals for their proposed sexual revolution. While it did not represent a consensus, Puente’s “Open Letter” may have laid to rest the possibility of substantial anarchist involvement in the WLSR.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{29}In Luis Huerta’s article “La eugénica ante la crisis económica mundial de hoy y sus previsiones para el futuro,” *Orto* 1 (1932): 11–17, the ten points approved by the 1928 Copenhagen congress appear, but there is little additional comment on the WLSR and nothing on its presence in Spain. *Orto*, which was criticized for its “Marxist” approach, particularly on economic issues, was extinguished in 1934. During its brief life, however, it published a wide range of articles; named among its collaborators were Puente and two central members of the Liga, Hildegart and Dr. Vital Aza. It is interesting and somewhat paradoxical to note that the Valencian section of the Liga, described in *Sexus* 2 (1933): 102, as “la [Sección] más antigua de las organizadas dentro de la Liga Española para la Reforma Sexual,” included Mari Civera, the director of the anarchist *Orto*, as both a member and the delegate in charge of the legislation section (*Sexus* 2 [1933]: 104).

\textsuperscript{30}One must not neglect the possible role that *Iniciales* or Mari Civera in Valencia may have had, but at present, the documentation permits little more than speculation on this question.
Second, the reformist/radical division expressed in the anarchist press reveals tensions if not a complete split in Spain’s “sex reform” movement. Whether or not such a divide permeated other chapters of the WLSR’s international organization is a subject for further research.

Third, and most significantly, the natural constituency of the Liga would have been if not anarchists then progressive figures in medicine and law. However, the branch of the sex-reform movement led by physicians and jurists had endured extremely difficult times in the late 1920s, illustrated by the outlawing of the “Eugenics Conference” in early 1928. While many of these difficulties should be attributed to adverse political and social factors extraneous to the sex-reform movement, the medical profession in Spain remained reluctant to support radical policies on sexuality. Credit must be given, of course, to tireless reformers such as Gregorio Marañón and Luis Jiménez de Asúa, but these figures were exceptional and generally isolated. If the Liga had managed to achieve widespread support and impetus, if it had been more than an elite organization, perhaps it would have survived the blow of the death of its secretary, Hildegart Rodríguez. But in Spain, a society with a limited history of democratic institutions, a stunted institutionalized scientific community, and trenchant opposition from anarchists who held an iconoclastic but arguably more mature trajectory of “sexual subversion,” the chapter of the World League for Sexual Reform faltered and disappeared.

---

31See, for example, the attempts made by Gregorio Marañón and Luis Jiménez de Asúa to liberalize attitudes toward male homosexuality in the late 1920s, an endeavor no doubt spurred on by their opposition to the dictatorship. For an analysis of the conjunction of concerns with respect to the question of homosexuality, scientific sexology, and law reform, see Francisco Vázquez García and Richard Cleminson, “La búsqueda de ‘los invisibles’: El Ángel de Sodoma, homosexualidad, y alteridad en la España contemporánea,” in Historia y alteridad (Cadiz, forthcoming).