

Claudia Bruns

Translated by

Katherine Faull

The Politics of
Eros: The German
Männerbund between
Anti-Feminism and
Anti-Semitism in
the Early Twentieth
Century

MÄNNERBÜNDE (MALE SOCIETIES) ARE FREQUENTLY DESCRIBED as transhistorical phenomena. From antiquity to the present day, *Männerbünde* have been identified and their founding principles sought out with the assumption that they are apparently similar at all points in time. I would certainly not wish to deny that there have been groups of men that have come together at different epochs in time. However, I would like to highlight the fact that it was only at the turn of the twentieth century that these groups of men in Germany began to be explicitly described as *Männerbünde*. Only at this point in time was a specific meaning ascribed to them that held significance for the concept of the state and society.

I consider the specificity of this historical moment to be of great significance for the consideration of the problem, in that such gender-specific homosocial associations experienced themselves explicitly less as a given, so that it became necessary to construct the term *Männerbund* as part of a new and particular discourse.

After World War I (1914–18), what began in different fields of scholarship soon rapidly spread and developed as a powerful *dispositiv* (per Michel Foucault) or “apparatus.” In 1933, the philosopher Max Scheler declared in retrospect that the obsession for the *Männerbund* in

the Weimar Republic was linked to an increasing desire for a leader (*Führer*):

It is self evident that the problem of *Führerschaft und Gefolgschaft* (leader and follower) for a people that has been robbed of its existing structures of leadership must burn in their souls . . . a paradigmatic desire for leadership is everywhere. . . this is perhaps most clearly shown in the infinite number of new "Gemeinschaften" (alliances), "Kreise" (circles), "Orden" (orders), "Sekten" (sects), "Schulen" (schools), that suddenly arose in our country to address all kinds of concerns in life, each one with a special "savior," "prophet," "do-gooder" at its center, each one with high expectations of all kinds to improve and convert the world.¹

Contrary to the widespread assumption that, above all, the discourse of the *Männerbund* centered on a notion of soldierly masculinity, I would like to show in the following how closely it was concerned with the question of Eros and the sexual bonds, *Bindungen*, between men. Only after the war did the stress shift to an emphasis on the structure of leadership and followers. Precisely this linkage of a strong emotional bonding between men and complete submission to a leader raised the National Socialists to the position of an ideal of a new state, organized along the principles of the *Männerbund*, as I will show in conclusion.

The "Invention" of the *Männerbund* around 1900

The term *Männerbund* first appeared in Germany around the turn of the twentieth century. The ethnologist Heinrich Schurtz (1863–1903), scientific assistant at the Bremen Museum of Natural History, Ethnology and Trade, provided the initial spark. With his 1902 text on *Altersklassen und Männerbünde*, Schurtz wanted to readdress the heavily disputed question of the patriarchal or matriarchal roots of human society.² Whereas the Basel archaeologist and jurist Johann Jakob Bachofen (1815–87) had claimed that in mythical ancient times there had been a phase of "mother right" and matriarchy,³ Schurtz declared men to be the point of departure for every higher cultural development.

From his observations of "primitive peoples" Schurtz derives the thesis that there has been a fundamental division at all times and in all countries between men and women that is precipitated out in "the for-

mation of social groups."⁴ Women are pushed toward the formation of families because of their "sexual instinct," whereas men have an (asexual) "social instinct" that takes them out of the family and motivates them to form "men's houses," or *Männerbünde*, (male societies). These societies are then supposed to become responsible for every "higher social order." Women on the other hand are supposed to have a "smaller amount of social power" and are thus reduced to operating within the familial sphere of activity: "The woman stands predominantly under the influence of sexual love and the feelings for the family that derive from this; the man on the other hand is determined in his behavior more by the pure "social instinct," which brings him together with his peers. Therefore women are the nursery (*Hort*) of all forms of society that emerge from the union of two people of the opposite sex, the man on the other hand is the representative of all kinds of union that are purely socially driven and thus of the higher forms of social organization."⁵

Like many of his colleagues, Schurtz presumed to see clearly in Africa earlier forms of his own culture alongside its multiple levels of development. Apparently, both the "primitive origin" and the present time of the author adhered to the same general (ahistorical) fundamental principles of social order, despite the differing levels of development. Thus, Schurtz interpreted the male-dominated culture of *Vereine* (associations) of the Wilhelmine Empire, with its political associations and bourgeois clubs, as a more highly developed form of "primitive bachelors' house."⁶ It could be said that "every secret society of the present led back to those forms" that it had assumed with the "primitive" peoples.⁷ Such a parallel between the "primitive bachelors' house" and the institutions of Wilhelmine society underscored the relevance of the young and not yet academically established field of *Völkerkunde* (ethnology) for the present. And it responded to the virulent questions of the debate about the sexes that had become so explosive due to the demands of the women's movement for equality of education and political enfranchisement.

At the same time, Schurtz's proposed division of gender and social association was able to attach itself to bourgeois discussions that had drawn sharply defined, gender inflected, lines between the private (familial) and public (social) spheres since the Enlightenment—however broken

these lines might have proven to be in practice. This division of familial and public-social space was perceived by contemporaries as a completely modern achievement⁸ and was supported in Schurtz's text by quotations from biological, psychological, and sociological discourses.⁹

Schurtz's concept resonated widely among his professional colleagues. Viennese Professor for Ethnology Michael Haberlandt (1860–1940) considered the “opposition in the behavior of the sexes in social life” to be an “extremely fruitful idea,” which was “revealed with a superb clarity through the facts.”¹⁰ In 1903, well-known sociologist Alfred Vierkandt (1867–1953), who had been promoted to professor in Berlin around 1900 as an ethnologist, also agreed with Schurtz that the *Männerbund* was fundamental to the founding of the state precisely because it stood in opposition to “family life”: “The *Bund* seeks to extract the men from the family and vice versa. Hence one cannot look for the origin and development of the race and the state in family life and familial instinct.”¹¹

156

A similar line of attack was followed by Viennese philosopher Otto Weininger (1880–1903) in his popular work, *Sex and Character* (trans. 1907; *Geschlecht und Charakter*, 1903). Schurtz had supposedly correctly shown, “with the benefit of rich materials,” “that the beginnings of the formation of society were to be found in the *Männerbünden* and not in the family”: “Women are in reality completely antisocial. . . . Women have no sense for the state, for politics, for social conviviality, and women's associations, into which men may not receive entry, tend to dissolve themselves after a short time. The family is an antisocial rather than a social form.”¹²

The reviews of contemporaries make it clear that Schurtz's texts were considered to be overwhelmingly attractive because they supplied new arguments to counter the demands for equality that were coming from the women's movement. Ultimately Schurtz, like many bourgeois men, saw how a “threatening legion of women fighting for equality,” with “gruff views against the world of men,”¹³ appeared to be encroaching on many middle-class men. Against this background the discovery of a “natural” need for association and bonding promised to strengthen the social position of men.

The Popularization of the *Männerbund* Discourse

MÄNNERBUND AND THE YOUTH MOVEMENT

Ten years later, the Berlin student and pharmacist's son Hans Blüher (1888–1955) popularized the theory of the *Männerbund* in a completely new fashion. He saw as his reference point not the so-called natural people, but rather an explosive phenomenon of his present day, namely the recent *Wandervogel* movement. Originally a kind of hiking club for high school students in Berlin-Steglitz, the movement quickly developed into an important part of the reform movement around the turn of the twentieth century and spread out across Germany.¹⁴ The movement embodied the new feeling for life of the young, predominantly educated middle-class generation that wished to free itself of certain demands of Wilhelmine society and then develop its own lifestyle, fashion, and music. They wore practical clothes, forsook comfortable travel, managed their money together, and stressed the wild romance of these trips that were just as much inspired by reading Karl May¹⁵ as by the ideal of the “traveling scholar” and the “bacchante” of the Middle Ages.

157

Blüher, himself active in the *Wandervogel* in his youth,¹⁶ wrote the first publication in 1912 about the genesis and history of the movement in three volumes, and that publication attracted much attention. It far exceeded a mere history of events, in that it offered a new explanatory model for the genesis of the movement, as well as answers to the greatest points of conflict: on the question of girls in the movement, the conflict between the generations, the *Führer* problem, and the “specter” of homoerotic friendships among the *Wandervogel*.

First, at least according to Blüher's tone in the first two volumes, the movement was a wild, “romantic revolution” against parents, “an uprising against being told what to do (*Dressur*),”¹⁷ an uprising of the male youth against their fathers. As their own fathers had become “a miserable creature,”¹⁸ Blüher claimed that the youth had “had to look elsewhere”¹⁹ in their search for a “hero” and “male heroes.”²⁰ They had had to look for “a better father,” a beloved leader (*Führer*), only a little older than themselves, with whom they were able to build up an emphatic relationship: “So now we have seen that the youth who had

become *Wandervogel* were exasperated by their fathers, that the latter had even become almost ridiculous to them—with good reason! But their inextinguishable father-son bond demanded a real replacement; the growing youth transferred these feelings onto a better kind of father.”²¹ The experience of embarking on ever longer hikes with a “horde” of boys, that were usually led by schoolboys or students who were only slightly older, offered Blüher and his fellow students the possibility to gain some distance from pressure from their parents and teachers, and to open up a free space that had never existed before. Thus bonds were established between the boys and their leaders (*Führer*) that Blüher repeatedly describes as extraordinarily close.

The fact that the traditions or customs of the older generation could no longer be seamlessly continued is considered by historian Barbara Stambolis to be a basic and common experience of the “Front generation”—that is, of those who were born between 1890 and 1900.²² In their place, Alfred Weber (1868–1958) summarizes the experience of his generation as an increased “self-upbringing” in groups of the same age and “socialization under one’s own direction.”²³ In this way, connections beyond the family could develop that were almost equivalent in intensity to those inside the family. Blüher writes in his autobiography of 1920, “We exchanged family and soft security for the youth groups and their secure softness.”²⁴ Here one was said to have received “that which one sought in vain at home, recognition.”²⁵

It was only with the background of an increasingly sharp generational conflict, which was above all expressed as a father-son conflict and that was accompanied by a general structural transformation of the family in the nineteenth century,²⁶ that the change from subordination to one’s father to subordination to a self-chosen authority figure could be experienced as a revolutionary act. Along with a dismantling of the father went a turn to the cult of the youth and the group leader.²⁷ According to Blüher, every youth had his “frequently adoringly worshipped favorite group leader,” with whom he wanted to hike along.²⁸ Group leaders of the *Wandervogel* were stylized into “rulers and kings,”²⁹ elevated to the status of “patron saints” and addressed with the words: “Hero, remain with us!”³⁰

The younger generation turned to those in the same age group and elevated this shift to an act of self-realization and masculinization. Remaining in the close family group was interpreted as a feminization, and the family was once again styled as the genuine realm of the woman. “The will to family” appeared in Blüher’s concept of the self as “the soft, unheroic, passive part of being,” a “seduction to that which is insignificant, everyday, and average, which was opposed to the will for all that is elevated.”³¹ Being the polar opposite to the family constituted the experience of being in a *Männerbund*.³²

Blüher’s 1912 published two-volume work, *Der Wandervogel. Geschichte einer Jugendbewegung*, on the development of the *Wandervogel* as a romanticized youth—searching for itself and consumed in the protest against parents, school, and jingoism—was shared and welcomed not only by the young *Wandervogel* but also by the older, more reform-minded generation of pedagogues and head teachers.³³ Who, in their youth, had not been outraged by “patriotic phrases” and not felt a desire for a “freedom from chains”? asked Edmund Neuendorff (1875–1961), teacher and federal leader of the *Wandervogel*.³⁴ The worship of the group leaders was quite accurately described in Blüher’s works, he agreed. There were such “male heroes” in every school class. Everyone knew “what kind of all-encompassing power they frequently exercised, how all class mates subordinated themselves to them in wonder.”³⁵

In a third, separately published volume, *Die Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen [The German Wandervogel Movement as an Erotic Phenomenon]*, Blüher proposed a new thesis that elicited heavy controversy and caused the movement to hold its breath for decades. Borrowing from modern psychoanalytical and sexological theories, Blüher claimed that the close connection of the male youth with each other and their dependence on the worshipped *Wandervogel* leaders could be explained only by more or less sublimated (homo)sexual “forces or drives.”³⁶ His assumptions followed Sigmund Freud, in that all social relations can be led back to sexual structures of desire. Same-sex desire was not a pathological form of behavior, as was implied by paragraph 175 of the civil code of law,³⁷ but rather an important part of “the general sexual-social animal species, the human.”³⁸

A SEXUAL THEORY OF SOCIETY

With his theory of sexuality Blüher was continuing discursive developments of the nineteenth century that attributed an ever-increasing significance to the natural and biological sciences. In this process, the recourse to sexuality provided not only a biological explanation for the development and reproduction of the individual, but also one for the collective.

Thus, Blüher's works required an explanation, not only of the close ties between the male youth in the *Wandervogel* movement, but, beyond this, the development of a universally valid "sexual theory of society" that ascribed to men a superior significance within the political realm. Sexuality between men should no longer be considered a pathological deviation from the norm, according to Blüher, but rather a biological force, which actually made of man a *zoön politikon*, because it granted him the ability for social bonding. It was not the family that constituted the basis for the state, but rather the homoerotic *Männerbund*: "The family, that product of the heterosexual drive, forms thus in no way the basis of the state, as one has until now erroneously considered by a superficial analogy in relation to the monarchical state, but rather the other way around the former is the powerful remainder of the homosexual [drive]."39

According to this logic of the drives, the male was thus better suited for politics, the state, and education, the stronger his erotic connections were to other men. The degree of his sexual inclination toward men became thus the individual's passport to social utility:

There were men who regarded love like the ancients, for whom the value of women lay in the furthest-most corner of consciousness and who dedicated all their strength to the young male sex and its development. . . . For . . . it was precisely these who [achieved] the greatest numerical increase [in the *Wandervogel* movement—C.B.], it was precisely they who aroused the deepest and most heartfelt enthusiasm in the young people. They were both intensively and extensively their pack leader in direct contrast to the model of the German headmaster for whom such feelings are suppressed and thus who means almost nothing for the young people.⁴⁰

Where the bonds derived from drives were absent, the local groups had seemingly failed.⁴¹ Here Blüher reversed the topos, developed by the critics of civilization, of the modern isolation of the individual that had been reflected in the picture of the asocial homosexual. The homosexual or homosocial⁴² man became a socializing factor in modern society, the social moment in an (un)-social and hostile environment (determined by parents and teachers), whereas heterosexual desire sank to mere necessity, not furthering a sense of community.

In this, Blüher was able to associate himself with the homosexual liberation movement that was developing at the end of the nineteenth century. If, in medical discourse, the homosexual was described as "sick," "degenerate," and a danger to the state, those who were affected by this had gathered arguments to the contrary that stressed the social utility of homosexuality. Thus, in the 1880s, the naturalist and popular reformer Gustav Jaeger (1832–1917) defined the "normality" and productivity for the state of the homosexual based on his particular ability to form social bonds.⁴³ Zoologist Benedict Friedlaender for his part claimed that the majority of homosexuals were in fact "bisexual" and thus useful for reproduction, but also, because of the strong mutual attraction, especially useful for the cohesion of the state. The example of the famous Greeks, he claimed, should provide proof enough of the special political competence of the male homosexual.⁴⁴

The fact that Blüher's theory corresponded to the scientific standards of his time can be seen from positive reviews in medical and psychoanalytical circles. Although he was not a doctor, but rather was finishing his humanistic studies at that time, after his first publishing success Blüher was able to publish numerous essays in journals dealing with sexuality and medicine that were edited inter alia by the Berlin doctor and sexual reformer Magnus Hirschfeld and by Sigmund Freud.⁴⁵

However, within the youth movement Blüher's theories shocked and worried parents, reform-minded pedagogues, and teachers. Eager to advertise his work, Blüher had sent 3,000 copies of "a sensationally colored prospectus" to personal addressees, among them "several Prussian headmasters" and the parents of members of the *Wandervogel* movement.⁴⁶ The federal leadership of the movement reacted in horror. They forbade

the young members from reading Blüher's texts, attempted to pathologize him personally, and announced a radical campaign to persecute such sexual relations among the young men. The result was that Blüher became an equally "famous and notorious man," and, due to the attraction of the forbidden, his theories of the *Männerbund* spread all the faster.⁴⁷

For the most part, the young men of the *Wandervogel* movement vehemently rejected the suspicion of sexual bonds among their ranks—and all the more so as the movement was suspected, in the wake of the "Eulenburg scandals," of being a "pederast's club."⁴⁸ At the same time a controversy began about the correct interpretation of certain common experiences of feeling, which Blüher—as even his critics granted—had described precisely. He provided an explanation and thereby also a legitimation for the dislike of girls, the emotional intimacy of boys, and the heroic admiration of the leader that did not allow itself to be simply refuted, because it was based on scientific theories, which most people did not consider themselves able to judge.

Although Blüher's texts fueled the debates about supposed homosexuality in the movement and thus also about the limits of "normal" masculinity,⁴⁹ many young men of the *Wandervogel* movement felt themselves strengthened in the feeling of an exclusive masculinity. Blüher's concept of a homoerotic bond was completely convincing for parts of the youth. In the leaders' paper of the *Young Wandervogel*, an open letter from a student leader, stated: "Since its appearance, Blüher's book has been the basis of our daily conversations. . . . It has set things on fire. I notice it every day. The boys understand themselves and me much, much more now than before."⁵⁰ As also Ulfried Geuter shows, Blüher's account of the *Wandervogel* had a lasting effect on the self-construction of the younger generation.⁵¹ Because of Blüher's theory of the drive, young people looked at themselves from a new perspective and began to interpret the relationships they had with each other as results of "unconscious" erotic feelings. The notion of an unconscious, erotic interior of the ego was *modern* in so far as it opposed an enlightened, autonomous, rational subject by means of a romantic, individual, inscrutable and passionate self.

162

THE ANTIFEMINIST EFFECTS OF THE MÄNNERBUND DISCOURSE

The political element in such a construction of an authentic subject of drives resided in the fact that the unconscious sexual nature of many of the youth was not only used to explain their most intimate feelings and passions, but also simultaneously became the explanation of a multitude of social distinctions, their likes and dislikes. This interweaving of the social and the sexual, as "flexibly normalistic"⁵² as the project of the masculinists might have been,⁵³ contributed on the other hand to the justification of protonormalistic exclusions based on sexual drive or instinct.

In this way, Blüher's theory attested to the fact that girls, because of their differently constructed sexuality, were incapable of forming comparably tight bonds of friendship. The acceptance of girls into the *Wandervogel* movement that had started in 1905, and that was described disparagingly by Blüher as an "experiment," proved to be "fateful." Through the possibility of (heterosexually) falling in love, the acceptance of girls, Blüher claimed, provoked a "definite tendency towards isolation," "while the love between men had the effect, for the most part, of socializing."⁵⁴ The mere presence of men-loving "male heroes"—a term that Blüher borrowed from Gustav Jaeger⁵⁵—"protected" the *Wandervogel* movement from the danger of disbanding.⁵⁶ Thus in 1912 Blüher developed a new justification for the exclusion of girls, right at the second high point of the debate on whether girls were allowed to hike along with the boys with equal rights.⁵⁷

The reference to the "drive-dependent" nature of the subject moved the question of social inclusion or exclusion into a realm of "inner truths," in that there was no more room for negotiation. These most secret and deepest truths on the subject that were now sought in its sexual feelings⁵⁸ at the same time provided new strategies for an effective separation from the other sex. For example, one leader of the *Wandervogel* wrote to Blüher: "But now I am reading your book these days and am finding in it a viewpoint that I did not expect, a new viewpoint, which, it appears, can claim to be correct. Everything is still whirling around inside me. . . . I very often observed a certain misogyny in the *Wandervogel*."

163

Similarly, that a whole local troupe was dependent on one person. The idea, that those people who play around with girls, do not belong in the W.—V. is pretty widespread.”⁵⁹

Also, Werner Kindt, a member of the *Wandervogel* and later historian of the movement, wrote in his diary about a “small group discussion” on Blüher that occurred on August 8, 1920: “Konni [Kleymann, C.B] explained, that the idea of the W.V. was solely friendship between boys. The spiritual side was secondary. A bond had to be built up based on a personal-erotic connection from person to person, a choice based on, “If I like you, then I like you.” [He] of course could not recognize any girl as a *Wandervogel*.”⁶⁰

Presented as sexual “nature,” the cultural production of the self—as well as that of the collective—was translated into biological, scientific categories that had previously been constructed as disciplinary truths in the realm of the humanities.⁶¹ “Embodied” in the individual, these discourses inscribed themselves in certain self-constructions and practices of the self, or else were incorporated into the “biographical operations” and thus took care of a controlled dispersion of knowledge. In this way, the body constitutes one of the central fields on which historical battles and practices are fought.⁶²

Thus, beyond the internal control of the conscious, beyond self-determination and biographical self-fashioning, discursive truths became the inner truths of the subject. The hegemonic effects of this process revealed themselves not only in the form of legal prohibitions or disciplinary control, but also in the desire and attraction of knowledge.⁶³ Any reference to one’s own (male–male) erotic drive developed into a secretive, lustful, and intimate truth, which provoked the subject to regard itself anew in this flattering and modern mirror, and which also in this very moment constituted its social distinctions, its sexual and racial boundaries. The politics of eros became powerful because of the appeal to an inner truth of the subject.

Strategically, the moment of the initial publication in 1912 of Blüher’s theses on the *Männerbund* coincided with a newly organized defensive stance of (grand)-bourgeois circles against women’s emancipation—namely, against women’s suffrage, women’s higher education, and women’s employment. In order to reestablish in the state and in society “men’s

rights and men’s worth,” the (grand)-bourgeois Association for the Fight against Women’s Emancipation⁶⁴ was created in 1912 by the Weimar head teacher Friedrich Sigismund. Sigismund was encouraged to found such an organization by the Berlin writer and U.S. correspondent Henry F. Urban, who had supplied nationalistic-conservative and also liberal papers for a long time with ever newer critical information about the U.S. women’s suffrage movement. In this way, on June 14, 1908, in the liberal *Berliner Tageblatt*, Urban pointed to the “female danger” that was threatening to feminize and finally to corrupt the male. According to Urban, the United States would soon discover that “exaggerated feminism” would finally lead to “national harm,” if America had to wage a “serious war” against “unspoiled men” and could only call up “feminized men to fight.”⁶⁵

The foundation of a German movement to fight against demands for women’s emancipation appeared to be even more necessary as the successes of the Women’s Movement in the late Wilhelmine Empire became more and more visible. Since 1908, women could not only study at Prussian universities, they could also become active in the political parties. These developments were perceived by the conservatives above all as an encouragement, even if party politics did remain the relatively uncontested preserve of hegemonic masculinity.⁶⁶ Added to this was the 1912 victory of the Social Democratic Party in the parliamentary elections. The new theories about the *Männerbund* found resonance not least because in them was seen a welcome means to resist “female incursions” into the domains of hegemonic masculinity.

The First World War as Catalyst for a Radicalized Männerbund

During the First World War the concept of a fundamental difference between the sexes was consolidated. That occurred despite the fact that women had occupied the primarily professional positions of men, had shown their loyalty to the state on the home front, and in 1918 had exercised their political suffrage for the first time.⁶⁷ The war had made the different realms of experience for the sexes clearer than ever and had given new energy to the fantasies of a heroic, soldierly masculinity. The war was supposed to have “brought the masculine principle back to the

forefront," according to Alfred Korn in 1917 in his essay on "The Future Physical Education of the Male Youth" in one of the publications of the *Wandervogel* movement. Whereas the man "in his battle for existence" does not grant himself any peace, the "feminine principle" leads to "the weakening of stiff, austere, masculinity, to the deadening of the instincts that allow man to rule, to the addiction to pleasure and finally to decadence."⁶⁸ Precisely because the actual experiences of men were anything but glorious and heroic, military defeat, disappointment, physical and psychological humiliation were considered to be female or even feminizing experiences by many men. A more fundamental remasculinization was demanded that associated itself with concepts of (past) national greatness. Both discourses, the nationalistic as well as the one about sexual identity, were dealt with simultaneously, and attempts were made to strengthen both.

During the First World War, and in keeping with the times, Blüher developed his opposition to including girls in the *Wandervogel* into a philosophy of "intellectual" antifeminism in short polemical pieces such as *What Is Antifeminism? (Was ist Antifeminismus?)* (1915); *Bourgeois and intellectual anti-feminism (Der bürgerliche und geistige Antifeminismus)* (1916); and *Polygyny and Motherhood (Mehrhe und Mutterschaft)* (1919), thereby distancing himself demonstratively from bourgeois antifeminism. According to him, the latter originated from "quite different thought positions" and fought "exclusively against feminism for—the woman."⁶⁹ The fact that Blüher's pamphlets on "intellectual anti-feminism" were unproblematically presented as accompaniments to the campaign organs of the society for antifeminism shows that commonalities were more highly valued there as elsewhere than differences.⁷⁰ And thus the demands that he derived from his position were deceptively similar to those of the bourgeois antifeminists: a woman should never become politically active, should not be able to vote, and should not intrude into any *Männerbund*.⁷¹ The women's liberation movement should be replaced by a "Movement for Women's Rights" created by men, coeducation should be rejected, and only unmarried women should have the right to work.⁷²

Even so, Blüher's "intellectual anti-feminism" was more modern, because he was operating with new strategies. Thus, in contrast to the antifeminist league, Blüher argued not for the restoration of the traditional

family and its patriarch, but rather for the self-organization of the youth into gender-separated groups.⁷³ And the more clearly Blüher could emphasize a movement toward emphasizing femininity in the new generation of women, so it became easier for him to integrate their search for their own realm, their own "island," into his gender conceptions, and to contrast them with the "youth leagues" (*Jünglingsbünden*).⁷⁴

The end of the war brought with it new practices among the *Männerbund* that transformed the discursive ideas of the *Männerbund* into an until then unknown radicality and combined it with a personal way of life. The antifeminist notions of the group against women's emancipation became the common property of the ever-growing *völkisch* movement, so much so that the *Deutsche Bund gegen die Frauemanzipation* gradually disbanded. The *Wandervogel* movement now called itself the *bündische* youth. The *Freikorps* soldiers who returned from war came together in militant groups, and the new political organizations on the right and left looked back to older *Bund* or group structures.

During the First World War, Blüher further developed his theory of the *Männerbund* in a systematic fashion. He now wanted to relate what he had previously shown for the *Wandervogel* movement alone to the whole of society. In 1917 and 1919 two volumes appeared with the title *The Role of the Erotic in Male Society (Die Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen Gesellschaft)*. With the publication of these two volumes, Blüher became known beyond the realms of the youth movement and the circles of doctors and was received also by literary and political circles. All the world was talking about the *Männerbund* and puzzling over the phenomenon of male-male *eros*. One side, including the well-known author Thomas Mann, sought him out to make him useful for the Republic,⁷⁵ while the other side elevated him to the model of a new fascist state, like the later Nazi chief ideologue, Alfred Baeumler. If initially Blüher was not very enthusiastic about the war and was excused from military service for health reasons, then his writings reflect a whole set of intellectual changes of mind that are completely within the trend of his times:

- First, a turn away from sexuality to religion and a metaphysics of *eros* can be discerned;
- Second, a stronger allegiance to hierarchical leadership models can be seen, which goes hand in hand with Blüher's political turn away from support of the left-wing

reform movement to adherence to the right-wing extraparlimentary opposition movement, Conservative Revolution (Konservative Revolution); and

• Third, the focus of opposition for the *Männerbund* shifted from antifeminism to anti-Semitism. All these tendencies intensified toward the end of the Weimar Republic. However, they were clearly visible from the outset.

THE TURN FROM SCIENCE TO A METAPHYSICS OF EROS

During the course of the growing pessimism surrounding the notions of progress and science during the First World War, Blüher turned away from sexology in a strict sense. The latter was considered to be too materialistically fixated on the body and its functions and had left the central questions about the meaning and fate of human life unanswered.⁷⁶ Instead Blüher campaigned for a Platonic/metaphysical concept of Eros, in keeping with the growing Plato reception during the world war. Eros—as Plato had explicated in *Symposium*—was a mysterious and divine power, which caused humans to fall for each other. That was the hard law of the “God Eros” that marked the value and fate of the human:⁷⁷ “Eros is not sexuality, but rather it is that which gives sexuality its meaning. . . Eros is the affirmation of the human regardless of worth. . . It is having to affirm unconditionally, unconditionally even to sacrificing one’s own life; this is not the same as desire or disgust, as play or amusement. . . Eros is a god, but a god with the lowered torch. . . [A]n old, serious, and awesome god, who knows no mercy.”⁷⁸

With the shift of emphasis in his theorizing to a metaphysically tinged concept of eros, Blüher answered questions of meaning that accompanied the horrors, insecurities, and experiences of loss in war. He also was reacting to his critics who had attacked his openness to homosexual practices in the youth groups as “Jewish” and “un-Germanic.”⁷⁹ The notion of the quickening effect of a (sublimated) “platonic Eros” between teacher and pupils was shared far more broadly by educators and parents. It had been firmly anchored in the canon of bourgeois values by the high status of the reception of the classics. Freud himself refused in 1921 to use the “more genteel terms Eros and Erotics,” even though he could, as he himself admitted, have saved himself “much contradiction.”⁸⁰

In contrast to Freud’s psychoanalysis, Blüher’s theory of the *Männer-*

bund raised the “unconscious streams” of eros to the status of the “lot” and “fate” of humanity.⁸¹ Right in the prologue to the first volume of *Rolle der Erotik* (1917), Blüher announces his new theory of the state, which should not be based on the foundation of the spirit in a Hegelian sense or on the economy as in Marxist sociological theory,⁸² but rather solely on (sublimated) male eros and the experience of being bonded to a leader (*Führer*): “The final justification for the need to build states of the human race can be found in his Eros. This root lies so deeply buried, and it has nothing to do with the superficial business of spirit or even economy. What matters is that the human being has the ability to fall for another person in a quite significant and particular way.”⁸³ By means of the particular apparatus in their psychic organization, humans were supposedly forced through a special “maximization of pleasure” to submit to “the idea of the state.”⁸⁴ The family, as Blüher now suggested, could be a constitutive principle of the state, but no more.⁸⁵ Its task was above all to guarantee the “survival of the species.” It was completely unmythical, because here sexuality was able to emerge quite clearly.⁸⁶

However, the *Männerbund*, as the vehicle of spiritual values and spiritual movements, and because of its secret eroticism, was always supposed to have a tendency toward the mystical about it.⁸⁷ And it was this eroticism that “was described by the “initiated,” the “true followers,” the “authentic ones,” as the “true essence”—yes, even as the “spirit” of these *Männerbünde*.⁸⁸ It was no “empty drive to sociability” in the sense of Schurz, but rather a powerful and violent eros that flowed strongly in the “deepest underground vaults of the state.”⁸⁹

In societies in which the family structure dominate, the development of the class of “spiritual leaders” supposedly stagnated. Only the *Männerbünde* guaranteed social revolutions.⁹⁰ For this reason, one could assume a position only of either friend or foe toward a masculine society. There were only those who were “inflamed and enemies” in relation to it, as this all concerned the ultimate issues of humanity.⁹¹ The *Männerbund* stood in “rigid opposition” to a “mixed society.”⁹² For this reason it should take over the education of the male youth in a future, antibourgeois society. The concept was aimed at a Germanically conceived theory of feeling that wanted to be in no way “irrational” but consciously “anti-rational.”

According to Blüher, the relationship to eros also determined the difference between the sexes. Because the woman has an extraordinarily close proximity to eros, she alone could be the “prophet and priestess of the kingdom of Eros” and find here her “island.”⁹³ However, Blüher’s concept was not an offer of equality. For the woman was hopelessly at the mercy of the powers of eros, according to Blüher, and therefore finally a slave to the man.⁹⁴ The woman supposedly remained chained to the material world, because she could never transcend the realm of pure eros, without giving up her femininity.⁹⁵

Only the man could unify eros and Logos in himself and combine feeling and understanding into a creative synthesis.⁹⁶ Only the possibility of the synthesis of *both* elements constituted the special “spirituality” of the man, which was important and which represented a “masculine monopoly.”⁹⁷ Central to the theory of the *Männerbund* was then not the ideal of a soldierly and purely reason-oriented masculinity. In contrast, Blüher set up a model of the passionate lover, the romantic artist, and the divine priest in opposition to the bourgeois model of the modern, rational man. Precisely his proximity to the creative genius was supposed to vouch for his qualities as a political leader.

The broadening of the constitution of the male subject to include the sensual-erotic dimension was something new in light of previous concepts of masculinity. It appeared primarily as a way out of a one-sided rational modernity for the new generation of young men, who had stood in the tradition of the *Lebensreform* and youth movements. It liberated them from the chains of pure intellect, of teleology and subordination to economic rationalism. What for a long time had been unthinkable in a bourgeois context became with Blüher the *Lebensphilosophie* ideal of a spirit/body synthesis as a possibility for the “new man.”

THE TURN TO STRUCTURES OF THE HIERARCHICAL LEADER (FÜHRER) AND HIS FOLLOWERS

If, in 1912, the *Wandervogel* stood in the center of the theory of the *Männerbund* with its loose groups and leadership structures, then after the war Blüher acquainted his readership with a state organized on a strictly hierarchical basis. From then on, he distinguished between the

order of a (feminine) “herd” and a (masculine) “state.” Whereas the “herd” represented a kind of chaotic, uncontrollable feminine mass, as loose and uncommitted as the sexuality of the woman (similar to le Bon’s *Psychologie der Massen*, 1895), the “state” was organized on the principles of will, order, and clear hierarchies. If Blüher had previously denounced the patriotic glorification of senseless killing, now the formation of the state no longer excluded the sacrifice of human life, but rather it became a constitutive condition of it: “The mere formation of a herd, a highly uncommitted and loose form of socialization, can be found everywhere in nature with changing strengths of connection. . . . But this is not a state. For a state one has to have present an illusion of objective will; for a state one needs the possible irrelevance of the individual animal, service to the whole, the victim and the superior. Man is no herd animal, but rather a state building being.”⁹⁸

From the erotic formations of love, relations of subordination are derived that, just as before, are supposed to be motivated by eros: only “fanatical” love toward the leader (*Führer*) brings men to their highest achievements and self-sacrifice. However, the man in a *Männerbund* is never “enslaved” like a woman. His form of surrender is always *voluntary*. Precisely his love for the leader brings him to perfect his character, because it motivates him to become as “perfect” as the leader.

The true problem of the people did not lie in their economic woes and therefore could not be assuaged by socialism, Blüher wrote in 1919. Far more, the two social structures of family and *Männerbund* had to be distinguished from one another more clearly. Until now the bourgeois “co-operatives” had had power rather than the *Männerbünde*. “Parties,” “bureaucracies,” and “administrations” could never create a “living Reich.” Only the *Männerbund*, moved by a real feeling of eros, could ensure the resurrection of the “German Reich,” guarantee a radical separation of the sexes and races, and ensure the reign of a new masculine spiritual nobility forever. For, according to Blüher, “only he who stands in the *Bund*, will not go down.”⁹⁹ The new “conservative-revolutionary” type of man should act based on his emotions and thereby lend his actions an immediate authenticity, which should dissolve the hated system of representation (which was identified with the Weimar democracy). In

the name of feeling, a dynamic change with the drawing of firm boundaries was tried, in which the swearing in of new aesthetic forms of originality and authenticity was carried over into hierarchical forms of authority.

For Blüher, this development was connected to a change in his circle of friends. Whereas his antifeminism was completely compatible with his left-wing political circle of friends and he became acquainted with comrades in the *Bund*, such as expressionist writer and pacifist publicist Kurt Hiller (1885–1972), Blüher's increasing anti-semitism announced a clearer separation from his earlier friends. If Blüher had previously moved in anarchic, reform-minded circles, in which many were of Jewish background,¹⁰⁰—in the community cooperative of the Berlin pacifist and doctor Ernst Joël (1893–1929)¹⁰¹ to which the Communist anarchist Gustav Landauer (1870–1919) and the Jewish philosopher of religion Martin Buber (1878–1965) belonged—then, after 1919 he oriented himself increasingly toward a supposedly Christian conservative elite. He came into contact with the *Herrenklub* (male club) of the conservative publicist Heinrich von Gleichen-Rußwurm (1889–1959), in which many major industrialists, Prussian Junker, and conservative–revolutionary thinkers such as cultural historian Arthur Moeller van den Bruck (1876–1925) and politician and lawyer Edgar Julius Jung (1894–1934) circulated.

Also, after 1928, Blüher repeatedly visited former German Kaiser Wilhelm II in his Dutch exile, who had for his part sought out contact with Blüher and who highly valued his works.¹⁰² Representatives of the *Konservative Revolution* were in part closely connected with the national conservative politicians. However, they spread their antidemocratic aims primarily through the print media and argued for a political alternative to the Weimar Republic, which ranged from a corporate state (*Ständestaat*) to restoration of the monarchy. They saw themselves as an opposition to the party political tendencies of the time, as an unpolitical “third party” that primarily wanted to exert influence on the political climate of the republic. Of all the conservative–revolutionary groupings, the *bündische* movement, defined by Blüher's *Männerbund* theory, had the strongest influence on politics—not least because from it a part of the later National Socialist leadership was recruited.¹⁰³

THE TURN FROM ANTIFEMINISM TO ANTI-SEMITISM

If, before and during the First World War, it was primarily women who were against the *Männerbund*, then gradually it was the “Jews” who relieved them of this position; it was the Jews who became the epitome of all that was not manly, German, and spiritual. The antifeminist and anti-Semitic foundations of the *Männerbund* had structural similarities, referred to each other, and strengthened one another.

Already during 1913, a year in which anti-Semitism manifested itself in the *Wandervogel* movement for the first time and became the subject of disagreement,¹⁰⁴ Blüher attempted to ground the cultural recognition of the man who loved men not only in his special virility but increasingly also in his racial superiority. In the second edition of his work *Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen* (1914), Blüher distinguished for the first time explicitly between the type of virile “male hero” and the “inverted sissy,” whom he now declared to be “decadent.”¹⁰⁵ One had to bear in mind that there were “deformed men” among the men who love men, “whose racial decadence is characterized by an overly strong endowment of feminine substance.”¹⁰⁶

The integration of feminine qualities up to a certain point was considered to be uplifting for the man—especially, as he expounded in later writings, for the “artist type”: “It is known that we are all androgynous, i.e. formed from masculine and feminine substance; a certain amount of stronger feminine substance within the male even helps the human transcend. . . . But at a certain point that stops.”¹⁰⁷

For Blüher, on the dangerous path of the masculine to the feminine, the borderline of “Jewish-liberal decadence” marked the precarious tipping point to a femininity that threatened to undermine the hierarchy of the sexes. This borderline had to be drawn carefully, especially in the context of the normalization of the virile “inverted” men, for, according to Blüher: “On the other side of that border, where the telymorphic impressions act to uplift the man, it is quite normal that one forces the demands of the decadent back to their proper place [because they—C.B.] lack everything that makes these men worthy of respect, namely their style, posture, vindication, and sense of social status.”¹⁰⁸

Blüher's two-volume major work, *Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen*

Gesellschaft, which was published in 1917 and 1919, reads as a transitional text in light of his later fundamental anti-Semitism. In it, one can still read Blüher's emancipatory tendencies as regards the social acceptance of male love. But the more clearly Blüher defended himself against the accusations of "decadence" and "degeneration" in his theories,¹⁰⁹ the more anti-Semitic his defense strategies became. Blüher's attempted "Germanification" of the homosexual was predicated on the exclusion of the "decadent Jew," because it was discursively logical to define "the essentially German" over and against "the Jewish."¹¹⁰ At the same time as the delimitation of what was deemed normal for the man became more flexible, the text defined even more rigidly norms for the opposite sex.

Nevertheless, because of their generative abilities, women had to be integrated into a theory that proclaimed itself to be one that represented the whole of society. In the breath in which Blüher included women in the future German Reich as a part of the family, he denied Jews the possibility of forming a part of the future state.

Between 1919 and 1922, as it is expressed in *Arstic des Jesus von Nazareth* (1921), the focal point of concern and unrest in Blüher's works shifted from the polarity of the sexes to racial difference: "Nature has given men the guarantee, that he one day will not feel himself overrun by feminine sexual characteristics; but the primary race does not have the guarantee that it will be spared by the secondary racial phenomena. Hence the fact that the position of mankind is one of despair."¹¹¹ The more explicitly Blüher aligned himself with the radical *Konservative Revolution*, the more his commitment to homosexual emancipation moved into the background. Instead, he was more concerned with a metaphysically loaded union between Christ and his disciples that constituted itself as a union of the "primary race" in opposition to the Jews.¹¹²

Just as with Blüher's "spiritual" antifeminism, his anti-Semitism claimed to be modern and innovative. He described the introduction of distinctions between "assimilated," "amalgamated," and "Zionistic" Jews as a marked change in strategy from prewar anti-Semitism to a new, more subtle, "relative" anti-Semitism that was harder to refute by means of statistics and everyday experience.¹¹³ A certain top level of Jews should continue to be accepted as intellectually excellent—here Blüher counted

especially the Jews with whom he had been friends until now—Buber, Landauer, and Hiller—in order to discriminate against the "masses" of Jews, the so-called *Tschandala Jews* who were especially inferior.¹¹⁴ Toward the end of the Weimar Republic this seeming relativity of anti-Semitism disappeared without a trace. The stigma of the "secondary race" was then transferred collectively onto the Jews.¹¹⁵

The deciding factor in the construction of the Jewish man as a central foil to the creative Germanic man of the *Bund* was his relationship to eros. As had been the case with antifeminism, anti-Semitism was concerned with the representation of the Germanic man as a singular creative "artist" subject, who through his unique combination of eros and Logos was in a position to form multiple male *Bünde* and thereby also create the coming Reich.¹¹⁶ According to Blüher, the Jewish man had a bond to eros that was simultaneously too strong and too weak: "It is like this with the Jews: they suffer from a weakness in male bonding and simultaneously from a hypertrophic family. They are overgrown with family and relations."¹¹⁷

According to Blüher, the energy of male bonding among the Jews was directed toward the family and not toward the state.¹¹⁸ The Jew, as a man who was strongly bonded to his family, was thus stylized as the prototype of the effeminate and feminized man, who thus also assumed the stigma of the homosexual. "The association between male character and the essence of being German," said Blüher in 1922, "and between the feminine and servile character with the Jewish is a direct intuition of the German people, which becomes more definite from day to day."¹¹⁹

If the Jew was considered on the one hand to be too feminine, on the other Blüher represented him as too intellectual, a type who thought abstractly, rationally, and uncreatively—purely logocentrically—and incorporated the negative characteristics of modernity, such as instrumental logic, mechanical thinking, increased bureaucracy, the tendency to mass culture, liberalization, and depersonalization. As such a "spiritless" and sterile man—who personified the subject of modernity, split between Eros and Logos, and was incapable of overcoming this duality—the Jew was unable to form bonds with other men and also to follow a leader: "the Jews thus lost out on the *Männerbund* and thereby also on friendship."¹²⁰

In this way Jews were denied any emotional attachment to the German state—instead of “platonic eros,” they had only a general love of humanity.¹²¹ Thus the constructed figure of the Jew framed the exaggerated ideal of the Germanic man in the *Reich* of the *Männerbund* at both its negative ends: “We Germans are bracketed in by this kind of Jew.”¹²²

In contrast, Blüher’s vision of the new Germanic man positioned itself between the shortcomings of, on the one hand, an overdeveloped connection to feminine materiality (coded as Jewish) and, on the other hand, a singularly instrumental reason. The man of the *Männerbund* was thus a man of the middle and of reconciliation, who promised to overcome the divisions of modernity. He was superior to women because he had assimilated their creative potential into himself in a spiritualized form. And he was superior to Jewish men because he promised to synthesize their conflicted state into a harmonic whole. “The Jew,” in contrast, mutated into a negative projection of a failed Germanic masculinity and a democratic, feminized nation that had been humiliated in war. At the same time, it had become completely immaterial not only to Blüher “whether there was such a thing as a true German: the German is a mythological figure, just like ‘the eternal Jew.’”¹²³

The social trend toward anti-Semitism had become so strong that Blüher hardly needed to fear resistance. On the contrary, recognition from precisely the conservative–revolutionary circles, the old nobility, and even the former German Kaiser Wilhelm II and church dignitaries was guaranteed him. Blüher described this development in 1922 in his work *Secessio Judaica* as a process of performative realization of anti-Semitic discourse on the body of the individual (nationalized) subject:

Anti-Semitism has become, without us wishing to admit it, the basic fundamental moment of the German man. One can no longer in one’s mind be for or against, if one is German, and there is no escape. Just as certain learned movements become subconscious for the body, and sink into our marrow, so that one can do nothing other than move oneself in that way, so the body of the German people can do nothing else today, but react anti-semitically. . . . It has already happened that each German has it in his blood: Prussianness and heroism belong together, Jewishness and the

spirit of defeat belong together. Every German knows, that the attitude which has caused us to be despised since defeat, is a Jewish attitude.¹²⁴

Whereas women had the possibility, as markedly “feminine women” or “German mothers,” and as the polar opposites of the men, to guarantee themselves an existence even within the framework of antifeminist *völkisch* theories, it became increasingly difficult for Jews to find a place as a part of the (gender-coded and increasingly polarized) German project of the state. For Blüher, “men and women”¹²⁵ and not Jews belonged to the “newly born master race.” Accordingly, Blüher demanded that Jews “be denied promotion to the higher offices of state.”¹²⁶ Already in 1922, Blüher considered the speeding up of the Jews’ departure from Germany, their *Secession Judaica*, to be the central political goal of the Germans.¹²⁷

The Männerbündisch Reason of State of the National Socialists

The National Socialist theory of the state had at its core a remarkably similar structure to the *Männerbund*, which, however, explicitly excluded the possibility of homosexual bonds. Baeumler (1887–1969), who was named the professor for political education at Berlin University in 1933 and who soon functioned as the chief Nazi ideologue (that is, in the education and ideology organ of the party), had a few years earlier already declared the strengthening of the *Männerbund* to be a central political aim of future politics.¹²⁸ At the same time he separated “friendship as a life relationship” between men clearly from so-called effete erotica and, like Blüher, declared the *Männerbund* to be the main principle of state: “The state emerges from the principle that is originally opposed to the family. The state is created through the deeds and the union of free men. Only there, where this union occurs, are both family and people (*Volk*) healthy.”¹²⁹

Gender conflict was considered by Baeumler to be “the most intimate German problem” and its solution to be the central concern of National Socialist politics. The woman should receive new honors solely as “mother.”¹³⁰ In a symbolic analogy to military honors, the “Mother’s Cross” was placed alongside the “Knight’s Cross.”¹³¹ Nevertheless, the

Männerbund as the central support of the state was placed in a hierarchically superior position over the family. The man was considered to be the real supporting strength to the state, which when organized in a *Bund* was conceived—alongside the family—as the second pillar of state. With this, Baeumler went back to a two-poled model of state that had been developed in the discourse of the *Männerbund*. “The state has the family and . . . the woman as mother as a precondition, but it itself is the stuff and work of the man. The talk about “understanding” is therefore just foolish and poisonous because it also has at its root, the goal of weaning us from our own masculine form of life that is directed towards the state, the goal of making us insecure and weak through urbanization.”¹³²

Already in the 1920s there was a rapid increase in ideas and alliances focusing on the *Bund*, as Baeumler himself remarked.¹³³ The new, revolutionary and antibourgeois elements in the National Socialist appropriation of *Männerbund* discourse were found in the explicit desire to turn “mere thoughts” into “action.” Baeumler emphasized the decisive expression of will, the development of strength, and the feeling of energy: “Action does not mean deciding for something . . . because that assumes that one *knows* what one is deciding for, rather action means to set a course, commit yourself, by means of a fateful mission, by means of one’s own right, without the possibility of backup. Action means to step in without security, only with certainty. It is linguistically possible to use the word “decision” for this action . . . the decision for something, that I have already recognized, is already secondary.”¹³⁴

The emotional “truth” and “authenticity” of the decision maker appears here to vouch for the quality of his politics. The more so, the more clearly it combined with an antimodern dissatisfaction, which opposed any one-sided, reason-oriented (teleological) rationality of the modern bourgeois world. In the decision for pure emotionality, the mere form, the direct affect declared itself not only as a protest but also as directly realized in the action itself. A representative form transferred itself into a direct immanence. The production of this feeling of immediacy and authenticity also was the central concern of National Socialist politics. The valid and representative form of power in the democracy of the Weimar Republic was supposed to be transformed into an immediate embodiment of power, a union and identity of *Führer* and *Volk*. The concept

of power did not lie far from Blüher’s erotic fusion of *Führer*, *Volk*, and *Männerbund*.

Nevertheless, purely affective decisions also had a political dimension. They created truths and marked lines of inclusion and exclusion, even if they were legitimized by a different foundation. All of the many practices that had until now existed in the *Männerbund* were now declared out of hand to be “mere thoughts” or a pitiful “chaos” in order to distance Baeumler’s own ideas as a more real “reality” from the realization of ideas of the *Bund*. This act of putting the *Männerbund* into action was loaded with the life philosophical mystique of the revolutionary and dynamic and was realized in the masculine (collective) subject:

The *bündisch* idea! How telling that one turns the *Bund* immediately into a thought, that one does not see that what matters is the real Bund, which even if it does not fulfill all wishes is still better than a mere thought—even if a *bündisch* thought! What kind of German fate is it to allow everything to be transformed into a thought—even the state, this greatest of all realities, in Germany is replaced by the thought of the state. A state does not arise only through thought—it is a product of powers, and the power that actually constitutes it, is the one that emerges from a union of free men.¹³⁵

In order to clarify what kind of *Männerbünde* correspond to Baeumler’s ideal, he referred to the “early days of the Youth movement” and in the same breath reminded one of the soldierly *Freikorps* groups that, at the beginning of the Weimar Republic, undertook terroristic action for political ends on their own and murdered many politicians of the young democracy: among others, Landauer, Rosa Luxemburg, and Walther Rathenau.

In this way he created a lineage that connected the hierarchical and paramilitary soldierly ideal of the *Freikorps* member with the myth of the “revolutionary” youth movement in the prewar era. Baeumler was thereby able to latch on to the connection that Blüher had made between the revolutionary youth and the *Führer*-follower relations in the *Bund* and had conceived of as an ideal of a future *Reich*.

Democratic bourgeois society for Baeumler was feminine and unheroic; in it every real connection from “man to man” would die. Only

the forms of the *Bund* and the family should remain within the "total state." The young man who presently felt isolated and estranged in his environment must find a new home in the future: "With us the young man with heroic desires turns away from society; he seeks a *friend* of the same age and a *friend* who is older, he seeks the comrade and the leader (*Führer*), the master and the role model, he seeks the *Bund*."¹³⁶ In fact, this notion of the *Bund* as a germ cell of political forms was transformed by the National Socialists by means of a multitude of organizations through the *Männerbund*: from the *Pimpfen* (Little Folk) to the *Hitler Youth* and *SA* as the brown fighters, to the elite groups such as the *Black Knights*, and the *SS*, as Adolf Hitler's personal protective unit.¹³⁷

In place of the erotic, friendship should be the bond that bound men to each other and to the state. Blüher's concept of *eros* was translated by Baeumler into a readiness for self-surrender and a fantasy of fusion, which could become all the more ecstatic the stronger it was conceived of as the order and hierarchy of the soldier: "There man stands next to man, pillar next to pillar; that is the front line, that is the temple, that is the sacred place, that is the state."¹³⁸ The desire for delimitation, vitality, and absolute creativity and the wish for order and security soon should meet at their ends and find an as much paradoxical as violent dissolution in the hierarchical cult of the *Führer*.

Notes

1. "Daß das Problem der Führerschaft und Gefolgschaft [. . .] einem Volke, das durch Krieg und Revolution seiner bisherigen [. . .] Führerschaften [. . .] beraubt ist, auf der Seele brennen muß, das ist selbstverständlich. [. . .] Es ist eine heillosse Sehnsucht nach Führerschaft allüberall lebendig—[. . .] Das zeigen vielleicht am deutlichsten die Zahllosen neuen »Gemeinschaften«, »Kreise«, »Ordens«, »Sekten«, »Schulen«, die mit einem Male in unserem Lande für alle Arten von Lebensinteressen emporgetaucht sind, jede mit ihrem besonderen »Heilande«, »Propheten«, »Weltverbesseren« in der Mitte, jede mit hohen Ansprüchen aller Art, die Welt zu bessern und zu bekehren." Max Scheler, "Vorbilder und Führer" (composed in 1911–12), in *Schriften aus dem Nachlass*, vol. 1, *Zur Ethik und Erkenntnislehre*, rev. ed., ed. Maria Scheeler (Bern: Francke, 1957 [1933]), 255–344, 257. (All translations, unless otherwise indicated, are by Katherine Faulstich.)
2. Heinrich Schurtz, *Altersklassen und Männerbünde: Eine Darstellung der Gesellschaft: Mit einer Verbreitungskarte* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1902).
3. Johann Jakob Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht: Eine Untersuchung über die Gynökratie der alten Welt nach ihrer religiösen und rechtlichen Natur: Eine Auswahl*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Heinrichs, 3d ed. (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1980 [1861]); Ralph Manheim, trans., *Myth, Religion, and Mother Right: Selected writings of J. J. Bachofen*, trans. from the German by Ralph Manheim, with a preface by George Boas and an introduction by Joseph Campbell (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992 [1967]).

4. Schurtz finds completely "primitive" forms of male group formation not only in the "natural peoples" of New Guinea, Melanesia, Micronesia, Polynesia, and Indonesia, but also on the Asian mainland, in America, and in Africa that stand in opposition to the formation of family structures and that are responsible for the cultural development of society. Schurtz, *Altersklassen und Männerbünde*, iv.
5. "Das Weib steht vorherrschend unter dem Einfluss der Geschlechtsliebe und der aus ihr entspringenden Familiengefühle, der Mann dagegen wird mehr durch einen reinen Geselligkeitstrieb, der ihn mit seinesgleichen verbindet, in seinem Verhalten bestimmt. Darum ist das Weib der Hort aller Gesellschaftsformen, die aus der Vereinigung zweier Personen verschiedenen Geschlechts hervorgehen, der Mann dagegen der Vertreter aller Arten des rein geselligen Zusammenschlusses und damit der höheren sozialen Verbände." *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*, 38–39.
7. *Ibid.*, 352.
8. Ute Planert, *Antifeminismus im Kaiserreich. Diskurs, soziale Formation und politische Mentalität, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 124* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1998), 29.
9. Thus, French biologist Alfred Espinas had already observed in mammals an "antagonism between the family and society." Alfred Espinas, *Die Thierischen Gesellschaften. Eine vergleichend-psychologische Untersuchung. Nach der vielfach erweiterten 2. Aufl. unter Mitwirkung des Verfassers. Deutsch hg. v. W. Schlosser, Autorisierte Ausgabe* (Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1879), v. It was the relations of the young to each other, whether they were based on instinct, love, or sympathy, that constituted the foundations "of every society that supersedes the family," while with family ties that were too tight there never or seldom developed a notion of people or nation (*Völkerschaft*). Espinas, *Die Thierischen Gesellschaften*, 453ff. Albert Eberhard Friedrich Schäffle (1831–1903), leading German social critic, shared this thesis of the separate formation of family and society in 1896 in the second edition of his work *Entwurf zum Bau und Leben des Sozialen Körpers* (1875–78). John Wyon Burrow, *Die Krise der Vernunft. Europäisches Denken 1848–1914* (München: Sequenzia, 2003), 120. And approximately contemporaneous with Schurtz, sociologist Otto Ammon developed a similar concept in the *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaften*. In Ammon's view, the "true formation of society only began where family life ended." Otto Ammon, "Der Ursprung der sozialen Triebe," *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft* 4 (1901): 101–13, here 104. What Espinas, Schäffle, and Ammon assume implicitly is made explicit by Schurtz. Schurtz, *Altersklassen und Männerbünde*, 21.
10. Michael Haberlandt, "Review of *Altersklassen und Männerbünde* by H. Schurtz," *Dr. A. Petermanns Mitteilungen: Aus Justus Perthes' Geographischer Anstalt* 48 (1902): 172–73, 593–94.
11. Alfred Vierkandt, "Review of *Altersklassen und Männerbünde* by H. Schurtz," *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie* 1 (1903): 64–67, 65.
12. Otto Weininger, *Geschlecht und Charakter: Eine prinzipielle Untersuchung*, 24th ed. (Wien and Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1922 [1903]), 258.
13. Schurtz, *Altersklassen und Männerbünde*, 45.
14. See, for example, Gerhard Ille, "Daten zur sozialen Herkunft Steglitzer Wandervögel 1896–1906," in *Der Wandervogel. Es begann in Steglitz. Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Jugendbewegung*, ed. *ibid.* and Günter Köhler (Berlin: Stapp, 1987), 134–38. In 1902 the *Wandervogel* movement included 150 "scholars," and four years later it already had 1,300 in 70 different towns. In 1910 the movement had grown to 8,800 young people in 204 towns, and, in 1913, 25,000 "scholars" were counted. Added to this number were the approximately 10,000 adults in parents and friends committees. The numbers can be found in *Wandervogel: Monatsschrift für deutsches Jugendwandern* 8 (1913), January 24. See Jakob Müller, *Die Jugendbewegung als deutsche Hauptrichtung neukonservativer Reform*

- (Zürich: Europa, 1971), 20. If, like sociologist Andreas Winnecken, one counts those who were organized into student associations for the reform of life and education, then one reaches the number of 60,000 for the year 1913–14 who could be counted to be in the youth movement. Andreas Winnecken, *Ein Fall von Antisemitismus. Zur Geschichte und Pathogenese der deutschen Jugendbewegung vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg*, Archiv der deutschen Jugendbewegung 7 (Köln: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1991), 16. The youth organization *bündische Jugend* of the Weimar period, including the religious organizations, is estimated at about 76,000. Winfried Mogge, "Jugendbewegung," in *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen: 1880–1933*, ed. Diethart Kerbs and Jürgen Reulecke (Wuppertal: Hammer, 1998), 181–96, here 189. Müller calculated, that up to the year 1925 almost half a million people of different generations were organized into the bourgeois youth movements. Müller, *Jugendbewegung als deutsche Hauptrichtung neukonservativer Reform*, 190.
15. Ille, "Steglitzer Wandervogelführer: Lebenswege und Lebensziele," in *Der Wandervogel: Es begann in Steglitz: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Jugendbewegung*, ed. ibid. and Günter Köhler (Berlin: Stapp, 1987), 99–127, 104.
16. At the age of 14 he was accepted into the *Wandervogel* as "scholar" # 33. "Wandervogel—Geschichte einer Jugendbewegung" (2 pages, probably by Wilhelm Herckmans Hengesch, ca. 1963), (Archiv der deutschen Jugendbewegung), Papers of H. Blüher. For the lists of members of the *Wandervogel*, see Ille, "Ausschuss für Schülerfahrten," in *Der Wandervogel: Es begann in Steglitz: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Jugendbewegung*, ed. ibid. and Günter Köhler (Berlin: Stapp, 1987), 130; Hans Blüher, *Werke und Tage* (Jena: Diederichs, 1920), 3–15; Hans Blüher, *Werke und Tage: Geschichte eines Denkers* (München: Paul List, 1953), 179–202.
17. Hans Blüher, *Wandervogel. Geschichte einer Jugendbewegung*, vol. 1, *Heimat und Aufgang*, with an introduction by Hans Blüher (Berlin-Tempelhof: Buchhandlung Bernhard Weise, 1912).
18. *Ibid.* vol. 2, *Blüte und Niedergang* (Berlin-Tempelhof: Buchhandlung Bernhard Weise, 1912), 97.
19. *Ibid.*, 25.
20. *Ibid.*, 175.
21. *Ibid.*, 24.
22. Barbara Stambolis, *Der Mythos der jungen Generation. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Kultur der Weimarer Republik* (PhD diss., Bochum, 1982), 12.
23. Alfred Weber as quoted in Werner Kindt, ed., *Die Wandervogelzeit: Quellenschriften zur deutschen Jugendbewegung 1896–1919: Quellenschriften, Dokumentation der Jugendbewegung* 2, ed. for Auftrag des Gemeinschaftswerks Archiv und Dokumentation der Jugendbewegung (Düsseldorf: Diederichs, 1968), 531.
24. Blüher, *Werke und Tage*, 73. In contrast, the *Wandervogel* leader Hans Breuer reports in the journal of the *Wandervogel Deutscher Bund* that in the beginning there were very close relations between the *Wandervogel* and the parents and friends' councils. Hans Breuer, "Karl Fischer: Ein Erinnerungsblatt," *Wandervogel: Monatsschrift des "Wandervogel" Deutschen Bundes für Jugendwanderungen* 4, 4–5, April/May: 48–50, 49.
25. Blüher, *Wandervogel*, vol. 1, 92.
26. See Walter Erhart, *Familienmänner. Über den literarischen Ursprung moderner Männlichkeit* (München: Fink, 2001), 23–62.
27. See also Jürgen Reulecke, "Männerbund versus Familie. Bürgerliche Jugendbewegung und Familie in Deutschland im ersten Drittel des 20. Jahrhunderts," in "Ich möchte einer werden so wie die . . ." *Männerbünde im 20. Jahrhundert, Geschichte und Geschlechter* 34, ed. ibid. (Frankfurt/Main: Campus, 2001 [1985]), 69–88, here 84.
28. Blüher, *Wandervogel*, vol. 2, 166.
29. Blüher, *Werke und Tage*, 9.
30. Blüher, *Wandervogel*, vol. 2, 97.
31. Blüher, *Werke und Tage*, 61.
32. See Harry Oosterhuis, "Male Bonding and Homosexuality in German Nationalism," in *Homosexuality and Male Bonding in Pre-Nazi Germany: The Youth Movement, the Gay Movement, and Male Bonding before Hitler's Rise*. Original transcripts from *Der Eigene*, the first gay journal in the world, ed. ibid. (New York and London: Haworth Press, 1991), 241–64, 244. Reulecke emphasizes that the division between the family and the *Männerbund* was supposed to receive its practical enactment in the lifestyles of the youth who were members of the *Bund* in the 1920s and was "typically heightened by the national socialist family and social ideology." Reulecke, "Männerbund versus Familie," 70.
33. Claudia Bruns, *Politik des Eros: Der Männerbund in Medizin, Politik und Jugendkultur* (Köln et al.: Bohlau, 2007).
34. E[dmund] Neuedorff, "Blühers Wandervogelgeschichte," *Monatsschrift für das Turnwesen: Zeitschrift für die Erziehung der Jugend durch Turnen, Spielen, Wandern, Schwimmen, Rudern und winterliche Leibesübungen* 32 (1913), 7: 289–95, here 289–91.
35. *Ibid.*, 293.
36. Hans Blüher, *Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen: Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis der sexuellen Inversion*, 3 vols. with an Introduction by Dr. med. Magnus Hirschfeld and with a Postscript by Hans Blüher (Berlin: Bernhard Weise Buchhandlung, 1912).
37. The Prussian civil code of 1851 had already contained the formulation that after unification was adopted by all other German states, finally as Paragraph 175 of the Imperial Criminal Code. "Unnatural sexual acts that take place between persons of the male sex or between humans and animals are criminal acts that are punished with imprisonment; such acts can also lead to the loss of rights as a citizen." As quoted in Hans-Georg Stünke, *Homosexuelle in Deutschland: Eine politische Geschichte* (München: Beck, 1989), 21. The paragraph was amended twice, in 1935 and in 1969–73. The paragraph was only removed from the Criminal Code in 1994 in the Federal Republic of Germany.
38. Hans Blüher, *Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen*, vol. 3, 70.
39. *Ibid.*
40. *Ibid.*, 30–33.
41. *Ibid.*, 34.
42. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosexual Desire, Gender and Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 2. John W. Crowley summarizes the two terms as follows: "[H]omosocial [is] referring to the entire range of same-sex bonds, and homosexual [is] referring to the part of the homosocial continuum marked by genital sexuality." However, he does consider this distinction to be problematic. See Crowley, "Howells, Stoddard, and Male Homosocial Attachment in Victorian America," in *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*, ed. Harry Brod (Winchester: Mass.: Allen and Unwin, 1987), 301–24, 302–3.

43. Gustav Jaeger, *Lehrbuch der allgemeinen Zoologie: Ein Leitfaden für Vorträge und zum Selbststudium*. III. Abteilung: Psychologie. Zugleich: Die Entdeckung der Seele, 3d ed. (Leipzig: Ernst Günther's Verlag, 1884 [1880]). See also Claudia Bruns, "The Politics of Masculinity in the (Homo-)Sexual Discourse (1880–1920)," *German History* 23 (2005), no. 3: 306–20.
44. Benedikt Friedlaender, *Die Renaissance des Eros Uranios: Die physiologische Freundschaft, ein normaler Grundtrieb des Menschen und eine Frage der männlichen Geselligkeitsfreiheit, in naturwissenschaftlicher, naturrechtlicher, culturgeschichtlicher und sittenkritischer Beleuchtung*, 2d ed. (Berlin: Zacks, 1908 [1904]). See Bruns, "The Politics of Masculinity," 310ff.
45. Thus in the years 1912 and 1914 Blüher published in the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Homosexualität*, ed. Magnus Hirschfeld; in *Sexual-Probleme. Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft und Sexualpolitik*, ed. Max Marcuse; in the *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie*, ed. W. Stekel; in the *Internationalen Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse. Offizielles Organ der Internationalen Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung* and in *Imago. Zeitschrift für Anwendung der Psychoanalyse auf die Geisteswissenschaften*, both ed. Sigmund Freud; and also in *Archiv für Sexualforschung*, ed. in conjunction with the Internationalen Gesellschaft für Sexualforschung (International Society for Sexual Research).
46. H. Albrecht, "Hans Blüher über die Wandervogelbewegung," *Sonderdruck aus der Zeitschrift der Zentralstelle für Volkswohlfahrt "Ratgeber für Jugendvereinigungen"* 3 (1913), March: 1–4, 1.
47. Blüher, *Werke und Tage*, 342.
48. See Ulfried Geuter, *Homosexualität in der deutschen Jugendbewegung: Jungenfreundschaft und Sexualität im Diskurs von Jugendbewegung, Psychoanalyse und Jugendpsychologie am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1994), 42–43.
49. The close emotional bonds between the slightly older group leaders and the members—that is between the leader and the scholar—now became the subject of strict social control that played out in a series of internal and external legal proceedings, in parent newsletters, and in debates in the simple *Wandervogel* publications. Seeing the "group-leader" as an "older friend" was suspected of being a "sign of emotional confusion and misdirected feeling."
50. Anonymous, "Jugend und Schule" [see *Wandervogel* I–III], *Kunstwart und Kulturwart: Halbmonatschau für Ausdruckskultur auf allen Lebensgebieten* 27 (1913a): 424–25.
51. Geuter, *Homosexualität*, 138–48.
52. See Jürgen Link, *Versuch über den Normalismus: Wie Normalität produziert wird* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verl., 1997), 79–80.
53. See Andrew Hewitt, "Die Philosophie des Maskulinismus," *Zeitschrift für Germanistik, Neue Folge* 1 (1999), 36–56.
54. Blüher, *Wandervogel: Geschichte einer Jugendbewegung*, vol. 2, 135.
55. Hans Blüher, *Die drei Grundformen der sexuellen Inversion (Homosexualität): Eine sexologische Studie*, special offprint from *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 13 (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1913), 27–28. See also Blüher, *Wandervogel. Geschichte einer Jugendbewegung*, vol. 2, 113.
56. *Ibid.*, 136.
57. On the history of girls in the *Wandervogel* movement, see Irmgard Klönne, "Ich spring' in diesem Ringe": Mädchen und Frauen in der deutschen Jugendbewegung, *Frauen in Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 7 (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus: 1990).
58. See Michel Foucault, "Das wahre Geschlecht," in Wolfgang Schäffner and Joseph Vogel, *Herculine Barbin; Michel Foucault, Michel Foucault über Hermaphroditismus* ed. (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1998), 7–18, here 11.
59. Expanded appendix to the 2d ed. (1914) of Blüher's *Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen*, vol. 3, 155.
60. Diary entry from 08.08.1920. Adj. Nl. W. Kind.
61. Hannelore Bublitz, *Foucaults Archäologie des kulturellen Unbewussten: Zum Wissensarchiv und Wissensbegehren moderner Gesellschaften* (Frankfurt/Main and New York: Campus, 1999), 201. On biographical "operations" or "protheses," see also Annette Runte, *Biographische Operationen: Diskurse der Transsexualität* (München: Fink, 1996); Klaus Müller, *Aber in meinem Herzen sprach eine Stimme so laut. Homosexuelle Autobiographien und medizinische Pathographien im neunzehnten Jahrhundert, Homosexualität und Literatur* 4 (Berlin: rosa Winkel, 1991).
62. Bublitz, *Foucaults Archäologie des kulturellen Unbewussten*, 205.
63. *Ibid.*, 207.
64. *Bund zur Bekämpfung der Frauenemanzipation*. From October 11, 1913, this organization called itself the *Deutscher Bund gegen die Frauenemanzipation*, "the German Association for the Fight against Women's Emancipation"; see Planert, *Antifeminismus*.
65. Henry F. Urban, "Die weibliche Gefahr," *Berliner Tageblatt* 29 (1908), June 14, as quoted in Planert (1998): *Antifeminismus*, 335.
66. On the term hegemonic masculinity, see Robert W. Connell, *Der gemachte Mann: Konstruktion und Krise von Männlichkeiten, Geschlecht und Gesellschaft* 8, 2d ed., ed. Ursula Müller (Opladen: Leske and Budrich, 2000).
67. Planert, *Antifeminismus*, 177–258.
68. "Zur Erschlaffung straffer herber Männlichkeit, zur Abtötung der Instinkte, die den Mann zur Herrschaft befähigen, zur Genußsucht und endlich zur Entartung." Korn's essay on "Die künftige Leibeserziehung der männlichen Jugend" was published in the leading newspaper of the *Jung-Wandervogel* (1917): 138.
69. Hans Blüher, *Ulrich von Wilamowitz und der deutsche Geist 1871/1915*, 3d ed. (Prien: Kampmann and Schnabel, 1920), 30.
70. Hans Blüher, *Der bürgerliche und der geistige Antifeminismus* (Berlin-Tempelhof: Buchhandlung Bernhard Weise, 1928 [1916]), 101–2.
71. *Ibid.*, 103 and 117.
72. *Ibid.*, 109 and 118–19.
73. Blüher also was a proponent of polygyny (which was above all supposed to fulfill the man more), and he praised the "free love" of the modern and emancipated "hetaera," which he verbally supported far more than E. F. W. Eberhard of the antifeminist league. Even after the First World War Eberhard considered the "hetaera" as the "representative of the feminist principle," which wished to "cause in men a voluntary lack of order by means of her personal charms." E. F. W. Eberhard, *Feminismus und Kulturuntergang: Die erotischen Grundlagen der Frauenemanzipation*, 2d ed. (Wien and Leipzig: Braumüller, 1927), 559.
74. Hans Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen Gesellschaft: Eine Theorie der menschlichen Staatsbildung nach Wesen und Wert*, vol. 2, *Familie und Männerbund* (Jena: Diederichs, 1921 [1919]), 34.

75. Even Thomas Mann connected his plea for a democratic republic with a concept of "eros as a state-man, as a founder of states," a thought that was "still being seriously propagated again" by Blüher, as Mann stressed in his speech "On the German Republic" (*Von deutscher Republik*) on October 13, 122 in Berlin. Thomas Mann, "Von deutscher Republik Gerhart Hauptmann zum sechzigsten Geburtstag," in Thomas Mann. *Essays*, vol. 2, *Für das neue Deutschland: 1919-1925*, ed. Hermann Kurzke and Stephan Stachorski (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer 1993, [1922]), 126-66, here 162.
76. Blüher, Hans, *Die Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen Gesellschaft* (Jena: Diederichs, 1917; (after 1919 it appeared with the title *Eine Theorie des menschlichen Staatsbildung nach Wesen und Wert*, vol. 1, *Der Typus Inversus*), 38.
77. Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, vol. 1, 159.
78. 'Eros ist nicht Sexualität, sondern ist dasjenige, was der Sexualität ihren Sinn gibt. . . . Eros ist die Bejahung eines Menschen abgesehen von seinem Wert. [B]edingungslos bejahen zu müssen, bedingungslos bis zum Opfer des eignen Lebens: das ist von anderer Art als Lust und Unlust, als Spiel und Zeitvertreib. . . . Eros ist ein Gott; aber der Gott mit der gesenkten Fackel. [E]in alter ernster und furchtbarer Gott, der keine Gnade kennt.' Ibid., vol. 1, 226-27.
79. See Bruns, "Völkische Gegner Blüher's," in *Politik des Eros*, 363-68.
80. Finally, the use of the Greek word *Eros* for the German word *Liebe* (love) was actually only a "weak" concession to the spirit of the times, according to Sigmund Freud, "Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse," in *Studienausgabe*, vol. 9 (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer, 2000 [1921]), 61-134, here 86.
81. Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, vol. 1, 51.
82. "All economically based sociology reaches at best to the level of the molecules and not to the elemental level" (*Alle ökonomistische Soziologie dringt daher bestenfalls zu den Molekülen vor, und nicht zu den Elementen*), according to Blüher. Ibid., vol. 2, 2.
83. 'Die letzte Begründung für die Staatshaftigkeit des Menschengeschlechtes [ist] in seinem Eros zu suchen. So tief liegt diese Wurzel vergraben, und sie hat nichts mit der Oberflächenangelegenheit Geist oder gar Ökonomie zu schaffen. Es liegt daran, daß der Mensch in einer höchst bedeutsamen und nur ihm eignen Weise die Fähigkeit hat, einem andern zu verfallen.' Ibid., vol. 1, 4.
84. Ibid., 190. The choice of friends does not supposedly depend on conscious influences but rather is determined by unconscious currents. "Whoever becomes our friend, that we cannot determine, that falls to us like a 'lot.' The choice of friends and spouse seem to follow the same inner law." "Wer unser Freund wird, das kann man nicht bestimmen, das fällt uns zu wie ein Los. . . . Freundswahl und Gattenuahl scheinen demselben inneren Gesetze zu gehorchen." Ibid., 206.
85. Ibid., 6.
86. Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, vol. 2, 91 and 94.
87. Ibid., 94.
88. Ibid., vol. 1, 204.
89. Ibid., 204. See also Hans Blüher, *Familie und Männerbund*, with a preface by Hans Blüher [Lecture to the "Berliner Sezession" on April 10, 1918, in Hamburg before the "Freideutschen Jugend" und Dresden] (Leipzig: Der Neue Geist: 1918), 22.
90. Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, vol. 2, 178.
91. Ibid., 3.
92. Ibid., vol. 1, 225.
93. Ibid., vol. 2, 26.
94. Being "enslaved" was the "a priori form of feminine Eros" ("Hörigkeit" sei die 'apriorische Form des weiblichen Eros'), *ibid.*, 35.
95. Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, vol. 1, 235.
96. Ibid., 232-35.
97. Ibid., 13.
98. 'Diese bloße Herdenbildung, eine höchst unverbindliche und lockere Art der Sozialisierung, findet sich überall in der Natur in wechselnder Stärke der Bindung. . . . Aber ein Staat ist das nicht. . . . Zum Staate gehört das Vorhandensein einer Illusion vom objektiven Willen; zum Staate gehört die mögliche Belanglosigkeit des Einzeliers, der Dienst am Ganzen, das Opfer und das Übergeordnete. Der Mensch ist kein Herdentier, sondern ein staatenbildendes Wesen.' Ibid., vol. 1, 5.
99. Blüher, *Ibid.*, vol. 2, 221.
100. Blüher was a member of the *Freien Studentenschaft* and the publication *Der Aufbruch* together with Ernst Joël, Gustav Landauer, Martin Buber, Kurt Hiller, Rudolf Leonhard, Alfred Wolfenstein, Hans Reichenbach, and other Jewish intellectuals. Blüher worked with Hiller between 1916 and 1917 in the activism movement, where they wanted to forge a new "band of spiritual leaders." See John Neubauer, "Am Scheideweg: Thomas Mann und Hans Blüher, München 1919 (mit einem unveröffentlichten Brief Blüher's an Mann)," in *Poesie als Auftrag: Festschrift für Alexander von Bormann*, ed. Dagmar Ottmann and Markus Symmank (Würzburg: Königshausen and Neumann, 2001), 171-83, 172; also Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, vol. 1, 212.
101. The 'Siedlungsheim' project had been born through Blüher's friend Ernst Joël. It was a kind of intellectual, "antibourgeois" educational institution, which lay in the middle of workers' quarters and was supposed to enable an exchange between "intellectuals" and the "proletariat." Lectures and discussions took place there.
102. Blüher, who neither was of noble birth nor could show any leading position in society, did not become a regular member of the *Herrenklub*. He himself connected this with his notorious affirmation of homosexuality. Blüher, *Werke und Tage*, 328-29. His new relationship with homeopathic doctor Else Wilhelmine Hebner (1893-1980) allowed Blüher to lead a bourgeois life. See his documents in his estate SBBPK Nl. H. Blüher, K. 1; see also Jürgen Plashues, "Hans Blüher—ein Leben zwischen Schwarz und Weiß," in *Jahrbuch des Archivs der deutschen Jugendbewegung 19, 1999-2001* (Schwalbach/Ts: Wochenschau-Verlag, 2004), 146-86, here 164.
103. This, according to the judgment of Armin Mohler. Mohler counts among the *Bündischen* exclusively those groups independent of churches or the state, such as the German *Freischar*, the *Adler* and *Falken* and the *Artamanen*. They did not get directly involved in politics, however, but they did, according to Mohler, have the largest political influence of all the conservative-revolutionary groups. Statistics at the end of the 1920s show that there were 50,000 to 60,000 members of the youth *Bund*. This is a smaller number in comparison to the youth *Bündis* that were organized through the political parties. According to Mohler, however, "a large part of the members of the *Bund* belonged to an elite, that later took on some of the duties of leadership and thereby never quite lost a certain *bündische* imprint even in a completely changed environment." Here is clearly meant a participation in "duties of leadership" during the time of National Socialism. Armin Mohler, *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland 1918-1932: Ein Handbuch, Haupt- und Ergänzungsband in einem Bd.*, 4th ed. [2., völlig neu bearbeitet und erw. Fassung 1972; 3. erweiterte Fassung 1989] (Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1994), 153.

104. Audreas Winnecken, *Ein Fall von Antisemitismus*, (Köln: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1991) 45–67.
105. Blüher, 'Vorwort zur zweiten Auflage,' in *Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung*, vol. 3, p. 10.
106. *Ibid.*, 10. The term "feminine substance" was probably borrowed from Otto Weinger.
107. *Ibid.*, 11–12.
108. *Ibid.*
109. Blüher himself was attacked for being "degenerate" and "Jewish"—for example, by Georg Schmidt, 'Nein, nein! Das ist nicht unser Wandervogel!', *Wandervogelzeitung* 3 (1968) [1913], February, reprinted in Kindt, *Die Wandervogelzeit*, 247–48.
110. See Shulamit Volkov, ed., *Antisemitismus als kultureller Code: Zehn Essays*, 2d ed. (München: Beck, 2000).
111. 'Die Natur hat dem Manne die Garantie gegeben, dass er sich nicht eines Tages von seinen weiblichen Geschlechtsmerkmalen überrannt fühlt; aber die primäre Rasse hat nicht die Garantie, von den sekundären Rassenereignissen verschont zu bleiben. Dadurch kommt es, dass die Lage der Menschheit im ganzen eine verzweifelte ist.' Blüher (1921–22), 42. At the same time, to Blüher's dismay, "racial difference" could less clearly be identified by biological features than by cultural ones. The so-called two-race phenomenon became at the same time synonymous with the difference between "Christian-Germanic" and "Jewish" types. *Ibid.*, 40.
112. On the metaphysical and also racist pathologizing of the Jews by Blüher, see Claudia Bruns, 'Die "metaphysische Pathologie" des Juden. Erkenntnistheoretische Dimensionen eines religiösen Rassismus um 1920,' in *Lebendige Sozialgeschichte: Gedenkschrift für Peter Borowsky*, ed. Hering, Rainer and Rainer Nicolaysen (Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verl., 2003), 278–95.
113. Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, vol. 2, 170–71, and Hans Blüher: *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth: Philosophische Grundlegung der Lehre und der Erscheinungen Christi* (Prien: Kampmann and Schnabel, 1921), 233.
114. Hans Blüher, *Deutsches Reich, Judentum und Sozialismus. Eine Rede an die freideutsche Jugend* [Vortrag v. 13. January 1919], 2d ed. (Prien: Anthropos, 1920), 141.
115. Hans Blüher, *Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter* (Hamburg and Berlin: Hansische Verlagsanstalt [Ringbücherei], 1931), 131–32.
116. See Blüher, *Deutsches Reich, Judentum und Sozialismus*, 130.
117. 'Mit den Juden steht es so: sie leiden an einer Männerbundschwäche und zugleich an einer Familienhypertrophie. Sie sind überwuchert vom Familientum und von der Verwandtschaft.' Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, 170.
118. Since the expulsion of the Jews by the Romans, the Jewish race has only been "carried by the family." Blüher: *Deutsches Reich, Judentum und Sozialismus*, 131.
119. Hans Blüher, *Secessio judaica* (1922), 49.
120. '[D]ie Juden gingen der Männerbünde und damit der Freundschaft verlustig,' says Blüher in his address to the Freideutschen Jugend. Blüher, *Deutsches Reich, Judentum und Sozialismus*, 131.
121. For Blüher, only the Zionistic Jew, who aspired to forming his own Jewish state, was acceptable. Blüher, *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth*, 74.
122. Blüher, *Deutsches Reich, Judentum und Sozialismus*, 141.
123. 'Ob es so etwas wie einen echten Germanen wirklich gibt: der Germane ist eine mythologische Gestalt, genau so wie der ewige Jude.' *Ibid.*, 133.
124. 'Der Antisemitismus ist, ohne dass man es schon ganz zugeben will, ein Grundvorgang des deutschen Menschen geworden. Man kann heute nicht mehr mit dem Gehirn für oder wider sein, man ist, wenn man Deutscher ist, bereits abgestempelt, und es gibt kein Entfliehen mehr. So wie in den Körpern gelehrte Bewegungen unbewusst werden und ins Rückenmark versinken, so dass man nicht mehr anders kann, als sich so bewegen, so kann der deutsche Volkkörper heute nicht mehr anders, als antisemitisch reagieren. . . . Es ist aber bereits Ereignis geworden, daß jeder Deutsche es im Blute hat: Preußentum und Heroismus gehören zusammen, zusammen gehören Judentum und der Geist der Niederlage. Jeder Deutsche weiß, daß die Gesinnung, durch die wir seit der Niederlage verachtet sind, jüdische Gesinnung ist.' Blüher, *Secessio judaica*, 49.
125. Blüher, *Die Rolle der Erotik*, vol. 2, 33.
126. Blüher, *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth*, 240.
127. Blüher, *Secessio judaica*, 49.
128. On October 17, 1930, Baeumler gave a speech at the meeting of the Hochschulrings deutscher Art at Schloss Boitzenburg: "the Renewal of the Student House." The background of the speech was the NSDAP's huge breakthrough in the elections for the German Reichstag on September 14, 1930, in which the latter entered the Reichstag for the first time with 107 representatives. This speech was published during the Nazi period with the title "The academic fraternity" in a collected volume of Baeumler's work, *Männerbund und Wissenschaft* with several reprintings. He exercised considerable influence over the party intelligentsia with his public essays and speeches on his interpretation of Nazi ideology long into the Second World War. See Hermann Weiß, ed., *Biographisches Lexikon zum Dritten Reich* (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer, 2002), 28–29.
129. 'Der Staat kommt aus dem Prinzip heraus, das dem der Familie ursprünglich entgegengesetzt ist. . . . [D]er Staat . . . wird . . . geschaffen durch die Taten und die Vereinigung freier Männer. Nur wo diese Vereinigung stattfindet, da sind auch Familie und Volk gesund.' Alfred Baeumler, ed., *Männerbund und Wissenschaft*, 3d ed. (Berlin: Junker and Dünhaupt, 1943 [1934]), 42.
130. Support of the fertility of women, financially and ideologically, really did belong to the central program of National Socialist politics, as also did the valorization of motherhood by means of public honors and awards. On the function of "mother" in National Socialism, see Claudia Koonz, *Mütter im Vaterland: Frauen im Dritten Reich* (Freiburg: Kore, 1991).
131. On the history of the "Mother's Cross," see Frauengruppe Faschismusforschung, ed., *Mutterkreuz und Arbeitsbuch. Zur Geschichte der Frauen in der Weimarer Republik und im Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer, 1981).
132. 'Der Staat hat die Familie und . . . das Weib als Mutter zur Voraussetzung, aber er ist Sache und Werk des Mannes. Das Gerede von der 'Verständigung' ist nur deshalb töricht und vergiftend, weil ihm zugleich die Absicht zugrunde liegt, uns der eigenen männlichen, auf den Staat gerichteten Lebensform zu entwöhnen, uns durch Urbanisierung unsicher und schwach zu machen.' Baeumler, *Männerbund und Wissenschaft*, 40–41.
133. *Ibid.*, 31. Thus there existed the *bündische* youth, which had replaced the *Wandervogel* movement of the prewar period, and which was now organized into gender-segregated groups, the paramilitary *Freikorps*, the student fraternities, literary and intellectual unions, the *völkisch* religious *Bünde* of all kinds and the *bündische* youth organizations of the political parties, to name just a few.
134. 'Handeln heißt nicht: sich entscheiden für . . . , denn das setzt voraus, daß man wisse, wofür man sich entscheidet, sondern handeln heißt: eine Richtung einschlagen, Partei nehmen, kraft eines schicksalhaften Auftrags, kraft 'eigenen Rechts', ohne die Möglichkeit einer Deckung. Handeln heißt: sich einsetzen ohne Sicherheit, nur

mit Gewissheit. Es ist sprachlich möglich, für dieses Handeln auch das Wort Entscheidung zu gebrauchen. . . . Die Entscheidung für etwas, das ich erkannt habe, ist schon sekundär." Baeumler in his speech "Der theoretische und der politische Mensch," before the students in Dresden, February 27, 133. Ibid., 94-112.

135. "Der bündische Gedanke! Wie bezeichnend, daß man den Bund sofort in einen Gedanken verwandelt, daß man nicht sieht: es kommt auf den wirklichen Bund an, der selbst dann, wenn er nicht 'alle Wünsche' erfüllt, immer noch viel besser ist als ein bloßer Gedanke—und sei es selbst ein bündischer Gedanke! Was für ein deutsches Schicksal ist es doch, das uns alles in einen Gedanken verwandeln läßt—selbst der Staat, diese größte aller Wirklichkeiten, wird in Deutschland zuletzt ersetzt durch den Staatsgedanken. Ein Staat entsteht nicht durch bloße Gedanken. . . . [E]r ist ein Erzeugnis von Kräften, und die Kraft, die ihn eigentlich konstituiert, ist diejenige, die in einem Bunde freier Männer hervortritt." Ibid., 32.
136. "Bei uns wendet der heroisch veranlagte Jüngling sich ab von der Gesellschaft; er sucht den gleichaltrigen und den älteren Freund, er sucht den Kameraden und den Führer, den Meister und das Vorbild, er sucht den Bund." Ibid., 37.
137. The new organization of the universities according to the principle of the *Führer* helped the form of *Männerbund* discourse through the National Socialist lecturers union to the National Socialist lecturers camp to achieve a new reality. From "an irrationally united community based on a reciprocal oath to loyalty" a "closed and goal oriented" political unity should emerge, as the rector of the University of Göttingen, the Germanist Friedrich Neumann demanded in August 1933. As quoted in Klaus von See, *Barbar, German, Arier. Die Suche nach der Identität der Deutschen* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1994), 334.
138. "Mann steht da neben Mann, Säule neben Säule: das ist die Schlachtreihe, das ist der Tempel, das ist das Heiligtum, das ist der Staat." Baeumler, *Männerbund und Wissenschaft*, 39.

Priesting like a Woman: A Phenomenology of Feminine Body in the Role of Episcopal Priest

IN THE PROLEGOMENON TO HER EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD of feminine embodiment, Iris Young notes that "[f]urther investigation into woman's bodily existence . . . must reflect on the modalities of a woman's experience of her body in its sexual being, as well as upon less task-oriented body activities."¹ Since the Episcopal Church began ordaining women to the priesthood in 1977, Young's "intuition that the general lack of confidence that [women] frequently have about [their] cognitive or leadership abilities" can be examined insofar as it relates to the experience of feminine bodies in their role as priests.

Women's experience of their bodies as sacred has been documented in the work of medieval women mystics, but not as it relates to women religious in the recent past, and especially not as it relates to women in the sacramental and leadership role of priest.² In my essay, I will build on Young's examination of feminine embodiment in order to illuminate the feminine body within the role of priest.

In her original essay, Young asks whether "the kind of task, and specifically whether it is a task or movement that is sex-typed, [has] some effect on the modalities of feminine bodily existence."³ I use Young's philosophical framework to focus more specifically on the tension that exists between a woman priest's understanding of her experience of body