

## 5 “How gay is Germany?”

### Homosexuality, politics, and racism in historical perspective

*Claudia Bruns*

In July 2004, the headline on the front page of *Bild*, Germany’s largest daily tabloid, posed the question “How gay is Germany?” (see Figure 5.1).<sup>1</sup> The article underneath was prompted by the fact that Guido Westerwelle (1961–2016), head of the Free Democratic Party (FDP) and the German Minister of Foreign Affairs between 2009 and 2013, had presented his partner at a reception in Berlin, a gesture with which he publicly acknowledged himself as homosexual.

In addition to Westerwelle, the article named the openly gay mayors of Berlin and Hamburg, as well as some gay comedians, to underline its message that homosexual men were more and more often becoming prominent representatives of the nation. The *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, an important daily newspaper in Germany, described the article as a silly story meant to fill the summer news lull – a *Sommerlochgeschichte* – but, nonetheless, took the trouble to respond to the question, asking, ironically, whether an entire country could be gay and mocking the tabloid’s sensationalistic style: “Quite formidable. So much, at least, is certain.”<sup>2</sup>

That response to the *Bild*’s puzzling connection between male sexual orientation and the German nation reveals that the article was more than just a way to get through the summer news slump. The article and the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*’s reaction to it reveal a certain unease that the alleged relationship arouses, a feeling that is difficult to understand. The vacillation between humor and seriousness in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*’s response to the tabloid’s suggestive question shows, in particular, how politically loaded and symbolic the relationship between the state and notions of normative sexuality and masculinity still is. A homosexual man in a political leadership role can be perceived as a threat to the masculinity of a state and a sign of its weakness (Heilmann 2011). The headline “How gay is Germany?” suggests that a few homosexuals in leading positions might be sufficient to change the character of a whole nation regarding its sexual preferences and by implication, its “normality,” its masculinity and health. The linkage between sexuality and the nation-state has a long tradition, one that leads us back to the nineteenth century and its discussions of gender, sexuality, nation, and race within the discourse on homosexuality. As I will briefly



Figure 5.1 "Wie schwul ist Deutschland?", *Bild*, July 22, 2004, p. 1

demonstrate at the end of this chapter, some of these discussions continue to affect public dialog today.

### The masculinity of the state and the discourse on (homo)sexuality

In Germany, as elsewhere in Europe, it was a common *topos* in the discursive system of the long nineteenth century that the state was an exclusively masculine domain (Dudink, Hagemann, and Tosh 2004; zur Nieden 2005a). The dominant gender regime of bourgeois society associated women with the private domestic field and men with the public sphere (Hausen 1977). In the German Empire, a strong, militarily powerful state was considered a sign of healthy and Germanic masculinity. By contrast, national degeneration was connected with sexually abnormal, racially deviant, and feminized men (Mehlmann 1998; Oosterhuis 2000; Schmersahl 1998). Thus, the political and social order of the German Empire was built on an unequal division of political and social privileges and rights between men and women and also necessitated a hierarchization of men and of different conceptions of masculinity (Brunotte & Herrn 2008; Bruns 2011a; Müller 1991). The preservation of social hierarchies in the German Empire was no longer legitimized

primarily through caste and corporate privileges but, rather, through biologically marked sexual and racial differences (Puschner 2001; Sigusch 2008; Weingart, Kroll, & Bayertz 1996).

Following the emergence of the social and biological sciences, sexuality became a dominant means of explaining social behavior. Contemporary social scientists used conceptions of sexuality not only to analyze the personality of the individual but also to predict and explain his or her biologically based, gender-coded (and racialized) ability to forge bonds with family and society. Increasingly, they explained the attachment of the individual to society, his or her productivity and usefulness, in terms of his or her sexuality (Bruns 2011b). Therefore, the debate in the German Empire over male homosexuality can be read as an illustration of the fundamentally biological explanation of the political-social order. That is to say, power struggles in the political sphere, for instance in parliamentary debates, were often framed as battles between different conceptions of masculinity and between the sexes (and races). This discourse was also visible in the sexual sciences and in social movements (Schmersahl 1998; zur Nieden 2005a; Bruns 2011b).

In the following, I examine connections between sexuality, gender, race, and social order in discourses on homosexuality in Germany around 1900. Although scholars have drawn *parallels* between discourses on sexual and racial difference and issues of intersectionality have increasingly become topics of theory,<sup>3</sup> German historiography has rarely explored the relationships between these discourses and their potentially reciprocal effects. Therefore, I am interested in interrogating how negotiations of homosexual identity shaped, and were shaped by, notions of race. Furthermore, I shall argue that the figure of the male homosexual was divided into good and bad, normal and abnormal, subjects according to a gendered hierarchy (between effeminate and masculine homosexuals), a division that was reinforced by racial characteristics that were ascribed to the effeminate homosexual.

### **Intersections of political discourses: (masculinist) homosexuality and race**

At the end of the nineteenth century, the discourse on sexual pathology became interwoven with an evolving discourse on degeneration. Physicians and sexologists tried to define the normality and abnormality of different patterns of sexual behavior that determined a person's biopolitical usefulness to society in general and the nation-state in particular (Foucault 1999, 276–305; Planert 2000).

The figure of the male homosexual, especially, challenged that notion of normal masculinity that was seen as a sign of a healthy race and a precondition for maintaining a strong nation-state. One of the first racial hygienists in Germany, Ernst Rüdin (1874–1952), argued that it did not matter whether a homosexual was sick or healthy since the only issue of relevance was whether he served “by and large the vital needs of the race” (Rüdin 1904a, 107). In

accord with the discursive logic of bio-politics, nothing less than the survival of the nation, or, in Rüdin's words, "the dying down of mankind or the defeat of one people (nation) against another," was at stake (ibid.).

At the turn of the century, a small but well-organized group of homosexual activists sought, in response to this discursive logic, to increase the perceived value of male–male relationships and break the connection that was believed to hold between homosexuality and racial degeneration. The group was affiliated with the Community of the Special Individuals (*Gemeinschaft der Eigenen*), which the writer and publisher Adolf Brand, together with Benedict Friedlaender and Wilhelm Jansen, founded in 1903 and which claimed to foster "the highest values of masculinity within the nation" and proclaimed a "joyful sense of masculinity – for the good and the progress of the state and the culture."<sup>4</sup> These masculinists stressed the special virility and cultural superiority of homoerotic friendships.<sup>5</sup> Their view stood in marked contrast to that of sexual reformers, such as the Berlin-based physician Magnus Hirschfeld. He was one of the founders of the *Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee* (Scientific-Humanitarian Committee) (WhK), which was founded in 1897, and he fought for the acceptance of male homosexuals by characterizing them as a "third sex," a feminine soul in a masculine body and vice versa for lesbians (Dose 2005; Herzer 2001; Wolff 1986). From the perspective of the masculinists, it was less important to fight for tolerance of their minority group than to advocate their way of life and to take pride in their masculinity, which they saw as important for the health of the German nation and race. By adopting arguments from racial and bio-political discourses and presenting themselves as the pinnacle of manhood, they challenged the dominant discourse, which characterized homosexuals as perverts and racial degenerates, and tried to integrate male–male sexuality into hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995; Connell & Messerschmitt 2005), but they thereby also modernized hegemonic structures that discriminated against women. They idealized a "male racially pure culture, as in Greek Sparta," while they regretted that "mankind was markedly getting feminized through contradictory racial instincts" (Mayer 1903, 57).

Other masculinist activists used the discourse on racial hygiene to defend male homosexuality against Rüdin's arguments. For example, the Berlin zoologist Benedict Friedlaender (1866–1908), who had agitated within the *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen* for a break with Hirschfeld, argued that homosexuals were indispensable for the survival and progress of the race. As bisexual men, they were able to start families and hold high positions in the state bureaucracy, and they could also build the sort of male–male relationships upon which the state depended. *The Renaissance of Eros Uranios*, as the title of Friedlaender's book proclaimed, would empower men to meet both their responsibility for biological reproduction and their patriotic duty to the nation, though, in his view, men's familial duties were less important than their contributions to the nation. "Same-sex love, as we understand it," he wrote,



“is therefore nearly identical with the social instinct itself” (Friedlaender 1904a, 215). Friedlaender thereby countered the assumption of the nascent racial-hygienist discourse that homosexuals were damaging to the “life process of the race” because they entirely “lacked the drive to preserve the species.”<sup>6</sup> He distinguished his “new man,” who had been created in an erotic renaissance, from men who were the product of excessive female influence. Thus, the construction of a new, nationwide homo-social male community was to be achieved through the complete rejection of women and femininity.

Friedlaender’s theory can be understood as a response to the social changes of his time. Around the turn of the century, women were challenging hegemonic masculinity with unprecedented success. They were gaining access to institutions of higher learning, founding women’s clubs and societies, entering the professions, and loudly voicing their emancipatory demands (Gerhard 1990; Planert 1998). The urgent need consequently felt by defenders of the patriarchal order to establish a new, clear social distinction between men and women gave socially and sexually marginalized men a strategic opportunity to reposition themselves in the discourse on hegemonic masculinity. Friedlaender sought to offer both a principled basis upon which to distinguish the sexes and a flexible norm governing male sexual identity. His vehemence in rejecting women’s emancipatory claims is symptomatic of his aims; “Nothing is so overwhelmingly stupid and such a great nonsense,” he wrote, “as the fanatic belief in gender equality, which is cultivated as the so called women’s question” (Friedlaender 1904a, 46, 74). He consigned women, as the “sexus sequior,” to the family, a primary social context (ibid., 269–271) that seemed to him uncivilized, disconnected, and primitive:

The sense for the family is one of the most primitive desires, shared with animals, that could only be praised by Gynaekocrats [men who want to be dominated by women]. Love between the two sexes or between parents is not the only kind of love; rather there is also a third type of love that is primarily social. It has nothing to do with procreation, but is the very foundation of the social principle. If one eliminated this third type of love, which exists between male adults, the state would disintegrate into a mass of individual families.

(Ibid., 213)

The accusation that homosexuals were causing national and racial degeneration was now directed against women: “A people under these influences [of women] must degenerate into an ochlocracy, a gynecocracy, a kleptocracy, and will lose the struggle between the nations. This is one of the few clearly discernible basic laws of the history of nations” (ibid., 278).

In 1912, Hans Blüher (1888–1955), a sexologist and popular chronicler of the *Wandervogel* youth movement who would later become a conservative revolutionary, began to build on Friedlaender’s masculinist views.<sup>7</sup> Expelled from the University of Berlin in 1916 without having completed his degree, Blüher

called himself a private scholar of the sexual sciences and published numerous psychoanalytic articles in Sigmund Freud’s and Hirschfeld’s journals. He also worked for a while as a lay analyst (Blüher 1920). Like Friedlander, Blüher argued, on the basis of Freud’s new psychoanalytical theories, that sexuality was the very foundation of the social. Specifically, he contended that a man’s suitability for political leadership was a function of the degree to which other men found him sexually attractive. Sexual relations between men, as Blüher put it in 1912, are not a pathological deviance from the norm but a manifestation of the biological power that makes a man a “zoon politicon” (a political animal) because it gives him the ability to connect homo-socially to other men (Blüher 1912, 70). His idea of a fundamentally homo-social, state-supporting *Männerbund* – literally, an “alliance of men” – was widely discussed in the first decades of the twentieth century (Geuter 1994, 114, 161–162, 171–185; Widdig 1992, 32, 54).

Also like Friedlaender, Blüher used anti-feminist arguments to break the perceived connection between racial degeneration and homosexuality. He argued that the “required appraisal of women as the sole objects of love and desire” was one-sided and possibly dangerous (Blüher 1912, 112f). Further, he wanted to refute “the former general opinion, which connects same-sex love with the racial question and especially with the decadent parts of the Jewish race” (Blüher 1913a, 20). Blüher stressed that, to the contrary, the homoerotic branch of the *Wandervogel* movement was virile and an “especially German entity” (ibid.). However, he encountered a number of difficulties. In 1913, he was accused of being a Jew (Schmidt 1968, 247f) and of representing Jewish ideas because he held to Freud’s psychoanalytic theory and was a member of Hirschfeld’s sexual reform movement. These accusations led him to stress his own racial purity and the racial purity of certain types of homosexuals (Bruns 2011a, 179–183).

### **The gender/race split within the homosexual: feminization versus masculinity**

In the years around 1910, the figure of the homosexual underwent a split. It was essentially a split along the lines of gender differences, but, as I shall show, it also involved categories drawn from racial discourse. In 1910, the three representatives of the burgeoning sexual sciences met to exchange ideas: Magnus Hirschfeld, a sexologist who fought for homosexual emancipation; Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis; and a member of the younger generation, Hans Blüher. Freud saw Blüher as a possible champion of the psychoanalytic movement and as someone who might bridge the increasing disagreements between the sexual-biological theories of Hirschfeld and the WhK, who defended a hereditary explanation of homosexuality, and psychoanalysts, who held that homosexuality had a social origin. In the course of their discussion over the degree to which homosexuality is healthy and normal, the three bifurcated the figure of the homosexual into the virile,

socially useful homosexual, on the one hand, and the neurotic and degenerate effeminate homosexual, on the other, though they disagreed over whether the effeminate male homosexual should be classified as racially deviant. Each integrated, in his characteristic way, the virile homosexual into the spectrum of normality, but this tended to exclude the effeminate gay man from the normal.

While Hirschfeld accepted the entire spectrum of homosexuality as non-deviant, Freud was not yet clear, in 1910, about his assessment of homosexuality. Five years before, in *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, he had claimed that “inverts” – the term Freud commonly used for homosexuals – were not to be classified as degenerates, for one could find virile individuals among them who “otherwise show no marked deviation from the normal” and whose “mental capacities are not disturbed, who on the contrary are distinguished by especially high intellectual development and ethical culture” (Freud 1938, 556; 2000a, 58). But in his article “Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood” (1910), Freud leaned toward the opinion that inversion was the result of an “individual inhibitor to development” [*individuelle Entwicklungshemmung*] (Freud 1989, 452; 2000b, 87–160). Though he did not believe that the cause of homosexual effeminacy was physiological, he did hypothesize that effeminate homosexuals suffered from a narcissistic over-identification with their mothers that inhibited the development of their masculinity. Homosexuals have a “very intensive erotic attachment to a female person, as a rule their mother,” who was, according to Freud, “frequently mannish” [*Mannweiber*]. These mothers were “women with energetic traits of character, who were able to push the father out of his proper place” (Freud 2000b, 125). According to Freud, because such a boy lacks a strong father he identifies with his mother. This identification with the mother causes a “regression” and “narcissism” (a kind of “autoeroticism”), which results in his inability to establish successful relationships, “for the boys whom he now loves as he grows up are after all only substitutive figures and revivals of himself in childhood” (*ibid.*). Thus, inversion became problematic for Freud when it stemmed from *feminine* identification. At the same time, though, Freud considered Blüher’s notion of a homoerotic male alliance (*Männerbund*) to be fundamental for higher cultural development, as I shall show in the following.

Blüher shared Freud’s stress on the cultural achievements of homosexuals, especially masculine homosexuals. And, contrary to Hirschfeld, he held that the “complete invert” [*Vollinvertierte*] could not be classified as effeminate on Hirschfeld’s scale of the intermediate degrees [*Zwischenstufen*] of homosexuality (Blüher 1912, 59). Blüher also believed that homosexuals could be just as happy as any other healthy human being. In July 1912, Blüher first distinguished three forms of homosexuality: “the latent [*latent*] one, ... the feminine ... and the normal in the Greek way [i.e. virile]” (Neubauer 1996, 142). He considered the first two of these to be pathological. According to Blüher, the latent and the feminine homosexual needed

society's pity and protection, while it must cultivate and foster the virile one. Questioning the credibility of Freud's judgment concerning male homosexuality, Blüher argued that Freud knew of only the pathological individuals who sought treatment. From his own experience in the youth movement, however, Blüher knew of heroic homosexual males who were happy and healthy.

Freud came closest to Blüher's position in 1912 and 1913. In his book *Totem and Taboo*, Freud sought to explain the history of mankind from its origins to his own time in terms of homoerotic male bonding. According to Freud, in prehistoric times, there was a powerful father who was killed by his sons. After the murder, the sons joined together (in a kind of male union or *Brüderclan*) and decided to avoid women in order to save "the organization that had made them strong and which was based upon homo-sexual feelings and activities," as Freud put it (Freud 1938, 917; 2000c, 426–428). According to him, the sons' homo-social feelings for one another were the first step in the development of civilization. Thus, Freud's theory came to incorporate Blüher's masculinist idea of a homoerotic male alliance (*Männerbund*). In fact, Freud had read the work of Blüher and other ethnographic literature prior to writing *Totem and Taboo*. In sum, then, Freud judged homosexual relationships positively when they were the result of identification with the father; it was only when caused by identification with the mother that homosexuality was problematic.<sup>8</sup>

Also in 1913, Blüher posited a closer relationship between the negative, feminized forms of inversion and racial degeneration. He associated *latent* homosexuality with "bad racial mixtures" and saw this form of inversion as a sign of "modern decadence" and "regression," something completely without cultural value (Blüher 1913b, 77–79). Hirschfeld protested his racializing of the effeminate homosexual in comparison to the masculine, but Blüher insisted, for nationalist and right-wing circles were now attacking him by (falsely) claiming he was a Jew and propounding Jewish theories. Displaying his own anti-Semitic worldview, he continued to stress the difference between the masculine hero and the effeminate homosexual [*invertierter Weibling*], claiming that the hero could be like a god to other men and that the cult of the hero stems from homoerotic desire, while an effeminate man was the result of Jewish-liberal degeneration. He further claimed that Jews possessed few of the qualities needed to build a nation because they suffered from a significant lack of homo-social structures [*Männerbundschwäche*] as a result of hypertrophied Jewish family relations (Blüher 1919, 170). As a man bound firmly to his family, the Jew became for Blüher the prototype of the effeminate male and thereby the proper target for the stigma theretofore ascribed to the homosexual. "The associative connection between maleness and Germanness," Blüher wrote in 1922, "and of the effeminate and servile with the Jewish is a direct intuition of the German people, one that becomes more certain day by day" (Blüher 1922, 49). After World War I, then, the signifier of failed masculinity in the masculinist discourse shifted from the effeminate, abnormal



homosexual man as described in Hirschfeld's theory of sexual gradations (*Zwischenstufentheorie*) to the Jewish man, who was of a "secondary race."<sup>9</sup>

## Conclusions

To conclude, the debates I have discussed show how the figure of the homosexual man was split on the basis of a gender dichotomy. Despite differences in the theoretical approaches of Hirschfeld, Freud, and Blüher, the three sexologists all agreed that the masculine homosexual was culturally more valuable than the effeminate one. Though Hirschfeld defended the effeminate homosexual, his theory also had anti-feminist implications. The gender binary functioned as a cultural marker that either normalized or made undesirable, enhanced or lowered the value of, certain identity constructions. To increase the perceived value of the masculine homosexual, the degradation of the effeminate one was accepted and even promoted.

This discourse also shows how debates about homosexuality were interwoven with racial discourses. The effeminate homosexual was not only categorized as narcissistic, mother-identified, pathological, and degenerate; he was also described with the colonial terms "backward" and "primitive." Specific concepts of race, gender roles, and sexual preferences corresponded to, and mutually reinforced, one another. More specifically, the category of race reinforced the gender gap that existed within the category of (homo)sexual identity. In Friedlaender's work, women and the reproductive realm of the family exemplified the "primitive." Repeating a long-established anti-Semitic trope that depicted Jewish men as effeminate, Blüher and his followers posited a close relationship between Jewishness and what they saw as the degenerate type of homosexuality. After World War I, this combination of homophobia and anti-Semitism became even more pronounced until the Jewish man was not only taken to exemplify the effeminate but came to symbolize a sort of gender undecidability disrupting the dualism of male and female that is crucial for maintaining heteronormativity and, by implication, for maintaining the vitality of the nation at large (Gilman 1991; Hödl 2007; Rohde 2005).

In the terms of racial-homosexual discourse, Blüher was struggling to disengage virile homosexuality from Jewishness. His statements to this effect were part of a general trend in German nationalist discourse to renew the German nation's masculine nature and reinstate its male-defined political order. This explains the appeal of Blüher's ideas, particularly in conservative circles. Inspired by Blüher's theories, some *völkisch* activists of the homosexual movement, including the young physician Karl-Günther Heimsoth (1899–1934), developed the ideal of an Aryan, homoerotic male leader and hero (Bruns & zur Nieden 2006; zur Nieden 2004; zur Nieden 2005a). Ernst Röhm (1887–1934), head of the National Socialist paramilitary (the SA), who openly praised homosexuality and practiced it with SA members, seemed to embody this ideal. Here is the beginning of the influential idea of the homosexual Nazi, which became more influential after World War II and is still

important (Zinn 1997; zur Nieden 2005b; Machtan 2001, 2002). The fact that Hitler was well informed about Röhm's sexual preference led masculinists in the early 1930s to assume, falsely, as it turned out, that the Nazi regime would tolerate male–male relationships if they exuded heroic, military masculinity. To the contrary, Röhm's arrest and his execution, together with numerous other SA functionaries during the Night of Long Knives in 1934, was the beginning of the persecution of homosexuality in Nazi Germany, which led to the murder of thousands of men in the 1930s and 1940s (Jellonnek 1990; Hancock 1998; Plant 1986). Contrary to the expectations of homosexuals sympathetic with right-wing politics, Hitler's justification for executing the SA's leaders was that the SA was a homoerotic alliance of men (*Männerbund*) conspiring against the state, a justification in terms of the still established and widely accepted discursive connection between sexual and political deviance.

The subtle interplay among discourses on race, gender, sex, and degeneration produced exclusions that stimulated the desire to be part of the so-called "Aryan body of the racialized nation" [*arischer Rassenkörper*]. It is important to note "that the denaturalization of one identity category is often achieved through a re-naturalization of another" (Somerville 2000, 175). Flexible homo-social desire among self-identified Aryan men was a form of denaturalizing the heterosexual norm, although it was instituted through the re-naturalization of women and Jews. This discourse was silent on female homosexuality, for it could not be reassessed in terms of its value to the state because the state identified itself exclusively with (homosexual or heterosexual) masculinity.

## Outlook

Some of these early twentieth-century discursive strategies are still being used in contemporary Germany. In order to disparage a male politician, critics often attribute feminine characteristics to him. And, because of the effeminacy often associated with his sexual orientation, a homosexual man in a leading political position seems to many to imply a weakening of the state. This homophobic trope was visible in 2000 on the cover of the German satirical magazine *Titanic*, which portrayed Guido Westerwelle, who was later the Foreign Minister, against the background of a crocheted tablecloth, thus associating him with the needlework usually associated with old-fashioned, elderly women (see Figure 5.2).

The cover's headline questions even more directly his gender identity by asking: "Free Democratic Party on the Rise: Will the next Chancellor be a Woman?" The male politician is called a woman, which devalues him. The cover also lampoons Westerwelle's often agitated and passionate speeches, visually articulated by his raised fist, and his cry, in the barely visible speech bubble, "Let's fist for freedom!" Westerwelle's plea for freedom, an important plank in his party's platform, is transformed into a call for gay sex, obviously to associate him with perversion and decay and devalue his political



Figure 5.2 *Titanic. Das endgültige Satiremagazin* No. 2, February 2009, p. 1

seriousness and perseverance. The identification of the two struggles shows how closely interconnected categories of gender, sexuality, and politics still are today and to what extent they rely on feminization, including the feminization of homosexuality, to undermine the other side in a political dispute.

We arrive at similar conclusions by examining the uses of homosexuality to criticize Russian politics. Thus, cartoons in the German media portray Vladimir Putin as a homosexual and also feminize him. Again, the cover of an issue of *Titanic* provides an example. It depicts Putin effeminately in tears over his re-election in March 2012 and asks, “How Gay is this Dictator?” Once again, then, feminization, homosexualization, and political critique go hand in hand. German demonstrators against anti-gay laws in Russia also use feminized images of Putin, depicting him as homosexual to express their criticism.

This nexus between discourses on homosexuality and those on national belonging remains a politically charged subject to this day. This became visible on the occasion of a public controversy that Judith Butler provoked in Berlin in June 2010, when she was to receive the Civil Courage Award [*Zivildcouragepreis*] of the CSD Berlin, Berlin’s LGBT(QI) pride association.

During the ceremony, at the very moment the award was being handed to her, she refused it, charging members of the CSD Berlin of unjustly accusing Germans with immigration backgrounds, and others from non-white communities, of homophobia. Her action created a fierce debate on racist attitudes in the LGBT(QI) movement. Jasbir Puar calls the phenomenon criticized by Butler "homo-nationalism," by which she means that some members of the gay emancipation movement profit from racialized discourses or justify the degradation of non-whites by arguing that they are not emancipated and have not adjusted to the liberal Enlightenment principles of Western nation-building, which in contemporary Germany are attributed to LGBT(QI) communities. According to Puar, "the woman question" now often appears alongside "the homosexual question." In the colonial period, a nation's answer to the question "[H]ow do you treat your women?" was, from the perspective of the colonizers, a determining factor of its capacity for sovereignty. Today, this question has been rephrased as "[H]ow well do you treat your homosexuals?" (Puar 2007, 139).

Berlin's LGBT(QI) movement seems to locate the homophobic Other all too easily outside of the white national community. This attitude resembles the attitude incorporated in the dominant discourse in Germany that ascribes patriarchal attitudes and anti-feminist behavior toward women to the Muslim (immigrant) man, and it reveals that certain colonial discourses, which we are used to thinking of as historical, can be used by queer people today to invest in a racialized construction of the nation as a white possession. Moral outrage and the fight for those same liberal Enlightenment principles on the part of the queer community can function simultaneously in at least two different ways: they can integrate homosexuals into the norm of the white, middle-class, nuclear family, and they can be a medium for representing white selves (Riggs 2006, xii).

Thus, the subtle interplay among discourses on sex, gender, and race still produces exclusions that this time entrench the need to be a part of the "(white) body of the nation." Ignoring these intersections risks fuelling the cycle of racist exclusions (Somerville 2005, 175).

## Notes

- 1 "Wie schwul ist Deutschland?", *Bild*, July 22, 2004, 1. See also "Wie homosexuell ist Deutschland?" *Welt am Sonntag*, July 11, 2004. [www.welt.de/print-wams/article113175/Wie-homosexuell-ist-Deutschland.html](http://www.welt.de/print-wams/article113175/Wie-homosexuell-ist-Deutschland.html) [Accessed February 28, 2016].
- 2 Bernd Graff, "Rätsel des Alltags. Wie Schröder ist der Kanzler? Wie Bild ist die Zeitung?", *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, July 22, 2004. [www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/2.220/raetsel-des-alltags-wie-schroeder-ist-der-kanzler-wie-bild-ist-die-zeitung-1.415589](http://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/2.220/raetsel-des-alltags-wie-schroeder-ist-der-kanzler-wie-bild-ist-die-zeitung-1.415589) [Accessed February 28, 2016].
- 3 Lutz et al. (2010); Kerner (2009); Klinger, Knapp, and Sauer (2007); Walgenbach et al. (2007); Knapp (2005). For the Anglosaxon context, see Hardy-Fanta (2006); McCall (2005); Crenshaw (1991); Stepan (1990).
- 4 Die Gemeinschaft der Eigenen, "Flugschrift für Sittenverbesserung u. Lebenskunst," [Advertisement] *Der Eigene. Ein Buch für Kunst und männliche Kultur* 6 (1906), n.p. [Appendix].



- 5 Bruns (2005); Keilson-Lauritz (1997); Hewitt (1996); Oosterhuis (1983).
- 6 See the controversy between the racial hygienist Ernst Rüdin and Friedlaender: Rüdin (1904a, 1904b); Friedlaender (1904b).
- 7 Blüher was both a member and the controversial chronicler of the *Wandervogel* movement in Berlin. Later, he was in contact with the *Herrenklub* of the conservative revolution around Heinrich von Gleichen. See Bruns (2004); Hergemöller (2000); Plashues (1999–2001); Breuer (2001, 256–258).
- 8 The academic literature discusses Freud's attitude toward male homosexuality controversially. Manfred Herzer, for example, comes to the conclusion, that Freud, after a phase of indifference, pathologized male homosexuality (Herzer 2001, 161). In contrast, Henry Abelove stresses Freud's liberal position toward homosexuality (Abelove 1993). Following Freud's oedipal status of homosexuality, analysts theorized a gendered split between identification and desire (Domenici and Lesser 2016). However, the gender bias within Freud's analysis of male homosexuality is barely mentioned. For a differentiated analysis of Freud's position toward female homosexuality, see Lesser and Schoenberg (2013).
- 9 In the 1920s, as Blüher drifted to the radical right politically, his interest shifted from emancipation, sexology, and aesthetics to religion, and he focused not on the homo-social *Männerbund* but on the religious bond between the "Aryan Jesus" and his disciples. See Blüher (1921, 1924, 1930, 1931a, 1931b).

## References

- Abelove, Henry. 1993. "Freud, Male Homosexuality and the Americans." In *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, eds. Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale and David M. Halperin, 381–396. London/New York: Routledge.
- Blüher, Hans. 1912. *Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen. Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis der sexuellen Inversion*, with a preface by Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld and an afterword by Hans Blüher. Berlin: Bernhard Weise Buchhandlung.
- . 1913a. "Studien über den perversen Charakter mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Inversion." *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse und Psychotherapie* 4, 1–2: 10–27.
- . 1913b. *Die drei Grundformen der sexuellen Inversion (Homosexualität). Eine sexologische Studie*. Leipzig: Max Spohr.
- . 1919. *Die Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen Gesellschaft*, vol. 2: *Eine Theorie der menschlichen Staatsbildung nach Wesen und Wert*. Jena: Diederichs.
- . 1920. *Werke und Tage*. Jena: Diederichs (expanded and revised version 1953).
- . 1921. *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth. Philosophische Grundlegung der Lehre und der Erscheinung Christi*. Prien: Kampmann & Schnabel.
- . 1922. *Secessio judaica. Philosophische Grundlegung der historischen Sicht des Judentums und der antisemitischen Bewegung*. Berlin: Weisse Ritter.
- . 1924. *Die deutsche Renaissance. Von einem Deutschen*. Prien: Kampmann & Schnabel.
- . 1930. *Deutscher Katechismus des Christentums*. Küstrin: Carl Adler.
- . 1931a. *Der Standort des Christentums in der lebendigen Welt*. Hamburg/Berlin: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt.
- . 1931b. *Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter*. Hamburg/Berlin: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt.
- Breuer, Stefan. 2001. *Ordnungen der Ungleichheit – die deutsche Rechte im Widerstreit ihrer Ideen, 1871–1945*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft.

- Brunotte, Ulrike and Rainer Herrn eds. 2008. *Männlichkeiten und Moderne. Geschlecht in den Wissenskulturen um 1900*. Bielefeld: Transcript (Gender Codes 3).
- Bruns, Claudia. 2011a. “Kontroversen zwischen Freud, Blüher und Hirschfeld. Zur Pathologisierung und Rassisierung des effeminierten Homosexuellen.” In *Dämonen, Vamps und Hysterikerinnen. Geschlechter- und Rassenfigurationen in Wissen, Medien und Alltag um 1900*, eds. Ulrike Auga, Claudia Bruns, Dorothea Dornhof and Gabriele Jähnert, 161–184. Bielefeld: Transcript (Gender Codes 13).
- . 2011b. “Politics of Eros: The German ‘Männerbund’ – Discourse between Antifeminism and Anti-Semitism at the Beginning of the 20th Century.” In *Masculinity, Senses, and Spirit in German, French and British Culture*, ed. Katherine Faull, 153–190. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- Bruns, Claudia and Susanne zur Nieden. 2004. *Politik des Eros. Der Männerbund in Wissenschaft, Politik und Jugendkultur 1880–1934*. Köln u.a.: Böhlau.
- . 2005. “The Politics of Masculinity in the Homosexual Discourse (1880 to 1920).” *German History. The Journal of the German History Society. Special Issue: Sexuality in Modern German History* 23, 3: 306–320.
- . 2006. “‘Und unsere germanische Art beruht bekanntlich zentnerschwer auf unserem Triebleben ...’ – Der arische Körper als Schauplatz von Deutungskämpfen bei Blüher, Heimsoth und Röhm.” In *Verkörperung – Entkörperung. Körperbilder und Körperpraxen im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Paula Diehl, 111–128. München: Fink.
- Connell, R. [Raewyn] W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Connell, R. [Raewyn] W. and James W. Messerschmitt. 2005. “Hegemonic Masculinity. Rethinking the Concept.” *Gender & Society* 19, 6: 829–859.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle W. 1991. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review* 43, 6: 1241–1299.
- Domenici, Thomas and Ronnie C. Lesser eds. 2016. *Disorienting Sexuality. Psychoanalytic Reappraisals of Sexual Identities*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Dose, Ralf. 2005. *Magnus Hirschfeld. Deutscher – Jude – Weltbürger*. Teetz: Hentrich & Hentrich 2005 (=Jüdische Miniaturen 15).
- Dudink, Stefan, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh eds. 2004. *Masculinities in Politics and War. Gendering Modern History*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1999. *In Verteidigung der Gesellschaft, Vorlesungen am Collège de France (1975–76)*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1938. *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*. Translated and edited by A. A. Brill. New York: Random House.
- . 2000a. “Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie [1905].” In *Studienausgabe* vol. 5, eds. Alexander Mitscherlich, Angela Richards and James Strachey, 37–146. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- . 2000b. “Eine Kindheitserinnerung des Leonardo da Vinci [1910].” In *Studienausgabe* vol. 10, eds. Alexander Mitscherlich, Angela Richards and James Strachey, 87–160. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- . 2000c. “Totem und Tabu (Einige Übereinstimmungen im Seelenleben der Wilden und der Neurotiker) [1912/13].” In *Studienausgabe* vol. 9, eds. Alexander Mitscherlich, Angela Richards and James Strachey, 287–444. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Friedlaender, Benedict. 1904a. *Die Renaissance des Eros Uranios*. Berlin: Renaissance.

- . 1904b. "Bemerkungen zu einem Artikel des Herrn Dr. Rüdin über die Rolle der Homosexuellen im Lebensprozeß der Rasse." *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* 1: 219–225.
- Gerhard, Ute. 1990. *Unerhört. Eine Geschichte der deutschen Frauenbewegung*. Unter Mitarbeit von Ulla Wischermann. Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Geuter, Ulfried. 1994. *Homosexualität in der deutschen Jugendbewegung. Jungenfreundschaften und Sexualität im Diskurs von Jugendbewegung, Psychoanalyse und Jugendpsychologie am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Gilman, Sander. 1991. *The Jew's Body*. New York: Routledge.
- Hancock, Eleanor. 1998. "'Only the Real, the True, the Masculine Held Its Value.' Ernst Röhm, Masculinity and Homosexuality." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 8, 4: 616–641.
- Hardy-Fanta, Carol ed. 2006. *Intersectionality and Politics. Recent Research on Gender, Race, and Political Representation in the United States*. Binghamton: Haworth.
- Hausen, Karin. 1977. "Die Polarisierung der 'Geschlechtscharaktere'. Eine Spiegelung der Dissoziation von Erwerbs- und Familienleben." In *Sozialgeschichte der Familie in der Neuzeit Europas*, ed. by Werner Conze, 363–393. Stuttgart: Klett Cotta.
- Heilmann, Andreas. 2011. *Normalität auf Bewährung. Outings in der Politik und die Konstruktion homosexueller Männlichkeit*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Hergemöller, Bernd-Ulrich. 2000. "Hans Blühers Männerwelten. Fragmente, Widersprüche, Perspektiven." *Invertito. Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Homosexualitäten* 2: 58–84.
- Herzer, Manfred. 2001. *Magnus Hirschfeld: Leben und Werk eines jüdischen, schwulen und sozialistischen Sexologen*, 2nd ed. Hamburg: MännerschwarmSkript-Verlag.
- Hewitt, Andrew. 1996. *Political Inversions. Homosexuality, Fascism, and the Modernist Imaginary*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hödl, Klaus. 2007. "Performative Beiträge zum Diskurs über den 'effeminierten Juden.'" In *Feminisierung der Kultur? Krisen der Männlichkeit und weibliche Avantgarde*, eds. Annette Runte and Eva Werth, 137–156. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann.
- Jellonnek, Burkhard. 1990. *Homosexuelle unter dem Hakenkreuz. Die Verfolgung von Homosexuellen im Dritten Reich*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Keilson-Lauritz, Marita. 1997. *Die Geschichte der eigenen Geschichte. Literatur und Literaturkritik in den Anfängen der Schwulenbewegung am Beispiel des Jahrbuchs für sexuelle Zwischenstufen und der Zeitschrift "Der Eigene"*. Berlin: Rosa Winkel (Homosexualität und Literatur 11).
- Kerner, Ina. 2009. *Differenzen und Macht. Zur Anatomie von Rassismus und Sexismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Klinger, Cornelia, Gudrun-Axeli Knapp and Birgit Sauer eds. 2007. *Achsen der Ungleichheit. Zum Verhältnis von Klasse, Geschlecht und Ethnizität*. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus.
- Knapp, Gudrun-Axeli. 2005. "'Intersectionality' – ein neues Paradigma feministischer Theorie? Zur transatlantischen Reise von 'Race, Class, Gender.'" *Feministische Studien* 23, 1: 68–81.
- Lesser Ronnie C. and Erica Schoenberg eds. 2013. *That Obscure Subject of Desire: Freud's Female Homosexual Revisited*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Lutz, Helma, Maria Teresa Herrera Vivar and Linda Supik. eds. 2010. *Fokus Intersektionalität. Bewegungen und Verortungen eines vielschichtigen Konzeptes*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

- Machtan, Lothar. 2001. *Hitlers Geheimnis. Das Doppelleben eines Diktators*. Berlin: Alexander Fest.
- . 2002. *The Hidden Hitler*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, Eduard. 1903. "Männliche Kultur. Ein Stück Zukunftsmusik." *Der Eigene. Ein Blatt für männliche Kultur, Kunst und Literatur*, 46–59.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs. Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30, 3: 1771–1800.
- Mehlmann, Sabine. 1998. "Das vergeschlechtlichte Individuum – Thesen zur historischen Genese des Konzepts von männlicher Geschlechtsidentität." In *Das Geschlecht der Moderne. Genealogie und Archäologie der Geschlechterdifferenz*, ed. Hannelore Bublitz, 95–118. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus.
- Müller, Klaus. 1991. "Aber in meinem Herzen sprach eine Stimme so laut." *Homosexuelle Autobiographien und medizinische Pathographien im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Rosa Winkel (Homosexualität und Literatur 4).
- Neubauer, John. 1996. "Sigmund Freud und Hans Blüher in bisher unveröffentlichten Briefen." *Psyche. Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse und ihre Anwendungen* 50, 2: 123–148.
- Oosterhuis, Harry. 1983. "Homosocial Resistance to Hirschfeld's Homosexual Putsch. The Gemeinschaft der Eigenen 1899–1914." In *Among Men, Among Women. Sociological and Historical Recognition of Homosocial Arrangements*, ed. Mattias Duyves, 305–321. Amsterdam: Universität Amsterdam.
- . 2000. *Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry and the Making of Sexual Identity*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Planert, Ute. 1998. *Antifeminismus im Kaiserreich. Diskurs, soziale Formation und politische Mentalität*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft 124).
- . 2000. "Der dreifache Körper des Volkes. Sexualität, Biopolitik und die Wissenschaften vom Leben." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 26, 4: 539–576.
- Plant, Richard. 1986. *The Pink Triangle: The Nazi War Against Homosexuals*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Plashues, Jürgen. 1999–2001. "Hans Blüher – Ein Leben zwischen Schwarz und Weiß." *Jahrbuch des Archivs der Deutschen Jugendbewegung* 19: 146–185.
- Puar, Jasbir K. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages. Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Puschner, Uwe. 2001. *Die völkische Bewegung im Wilhelminischen Kaiserreich. Sprache, Rasse, Religion*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Riggs, Damien W. 2006. *Priscilla (White) Queen of the Desert: Queer Rights/Race Privilege*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Rohde, Achim. 2005. "Der innere Orient. Orientalismus, Antisemitismus und Geschlecht." *Die Welt des Islams* 45, 3: 370–411.
- Rüdin, Ernst. 1904a. "Zur Rolle der Homosexuellen im Lebensprozess der Rasse." *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 1: 99–109.
- . 1904b. "Erwiderung auf vorstehenden Artikel Benedict Friedlaenders." *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 1: 226–228.
- Schmersahl, Katrin. 1998. *Medizin und Geschlecht. Zur Konstruktion der Kategorie Geschlecht im medizinischen Diskurs des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Opladen: Leske u. Budrich (Sozialwissenschaftliche Studien 36).
- Schmidt, Georg. 1968. "Nein, nein! Das ist nicht unser Wandervogel!" In *Wandervogelführerzeitung* 3 (February 1913), reprinted in *Die Wandervogelzeit. Quellenschriften zur deutschen Jugendbewegung 1896–1919*. Quellenschriften,



- ed. Werner Kindt, 247–248. Düsseldorf: Diederichs (Dokumentation der Jugendbewegung 2).
- Sigusch, Volkmar. 2008. *Die Geschichte der Sexualwissenschaft*. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus.
- Somerville, Sibhan B. 2000. *Queering the Color Line. Race and the Invention of Homosexuality in American Culture*. Durham, NC/London: Duke University Press.
- Stepan, Nancy Leys. 1990. "Race and Gender. The Role of Analogy in Science." In *Anatomy of Racism*, ed. David Theo Goldberg, 38–57. Minneapolis, MN/London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Walgenbach, Katharina, Gabriele Dietze, Lann Hornscheidt and Kerstin Palm eds. 2007. *Gender als interdependente Kategorie. Neue Perspektiven auf Intersektionalität, Diversität und Heterogenität*. Opladen/Farmington Hills: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Weingart, Peter, Jürgen Kroll and Kurt Bayertz. 1996. *Rasse, Blut und Gene. Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland*, 2nd ed. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Widdig, Bernd. 1992. *Männerbünde und Massen. Zur Krise männlicher Identität in der Literatur der Moderne*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Wolff, Charlotte. 1986. *Magnus Hirschfeld. A Portrait of a Pioneer in Sexology*. London/New York: Quartet Books.
- Zinn, Alexander. 1997. *Die soziale Konstruktion des homosexuellen Nationalsozialisten. Zu Genese und Etablierung eines Stereotyps*. Frankfurt am Main/New York: P. Lang.
- zur Nieden, Susanne. 2004. "Die 'männerheldische heroische Freundesliebe' bleibt 'dem Judengeiste fremd.' Antisemitismus und Maskulinität." In *Der Sexualreformer Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935). Ein Leben im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft, Politik und Geschichte*, eds. Elke Vera Kotowsky and Julius H. Schoeps, 329–342. Berlin: be.bra wissenschaft.
- ed. 2005a. *Homosexualität und Staatsräson. Männlichkeit, Homophobie und Politik in Deutschland 1900 bis 1945*. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus (Geschichte und Geschlechter 46).
- . 2005b. "Homophobie und Staatsräson." In *Homosexualität und Staatsräson. Männlichkeit, Homophobie und Politik in Deutschland 1900 bis 1945*, ed. Susanne zur Nieden, 17–51. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus (Geschichte und Geschlechter 46).