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 and 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" (associations), "Kreise" (circles), "Orden" (orders), "Selten" (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 Schutz (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, Schutz 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 Schutz declared men to be the point of departure for every higher cultural development.

From his observations of "primitive peoples" Schutz 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 (Hof) 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, Schutz 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, Schutz interpreted the male-dominated culture of Vereins (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 Volkerkunde (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, Schutz'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 achievement and was supported in Schurz's text by quotations from biological, psychological, and sociological discourses.

Schurz'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.” 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 Schurz that the Männerbund was fundamental to the founding of the state precisely because it stood in opposition to “family life”: “The Bond 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.”

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). Schurz 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.”

The reviews of contemporaries make it clear that Schurz'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 Schurz, like many bourgeois men, saw how a “threatening legion of women fighting for equality,” with “gruff views against the world of men,” 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

MANNERBUND 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 Wanderweg 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. 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 May as by the ideal of the “traveling scholar” and the “baccalante” of the Middle Ages.

Blüher, himself active in the Wanderweg in his youth, 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 Wanderweg.

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),” an uprising of the male youth against their fathers. As their own fathers had become “a miserable creature,” Blüher claimed that the youth had “had to look elsewhere” in their search for a “hero” and “male heroes.” 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 Wanderwegl 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 Wanderwegl 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 Wanderwegl. Geschichte einer Jugendbewegung, on the development of the Wanderwegl 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 Wanderwegl but also by the older, more reform-minded generation of pedagogues and head teachers.33 Who, in their youth, had not been outraged by "patrician phrases" and not felt a desire for a "freedom from chains"? asked Edmund Neuenstüff (1875–1961), teacher and federal leader of the Wanderwegl.34 The worship of the group leaders was quite accurately described in Blüher's work, 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 Wanderweglbewegung als erotisches Phänomen [The German Wanderwegl 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 Wanderwegl 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 Waisenhaus 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 zein politik, because it granted him the ability for social bonding. It was not the family that constituted the basis for the state, but rather the homocrotic 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 those who [achieved] the greatest numerical increase [in the Waisenhaus 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 criticos of civilization, of the modern isolation of the individual that had been reflected in the picture of the asocial homosexual. The homosexual or homosocial 42 man became a socializing factor in modern society, the social moment in an (an)-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 Grecians, 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 addresses, among them "several Prussian headmasters" and the parents of members of the Waisenhaus 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 Männerbind spread all the faster.41

For the most part, the young men of the Wanderweg 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.”42 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,43 many young men of the Wanderweg 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 Wanderweg, 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.”44 As also Ulfried Geuter shows, Blüher’s account of the Wanderweg had a lasting effect on the self-construction of the younger generation.45 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, inescapable and passionate self.

THE ANTIFEMINIST EFFECTS OF THE MÄNNERBIND 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”46 as the project of the masculinists might have been,47 contributed on the other hand to the justification of protofeministic 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 Wanderweg 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.48 The mere presence of men-loving “male heroes”—a term that Blüher borrowed from Gustav Jaeger49 — “protected” the Wanderweg movement from the danger of disbanding.50 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.51

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 feelings52 at the same time provided new strategies for an effective separation from the other sex. For example, one leader of the Wanderweg 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 Wanderweg.
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 Wanderwag and later historian of the movement, wrote in his diary about a "small group discussion" on Blüher that occurred on August 8, 1920: "Kron [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 Wanderwag.59

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.60 "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, solderly 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 Wanderreise 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.” 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 masculinization 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 Wanderreise into a philosophy of “intellectual” anti-feminism 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 Polygamy and Motherhood (Mehrzeh und Mutterschaft) (1919), thereby distancing himself demonstratively from bourgeois anti-feminism. According to him, the latter originated from “quite different thought positions” and fought “exclusively against feminism for—the woman.”

The fact that Blüher’s pamphlets on “intellectual anti-feminism” were unproblematically presented as accompaniments to the campaign organs of the society for anti-feminism shows that commonalities were more highly valued there as elsewhere than differences. 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. 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.

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. 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). 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 Frauenemancipation gradually disbanded. The Wanderreise movement now called itself the bundische 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 Wanderreise movement alone to the whole of society. In 1917 and 1918 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 cot. One side, including the well-known author Thomas Mann, sought him out to make him useful for the Republic, 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 sexology to religion and a metaphysics of eter can be discerned;
- Second, a stronger allegiance to hierarchically 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 extraparliamentary 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 materiallyistically fixated on the body and its functions and had left the central questions about the meaning and fate of human life unanswered. 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: 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. In old, serious, and awesome god, who knows no mercy.

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." 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."

In contrast to Freud's psychoanalysis, Blüher's theory of the Männerbund raised the "unconscious streams" of eros to the status of the "lot" and "fate" of humanity. Right in the prologue to the first volume of Règle 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, 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." 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." The family, as Blüher now suggested, could be a constitutive principle of the state, but no more. Its task was above all to guarantee the "survival of the species." It was completely unmystical, because here sexuality was able to emerge quite clearly.

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 mythical about it. 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. 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."

In societies in which the family structure dominate, the development of the class of "spiritual leaders" supposedly stagnated. Only the Männerbünde guaranteed social revolutions. 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. The Männerbund stood in "rigid opposition" to a "mixed society. For this reason it should take over the education of the male youth in the 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."\(^9\) 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.\(^9\) The woman supposedly remained chained to the material world, because she could never transcend the realm of pure eros, without giving up her femininity.\(^9\)

Only the man could unify eros and Logos in himself and combine feeling and understanding into a creative synthesis.\(^9\) 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."\(^9\) 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 Lebensphilosophic ideal of a spirit/body synthesis as a possibility for the "new man."

THE TURN TO STRUCTURES OF THE HIERARCHICAL LEADER (FUHRER) 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, 1893), 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."\(^9\)

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 (Fuhrer) 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."\(^9\) 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,\textsuperscript{100}—in the community cooperative of the Berlin pacifist and doctor Ernst Joël (1893–1929)\textsuperscript{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 Glienicke-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.\textsuperscript{102} Representives 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 corporative 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 konservative 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.\textsuperscript{103}

\textbf{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,\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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 telomorphic 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.”\textsuperscript{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, 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 against “the Jewish.” 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 Artistic 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.” The more explicitly Blüher aligned himself with the radical Konervative 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.

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. 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 Tschandale Jews who were especially inferior. 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.

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. 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.”

According to Blüher, the energy of male bonding among the Jews was directed toward the family and not toward the state. 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.”

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 bureaucracies, 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.”
Apercus

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. 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.”

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 mythical figure, just like ‘the eternal Jew.’”

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 Sezession 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.

Whereas women had the possibility, as marked “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” and not Jews belonged to the “newly born master race.” Accordingly, Blüher demanded that Jews “be denied promotion to the higher offices of state.” Already in 1922, Blüher considered the speeding up of the Jews’ departure from Germany, their Sezession Judaica, to be the central political goal of the Germans.

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. Baue (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. 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 (Volks) healthy.”

Gender conflict was considered by Baue 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.” In a symbolic analogy to military honors, the “Mother’s Cross” was placed alongside the “Knight’s Cross.” 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 preconditional, 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.”

Already in the 1920s there was a rapid increase in ideas and alliances focusing on the Bund, as Baeumler himself remarked. 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.”

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 bundisch 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 bundisch 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.

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." 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.

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 Baumeier into a readiness for self-surrender and a fantasy of fusion, which could become all the more ecstatic the stronger it could be 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." The desire for disimulation, 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.
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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." 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. 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." 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