

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Modern Languages Faculty Publications

Modern Languages

1-1-2013

Intersexes and Mixed Races: Visuality, Narrative, and "Bastard" Identity in Early Twentieth-Century Germany'

Kevin S. Amidon

Fort Hays State University, ksamidon@fhsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/mlng_facpubs

Recommended Citation

Amidon, K. S. (2013). Intersexes and Mixed Races: Visuality, Narrative, and "Bastard" Identity in Early Twentieth-Century Germany'. In D. A. Barnstone & T. O. Haakenson (Eds.), *Representations of German Identity* (pp. 103–127). Peter Lang AG.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Modern Languages at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Modern Languages Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

KEVIN S. AMIDON

Intersexes and Mixed Races: Visuality, Narrative, and “Bastard” Identity in Early Twentieth-Century Germany¹

609464abb7aaeb72fad4cad25cfc8e25
ebrary

The founding of the German Empire in 1871, and the resulting constellation of intra-European and colonial conflicts, generated a wide range of new concerns about the characteristics and determinants of “German-ness.” Scholars, politicians, medical authorities, legal professionals, and artists explored and debated standards of inclusion and exclusion as they propagated both intellectual and institutional ways to develop and maintain standards for what qualified as German. Wolf Lepenies argues that the result was a tenuous relationship between the newly state-defined German political sphere and the other fluid means of establishing the German-ness of those who inhabited the new state. “At times, it ... seemed as if the German state was a state without politics, that is, a state with vassals but without citizens. Yet it never aimed at being a state without culture.”² It thus often appeared that any self-defined German identity took a back seat to a range of intellectually and disciplinarily defined arguments for German-ness.³ The concept “culture,” encompassing the entire spectrum of the of the practical and abstract arts and sciences, marked the full scope of

609464
ebrary

- 1 The author wishes to thank Thomas O. Haakenson, Deborah Ascher Barnstone, Ralph M. Leck, David J. Prickett, Scott Spector, Michael Thomas Taylor, and Suzanne Zilber.
- 2 Wolf Lepenies, *The Seduction of Culture in German History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006) 15. See also: Celia Applegate and Pamela Potter, ed. *Music and German National Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002) 1–58.
- 3 Stanley Corngold, *The Fate of the Self: German Writers and French Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

609464abb7aaeb72fad4cad25cfc8e25
ebrary

definitions for German-ness. Issues wrestled with by commentators across the cultural continuum included ways to delimit the unclear boundaries of German-ness; the possibility that visual evidence might guide a universal determination of German identity; and the extent to which different identities needed to have their stories told through narratives that reflected the elaborate and multivalent history of each individual case.

Two German medical scientists prominent in the early decades of the twentieth century, Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935) and Eugen Fischer (1874–1967), approached the complex questions of the definition and determination of identity differently. Both scientists expanded and explored the techniques of visual analysis that could assist in the definition and delimitation of German-ness by revealing potential physiological determinants of German identity largely independent of fluid concepts of “culture.” Hirschfeld made sexual identity the focus of his work and explored extensively how narrative self-representation of identity could be made to relate to visual evidence generated through medical and scientific methods. Fischer explored the way race, and particularly a German race, could be defined but not through the construction of hypostasized categories to which individuals were simply ascribed. Rather, he focused on how racially linked traits manifested themselves in mixed-raced individuals to define which traits might be considered dominant, superior, or primary. During the late nineteenth century, Catholics, Jews, and socialists formed the most highly visible targets of exclusionary claims in the German political sphere.⁴ At the same time, bio-medical concepts, methods, and institutions were growing rapidly, and scholars and commentators increasingly applied standards of evidence, in particular visual evidence, to establish physiological, hereditary, or pathological norms for identity. Defining German-ness and German identity thus were necessary but problematic aspects of an emerging scientific visual culture in the second half of the nineteenth century. Hirschfeld and Fischer contributed centrally to this process by leading efforts to explore how the difficult boundary cases of

4 David Blackbourn, *A History of Germany 1780–1918: The Long Nineteenth Century*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003) 195–9, 216–19.

mixed, unclear, fluid, or hybrid sexual or racial identity could be brought into scientific, medical, national, and political categories in new ways largely through visual evidence and investigation.

Beginning in the 1860s, intense controversy about what scientific evidence was valid and persuasive erupted in the territories that would become unified Germany. The debates focused on how recently established scientific disciplines should use visual data. Two principle approaches arose which varied in how they applied visual elements to their ultimate epistemic goals. For some scientists, visual observation and evidence established the starting point for elaborate historical narratives of developmental and evolutionary change. Knowledge of identity often went beyond the visually immediate however. Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919) exemplifies this branch of thought. For other scientists, including the highly politically active Rudolf Virchow (1821–1902), biological knowledge generally remained closely and inherently linked to the diagnosis of immediately visual characteristics. The two modes of biological understanding, which can be called the “narrative-historical” and the “visual-diagnostic,” were not exclusive categories but represented an epistemic and discursive continuum upon which investigators located themselves. As they did so, scientists built competing institutions. Many were highly visually oriented, like museums, research expeditions, aquaria, research collections, and zoos. Others, like publishing projects, journals, and clinical institutions, were focused more in the discursive sphere. In every case, however, scientists used narrative history and visual diagnosis to expand and propagate their work.⁵ The new institutions and the discursive field not only contributed knowledge that could be used to explore questions of human identity but also played a central role in the construction of a scientifically supported German national and cultural identity.

5 Lynn K. Nyhart, *Modern Nature: The Rise of the Biological Perspective in Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009); H. Glenn Penny, *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

Two concepts emerged as central and mutually implicated markers of human identity in biomedical developments: sex and race.⁶ Sex and race appeared to many to be determinable through visual investigation and subsequent categorization. Nonetheless the behavioral correlates of sex and race, often understood as “sexuality” and “racial character,” raised challenging questions because they so often showed complex or ambiguous characteristics that resisted clear taxonomy. Could individuals show characteristics of multiple sexes or races? Because homosexuality and racial hybridity both seemed to indicate that this might be possible, homosexuality and racial hybridity became central points of reference and contestation in numerous approaches to German-ness.⁷ Homosexuality was troublesome because its manifestations were so difficult to relate to physiology and therefore seemed to call into question approaches to sex that limited the concept only to “male” or “female.”⁸ In particular, male homosexual behavior, a serious crime under the notorious Paragraph 175 of the German Imperial Penal Code, appeared to clash with prevailing understandings of masculinity. Mixed-race individuals raised questions about the primacy, dominance, or essential nature of “racial character.” Ambiguous sexuality and racial hybridity thus became the grounds for heavy social stigma in Germany.

In the first decades of the twentieth century, Hirschfeld and Fischer made research into the roots and consequences of hybrid identities their focus. Hirschfeld became the foremost researcher and advocate of homosexual individuals as members of a “third sex,” while Fischer made himself

- 6 Cynthia Eagle Russett, *Sexual Science: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989); Louise Michele Newman, *White Women's Rights: The Racial Origins of Feminism in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- 7 Hybridity was itself a strongly contested concept at the time. New forms of biological research, especially those focused on heredity, sought to explore it, particularly through new experimental methods in plant breeding. See: Staffan Müller-Wille and Hans-Jörg Rheinberger, ed. *Heredity Produced: At the Crossroads of Biology, Politics, and Culture, 1500–1870* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007).
- 8 Dagmar Herzog, *Sexuality in Europe: A Twentieth-Century History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) 37–41.

the leading empirical investigator of interracial human beings. Both became political figures, because their work addressed how the German national community itself could be defined and delimited. Their accomplishments eventually allowed both Hirschfeld and Fischer to become the leaders of major research institutions that explored human social and sexual activity. Hirschfeld directed his own *Institut für Sexualwissenschaft* [Institute for Sex Research] in Berlin's Tiergarten from 1919 until the early 1930s. Beginning in 1927 Fischer served as the founding director of the now-notorious *Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik* [Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics] (KWIA) in Berlin-Dahlem.⁹

While Hirschfeld and Fischer rarely cited each other's work and do not appear to have known one another personally, their intellectual worlds stood in constant contact. Late in his career, in 1930, Hirschfeld made this affinity visually manifest: an opening image accompanying the section of his five-volume *Geschlechtskunde* [Sex and Sexuality Studies] that describes research institutions on sex, reproduction, and heredity displays his institute's building below Fischer's KWIA. The image shows what the text describes as "the ... most important research institutes that were established after the world war in Berlin to study the laws of sexual attraction and reproduction."¹⁰ Despite the forthrightly acknowledged affinity, however, Hirschfeld and Fischer are remembered vastly differently: Hirschfeld as a strong advocate of justice and inclusion for homosexuals, and Fischer as a symbol of complicity with the exclusionary and violent ideological developments of the Nazi period. Vern Bullough calls Hirschfeld one of the "three giants of modern sex research in the first part of the twentieth century."¹¹ Sheila Faith Weiss, a scholar of German race hygiene and

9 Paul Weindling, *Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 430–9; Robert Proctor, *Racial Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988) 40–3.

10 Magnus Hirschfeld, *Geschlechtskunde*, vol. 4 (Stuttgart: Julius Püttman, 1930): 850–1.

11 Vern L. Bullough, *Sex in the Bedroom: A History of Sex Research* (New York: Basic Books, 1994) 60.

eugenics, dubs Fischer “the Devil’s first disciple,” for “there is very little evidence that Fischer or his colleagues thought long and hard about the consequences of placing their science at the service of the Third Reich.”¹² Despite contrasting reputations, together Hirschfeld’s and Fischer’s work delineates the political-institutional space in which scientific arguments about identity functioned in early twentieth-century Germany.

Hirschfeld and Fischer pursued new research particularly between 1900 and 1920 that could contribute to the central question: how visible must German identity be? Each also engaged with a specific area of innovation in bio-medical practice that appeared able to support both a large-scale research program and a notable career. Fischer explored racial hybridity in relation to the scientific investigation of heredity, a field that had grown rapidly around 1900 with the development of microscopic techniques that could observe both chromosomal change inside cells as well as the transmission and mixing of traits generally understood under the rubric “Mendel’s Laws.” Fischer particularly sought to use photographs of human subjects to reveal systematically the ways in which racial characteristics might manifest themselves in later generations. Hirschfeld sought to expand on the collection and analysis of elaborate individual narrative case histories with conflicted sexual identities, identities that manifested themselves visually in various physiological or behavioral ways. He often mixed textual and visual evidence freely, using interviews, clinical observations, questionnaires, photographs, drawings, and diagrams. Both Fischer and Hirschfeld therefore engaged with visual evidence but where Fischer’s practice of studying interracial individuals and populations retained the close visual correlations of diagnostic biomedicine, Hirschfeld’s investigations of homosexual and intersex individuals and groups tended to expand beyond the immediately visual into broader historical-narrative patterns of explanation. For both Hirschfeld and Fischer, the year 1908 became a significant turning point. Fischer began a research expedition to Africa that would cement his professional reputation and Hirschfeld became the

12 Sheila Faith Weiss, *The Nazi Symbiosis: Human Genetics and Politics in the Third Reich* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010) 72.

focus of great public interest and some derision because of his testimony as an expert witness in one of the great homosexual scandals of the day.

Hirschfeld always found both visual and narrative evidence useful. In the earlier stages of his career, case history technique superseded visual evidence. Later, he tended to rely more exclusively on the visual. The publication of Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia sexualis: eine Klinisch-Forensische Studie* [Sexual Psychopathy: A Clinical-Forensic Study] in 1890 and its subsequent success as a biomedical "best-seller" established the narrative case history as the primary means of medical and scientific access to the relationships between behavior, identity, and pathology.¹³ The fraught and still controversial field of psychoanalysis, with its focus on the invisible phenomena of the unconscious accessible through the process of a "talking cure," demonstrates particularly clearly how constructed narratives became central to scientific and scholarly practice at the time. For a few years around 1910, Hirschfeld was regularly in contact with Sigmund Freud and the growing psychoanalytic movement.¹⁴ Like Hirschfeld, Freud regularly analyzed individuals through a "talking cure" but also through an examination of their memoirs and other texts. The most famous case was his extensive monograph on the 1903 book *Denkwürdigkeiten eines Nervenkranken* [Memoirs of My Nervous Illness] by the judge Daniel Paul Schreber, who believed himself to be turning into a woman.¹⁵ Taking his lead from Freud, Hirschfeld chose to emphasize the behavior of homosexual and intersex individuals through narrative case studies in several of his most significant works published between 1903 and 1914. Hirschfeld did begin to explore the use of photography as evidence for his claims during this period but generally expanded visual material into case-study-based narratives and theoretical structures. David J. Prickett draws particular attention to Hirschfeld's early use of photography in *Geschlechts-Übergänge*

13 Harry Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000) 12, 16–17, 185, 220–30.

14 George Makari, *Revolution in Mind: The Creation of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Harper, 2008) 123, 298; Bullough, *Science in the Bedroom*, 148–50.

15 Eric L. Santner, *My Own Private Germany: Daniel Paul Schreber's Secret History of Modernity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997).

[Gender Crossings] to argue that “Hirschfeld is a product of modernity who seizes upon the photograph as visual verisimilitude.” The work includes several photographs of individuals with intersex characteristics. At the same time, Hirschfeld’s work shows “reliance on written *and* visual testimony of hermaphrodites and homosexuals.”¹⁶ This mixture of textual and visual elements characterized Hirschfeld’s work for the remainder of his career, including in his large multivolume works *Sexualpathologie* [Sexual Pathology] (see Figure 5.1). Beginning around 1914, new endocrinological methods and microscopic techniques induced Hirschfeld to consider more deeply how visual evidence for the characterization of homosexual and intersex individuals could serve his arguments about identity and pathology. He also reconsidered whether homosexuality should exclude individuals from German-ness.¹⁷

The greatest political scandal of the late *Kaiserreich* threw questions of sexual behavior and identity in Germany into high relief in the years 1907 and 1908.¹⁸ A long series of civil and criminal trials emerged from the journalist Maximilian Harden’s attempts to break up what he believed to be Kaiser Wilhelm II’s cabal of overly moderate and homosexual confidants.¹⁹ The central focus was the Kaiser’s personal friend and longtime

16 David J. Prickett, “Magnus Hirschfeld and the Photographic (Re)Invention of the ‘Third Sex,’” Gail Finney, ed., *Visual Culture in Twentieth-Century Germany: Text as Spectacle* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006): 103–19. Here 105–6; emphasis added.

17 On Hirschfeld’s admiration for Ernst Haeckel and Haeckel’s German Monist League see: Andreas Seeck, “Wilhelm Ostwald, Monistenbund, Energie und Sexualwissenschaft,” *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft* 22–3, 1996: 67–97.

18 Norman Domeier, *Der Eulenburg-Skandal: Eine politische Kulturgeschichte des Kaiserreichs* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008); Peter Winzen, *Das Ende der Kaiserherrlichkeit: Die Skandalprozesse um die homosexuellen Berater Wilhelms II. 1907–1909* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2010); Peter Jungblut, *Famose Kerle: Eulenburg – Eine wilhelminische Affäre* (Hamburg: MännerschwarmSkript, 2003).

19 Accusations of homosexuality also played a part in the 1902 Krupp scandal; Harden and Eulenburg even crossed rhetorical swords previously in the 1893 *Kladderadatsch* scandal. Domeier, *Der Eulenburg-Skandal*, 24–5.

confidant, Prince Phillip zu Eulenburg-Hertefeld (hereafter Eulenburg). Hirschfeld's growing reputation as a leading authority on homosexuality brought him directly into the so-called Harden-Eulenburg affair. The incident demonstrates how narrative forms of argument generally took precedence over the visual in his work at the time.

Hirschfeld was invited to testify as an expert witness in two of the civil trials of Kuno von Moltke (hereafter Moltke), trials that led up to a final, later case in which Eulenburg was charged with criminal homosexuality. Hirschfeld's first round of testimony came in a defamation suit brought in October 1907 against Harden by Moltke, the scion of a military family and close personal friend of Eulenburg. Importantly, Moltke was also the former Berlin military commander and personal adjutant of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Harden parodied Eulenburg and Moltke as lovebirds in a published caricature.²⁰ In order to adjudicate the case, the court had to make a determination about Moltke's sexuality and called as witnesses both Hirschfeld and Moltke's estranged wife. The latter testified about Moltke's behavior around other men. Hirschfeld's testimony was carefully modulated to bring attention to homosexuality without incriminating Moltke directly. He argued that Moltke had a homosexual orientation that was "not conscious to him."²¹ Harden was acquitted of defamation based on Hirschfeld's testimony; thus the invisible, unconscious factors driving behavior became legal proof of sexual identity.

An inherent tension in Hirschfeld's arguments soon became manifest, however: which was more important, visible behaviors or unconscious drives? German law required proof of homosexual behavior and largely ignored non-manifested and invisible motivation or inclination. Circumstances led the judge to vacate the verdict in Moltke's first trial and during the retrial, in December 1907, Moltke's wife was declared hysterical by medical experts, including two well-known investigators of sexuality:

- 20 James Steakley, *Die Freunde des Kaisers: Die Eulenburg-Affäre im Spiegel zeitgenössischer Karikaturen* (Hamburg: MännerschwarmSkript, 2004). Steakley reproduces dozens of the caricatures and includes a detailed narrative of the Eulenburg affair.
- 21 Winzen, *Das Ende der Kaiserherrlichkeit*, 139; Domeier, *Der Eulenburg-Skandal*, 168–9.

Albert Moll and Albert Eulenburg. Her testimony was thrown out as a result.²² Erwin Haeberle argues that the move for retrial was primarily the result of the increasingly anti-Semitic Prussian elite's dissatisfaction with the actions of both the converted Jew Harden and the practicing Jew Hirschfeld.²³ The retrial put Hirschfeld in a difficult position. If he stood by his testimony that Moltke was unconsciously homosexual when there was no sworn testimony about visible manifestations of his behavior, then the burden of proof was essentially on Hirschfeld to justify his claims.²⁴ The challenge was how to prove that homosexuality's status as a medical condition, and thereby an identity, could be read as a narrative in the language of both testifying witnesses and the suspect individuals themselves.²⁵ In the interests of his reputation, particularly in the face of the potentially anti-Semitic tendencies described by Haeberle, Hirschfeld thought better of making the salacious Moltke-Harden case the grounds for a public stand about his theories and practices. He therefore withdrew his expert opinion. Given the absence of proof of Moltke's homosexuality, Harden was convicted of defamation and was sentenced to four months in jail.²⁶ The last trial in the series, in June 1908, saw Eulenburg in a Berlin criminal courtroom facing charges of homosexuality. On 28 June the judge suspended the trial in deference to Eulenburg's precarious health. After protracted delays and deferments of his case, the Prince died in 1921 with no legal finding of fact.

The original motivation for the complex Harden-Eulenburg affair is itself constructed around conflicts over masculine and national identities in Germany at the end of the *Kaiserreich* [empire]. Harden was a rampant

22 Domeier, *Der Eulenburg-Skandal*, 269.

23 Erwin J. Haeberle, "Justitias zweischneidiges Schwert: Magnus Hirschfeld als Gutachter in der Eulenburg-Affäre," *Archiv für Sexualwissenschaft*, n.d., web, 11 June 2012.

24 Winzen, *Das Ende der Kaiserherrlichkeit*, 198.

25 Domeier, *Der Eulenburg-Skandal*, 168–9; compare also: Scott Spector, "Where Personal Fate Turns to Public Affair: Homosexual Scandal and Social Order in Vienna, 1900–1910," *Austrian History Yearbook* 38, 2007: 15–24.

26 Haeberle, "Justitias zweischneidiges Schwert," n.p.

German nationalist and supporter of Bismarck. He in fact claimed that it was Bismarck himself who had given him the first information about Eulenburg's alleged homosexuality. Harden apparently believed that the policies promoted by the allegedly homosexual cabal around Eulenburg were insufficiently supportive of an aggressively independent German foreign policy.²⁷ Harden's attacks on the men's sexual identities were therefore not just vicious attempts to destroy their social, political, and personal lives, but also a proxy for claims about how Germany should present itself in world affairs. Masculine identity, and in particular an aggressive masculinity marked clearly as German, stood at the center of the behavior considered appropriate among those charged with leading the German nation, its politics, and its military.²⁸

The Harden-Eulenburg affair can be seen, most broadly, as a major public relations battle in the fight over German identity. Harden's attacks on Eulenburg and his colleagues form a domestic correlative to the development of an early German masculine-military. By the early twentieth century, the view of German identity was rapidly shifting toward a highly confrontational, hardened, combat- and destruction-oriented masculinity. Male homosexuals were increasingly excluded from German-ness because they were generally marked as effeminate or weak and their masculinity was perceived as inadequate or compromised. Isabel Hull's study of the practices of the German military in colonial wars demonstrates that there was a continuous trajectory in the development of German military culture from the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1 through the First World War. German military culture had several features that contributed to an inner logic. The inner logic, furthermore, drove German military practice ever more in the direction of a symbolic vision of total order, a total order emerging from total victory over an utterly destroyed enemy.²⁹ Male homo-

27 Isabel V. Hull, *The Entourage of Kaiser Wilhelm II, 1888–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982) 109–45.

28 Claudia Bruns, "The Politics of Masculinity in the (Homo-)Sexual Discourse (1880–1920)," *German History* 23.3, 2005: 306–20.

29 Isabel V. Hull, *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005) 3, 57 fn. 55, 170.

sexuals, given their interest in intimacy with other men, did not fit such a model of masculinity through destruction. In Hull's reading, sexuality often remained a secondary but nevertheless important underlying issue. Yet in the Harden-Eulenburg controversy, sexuality erupted violently onto the surface of German politics and social life.

Hirschfeld's nuanced and troubled involvement in the Harden-Eulenburg affair further reveals the visibility and the invisibility of sexual identity as a central epistemic and legal question for Germany identity during the period. Hirschfeld's work was driven by a complex and labile set of personal and political investments. At the time of the Harden-Eulenburg affair he was already a widely published and controversial author. He was particularly well known for his theory of homosexuals as intersex forms, so called "Zwischenstufen," human beings that cannot be classified according to any simple male-female dimorphism. The colleagues with whom he founded the Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee [Scientific-Humanitarian Committee] in 1897 spoke forcefully for the repeal of Paragraph 175's criminalization of (male) homosexuality. Hirschfeld nonetheless remained pragmatically circumspect in many debates about whether homosexuality represented a natural pathological development or a dangerous phenomenon of unnatural degeneration.³⁰ Beginning in 1899 he edited the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* [Yearbook of Intermediate Sexual Forms], and in the first years of the twentieth century he published a number of significant tracts, both popular monographs and large academic articles, that elaborated on his theories and the ways that sexual behavior, particularly in urban settings like Berlin, revealed them. The most significant of these publications included *Ursachen und Wesen des Uranismus* [Causes and Character of Uranism (Male Homosexuality)], *Der uranische Mensch* [The Uranian (Male Homosexual) Person], and *Berlins drittes Geschlecht* [Berlin's Third Sex]. Soon after the Eulenburg scandal he published his three most famous monographs: *Die Transvestiten* [The Transvestites], *Naturgesetze der Liebe* [Natural Laws of Love], and

30 Volkmar Sigusch, *Geschichte der Sexualwissenschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008) 64–5.

Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes [The Homosexuality of Men and Women].

The case narratives contained in Hirschfeld's major works are often dozens of pages long and reveal the ways in which he sought to relate an emergent German identity to his still developing understanding of sexual and gender expression. He found particular fascination in individuals who chose to construct extensive narratives of their own sexual identities. His "Ursachen und Wesen des Uranismus," for example, contains numerous lengthy quotations from individual narratives as well as a thirty-four-page appendix entitled "life story of the Uranian [homosexual] worker S., as told in his own words."³¹ Hirschfeld's rhetoric in the text also regularly couches conclusions drawn from narrative representation in visual metaphor, such as "We see in this case" or "We thus see here," suggesting that the traits could be literally *seen* by readers.³² He interpretively concludes nine pages of narratives from homosexuals about their childhoods with the words "these true-to-life reflections, selected from a large number of similar ones, grant most valuable insight into the psychology of the Uranian [homosexual] child-soul."³³ Hirschfeld thus embeds his combination of visual-diagnostic interpretation and textual-narrative explication at the deepest level of his rhetoric.

Hirschfeld also wrote an epilogue to one of the most significant memoirs about sexual identity of his day, *Aus eines Mannes Mädchenjahren* [Memoirs of a Man's Maiden Years] by Karl Baer (1885–1956), who published the work under the pseudonym "N. O. Body" in 1907.³⁴ Baer had been assigned a female gender in childhood because although his cells were XY-chromosome, he had ambiguous genitalia. He eventually declared his gender identity as male. Visual surveillance forced his gender transition as well. Beginning in late adolescence he was regularly suspected by police

31 Magnus Hirschfeld, "Ursachen und Wesen des Uranismus," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 5, 1903: 1–193. Further references in this passage are parenthetical.

32 Ibid., 26, 31.

33 Ibid., 64.

34 N. O. Body [Karl Baer], *Memoirs of a Man's Maiden Years*, Deborah Simon, trans. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

of being a man dressed as a woman, which was a crime in many European jurisdictions.³⁵ Hirschfeld's summary of the case repeated the visual rhetoric he deployed in "Ursachen":

We see here how far-reaching conflicts may occur already in the souls of children, certainly an instructive example for our times in which we, unfortunately, have far too many occasions to read of suicides committed by schoolchildren and other tragedies involving children. ... We further see an absolutely classical example of the struggle between a congenital disposition and external influences, between the inherited and the acquired. We observe how, with elemental force, certain inner impulses break through barriers that education and environment have erected, and how in spite of everything, in the end it is the spirit that molds life.³⁶

Not only does this summary emphasize the links between the visual and the narrative but it prefigures Hirschfeld's testimony just months later during the Eulenburg affair by highlighting tensions between "inherited" traits, unconscious "disposition," conscious or "acquired" behavior, and observable "external influences."

Hirschfeld understood the strategies of sub-disciplinary conflict and appropriation only too well. He knew that if his arguments were to stick, they had to be capable of persuasively engaging with other areas of scholarly interest that laid claim to similar objects of study. The scholarly area that overlapped most significantly with Hirschfeld's sex research was eugenics, because it too focused on sex, sexuality, and reproduction. Eugenics also was often known in Germany under the slightly more specific term "race hygiene," or Rassenhygiene.³⁷ Hirschfeld preferred the Anglo-Greek term "Eugenik," coined originally by Francis Galton, rather than the Germanized "race hygiene." In 1913, at the time that Hirschfeld was working extensively

35 Sander L. Gilman, "Preface: Whose Body Is It Anyway?: Hermaphrodites, Gays, and Jews in N. O. Body's Germany," N. O. Body, *Memoirs of a Man's Maiden Years*, Deborah Simon, trans. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006) xvii.

36 Magnus Hirschfeld, "Epilogue," *Body, Memoirs*, 109.

37 *Rassenhygiene* is usually translated as "racial hygiene" (cf. Proctor, *Racial Hygiene*), but this author prefers "race hygiene" for its clearer connotation of "hygiene of/for the race" rather than "hygiene by/through means of race."

to expand his reputation, he, Max Marcuse, and Albert Eulenburg founded the *Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Sexualwissenschaft* [Medical Society for Sex Research]. They added “*und Eugenik*” to its name just months after its founding.³⁸ The organization did not become highly effective in its efforts to promote what the founders suggested were acceptable sexual and reproductive practices. Nonetheless Hirschfeld’s enthusiasm for the potential of positive eugenics accompanied the remainder of his career.

Particularly after the founding of the Institute for Sexual Science in 1919, as political and social pressure increased to define German identity more clearly in medical-scientific terms, Hirschfeld’s work branched out from its focus on narrative patterns to subsume the development of a more visual logic. Between 1916 and 1920 he published his three-volume textbook on *Sexualpathologie* (Sexual Pathology). The entire second volume treated “intermediate sexual forms.” During and after the First World War, Hirschfeld became particularly interested in the work of the Viennese physician Eugen Steinach, who experimented in the early 1920s with the transplantation of testes as therapy for homosexuality.³⁹ Steinach explored glandular explanations for the development of the intermediate sexual forms that Hirschfeld believed to be the basis for homosexual behavior. Such research led Hirschfeld to rely less on the complex narrative case studies; he increasingly came to believe that the etiology of homosexuality could in fact be made visible. When it appeared, *Geschlechtskunde* proved scientifically as well as publicly significant in debates over German identity. The entire fourth volume was filled with plates, drawings, and illustrations. An example from the volume demonstrates Hirschfeld’s forms of visual interpretation through representation (see Figure 5.1). In it, full-length photographs show three youths posed artfully to demonstrate what Hirschfeld calls “female pubic hair and female pelvic development in intersexual youths.” The photographs are stylized through classical allusions and vary widely in form. One youth, for example, looks into the camera, while the second

38 Sigusch, *Geschichte der Sexualwissenschaft*, 91–3.

39 Chandak Sengoopta, *The Most Secret Quintessence of Life: Sex, Glands, and Hormones, 1850–1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006) 75–82.

looks away from it; the third is represented from the rear. The various poses grant each photograph, despite the intended representation of physiological development, an individual quality in which the subject appears as a largely whole person, potentially loaded with emotion. The photographs Fischer used in his practice, described below, are quite different.

Hirschfeld's growing reliance on visual materials derived from two things: the increasingly central position such materials assumed in the medical field and the related broadening of Hirschfeld's focus beyond homosexuality. Medical researchers used photography, x-rays, and other optical means to create and disseminate evidence. The broadening of his focus however, did not prevent Hirschfeld from becoming the target of Nazi agitation and assaults even well before 1933. Not only was Hirschfeld a Jew, which explains the Nazi attacks to some extent, but his research also presented an inherently subversive understanding of key aspects of a supposedly racially and sexually pure German identity. Hirschfeld's nuanced and polyvalent understanding of the relationships between sexuality and German-ness was increasingly distinct from shifting forms of German masculinity that focused on violence, domination, and exclusion. He left Berlin for a world lecture tour in 1930, and never returned. After a raid by Nazi students, much of library of his Institute fed the flames at the Nazi book burning in Berlin's Opernplatz on May 10, 1933.

In contrast to Hirschfeld, Fischer was a medical anatomist primarily interested in racial anthropology. Fischer chose to make visual observation central to his work on racial hybridity before the First World War. He constructed arguments about how heredity revealed itself most reliably through visible traits that could be explained through Mendelian dominant-recessive models. Later, however, Fischer's work with the Genetic Health Courts mandated in Nazi law after 1933 reemphasized the significance of diachronic case histories in the construction of hereditary pathology. Fischer developed expertise in anthropological photography, a method that ostensibly allowed research subjects to be evaluated successfully and rigorously by scholars that were not in these research subjects' immediate

physical or geographic proximity.⁴⁰ The formal portrait of Fischer from his time as KWIA director shows precisely the core of his method in racial anthropology: he believed that the observation of photographic representations of research subjects made possible epistemic access to race, its characteristics, and its consequences.

Fischer's work sits squarely within the tradition of visual explication through photography of otherwise invisible human traits, a tradition reaching from Cesare Lombroso's biologicistic criminology of the 1870s to the forms of race theory that dominated Nazi-era social science in the early twentieth century. Examples of the tradition include textbooks developed in the early 1920s such as Hans F. K. Guenther's *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes* [Race Theory of the German People] and Fischer's own *Grundriß der menschlichen Erblchkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene* [Outlines of Human Inheritance Theory and Racial Hygiene], the latter of which was first published with collaborators Erwin Baur and Fritz Lenz in 1921.⁴¹ Fischer's methods embedded a history of his research subjects within a construction of their family trees. The result of this historically oriented investigation was not narrative text, but representation of relationships through symbolic schemas that appeared able to link the identities of individuals visibly to the characteristics of their ancestors.

Parallel to the legal endgame in the Harden-Eulenburg affair and the concomitant public and political concern over German-ness, Fischer was engaged in final preparations for the research expedition that would establish his academic reputation. On 22 July he departed from Hamburg on the steamer *Gertrud Woermann*, bound for the port of Swakopmund in German Southwest Africa, present day Namibia. He was intent on undertaking a thorough anthropological survey of a hybrid European-African population, centuries old, numbering several hundred individuals. The group lived in the region around the town of Rehoboth, south of

40 Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) 97–9, 164–85; Christopher Pinney, *Photography and Anthropology* (London: Reaktion Books, 2011).

41 Later editions published through 1940 bore the title *Menschliche Erblchkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene*.

Windhoek in the Namibian interior. The population was comprised of mixed-race descendants of Dutch immigrants and indigenous peoples in the South African Cape Colony who had left together for Namibia in the late nineteenth century. Fischer hypothesized that this population should have visible traits demonstrating the dominant-recessive hereditary patterns that had become central to biological inquiry after the rediscovery of Mendel's laws in 1900. Financed by the Prussian Academy of Sciences and the German Anthropological Society, Fischer executed his survey between August and October 1908. He extensively photographed 310 research subjects and took sufficient personal data from them to construct family trees of almost the entire population. His resulting monograph, *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem beim Menschen: Anthropologische und ethnographische Studien am Rehobother Bastardvolk in Deutsch-Südwest-Afrika* [The Rehoboth Bastards and the Bastardization Problem in Humans: Anthropological and Ethnographic Studies of the Rehoboth Bastard Peoples in German Southwest Africa] appeared in 1913. In it he claimed confirmation for his hypothesis that human physical traits do follow Mendelian hereditary patterns.⁴² The transmission of eleven key traits appeared to justify his conclusion: height, fat deposition, proportions of buttocks to limbs, head and facial size, eyelids, nose, lips, ears, skin, hair, and eye color.

Fischer's rhetoric in this work is largely descriptive and distinctly sober in tone. He does, however, reveal the priority of the visual in his method at key moments. The introductory passage to a section of his monograph in which he elaborates his conclusion that human racial traits follow Mendelian patterns, culminates in the following ringing answer to a visually framed rhetorical question: "Can one now, according to the current state of knowledge about heredity and the research into bastardization [Bastardierungslehre], create theoretically a picture [Bild] of what is to

42 Fischer used the German term *Bastard* to refer to interracial animals and humans. At the time *Hybrid* and *Bastard* were largely synonymous in German, though *Bastard* was used more commonly to refer to what were perceived as racial crossings in humans or animals (like dog breeds).

be expected anthropologically from this European-Hottentot mixture? Certainly.”⁴³ The photographs of research subjects included in the book, shown representatively, specifically emphasize the observable traits that Fischer believed to be significant among interracial individuals (see Figure 5.2). Each figure is carefully posed, reducing each subject to a face turned to emphasize certain characteristics. The subjects have blank expressions; Fischer wished them to appear as neutral as possible. They are therefore rendered through photographic technique into stereotypes of racial traits, evacuating their status as complex individuals.

In the early twentieth century, Fischer’s Rehoboth work was considered highly persuasive in debates about visible evidence related to German racial identity, which made him a major if controversial figure in bio-medically oriented anthropological research. For example, major American biologists, anthropologists, and eugenicists of the 1930s including W. E. Castle, Earnest Hooton, Herbert Spencer Jennings, and Otto Klineberg referenced his work regularly as the leading study of race crossing in humans.⁴⁴ After the rise of reliable techniques in classical genetics, and particularly after the synthesis of Darwinian evolutionary theory and classical genetics in the 1930s and 1940s, Fischer’s visually descriptive, largely non-statistical work rapidly lost credibility. The transition away from Fischer’s importance in anthropology reveals changing concerns about German identity as well. Fischer’s younger colleagues Fritz Lenz and Otmar von Verschuer developed his techniques extensively in the 1930s at the KWIA. In his attempt to dissociate genetic from environmental influences on development, and thus to distance his work from Fischer’s, Verschuer pioneered many new techniques in twin studies that broadened the source of his claims well beyond visually observable traits into physiological and cytological mark-

43 Eugen Fischer, *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem beim Menschen* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1913) 141.

44 W. E. Castle, *Genetics and Eugenics*, 4th edn (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932) 340; Earnest A. Hooton, *Twilight of Man* (New York: Putnam, 1939) 156–63; Herbert Spencer Jennings, *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* (New York: Norton, 1930) 280; Otto Klineberg, *Race Differences* (New York: Harper, 1935) 212, 216.

ers, including blood type, cellular structure, and pathology. His student Josef Mengele infamously misused some of these techniques at Auschwitz, while sharing data with Verschuer and the KWIA.⁴⁵ Yet Fischer's work continued to trouble, if not directly challenge, developing ideas about racial purity and Germany identity well beyond the early 1930s. His 1913 book was even reprinted in the early 1960s.

One later moment in Fischer's career further reveals how the issue of "bastardization" remained unsettling for those committed to discourses of racial purity, of a German identity that could not allow for admixture, hybridity, or multiplicity. Despite his prestigious position as director of the KWIA and his election in 1933 as rector of the University of Berlin, Fischer was attacked in the Nazi press as a proponent of "race-mixing" because the arguments made in his monograph on the Rehoboth population do seem to admit of a concept of "hybrid vigor" among human races (i.e., that populations of racial crossings in fact have a superior capability to adapt and flourish than do racially "pure" groups).⁴⁶ The strategy deployed by the Nazis was to coerce Fischer's unalloyed complicity with their goals: they were trying to get Fischer to limit his views and pronouncements on race to those entirely congruent with Nazi ideologies about "pure" German-ness. After the controversy, which did not cost him his position at the KWIA, Fischer redoubled his efforts to ingratiate himself into the Nazi hierarchy. He put the resources of the KWIA clearly into the service of the Nazis' Genetic Health Courts, and wrote many expert opinions about the "genetic health" of individuals who did not meet the Nazis' increasingly rigid standards for pure German-ness based on readily observable racial and sexual characteristics.⁴⁷

Between about 1890 and 1910, heredity became a dominant concept in many branches of biomedical science because it immediately demanded

45 Weiss, *The Nazi Symbiosis*, n.p.

46 Niels C. Löscher, *Rasse als Konstrukt: Leben und Werk Eugen Fischers* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997) 245.

47 Weiss, *The Nazi Symbiosis*, 101; See also Eric Ehrenreich, *The Nazi Ancestral Proof: Genealogy, Racial Science, and the Final Solution* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007).

elements of both visual-diagnostic and narrative-historical argumentation. Heredity therefore also held promise to reconcile the visual with the narrative. Research into heredity marked the pursuit of mechanisms, causes, and determinants of the forms of life in future generations and often focused on the predictive power of reproductive mechanisms and behaviors. Fischer's race science, and Hirschfeld's sex research stand together as sub-disciplinary emanations of a hereditarian argument.⁴⁸ Fischer's interest in heredity marked all of his major works beginning with his 1913 monograph on the Rehoboth population. In Hirschfeld's case heredity was not conceptually dominant but always accompanied his arguments significantly. Not only did he establish this most clearly with a twenty-one-page chapter entitled "Heredität und Homosexualität" [Heredity and Homosexuality] in *Ursachen und Wesen des Uranismus*, but he also remained fascinated with the potential of eugenics throughout the remainder of his career, working regularly with fellow sex researchers including Max Marcuse and Iwan Bloch who shared his interest.⁴⁹

Fischer's and Hirschfeld's activities were part of a complex matrix of scientific research into the characteristics that constituted the possibility of defining a pure Germany identity. The ultimate goal was to utilize that definition for eugenics and to direct the future development of the German population and nation. Yet German eugenics was a curiously heterodox phenomenon with a complex, contested history.⁵⁰ Many different figures advocated for a wide range of eugenic measures from across the spectrum of political and scientific opinion. Alfred Ploetz coined the concept Rassenhygiene to link eugenics to hygiene rhetorically; it was a specifically ideological move through which he sought to bridge medical, social, anthropological, and political interests. Ploetz and his colleagues who advocated race hygiene sought to subsume and then redirect medical and social hygiene into a future-oriented program for "racial improvement"

48 Hirschfeld, "Ursachen und Wesen des Uranismus," 138–59.

49 Sigusch, *Geschichte der Sexualwissenschaft*, 378–82.

50 A useful resource is Alison Bashford and Philippa Levine's *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

and resistance to “degeneration.” They sought new means to investigate, organize, and control behavior and reproduction, goals shared by both Hirschfeld and Fischer. Ploetz pursued a program for the maintenance of the *Tüchtigkeit unserer Rasse* [fitness of our race], as the title of his eponymous book makes clear. He and several colleagues established the German Society for Race Hygiene, a group whose work had direct implications for debates about German identity.⁵¹ But Ploetz was not alone: the work of the medical doctor and writer Wilhelm Schallmayer, who published three widely disseminated and prizewinning books on race hygiene, degeneration, and German national policy, represents the often-dissonant conceptual world of German race hygiene. He worked to advance Germany, its international standing, and its people, but nonetheless spoke and wrote vigorously against “scientific racists” like Vacher de Lapogue, Ludwig Woltmann, Otto Ammon, and Ludwig Wilser, whom he derisively called “the active apostles of modern racial ideology.”⁵² Schallmayer developed his arguments in his book *Beiträge zu einer Nationalbiologie* [Contributions to a National Biology]. By expanding the concept of hygiene in German eugenic thought, the sense that biology was a central factor determining identity both for the future of the nation and in its population, unified what can otherwise appear to be widely differing political positions. Fischer became an early contributor to Ploetz’s German Society for Race Hygiene, leading its Freiburg branch after 1910. Fischer, like Hirschfeld, tended to prefer the term “Eugenik” to “Rassenhygiene” because the former term had greater

609464abb7aaeb72fad4cad25cfc8e25
ebrary

international resonance. Fischer’s and Hirschfeld’s work on eugenics in relation to the racial and sexual aspects of Germany identity, respectively, occurred within a German scientific climate that was itself undergoing significant transition. Scholars engaged in race biology and sex research sought to subsume each other’s subfields discursively, epistemologically, or institutionally. The

51 Weindling, *Health, Race, and German Politics*, 123–5, 141–7; Proctor, *Racial Hygiene*, 17.

52 Sheila Faith Weiss, *Race Hygiene and National Efficiency: The Eugenics of Wilhelm Schallmayer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987) 91, 99.

most dramatic attempt came in the journal of the German Society for Race Hygiene, the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* [Archive for the Biology of Race and Society] (hereafter *ARGB*).⁵³ The controversy demonstrated the centrality of constructions of German identity in the development of sub-disciplinary forms and contexts. In the very first issue of the *ARGB*, in 1904, the psychiatrist Ernst Rüdin unambiguously appropriated for the field of racial hygiene the endlessly controversial aspect of sexual behavior that had motivated much of the investigation and advocacy of sexual scientists: homosexuality. In an article entitled “Zur Rolle der Homosexuellen im Lebensprozeß der Rasse” [On the Role of Homosexuals in the Life Process of the Race], he demanded that homosexuality be treated as a biological issue. Rüdin felt homosexuality should be seen not as an individual issue for medical or psychiatric investigation or therapy but rather as a social problem derived from hereditary degeneration that damaged the reproductive capacities of the “race.” He bemoaned what he perceived to be a “waste of reproductive material,” argued that homosexuality undermined the “fighting nature” of human beings, and vigorously attacked Hirschfeld’s arguments that homosexuality was not evidence of degeneration. In Rüdin’s efforts to appropriate authority over sexual behavior for racial hygiene, he even went so far as to argue counter-intuitively that the legal ban on homosexuality in Germany should be repealed because homosexuals would “die out” if legal obstacles that might encourage homosexual activity were removed.

Rüdin’s appropriation of homosexuality for the *ARGB* turned out to be surprisingly successful. For well over a decade, research articles and commentary about the issue appeared regularly in the journal. Leading figures in racial hygiene, sexual science, and general biological research weighed in on its pages about the determinants and forms of same-sex sexual behavior. Rüdin’s article stimulated a rebuttal in the second issue of the *ARGB* by Benedict Friedlaender (1866–1908), a scholar associated with Hirschfeld’s Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, but who did not

53 The following material is based partially on: Kevin S. Amidon, “Sex on the Brain: The Rise and Fall of German Sexual Science.” *Endeavour* 32.2, 2008: 64–9.

accept Hirschfeld's theory of homosexual intersexes. Friedlaender argued that homosexuality was a form of "physiological friendship." His rebuttal was accompanied, in typical *ARGB* fashion, by a further response from Rüdin. Five years later, in 1909, the race theorist Otto Ammon, prompted in part by Alfred Ploetz, stimulated a major controversy among the advocates of racial hygiene with an article about evolution, homosexuality, and masturbation. Ammon's article provoked a series of energetic responses from Rüdin and August Forel, both of whom supported Ammon's claims about homosexuality as evidence of degeneration but disagreed with his arguments that masturbation was the primary cause of homosexuality. These contributions collectively reveal that sexual activity had become central to a discussion of race purity and German identity by the early decades of the twentieth century.

The later articles on homosexuality in the *ARGB* give evidence of the rapidly increasing status of experimental investigations of heredity in the life sciences after 1900. The investigations informed Fischer's and Hirschfeld's work and their contributions to discussions about German identity. In 1912, Fritz Lenz produced an article on the heredity of sex-linked traits and pathologies. While his focus was the hereditary nature of disease, he concluded, echoing the misogynistic Viennese philosopher Otto Weininger (1880–1903), that "there is an idioplasmatic [germ cell-generated] correlation between 'sex and character.'" He also argued that the "Nordic race" demonstrates the strongest sexual dimorphism, a conclusion that had direct implications for the scientific debates about the "purity" of German identity. Lenz's work participated in the *ARGB*'s discursive construction of homosexuality, which he confirmed in a snide footnote by suggesting that homosexuality was a practice for "those who wish to be less than whole men." Finally, in 1916, Richard Goldschmidt, recently appointed director of the Department of Genetics at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Biology in Berlin, extensively revisited the literature on homosexuality in light of the problem of intersex forms. Goldschmidt had developed a general theory of hereditary sex determination through his experimental work on the gypsy moth *Lymantria dispar*, a species in which intersexes do appear. He concluded with overt reference to the work on homosexuality pursued by sexual scientists including Hirschfeld

that human intersexes exist. Goldschmidt also argued that “genetic” sex did not need to correspond to “gonadal” sex. He thereby dramatically reformulated and restated Hirschfeld’s arguments that visible sexual traits or characteristics do not need to bear a relationship to sexual behavior or identity, a restatement with significant implications for the concept of a distinctly heterosexual, racially pure German identity. Goldschmidt later retreated from this strong position about human intersexes, but his 1916 intervention retained its resonance in sex research at least until the political shifts upended the discursive relationship between sex research and race hygiene after 1933.⁵⁴

Hirschfeld and Fischer both achieved substantial institutional, scholarly, and publishing success that made them persuasive leaders in the debates over the role of race and sex in constituting a distinctly German identity in the early twentieth century. They stand together in the early twentieth century as subtly but strongly linked constituents in the development of biomedical arguments about human evolution, development, and behavior. Heredity was the abstract concept that guided and enabled their research, through which sexual practices and race hygiene revealed a tense, troubled dialectic of authority mediated through visual data and narratives. Yet it is their differently elaborated but equally significant interests in eugenics that link their concerns at the deepest level. Their research contributed to the development of scientific visual culture in ways that helped define contemporary notions of German-ness, thereby playing a significant role in the creation of a scientifically informed German identity. Their contrasting but parallel legacies are part of a common visual cultural history of German identity even today.

- 54 Michael Dietrich, “Of Moths and Men: The Persistence of Richard Goldschmidt’s Theory of Homosexuality,” *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences* 22, 2000: 219–47; Florian Mildenerger, “Ein Zoologe auf Irrwegen – Richard B. Goldschmidt (1878–1958) als Sexualforscher und seine Rezeption im Dritten Reich,” *Sudhoffs Archiv* 85.1, 2001: 64–81.