

## Race, Gender, and Religious Fundamentalism

---

*Debates between Christians  
and Jews at the End of the Weimar Republic*

*The Case of Hans Blüher  
and Hans-Joachim Schoeps<sup>1</sup>*

CLAUDIA BRUNS

In history, debates about Christianity and Judaism did not take place on the religious level alone. In early twentieth-century Germany in particular, interreligious controversies were tightly intertwined with gender and racist discourses. In this article, I want to elaborate on the question whether racist elements in Christian-Jewish dialogue can be read as signs of fundamentalist tendencies, that is, to what extent a connection exists between fundamentalism, racism, and gender. We might suspect that by no means *every form* of fundamentalism contains or must contain racist elements, but that all racism appearing in the guise of religious discourse has the effect of increasing its fundamentalist nature. Perhaps that is why it is so difficult nowadays to speak of fundamentalist movements without falling into fundamentalist patterns of argumentation themselves. Racist presuppositions slip quickly

1. Translated from German by Pamela Selwyn.

into discussions of the religious Other. Racist and religious discourses not infrequently enter into an "unholy alliance." The sociologist of religion Martin Riesebrodt recently and convincingly referred to Samuel Huntington's argumentation about the "clash of civilizations" as in itself fundamentalist. According to Huntington, religions exist in diametrical opposition to one another in homogenized spaces along an East-West schema; this plays down the tensions *within* a given religion and turns those between different religions into insurmountable barriers, thereby introducing cultural racism into religious discourse.

It is no accident that Huntington's bestseller brings up associations of Spengler's early twentieth-century *Untergang des Abendlandes* (*Decline of the West*, 1918/22), since he regards himself as a modern-day disciple of Spengler.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, the public controversies over the role of Islam in Germany that have attracted so much media attention recall debates during the Weimar Republic in which the relationship between Jews and Christians was discussed as a "national question." Then as now, the treatment of religious affiliation was simultaneously a debate on the racialized and gendered collective identity of the German nation.

In the following, I would like to examine the religious disputation between a Jew and a Christian, both of whom experienced a strong personal turn toward religion during the era of the Weimar Republic and had roots in the German youth movement.<sup>3</sup> One of them speaks of a veritable "conversion" to Christianity, the other of rediscovering his Jewish roots. However, one of them, Hans Blüher (1888–1955), evolved into an anti-Semitic Protestant, while Hans-Joachim Schoeps (1909–1980), twenty years his junior and a Prussian conservative, was soon referred to in reviews as a "revelationist Jewish theologian," although German-Jewish religious philosopher and historian would be a more fitting description.<sup>4</sup> Based on the debate between the two men, which was published in 1933 under the title *Streit um Israel* (Dispute over Israel) (Blüher/Schoeps), I will show in this article how deeply the categories of race, gender, and national community had penetrated religious

2. Hempel, "Schoeps."

3. Ibid.; Schoeps, *Ja—nein—und trotzdem*; Bruns, "Eros, Macht und Männlichkeit."

4. Kroll, "Wider den Zeitgeist"; Hillerbrand, "Schoeps"; Faber, "Deutschbewusstes Judentum." For Blüher's biography, see Bruns, "Politics of Eros"; Hergemöller, "Blüher's Männerwelten."

discourse at the end of the Weimar Republic and how they enforced its fundamentalist tendencies.<sup>5</sup>

It is remarkable that the entire discussion between Schoeps and Blüher revolves around religious derivations of community from "blood" and the male "seed." That one *is* a Jew by virtue of birth, blood, and seed, but *becomes* a Christian by virtue of baptism is at the center of concern. Membership in a collective seems at once so shaken and yet so highly desirable that it becomes an obsession explicable only on the highest metaphysical and existential plane. At this moment in history, religious and national political discourses were becoming ever more tightly intertwined.

At the same time, the positions in the disputation (particularly Blüher's) exhibit fundamentalist traits. This is particularly apparent if we follow Riesebrodt's view that fundamentalisms are characterized by a radical critique of certain manifestations of modernity (social critique) and juxtaposed with the model of an ideal social order, as well as rooted in an interpretation of the present in the light of the history of salvation.<sup>6</sup> Blüher, at least, was also concerned with a particular approach to the "truth" of the Holy Scripture. This truth was ascertainable not by historical-critical methods but solely through a special cognitive process accessible only to a small, select group. In addition, Blüher and Schoeps regarded themselves as religious laymen who nevertheless felt called upon to speak in the name of and to radically renew their religions, whose official institutions and representatives had failed. The two also speak from an elitist position typical of fundamentalist approaches, convinced of belonging, respectively, to the "legalist remnant" or the "primary race" that could assert a sole claim to the truth.

We would nevertheless be justified in asking whether their dispute was not better categorized as an aspect of "religious-nationalist movements," which are distinguished in the literature from genuine fundamentalisms. Juergensmeyer characterizes religious-nationalist movements as politically oriented and fixated in particular on ethnic or national differences, which applies in the case discussed here. The reli-

5. See also Lease, "Wer war hier Christ"; Lease, *Odd fellows*.

6. Riesebrodt, "Fundamentalismus," 19; see also LeVine, "What Is Fundamentalism"; Heilman, "Jews and Fundamentalism"; Ingber, "Fundamentalismus im Judentum"; Armstrong, *Im Kampf für Gott*; Antoun, *Understanding Fundamentalism*; Kienzler, *Der religiöse Fundamentalismus*.

gious regulation of ways of life is generally less central. While religious fundamentalism allows for conversion, ethnic-nationalist movements do not.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the lines between fundamentalism and religious nationalism are fluid, and hybrid forms are frequent, so that the case presented in this essay may reveal such a hybrid form, since religious argumentation is actually in the foreground here.

Scholars have also debated whether fundamentalism, especially in its religious-nationalist variant, is not primarily a *political* reaction to social and economic changes that has only coincidentally assumed a religious form. Riesebrodt rightly considers this to be a "fundamental misjudgment,"<sup>8</sup> since religion is more than mere outer appearance. Religion decisively shapes the fundamentalist milieu by playing a key role in determining its identity formation, its expectations of solidarity, and its political interests. The kind of discourse in which political questions are discussed also makes a significant difference: whether the questions of membership in a religiously, nationally or gender-coded collective are treated and transported in a partisan political, scientific, or religious discourse is *not* unimportant, because each of these discourses has a logic of its own and provides and structures the framework for potential negotiation processes.

### The New Religious Movements and the Case of Blüher and Schoeps

I would like to start by returning to our case study and its two protagonists for a closer look. Riesebrodt has suggested that fundamentalism arises from the "dynamic of new group and class formation in the context of social restructuring processes. Changes that people experience as dramatic cast doubt on traditions and no longer allow traditionalists to take them for granted."<sup>9</sup> This applies in particular to the period of the Weimar Republic. As enthusiastically as they had entered World War I, Germans found themselves severely disillusioned by the final defeat of 1918. The experience of hardship and death, destruction and hunger, and the ultimate tally of some seventeen million dead, 9.7 million of them

7. Riesebrodt, "Fundamentalismus," 21.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*, 19.

soldiers, including nearly two million (young) men from Germany, gave an undreamt-of boost to religious and metaphysical questions.

In 1921, Richard Heinrich Grützmacher (1876–1956), professor of Protestant theology in Erlangen, noted, "In our present day, religion has regained relevance for the formation of a worldview."<sup>10</sup> Religiosity outside the churches became more differentiated and individualized. At the same time, a wide variety of religious associations, groups, and leagues emerged.<sup>11</sup> In the *völkisch* or racist-nationalist milieu alone some seventy different religious organizations existed between 1890 and 1945.<sup>12</sup> Some of these groupings were strongly Christian-oriented (for instance the so-called German Christians), while others understood themselves as "neopagan" and rejected all things Christian. Many, such as the Monistenbund or "Union of Monists," sought a synthesis between modern scholarship and religion and worked towards a syncretism of science and faith.<sup>13</sup>

Grützmacher counted Hans Blüher among the "critics and re-creators of religion in the twentieth century" alongside the religious philosophers Heinrich Scholz (1884–1956), Max Scheler (1874–1928), and the professor of Protestant church history Albert Hauck (1845–1918), as well as the philosopher of life and culture Count Hermann von Keyserling (1880–1946), philosopher Leopold Ziegler (1881–1958), author Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855–1927), and the anthroposophist Rudolf Steiner (1861–1925). Blüher's positions on religious philosophy represented a "particular type of religious critique and re-creation of religion at the beginning of the twentieth century" and were thus worthy of closer attention.<sup>14</sup> While sharply criticizing his ahistorical biblical exegesis, Grützmacher nevertheless believed Blüher's positions to be typical of the "modern era" and expected that he "would surely

10. Grützmacher, *Kritiker und Neuschöpfer*, 3; Bertz, "Jüdische Renaissance"; Kläcker, "Erneuerungsbewegungen."

11. Linse, "Säkularisierung," 120. Many of these movements were anti-modernist and ambivalent in their effects. Schieder also observes that the nineteenth century is "characterized less by a dramatic decline in religion" than by an "increase in religiosity outside the churches" (Schieder, "Sozialgeschichte," 18).

12. Cancik and Puschner, *Antisemitismus*; Schnurbein and Ulbricht, *Völkische Religion*; Nanko, *Glaubensbewegung*; Schnurbein, *Religion*.

13. Linse, "Säkularisierung"; Hering, "Säkularisierung, Entkirchlichung"; Figl, "Säkularisierung und Fundamentalismus."

14. Grützmacher, *Kritiker und Neuschöpfer*, 44. For a more detailed analysis of Blüher's religious racism, see Bruns, "Die 'metaphysische Pathologie' des Juden."

prove popular among the broad mass of the reading public, especially those with no knowledge of Greek." Presumably, wrote Grützmacher, most would acknowledge "this 'laying of foundations' as a result of scholarship."<sup>15</sup>

In fact, a series of enthusiastic reviews shows that Blüher's religious writings, including the disputation with Schoeps, met with a lively and surprisingly positive response. Writing from the perspective of 1922, Keyserling saw a connection between his publications and the new religious awakening and messianic expectations that followed the war.<sup>16</sup> After all, at this time, Blüher also moved in the circles of the highest church dignitaries surrounding the exiled Kaiser Wilhelm who were still dreaming of his return to the throne and the resacralization of Prussia.

Alongside the search for religious meaning, tough political conflicts were also being fought out between right and left. While the Revolution enjoyed initial successes and the workers' and soldiers' councils gained political power, on the other side of the divide new, extraparliamentary forms of political organization oriented toward the soldierly ideal also emerged. These included the newly formed youth leagues on both the left and the right. From the remnants of the prewar *Wandervogel* youth movement arose the more tightly and hierarchically organized *Bündische Jugendbewegung* of the Weimar Republic, which now also separated boys and girls and racialized religious groups from one another.<sup>17</sup> The exclusion of Jewish youths, who then organized groups of their own, had already occurred before the First World War.<sup>18</sup> As part of the *Freideutscher Werkbund*, Schoeps was one of fewer than two hundred fifty unbaptized Jewish members of the youth movement.<sup>19</sup> This development notwithstanding, Jewish and Christian young people experienced many of the upheavals in similar ways. Both groups sought the roots of their own religion and spawned movements of religious renewal and self-styled awakening that were also supported by young people and spread in the life-reform milieu. Both groups experienced conflicts between renewal and tradition as well as fundamentalist at-

15. Grützmacher, *Kritiker und Neuschöpfer*, 44.

16. Keyserling, *Das Erbe*.

17. Bruns, *Politik des Eros*; Bruns, "Politics of Eros."

18. Winnecken, *Ein Fall von Antisemitismus*; Bruns, *Politik des Eros*, 373-86.

19. Rheins, "Deutscher Vortrupp," 209.

tempts at a "conservative revolution."<sup>20</sup> Both engaged in a search for new means of claiming origins and roots that incorporated a modernized reinvention of traditions.

Hans Blüher was one of these young conservative revolutionaries. He had belonged to the *Wandervogel* movement and enjoyed great success and a wide public response as the author of writings on the foundations of the movement in homoeroticism and male bonding. At the beginning of the Weimar Republic, Blüher subscribed to the doctrine of Jesus Christ's *arete* and elite kingdom, which was reserved for the few and the best.<sup>21</sup>

Woven into this new reading of the New Testament was a turn from gender to racial discourse. While before the war distancing himself from women's emancipation had been a central objective for the anti-feminist Blüher, the "women's question" now appeared to have been largely "resolved." The war had clearly restored the soldierly virtues of masculinity and thus of gender difference, so that women's emancipation was at first no longer perceived as a central threat.

Blüher thus stated in his monograph *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth* (The Arete of Jesus of Nazareth, 1921) that "Nature has given man the guarantee that he will not someday feel overrun by his female sexual characteristics; the primary race, however, has no guarantee of being spared secondary racial events. That is why the situation of mankind as a whole is a desperate one."<sup>22</sup> The dominant anti-feminist gender discourse had been transferred unnoticed into a racial discourse with anti-Semitic implications, which at the same time promoted a hierarchical class structure—one headed by the "intellectual aristocracy" of the educated middle class. According to Blüher, the bipolar split in humanity now ran along the lines of primary and secondary "races." To Blüher's dismay, "racial difference" was harder to pin down to biological than to cultural and religious traits.<sup>23</sup> No good or bad behavior would be of any

20. Breuer, *Ordnungen*; Mohler, *Die konservative Revolution*.

21. Bruns, "Die 'metaphysische Pathologie' des Juden."

22. Blüher, *Die Aristie*, 42; Kläber, "Blüher's Christologie"; Matthias, "Blüher und das Christentum."

23. Blüher, *Die Aristie*, 52. The notion of "race" was indeed not a clearly biological one, but from the beginning of racism was imbued with cultural categories. See Weingart et al., *Rasse, Blut und Gene*, 91–103, 230–32. "As difficult as it is today to disentangle the two original races of mankind in a precise *biological* sense—too much

use to human beings, but only "a new act of creation by Nature." There was no route to the kingdom of heaven other than "natural belonging." According to Blüher's interpretation of the Bible, "all of mankind is called but . . . they are fooled, for only few are chosen."<sup>24</sup> The redemptive turning point is like an "organ that functions only in the primary race."<sup>25</sup> Many would have to disappear to bring forth a new race, that of the "Son of Man."<sup>26</sup> In Blüher's assessment, humanity was engaged in "a losing battle." The creation of the human species was a big "mistake" of nature "until the coming of the Son of Man."<sup>27</sup> Only the "primary race" still had the right to live. The great majority of the "secondary race" was inferior and dangerous, for the "primary race" often fell "victim to the bared teeth of the secondary."<sup>28</sup> He sought to derive this basic idea from the Gospel of John and the Apocrypha.

For Blüher, Jesus became the central figure in a properly understood Christianity. Johannes Weiss's (1863–1914) "consistent eschatology" and Albert Schweitzer's (1875–1965) "research on Jesus" had confirmed him in this.<sup>29</sup> The focus was no longer on Jesus the historical person—liberal theology had abdicated its authority—but on his myth, the "eschatological line" in the life of Jesus, which would restore his grandeur.<sup>30</sup>

Associated with this was the shift from a psychoanalytic and (homo)sexological discourse on male bonding to one rooted in re-

mixing has already occurred—their disparate nature becomes absolutely clear if their essence is projected onto the spiritual (*geistige*) dimension" (Blüher, *Die Aristie*, 40; emphasis added). Here Blüher could refer to the well-known positions of the French anti-Semite Count Joseph Arthur de Gobineau, who attributed what he saw as the severe decline in the nobility of mankind to racial mixing. See Zerger, *Was ist Rassismus*, 36–39.

24. Blüher, *Die Aristie*, 141.

25. *Ibid.*, 57.

26. *Ibid.*, 80.

27. *Ibid.*, 19. "All the other species of animal are successful in building their nests and dens. They do well in all their undertakings . . . only human beings have to fight with constant experiences of failure . . . is it possible that nature may have made a mistake in creating human beings . . . at least until the coming of the Son of Man?" (*ibid.*, 12).

28. *Ibid.*, 59. "The human species is the most brutal and the worst of all creatures. It is split into two races that misunderstand each other and diverge wildly, and the best specimens of the whole type succumb to melancholy" (*ibid.*, 183).

29. *Ibid.*, 117.

30. *Ibid.*, 119.



ligious studies. And yet one can trace analogies and interferences in the patterns of argumentation and exclusion, which are similar in the two discourses. While anti-feminism revolved around the exclusion of women from the arena of political representation, Blüher's religiously-based anti-Semitism sought to exclude Jews from positions in the state and military and thus from control over the national community, which was defined as genuinely "German Germanic."

Hans-Joachim Schoeps (1909–1980) became acquainted with Blüher's works on male bonding and later his religious writings in the context of the youth movement, which he enthusiastically joined in 1923 at the age of fourteen. Schoeps came from a family of German Jews loyal to the Kaiser who felt more drawn to Prussian tradition than the Jewish religion.<sup>31</sup> His father, who worked as a general practitioner in Berlin, had gained honors and medals as a military doctor during the First World War. Schoeps himself describes how he gradually "grew into" Judaism (especially after meeting Eberhard Beyer—a student of Karl Holl, professor of church history and Lutheranism—in 1926) despite the religious indifference of his parents, which he attributed to his "basically conservative instincts."<sup>32</sup> He felt repelled by nineteenth-century liberalism and believed that "Jewish beliefs needed to be completely reconceptualized."<sup>33</sup> For a time, while part of the Freideutsche Jugend (Free German Youth) movement, he was associated with a group of new religious Protestants. During his time as a student at the University of Heidelberg in 1928, Schoeps was accepted as a member of the more hierarchically-organized *bündisch* youth movement, Deutsche Akademische Freischar, became the *Bundesführer* of the Freideutsche Kameradschaft (F. K.) a year later, and was attracted to the burgeoning movement of the Conservative Revolution as well as the Prussian monarchy.<sup>34</sup> The emphasis of the F. K. was on "spiritual tasks" and the search for a new *Volkstum* within an authoritarian state, drawing from divergent conservative spokesmen such as Wilhelm Dilthey, Martin Heidegger, Rudolf Bultmann, Carl Schmitt, Othmar Spann, and

31. Schoeps, *Rückblicke*, 72.

32. *Ibid.*, 71; Rheins, "Deutscher Vortrupp," 209.

33. Schoeps, *Rückblicke*, 73.

34. Faber, *Deutschbewusstes Judentum*, 103–5; Lease, "Wer war hier Christ" 223.

Wilhelm Stapel, among others.<sup>35</sup> On 26 February 1933, less than four weeks after Hitler's appointment as chancellor of the *Reich*, Schoeps founded the Deutscher Vortrupp, Gefolgschaft deutscher Juden (D. V.), hoping to reaffirm Jewish participation in the movement of "national regeneration" by creating a separate Jewish youth movement founded upon strict nationalist principles.<sup>36</sup>

Schoeps's commitment to a conservative revolution was accompanied by his interpretation of Judaism, which gave his subsequent political attitudes a particular thrust.<sup>37</sup> Through his contact with Beyer, Schoeps learned more about Protestant approaches to religious questions, so that he became interested in his own (Jewish) heritage and aimed to integrate the two components into his thinking. He began to study the Jewish philosopher Salomon Ludwig Steinheim (1789–1866), whose anti-rationalist approach set him apart from both liberal and Orthodox Jewish thinkers of his era—an isolated position with which Schoeps identified. He decided to study religion at the University of Leipzig with Joachim Wach, completed his doctoral dissertation in 1931 on the topic of the history of modern Jewish religious philosophy (*Geschichte der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie in der Neuzeit*), and published his first major theological monograph, *Jüdischer Glaube in dieser Zeit*. Here he tried to "point the way towards a thorough reorientation of Jewish religious thought" using methods and addressing problems raised by Søren Kierkegaard and Karl Barth and was attacked by both Jewish liberals and Zionists in Germany.<sup>38</sup> Trying to develop a system of religious belief from an anti-Zionist perspective that would allow Jewish youth to remain loyal to both their German "fatherland" and their Jewish heritage, he aimed to demonstrate the compatibility between Judaism and German Protestantism.<sup>39</sup>

Around this time, Schoeps penned a first scathing critique of Blüher's religious anti-Semitic writings<sup>40</sup> in the newspaper of the Central-Verein, a German-Jewish organization dedicated to combat-

35. Schoeps, *Ja—nein—und trotzdem*, 82.

36. Rheins, "Deutscher Vortrupp" 207–8.

37. *Ibid.*, 210.

38. *Ibid.*, 211.

39. *Ibid.*, 212.

40. Schoeps was referring in particular to Blüher's recent (1931) publication: Blüher, *Die Erhebung Israels*.

ing anti-Semitism.<sup>41</sup> Blüher thereupon challenged Schoeps, who was twenty years his junior, to a disputation in which their positions would alternate in longer essays. Written in 1932, these essays were published in the book *Streit um Israel* (Dispute over Israel) and appeared under the imprint of Blüher's regular publishing house, the conservative Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt. A few months after its appearance in 1933, it was withdrawn from the market by the publishing house itself. After the Nazi Party (NSDAP) came to power in March, the publication of a religious dispute between a Christian and a Jew, and particularly a Jewish author, was obviously no longer viewed as opportune. Nevertheless, it elicited a substantial response together with Blüher's recently published *Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter* (Israel's Revolt against the Goods of Christianity, 1931).

### "Dispute over Israel"

#### 1. *The Fundamentalist Conservative Revolution as a Modern Movement with an Anti-Modernist Thrust*

Schoeps and Blüher certainly had some things in common, which is perhaps the reason why they entered into a debate in the first place. Both came from the youth movement and wrote enthusiastically about homoerotic male bonding; both belonged to the "conservative revolutionary" camp in politics and were dedicated to Prussia and the monarchy "by the grace of God." A further commonality was their rejection of the Enlightenment, liberalism, and above all Bolshevism, but also relativism, egalitarianism, and pluralism. Based on their basic religious stance, both of them were dedicated to resacralizing a world pushed to the brink by the Enlightenment and democracy. According to Blüher, even modern natural science and sexology had been ruined: "the best scientific descriptions of external processes" remained "utterly obscure" and could "only be illuminated by the concealed and nameless reconnection (*religio*), which the researcher's inner being has to the things he is studying."<sup>42</sup> Darwin's theories were ultimately also only a "purely

41. Schoeps, "Soll Homosexualität strafbar bleiben."

42. Blüher, *Die Aristie*, 55-56.

metaphysical myth" and "no more 'scientific' than the sentence 'And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds.'"<sup>43</sup>

Such religiously justified resistance to certain transformations of the modern age is quite typical of fundamentalist currents.<sup>44</sup> Usually, they have recourse to premodern traditions that are purportedly immune to enlightened emancipation processes. Following Riesebrodt, we could speak of a reinterpretation of tradition, which is often not merely reformed but also radicalized and even revolutionized.<sup>45</sup> At the same time, an "exact" return to allegedly eternally valid, sacred principles, commandments, or laws is supposed to help overcome the crisis.<sup>46</sup>

It also becomes clear, however, that the objective is not a return to the Middle Ages but rather a mixture of the selective acceptance and rejection of modern institutions and ideologies. The biblical dictum that only "few are chosen" is translated into a modern "theory of two races," which had not previously been a genuine element of the biblical Christian tradition. It is quite typical of fundamentalists to borrow from other ideologies, in this case nationalism or fascism, and to seek not merely to overcome the modern natural sciences but also to reconcile science and religion.<sup>47</sup> To that extent, we can describe fundamentalism as a deeply modern movement with an anti-modernist thrust. Its strong resemblance to the extraparliamentary movement of the Conservative Revolution is no accident.

## 2. *The Function of Blood and Gender in the Model of an Ideal Order*

Blüher and Schoeps's shared objective was to save the world by creating a religiously-based elite. Schoeps speaks of a small "legalist remnant," distinct both from the Zionists and the mass of apostate liberal Jews—and certainly from Jews like Freud, Marx, and Trotsky, whom he personally considered "demonic." Blüher, in contrast, put his faith in the few elect men of the "primary race," who alone were destined to succeed Jesus and establish his "kingdom." While for Schoeps an act, the observance of laws,

43. *Ibid.*, 76.

44. Prutsch, *Fundamentalismus*, 59.

45. Riesebrodt, "Fundamentalismus," 19.

46. *Ibid.*, 18.

47. *Ibid.*, 20.

marked the difference between the groups of Jews, whether an individual belonged to the inferior mass or the elect few was for Blüher determined by fate and scarcely subject to influence. The Christian religion should ultimately be understood not legalistically but mystically. According to Blüher, there was no freedom to choose the good.

Here, too, Blüher brings racial predisposition into play. Thus he believed that the North Germans had especially good racial prerequisites for accepting and internalizing Christ's message. The Jews, in contrast, were *per se* incapable of accepting Christ's doctrine of salvation. The divine plan for salvation, which was also tantamount to a great apocalypse, had chosen a different fate for Jews. They were condemned to play the role of the Anti-Christ and to embody the eternal adversaries of Christendom. Only the Jewish religion could have spawned the idea that revelation is consistent with human reason, because Judaism posited a "relationship of compensation" between man and God. Freud, Marx, and Trotsky were the tip of the iceberg and ultimately "demonic powers." In light of the corruption and forsakenness of the world, Blüher implies that one day, in a distant, paradisiacal epoch, the separation of the races could be overcome, since the split of humanity into two races was ultimately the world's great drama and disaster. After an apocalyptic end, at some point only the "best" would exist, and all others would have disappeared.

Such a coherent interpretation of the world with a dualist-Manichaean worldview is characteristic of fundamentalist movements.<sup>48</sup> Bassam Tibi speaks of an "eschatological drama" in which the fundamentalists see themselves as warriors of light itself.<sup>49</sup> In the existential struggle between divine and satanic powers, compromise and pluralism can only mean ruin. It is quite typical that general decline is blamed on concrete groups. The traitors are usually the agents of change and presumed beneficiaries of modernization—in Blüher's case, the Jews.<sup>50</sup> Blüher stresses here that his anti-Semitism springs not from age-old wrath and "mere affect" but rather from religious understanding and insight into the history of salvation.

48. Prutsch, *Fundamentalismus*, 59.

49. Tibi, *Fundamentalismus im Islam*, 15.

50. Riesebrodt, "Fundamentalismus," 23.

For Blüher, blood plays a very particular role in this apocalyptic interpretation of the history of salvation. For him, blood and seed are Jewish "organs of faith" "for the unmediated reception of revelation." Since God made a covenant with the Jews, he sanctified their blood, and this sanctification goes far beyond an ethnological foundation of the Jewish community, which is never a "mere religion"; indeed, it extends to the divine itself and is thus of a wholly different quality than anything that Christians could ever attain. A person could choose to join the Christian community through baptism, but Jews are such by virtue of birth and God's choosing. This gives Jews a sort of racial surety or *Rassenbürgschaft*, unattainable by Christians.<sup>51</sup> According to Blüher, transubstantiation during the Eucharist was a transitory affair in comparison. Jews were also seen as bound to each other by the sacred blood, though, and could never leave this covenant. That was what made them so special and so demonic. Even in the diaspora, Jews were still *one* people. For that reason, they could (in Blüher's view) never become part of the German people. In short, Jews appeared to possess everything desirable: a divinely guaranteed, indissoluble collective that would exist until the end of time even without a state. To be sure, Schoeps contradicts Blüher at this point. He submits that the sanctification of the blood merely guarantees a "possibility of redemption," which has to be continually reinforced by piety and obedience to the laws; and he believes that the Germans are also no closer to God, since the Redeemer did not maintain "branch offices" for individual peoples. After all, according to Schoeps, "Jesus died on the Cross and was not a Germanic duke leading his armed servants to Valhalla."<sup>52</sup>

For Schoeps, too, however, the covenant with God was indissoluble and Israel a "divine institution of revelation composed of flesh and blood." Every Israelite is described as a "son of God" and bears the predisposition for redemption within himself "through his corporeality"; he possesses in Schoeps's view an "organic disposition to receive revelation."<sup>53</sup> Nevertheless, Jews were not responsible for one another and also differed from each other; therefore Schoeps distanced himself

51. Blüher and Schoeps, *Streit um Israel*, 18.

52. *Ibid.*, 119.

53. *Ibid.*, 55.

from actions of apostate Jews such as Freud and Marx, who in his view were truly "demonic."

This did not convince Blüher, however. He was obsessed with the idea of a magical blood cohesion that still distinguished Jews "physically" from other peoples and fatefully tied them together even after three thousand years. And even Schoeps remarks in a footnote that there were "undoubtedly" "physical and constitutional differences" between Jews and other groups. A reviewer notes that while Blüher followed a pagan "sacred myth," Schoeps could not decisively best his opponent because he himself adhered to a "blood monism" including a "biological founding of the sacred," so that it is not surprising that the debate broke off without a winner.<sup>54</sup>

Along with the reference to the racialized idea of a special religious blood cohesion the gender dimension also played an important role in their vision of an ideal social order. In most fundamentalist movements, the apocalyptic Manichaean worldview, as described here, leads to an idealization of patriarchal authority and morality.<sup>55</sup> The family is regarded as a holy institution and clear relationship of authority in which the wife should be subordinate to her husband and responsible for home, hearth, and children. This gender order is assigned significance for the history of salvation. Only a return to patriarchal principles could overcome the crisis of the present and its moral decadence.<sup>56</sup>

The debate discussed here, however, invokes the family as a holy institution far less than it does the concept of "male bonding" (which was developed in the youth movement and came to be known by the German term *Männerbund*). After the First World War it was transferred to the religious sphere, whether in the communion of Christian disciples, as Blüher put it, or in Schoeps's writings in the Old Testament covenant with God, which is passed down solely through the generational flow of male seed.<sup>57</sup> In both instances, male bonding mirrors the divine order of the world. Citing the Apocrypha, Blüher also interprets Jesus Christ (literally) as a "fertile provider of seed" and "brilliant Creator" who came to "destroy the works of femininity." The capacity to

54. Koch, "Streit um Israel," 65.

55. Howland, *Religious Fundamentalisms*; Bendroth, *Fundamentalism & Gender*.

56. Riesebrodt, "Fundamentalismus," 25.

57. Faber, "Theokratie," 69.

"propagate his works" was reserved for the German character, which thus demonstrated its masculine nature.<sup>58</sup> At the same time, the figure of the son plays a particular role. For Blüher, the hope of a new society—a new, both physically- and metaphysically-grounded human "species"—is concentrated in the eternal son: As the son of God, Jesus Christ rose to become not just the "turning point" in the "living substance" but also sensed the coming of the kingdom as an "*organic feeling in his own body*."<sup>59</sup> The new Christian artist-genius would thus appropriate Nature in such a way that he himself could bring forth Nature. The capacity for creaturely procreation would have been transferred to him, the *male genius*.

Schoeps makes no mention of the matriarchal line, which actually plays a major role in the Jewish tradition. To be sure, he criticizes the vitalist thrust of the male-bonding elements of Blüher's theory, but ultimately both men sought the redemption of the world in the male-bonding order, which they believed was the realization of an apparently godly, meaningful order.

### 3. Interpretation of Secular History via the History of Salvation

Biblical figures often play a central role in world history as viewed from a fundamentalist perspective. For Blüher, the event of Jesus Christ and his adversaries explains the wicked and strife-torn condition of the modern world. He places the secular history of events in the context of the history of salvation and virtually equates the former with the latter. Schoeps criticizes Blüher's confusion of the history of salvation with actual history. It would be arrogant of him to believe that he has direct access to the history of salvation. In his opinion, God is still the judge, over the apostates as well. Nevertheless, Schoeps's epistemic interest lies in exploring how the history of creation and human history interpenetrate and determine one another. And both men cite the past as a time of true redemption, while loading the future with millenarian and apocalyptic expectations.<sup>60</sup> A "modern view of history as a continual growth of freedom, prosperity, and control over nature" is juxtaposed with a "scenario of increasing . . . decay rooted in the history of salva-

58. Blüher, *Die Aristie*, 30.

59. *Ibid.*, 28.

60. Prutsch, *Fundamentalismus*, 59.



tion"; history appears as degeneration, as a falling away from divine law and sacred tradition.<sup>61</sup> This scenario frequently leads to a specifically fundamentalist interpretation of historical events with a considerable potential for radicalization.<sup>62</sup>

#### *4. Reviews and Reactions to the Dispute between Schoeps and Blüher*

The many positive reviews of the disputation between Blüher and Schoeps in the 1930s are interesting not least because a number of Christian magazines and church newspapers felt compelled to offer their opinions alongside right-wing extremist publications such as the *Stahlhelm*. Regardless of their political parties or religious or secular affiliations, reviewers came to sometimes surprisingly similar conclusions. Astonishingly enough, almost all reviews stressed that Blüher's positions were convincingly arguing for a radical anti-Semitism in metaphysical terms and approved the expressed anti-Semitism as such, though for different reasons and to varying degree. Blüher's position was "no common street anti-Semitism," noted the Prussian Lutheran monthly *Monatsblatt der Vereinigung der Evangelisch-Lutherischen innerhalb der preußischen Landeskirche* (formerly the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*), since he did not place race "above all else" or promote "enticing people away from Christianity."<sup>63</sup> Positive emphasis was given to the fact that Blüher, in contrast to "pure" racists, argued in religious terms and nevertheless exhaustively demonstrated the "secret influence of Jewry." The *Stahlhelm* reviewer on the other hand called Blüher's work a "wake-up call to both Catholics and Protestants" to "regard and combat Jewry as the shared, great anti-Christian foe." Here, Blüher's anti-Semitism was seen as positive because it was "expressed in an unprecedented sharpness" and due to its potential to weaken the Christian churches as Blüher managed to convincingly combine both, the racial and the theological discourse: "Since Blüher analyses the role of Jewry in history from a racial, but also from a theological-political standpoint, his writings are not only unassailable and truly dangerous for the Jewish

61. Riesebrodt, "Fundamentalismus," 23.

62. *Ibid.*, 27.

63. Anonymous, "Hans Blüher."

people, but also bring down the Christian churches."<sup>64</sup> Others affirmed the theological perspective in order to come to terms with problems of race. In *Stimmen der Zeit* (published by Herder Verlag), Anton Koch argued that one could not "come to grips with the Jewish question with positivism and liberal 'tolerance.'" It was impossible "without physics and metaphysics," that is, "without theology."<sup>65</sup> To that extent, reviewers welcomed the disputation.<sup>66</sup>

Some Christian writers criticized Blüher from a theological standpoint, however, and accused him of "neo-Hellenic paganism." Writing in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (Theological Literary Magazine), Hartling insisted that God's mercy was dependent on blood only from a Jewish (and not from a genuinely Christian) perspective.<sup>67</sup> Others—more traditionally—believed that the only "solution" to the dispute was Jewish conversion to Christianity, while Jews such as the well-known rabbi Joseph Carlebach criticized Blüher's anti-Semitic notion of truth.<sup>68</sup>

Few non-Jews came to the defense of Jews. The conservative author Oskar A. H. Schmitz, who was close to the circle around the poet Stefan George and described himself as an "ideal mixture" of a Jewish mother and an "Aryan" father, tried to formulate a compromise between the different positions. He proposed a distinction between "desirable and undesirable Jews" as an alternative to the anti-Semitism that Blüher himself referred to as "radical."<sup>69</sup> After all, in his view, Jews could "still" improve and "turn themselves" around—an approach that was also not free of ambivalence and anti-Semitic implications.

64. Anonym, "Die Erhebung Israels."

65. Koch, "Streit um Israel," 65.

66. See, for example, the following reviews: W. R., "Streit um Israel"; R., "Streit um Israel"; Meinhold, "Religion—Theologie—Kirche"; Anonymous, "Streit um Israel"; Glaser, "Hans Blüher"; Müller, "Antimesianismus"; Anonymous, "Vom Büchertisch"; Niekisch, "Die Erhebung Israels."

67. Hartling, Review of *Streit um Israel*, 151.

68. Carlebach, "Hans Blüher"; Schriflleitung, "Anmerkungen."

69. Schmitz, "Wünschenswerte Juden"; idem, "Judenfrage."

## Conclusions

We can conclude that the Christian-Jewish disputation between Schoeps and Blüher of 1933 is characterized by the following fundamentalist elements: a radical critique of modernity and its manifestations such as liberalism, egalitarianism, and rationality; the utopia of a racially pure, religious, and self-assured society in conjunction with a Manichaean, apocalyptic worldview; and the claim to be in possession of the truth of holy scripture, accessible only to the few who belonged to the primary race. Jesus becomes a figure of the "primary race," his *arete* is proof of the consistency of spiritual and natural, biological traits. "Blood" is a central theme in the dispute: it organizes the national and religious certainty of redemption and is not coincidentally located at the intersection of natural science and religion, modernity and tradition.

The extent to which fundamentalist movements are characterized by a specific relationship to politics is controversial. In this case, however, it is obvious that the religious discourse treats the foundations of the collective order—one in which the Germans believed themselves to be the elect and sought to occupy the imaginary position of the Jews. Because it was assumed that Christians and Jews enjoyed a special affinity, it was also considered that they shared a similar, or at least an interconnected destiny. Taken to the extreme, this meant that the Germans could only become "German" to the extent that the Jews became "Jewish" (according to the view of the German anti-Semite Paul de Lagarde, whose positions had some influence in the middle classes and the youth movement).<sup>70</sup> The fiction of a symbiosis became a reverse mimicry, since the Jewish religion appeared to have everything the Christian faith lacked: the certainty of being chosen, particularity, and the possibility of remaining "pure" and "unmixed," that is, of not disappearing (even without a state); to have a fixed identity and demonic powers; and to represent an indissoluble unity. While the Jewish "Other" was initially branded as weak and "feminine" when he (still) embodied the spirit of defeat immediately following World War I, later—after his promotion to a masculine and demonic force—the aim was to supplant and succeed him.

The distance posited between God and humanity in Judaism is undermined and negated by the concept of an immediate "blood covenant" with God. And this appears to be typical not least of a Christian

70. Bruns, *Politik des Eros*, 385–86.

position that proceeds from an abolition of this distance when man becomes divine in the guise of the son of God, who here is quietly turned into the incarnation of German man.

The supposed transformation of pagan Eros into Christian love that Blüher sees in Christianity represents not an ethical law or morality, but rather a vitalist force that manifests the divine in the physically beautiful body and thereby creates a new, modernist boundary between the elect and the disinherited, the spiritual and the mass, which runs along the lines of religious physiognomy. Participation in *arete* is not coincidentally conceived as a communion of disciples and an associated resacralized conception of the state, which—beyond the boundaries of the religious—also represents the commonality between the two disputants. Schoeps, too, sees a particular predisposition toward redemption in blood and seed. He, too, believes in the divine theocratic state, which however functions less through vitality than through laws, which in turn derive directly from God.

Although Schoeps certainly recognized the vitalization in Blüher's manner of thinking and distanced himself from it, their shared experience of the youth movement and a certain adoration for the author of the homoerotic male-bonding concept let him enter the discussion. His aim to demonstrate a certain closeness between Judaism and German Protestantism in order to path the way for the Jewish youth to remain loyal to both—Prussia and their Jewish heritage—nevertheless remained the decisive motivation for him to engage in the religious dispute. Although the dispute was not quite leading to a reconciled end, Schoeps still tried to close the disputation of 1933 with an ironical remark by saying that God in his infinite goodness must have a sense of humor in order to bear the disputation between the two of them.

The life paths of the two men subsequently diverged radically. Schoeps, accompanied by a troop of young Jewish men, tried unsuccessfully to gain an audience with Hitler in order to convince him of the Prussian sentiments of Jewish youth. He was forced to flee to Sweden in 1938. His parents were deported and died at Auschwitz and Theresienstadt. Blüher, in contrast, was left unmolested under National Socialism. After the war he even managed to gain recognition as a "victim of fascism" based on his good relationship with Jews such as Schoeps, which gave him access to the much sought-after "Ration Card One." Schoeps, still a strong nationalist, already returned to Germany in 1946

and became professor of religious and intellectual history at the University of Erlangen in 1950.<sup>71</sup> Not long thereafter, he tried to connect with conservative circles but was soon excluded, not least because of his public support for the abolition of discrimination against homosexuals.<sup>72</sup> Disappointed, Schoeps saw to it that Blüher's works on (homosexual) male bonding were reprinted in postwar Germany. Blüher himself, who died in 1955, was discussed in the press as a homeopath, philosopher, and Kant scholar. His ideas on male bonding, but also his anti-Semitism, went largely unmentioned in postwar Germany.

In retrospect, the debate between Schoeps and Blüher at the beginning of the 1930s recalls not only the debate on Jewish emancipation around 1800 but also the immigration debate that has been unleashed anew in recent years in Germany. In particular, notions of a "Jewish gene" and a fixed "Muslim character" parallel earlier discussions of "blood." The search for the racial "substance" of religion has clearly lost little of its allure. Even today, religious and racial ordering systems are still closely intertwined. An invisible, assimilated "Other," however, appears to have taken on a newly dangerous quality of late, since he could be living amongst us as a "sleeper." From this perspective, the "nationalist rampage," as Schmitz clear-sightedly called it in 1926, is apparently a response that remains close at hand today.

Thilo Sarrazin's much-discussed book *Deutschland schafft sich ab* (*Germany Does Away with Itself*, 2010) also expresses fears that the very existence of the nation is threatened because there are too many non-Christians—in this case, Muslims—living in the country, a topic that catapulted Sarrazin onto the list of the bestselling non-fiction titles since 1945. Once again, the German nation is being conceptualized as an ethno-racial unit created above all through religious difference. Once again, a political problem is being wrapped in the garb of national-religious apocalypse. "We" are faced with nothing less than doom and annihilation. The remedy of a return to national values and a wave of births among ethnic-German women academics (who in the process also incidentally find their way back to subordinate positions), is part and parcel of this idea. In the name of religious conflicts, older forms of (cultural and eugenic) racism, which perhaps never wholly disap-

71. Schoeps, "Hitler ist nicht Deutschland."

72. Schoeps, "Soll Homosexualität strafbar bleiben"; Keilson-Lauritz, "Hans-Joachim Schoeps."

peared, have been reactivated. Even today, the "nomos of election" can easily become the "physis of biology," as Schoeps put it.<sup>73</sup>

### Bibliography

- Anonymous. "Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter." *Der Stahlhelm. Helden und Zeiten* 15/4 (Apr 17, 1932) 17.
- Anonymous. "Vom Büchertisch, Hans Blüher: 1. Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter, 2. Der Standort des Christentums in der lebendigen Welt." *Niederdeutsche Kirchenzeitung. Evangelisch-lutherisches Halbmonatsblatt für Kirche und Volkstum in Niederdeutschland* 2/6 (Mar 15, 1932).
- Anonymous. "Streit um Israel. Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch. Von Hans Blüher und Hans Joachim Schoeps." *Der deutsche Vorwärts* 2 (Apr 1933).
- Anonymous [Sup: D. Dr. Matthes?]. "Hans Blüher: Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter und der Standort des Christentums in der lebendigen Welt." *Monatsblatt der Vereinigung der Evangelisch-Lutherischen innerhalb der preussischen Landeskirche (bekenntnistreue Gruppe). Früher Evangelische Kirchenzeitung. Literarische Beilage* zu 2/3 (Mar 1932).
- Antoun, Richard T. *Understanding Fundamentalism: Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Movements*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2004.
- Armstrong, Karen. *Im Kampf für Gott: Fundamentalismus in Christentum, Judentum und Islam*. München: Siedler, 2004.
- Bendroth, Margaret Lamberts. *Fundamentalism & Gender, 1875 to the Present*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Bertz, Inka. "Jüdische Renaissance." In *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen*, edited by Diethart Kerbs and Jürgen Reulecke, 551–64. Wuppertal: Hammer, 1998.
- Blüher, Hans. *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth: Philosophische Grundlegung der Lehre und der Erscheinungen Christi*. Pricn: Kampmann & Schnabel, 1921.
- . *Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter*. M. e. Vorwort v. Hans Blüher [Weihn. 1931] u. e. bebilderten Anhang zu Martin Buber, Friedrich Gundolf u. zu „der Presse.“ Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt (Ringbücherei), 1931.
- Blüher, Hans, and Hans-Joachim Schoeps. *Streit um Israel: Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch*. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1933.
- Breuer, Stefan. *Ordnungen der Ungleichheit: Die deutsche Rechte im Widerstreit ihrer Ideen 1871–1945*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001.
- Bruns, Claudia. "Eros, Macht und Männlichkeit: Männerbündische Konstruktionen in der deutschen Jugendbewegung zwischen Emanzipation und Reaktion." In *Jugendbewegte Geschlechterverhältnisse*, edited by Meike Sophia Baader and Susanne Rappe-Weber, 25–54. Schwalbach: Wochenschau-Verlag, 2012.
- . "The Politics of Eros. The German "Männerbund" between Anti-Feminism and Anti-Semitism in the Early Twentieth Century." In *Masculinity, Senses, Spirit*, edited by Katherine M. Faull, 153–90. Apercus. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2011.

73. Blüher and Schoeps, *Streit um Israel*, 27.

- . *Politik des Eros: Der Männerbund in Wissenschaft, Politik und Jugendkultur 1880–1934*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2008.
- . "Die 'metaphysische Pathologie' des Juden: Erkenntnistheoretische Dimensionen eines religiösen Rassismus um 1920." In *Lebendige Sozialgeschichte: Gedenkschrift für Peter Borowsky*, edited by Rainer Hering and Rainer Nicolaysen, 278–95. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2003.
- Cancik, Hubert, and Uwe Puschner, editors. *Antisemitismus, Paganismus, Völkische Religion*. München: Saur, 2004.
- Carlebach, Joseph. "Hans Blüher oder der neue antisemitische Wahrheitsbegriff?" *Der Israelit: Centralorgan für das orthodoxe Judentum* 73/27 (1932) 1–3.
- Faber, Richard. *Deutschbewusstes Judentum und jüdischbewusstes Deutschtum: Der historische und politische Theologe Hans-Joachim Schoeps*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2008.
- . "'Theokratie von unten versus Theokratie von oben': Die Antipoden Hans-Joachim Schoeps und Jacob Taubes." In *Wider den Zeitgeist: Studien zum Leben und Werk von Hans-Joachim Schoeps (1909–1980)*, edited by Gideon Botsch et al., 63–92. Hildesheim: Olms, 2009.
- Figl, Johann. "Säkularisierung und Fundamentalismus." In *Religiöser Fundamentalismus: Vom Kolonialismus zur Globalisierung*, 2nd ed., edited by Clemens Six et al., 33–51. Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2005.
- Glaser, Ludwig. "Hans Blüher: Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter. Der Standort des Christentums in der lebendigen Welt. Streit um Israel." *Allgemeine Weltrundschau*, April 30, 1933, 743.
- Grützmacher, Richard Heinrich. *Kritiker und Neuschöpfer der Religion im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert: Keyserling, L. Ziegler, Blüher, Chamberlain, Steiner, Scholz, Scheler, Hauck*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1921.
- Hartling, D. von. Review of *Streit um Israel. Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch*, by Hans Blüher und Hans Joachim Schoeps. *Theologisches Literatur-Blatt* 10 (1934) 151.
- Heilman, Samuel C. "Jews and Fundamentalism: Transnationalism versus Fundamentalism." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 42/1 (2007) 29–41.
- Hempel, Wolfgang. "Hans-Joachim Schoeps und die deutsche Jugendbewegung—Texte." In *Wider den Zeitgeist: Studien zum Leben und Werk von Hans-Joachim Schoeps (1909–1980)*, edited by Gideon Botsch et al., 213–26. Hildesheim: Olms, 2009.
- Hergemöller, Bernd-Ulrich. "Hans Blühers Männerwelten. Fragmente, Widersprüche, Perspektiven." *Invertito* 2 (2000) 58–84.
- Hering, Rainer. "Säkularisierung, Entkirchlichung, Dechristianisierung und Formen der Rechristianisierung bzw. Resakralisierung in Deutschland." In *Völkische Religion und Krisen der Moderne: Entwürfe "arteigener" Glaubenssysteme seit der Jahrhundertwende*, edited by Stefanie von Schnurbein and Justus H. Ulbricht, 117–41. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2001.
- Hillerbrand, Hans J. "Hans-Joachim Schoeps als Religionswissenschaftler." In *Wider den Zeitgeist: Studien zum Leben und Werk von Hans-Joachim Schoeps (1909–1980)*, edited by Gideon Botsch et al., 45–62. Hildesheim: Olms, 2009.
- Howland, Courtney W., editor. *Religious Fundamentalisms and the Human Rights of Women*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2003.
- Ingber, Michael. "Fundamentalismus im Judentum und in der Jüdisch-Israelischen Gesellschaft im Staat Israel." In *Religiöser Fundamentalismus: Vom Kolonialismus zur Globalisierung*, 2nd ed., edited by Clemens Six et al., 91–115. Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2005.
- Jürgensmeyer, Mark. *The New Cold War?: Religious Nationalism Confronts the Secular State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Kaiser, Jochen-Christoph. "Erneuerungsbewegungen im Protestantismus." In *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen*, edited by Diethart Kerbs and Jürgen Reulecke, 581–94. Wuppertal: Hammer, 1998.
- Keilson-Lauritz, Marita. "Hans-Joachim Schoeps, Hans Blüher und der Männerbund. Überlegungen zu Hans-Joachim Schoeps und dem Thema Homosexualität." In *Wider den Zeitgeist: Studien zum Leben und Werk von Hans-Joachim Schoeps (1909–1980)*, edited by Gideon Botsch et al., 177–98. Hildesheim: Olms, 2009.
- Keyserling, Hermann. "Zu Hans Blühers Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth" (1922). In *Das Erbe der Schule der Weisheit: Unveröffentlichte Essays und Buchbesprechungen*, introduced and selected by Arnold Keyserling, 1:129–31. Vienna: Palme, 1981.
- Kienzler, Klaus. *Der religiöse Fundamentalismus: Christentum, Judentum, Islam*. 2nd ed. München: Beck, 1999.
- Kläber, Kurt. "Blühers Christologie." *Die Tat* 13/10 (1922) 796–99.
- Kläcker, Michael. "Erneuerungsbewegungen im römischen Katholizismus." In *Handbuch der deutschen Reformbewegungen*, edited by Diethart Kerbs and Jürgen Reulecke, 7–56. Wuppertal: Hammer, 1998.
- Koch, Anton. "Streit um Israel." *Stimmen der Zeit* 7 (1932/1933) 64–66.
- Kroll, Frank-Lothar. "Wider den Zeitgeist. Zum hundertsten Geburtstag des Historikers Hans-Joachim Schoeps." *Mitteldeutsches Jahrbuch für Kultur und Geschichte*, Sonderheft, 16 (2009) 127–40.
- Lease, Gary. "Wer war hier Christ, wer Jude? Das Gespräch zwischen Hans-Joachim Schoeps und Hans Blüher." In *Das jüdisch-christliche Religionsgespräch*, edited by Heinz Kremers and Julius H. Schoeps, 114–30. Sachsenheim: Burg, 1988.
- . "Who Was the Christian, Who the Jew? The Dialogue between Hans-Joachim Schoeps and Hans Blüher." In *"Odd fellows" in the Politics of Religion: Modernism, National Socialism, and German Judaism*, 211–31. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.
- LeVine, Mark. "What Is Fundamentalism, and How Do We Get Rid of It?" *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 42/1 (2007) 15–28.
- Linse, Ulrich. "Säkularisierung oder neue Religiosität? Zur religiösen Situation in Deutschland um 1900." *Recherches Germaniques* 17 (1997) 117–41.
- Matthias, Leo. "Hans Blüher und das Christentum." *Der neue Merkur: Monatshefte* 5/11 (1922) 775–78.
- Meinhold, Joh. "Religion—Theologie—Kirche: Hans Blüher; Hans Joachim Schoeps. Streit um Israel." *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 5/17 (1934) 769–72.
- Mohler, Armin. *Die konservative Revolution in Deutschland 1918–1932: Ein Handbuch*. Hauptband und Ergänzungsband (mit Korrigenda) in einem Band



- (Diss. Basel, 1949). 4th ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994.
- Müller, Ferdinand. "Antimesianismus." *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, Jan 28, 1933.
- Müller-Jung, Joachim. "Sarrazins Biologismus. Phantasma 'Juden-Gen.'" *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Aug 30, 2010, n.p. Online: <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/feuilleton/dcbatten/integration/sarrazins-biologismus-phantasma-juden-gen-11028466.html>.
- Nanko, Ulrich. *Die deutsche Glaubensbewegung: Eine historische und soziologische Untersuchung*. Marburg: Diagonal, 1993.
- Niekisch, Ernst. "Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter." *Widerstand: Zeitschrift für nationalrevolutionäre Politik* 7 (1932) 26–29.
- Prutsch, Markus Josef. *Fundamentalismus: Das "Projekt der Moderne" und die Politisierung des Religiösen*. 2nd ed. Vienna: Passagen, 2008.
- Puschner, Uwe. *Die völkische Bewegung im wilhelminischen Kaiserreich: Sprache—Rasse—Religion*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001.
- R. "Streit um Israel. Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch von Hans Blüher und Hans Joachim Schoeps, Hamburg 1933." *Die Christliche Welt*, Mar 18, 1933, n.p.
- Rheins, Carl J. "Deutscher Vortrupp, Gefolgschaft deutscher Juden 1933–1935." *Publications of the Leo Baeck Institute: Year Book* 26 (1981) 207–29.
- Riesebrodt, Martin. "Was ist 'religiöser Fundamentalismus?'" In *Religiöser Fundamentalismus: Vom Kolonialismus zur Globalisierung*, 2nd ed., edited by Clemens Six et al., 13–32. Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2005.
- Sarrazin, Thilo. *Deutschland schafft sich ab: Wie wir unser Land aufs Spiel setzen*. München: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2010.
- . *Sarrazin: Eine deutsche Debatte*. Edited by Deutschlandstiftung Integration. 2nd ed. München: Piper, 2010.
- Schieder, Wolfgang. "Sozialgeschichte der Religion im 19. Jahrhundert: Bemerkungen zur Forschungslage." In *Religion und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by Wolfgang Schieder, 11–28. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1993.
- Schmitz, Oscar A. H. "Die falsch gestellte Judenfrage" (1923). In *Das geistige Deutschland angesichts der jüdischen Frage: Positionen 1922–1938*, edited by Oliver Humberg and Stephan Hötzel, 49–57. Velbert: Humberg & Fresen, 1994.
- . "Wünschenswerte und nicht wünschenswerte Juden." *Der Jude*, Sonderheft, 1 (1925) 17–33.
- Schnurbein, Stefanie von. *Religion als Kulturkritik: Neugermanisches Heidentum im 20. Jahrhundert*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1992.
- Schnurbein, Stefanie von, and Justus H. Ulbricht, editors. *Völkische Religion und Krisen der Moderne: Entwürfe "arteigener" Glaubenssysteme seit der Jahrhundertwende*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2001.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. "Antwort an Hans Blüher [Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter]." *Central Verein-Zeitung* 11/6 (1932) 47.
- . *Ja—nein—und trotzdem: Erinnerungen, Begegnungen, Erfahrungen*. Mainz: Hase & Koehler, 1974.
- . *Rückblicke. Die letzten dreißig Jahre (1925–1955) und danach*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Haude & Spener, 1963.
- . "Soll Homosexualität strafbar bleiben?" *Der Monat* 15/171 (1962) 19–27.

- Schoeps, Julius H. "Hitler ist nicht Deutschland': Der Nationalsozialismus, das Exil in Schweden und die Rückkehr von Hans-Joachim Schoeps in die ehemalige Heimat." In *Wider den Zeitgeist: Studien zum Leben und Werk von Hans-Joachim Schoeps (1909-1980)*, edited by Gideon Botsch et al., 227-48. Hildesheim: Olms, 2009.
- Schriftleitung des Central-Vereins. "Anmerkungen zur Debatte zwischen Blüher und Schoeps um Hans Blühers 'Die Erhebung Israels gegen die christlichen Güter.'" *Central Verein-Zeitung* 11/6 (1932) 46.
- Schwarz, Patrik, editor. *Die Sarrazin-Debatte: Eine Provokation—und die Antworten*. Hamburg: Die Zeit, 2010.
- Spengler, Oswald. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes: Umriss einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*. 2 vols. Vienna: Braunmüller, 1918; München: Beck, 1922.
- Tibi, Bassam. *Fundamentalismus im Islam. Eine Gefahr für den Weltfrieden?* Darmstadt: Primus, 2002.
- Weingart, Peter, et al. *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1996.
- Winnecken, Andreas. *Ein Fall von Antisemitismus. Zur Geschichte und Pathogenese der deutschen Jugendbewegung vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. Köln: Wissenschaft & Politik, 1991.
- W. R. "Streit um Israel." *Deutsches Adelsblatt* (1933).
- Zerger, Johannes. *Was ist Rassismus? Eine Einführung*. Göttingen: Lamuv, 1997.