



Department of International & European Studies
Department of Balkan, Slavic & Oriental Studies

Master's in Human Rights and Migration Studies

MA Thesis Gay persecution and Biopolitics: a comparative analysis in Nazi
Germany and Chechnya

Supervisor: Tsibiridou Fotini

Andreas Zakalkas

Thessaloniki, 2023

Abstract

This thesis examines why the LGBTIQ+ community has been persecuted and compares two big cases of "anti-LGBTIQ+ witch hunts" conducted by the power of modernity. As a result of Michel Foucault's interpretation of the biomedical discourse that leads to homosexual persecution, this study explores the source of homosexual persecution through biomedical discourse. This course examines how sexuality is constructed and viewed from the perspective of psychiatry, sexology, and other disciplines. Moreover, it also discusses how Nazi Germany and Chechnya persecuted homosexual desires and how biomedical science played a role in developing these homophobic policies. As well as highlighting how sexuality and sex/gender operate alongside an apparatus of biopower, it emphasizes how biomedical discourses create the norm of sexuality by fabricating it. Lastly, it argues that these two specific cases represent a crucial point in the history of persecution and repression of homosexuality. As part of this dissertation, I intend to examine how gender, sex, and sexuality developed historically and how that has affected our understanding of these topics today. Try to explore how notions of male-female, heterosexual-homosexual, healthy and sick, normal and abnormal are dualistic concepts shaped by biomedical science to define the normal and the pathological and operate as a technology of power to control the body, populations and life itself.

Key words: homosexuality, Nazi Germany, Chechnya, biomedical discourse, biopolitics

Contents

Introduction	3
Theoretical and methodological issues	4
Structure of the thesis	6
Chapter 1: Sexuality, Gender and Biopower	9
Chapter 2: The Invisible Triangle (Psychopathia Sexualis)	14
<i>2.1. Genealogy of Homosexuality</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>2.2 Sexualize race or Racialize sex?</i>	<i>19</i>
Chapter 3: The Pink and the Black Triangle	25
Chapter 4: We don't have any gays.	32
Conclusion: The triangle that we wear	39
Bibliography	46

*For many years, we have all been
living in the realm of Prince Mangogul: under the spell of an
immense curiosity about sex, bent on questioning it, with an
insatiable desire to hear it speak and be spoken about, quick
to invent all sorts of magical rings that might force it to
abandon its discretion.*

Michel Foucault (History of Sexuality, the Will to Knowledge)

Introduction

From the moment I realized that I had a sexuality other than defined by normality, I felt an unbearable burden, an internal persecution that I struggled to suppress, to escape, to control. Because, quite simply, I felt that I was not normal. I thought that I was sick. A sick subject who could never fit within the framework of the social contract could never be loved or accepted, someone who must always hide his own desires. While it took me several years to accept myself, to embrace my sexuality, to accept who I am, what I am, what I could never understand was why I felt a sense of repression, why I felt I had to suppress myself, my desires, and why I was considered sick? This experience of repression and suppression is an example of biopolitics, a form of power that operates through regulating and controlling bodies and populations.

For the purpose of this thesis, a bibliography review was followed by focusing on the literature from gender studies, theories of sexualities and biomedical discourse of the 19th and 20th centuries that shaped the idea of sex/ gender and sexuality as it is known today. More specifically in this paper, I will discuss how gender, race, class, and sexuality are interconnected and constructed in the dominant European biomedical discourse, reproducing normative frameworks of biopolitical technologies for the body, desire, and therefore for life itself. Based mainly on the term biopolitics developed in Michel Foucault's History of Sexuality, Albert Moll's theory of degeneration and Kraft Ebbing's Psychopathia Sexualis as interpreted through the works of Dimitra Tzanaki, I conduct secondary bibliographic research focusing on where the persecution of homosexual desire, what role does 19th and 20th-century science play in the construction of

"sick" homosexual desire, how gender, race, class and sexual identity are interconnected within the dominant currents of Western biomedical discourse and how this word is colonized on the body of the "mentally ill homosexual" Other. Taking as case studies the persecution of homosexuals by the Third Reich and the anti-gay witch hunts in the Chechen Republic, I try to show that the persecution and repression of homosexual desire have not stopped but continue to occur daily within various power relations. and "liberating" identities - the triangles we wear on ourselves.

Theoretical and methodological issues

Biopolitics seeks to shape people's behaviours to produce a desired outcome, usually in pursuit of social and political order. This can be attributed to societal norms and expectations, which many LGBTQ+ individuals feel they must adhere to be accepted in society. They often face stigma and discrimination, which can lead to feelings of shame and repression. Therefore, they may feel they have to hide their true selves and desires to be accepted. Moreover, as of September 2022, 67 countries and four sub-national jurisdictions have laws criminalizing homosexuality. Among these, 42 criminalize not only male homosexuality but also female homosexuality. In 11 of them, homosexuality is punished with the death penalty (Mendos, et al., 2020). Based on the above, my interest is to determine, using a specific historical example, when and under which circumstances homosexuality was problematized; Moreover, why is this persecution still with us? To overcome this repression on a personal and social level, it is necessary to conceptualize how sexuality has been historically governed and limited. Based on the above, I choose "Gay persecution and biopolitics, a comparative analysis in Nazi Germany and Chechnya" as the subject of my diploma thesis. My purpose was to see why the LGBTIQ+ community has been persecuted and to compare two big cases of "anti-LGBTIQ+ witch hunt" which was conducted by the power of modernity and to identify similarities and differences between the gay persecution in Nazi Germany as well as the one in Chechnya and in addition to discover the reasons behind these homophobic policies. However, as I was studying the literature, I came to the conclusion that I had to reapproach my initial thought and that my focus had to be on the source of homosexuality persecution through biomedical discourse instead. It is clear that there we have an account of discourses of how Western civilization defines in its own specific way the area of its suffering, of anomalies, deviations, disturbances and imagined normality. Within this backdrop, through this work, I will not raise essentialist questions (e.g., what are the reasons it happens) in the sense of simple continuous history, but I will try to focus on the genealogy of the emergence of gay persecution - that is the gaps, the ruptures, the contrasts in history and *the thinking systems that are familiar to us, that seem evident to us and that constitute part of our perceptions, attitudes and behaviours* (Crespo, et al., 2016). By doing this analysis, I have no intention of undermining the importance of the persecutions that

took place in Nazi Germany and the one that is still happening in Chechnya, but on the contrary, I think that these two specific cases can represent the crucial point in the history of the persecution and repression of homosexuality. Moreover, by examining these two cases, I am going to highlight how sexuality and sex/gender are operating alongside an apparatus of biopower and how the biomedical discourses (sexology, psychoanalysis, psychiatry, etc.) fabricate the norm of sexuality and sex/gender. A normality that considers sick, criminal, and contiguous unworthy life, any person whose sexuality and sex/gender do not fit in the narrow margins of *scientia sexualis*. Regarding biomedical discourse, I would construe it based on interpretations of Michel Foucault. That discourse accumulates thoughts and acts and shapes a regime of truth that establishes the norm. Moreover, drawing on the work of Demetra Tzanaki (Τζανάκη, 2018) (Τζανάκη, 2021), I am not just referring to normality but to patriarchal normality and truth that feeds a sexist power. As a result, poverty, misery, violence, and disease are seen as the result of the psychic sodomite. Then I speak for a patriarchal regime of truth in which individuals began to recognize themselves as subjects of sexuality, whereby these subjects were exposed to highly diverse dominions of Knowledge articulated by systems of rules and restrictions. So, if I could put another title for my thesis, it would be suppression and persecution of homosexuality, homosexuals under the expert's microscope; and how this regime of truth/normality changes how individuals are thought to make sense of and value their conduct.

This review aims to understand the historical development of sex/ gender and sexuality and how this has shaped our current understanding of these concepts. Additionally, it looks at the ways in which feminist and queer theorists have challenged and reshaped these concepts over time. Male- female, heterosexual-homosexual, healthy and sick, normal, and abnormal are just dualistic concepts shaped by the biomedical science of the 19th and 20th centuries to define the normal and the pathological, as Georges Canguilhem has said. In order to answer the thoughts that were raised above and deconstruct the dualistic way of thinking, the essay is developed by the method of archaeology with Michel Foucault terms, as well as I choose to use the terminology of psychiatry, sexology, criminology and psychoanalysis of the 19th and 20th century in order to ‘unfold’ the persecution and suppression of homosexuality in Nazi Germany and Chechnya. Regarding the terminology in this thesis, I use the terms of the time, such as *paedophilia*, *sodomism*, *homosexuality*, *tribadism* and *lesbianism*, which were introduced by Western European biomedical science and their dominant representatives. However, it should be pointed out that my terminology for identities and sexual/gender activities need some explanation. I've used the terms "LGBT" and "queer" simply as general terms for a wide range of activities and identities that depart from mainstream heterosexuality. It is mostly about gay men and men who had sex with men and lesbians and women who had same-sex relationships. This mirrors two things: first, the focus of my research on state and expert persecution of LGBTQ people and the relative weight of accessible source material.

Since the mid-20th century, social theories have raised concerns and conflicting perspectives on gender, sexuality, and the human body, addressing them either naturalistically, constructivistically, or phenomenologically. For naturalism, the body is a purely biological entity, and the resulting inequalities are determined by the biologically gendered body (male-female). Taking the naturalistic view that women's passive, weak, and frail bodies cause gender inequalities, women are socially excluded and inferior - primarily from the lower classes. As far as race is concerned, naturalism reads bodily data to document the inferiority of non-white bodies. Shaped by the works of Michel Foucault and the feminist theories of the third wave, the constructivist view bases its theorization on the social construction of the body. It focuses on the institutional processes and practices that shape the body, gender and sexuality. For Foucault, the body is a product of authoritative knowledge that must be controlled, defined and reproduced. An anatomopolitics of the body and biopolitics of the population, in other words. Foucault's influence on feminist and queer theory regarding sex and sexuality is indisputable. These approaches emphasize the absence of inherent characteristics of the female body that justify the social degradation of women and femininity. Instead, they see the female body as the epicentre of patriarchal power systems. From the 1980s onwards, phenomenological approaches to the body emerged (mainly influenced by Merleau-Ponty's *The Phenomenology of Perception*) and are built into the concept of embodiment. According to the embodiment, the body is considered an incomplete biological and social phenomenon as a sociobiological entity. It focuses on the analytical importance of the distinction between a certain stage of development of the human body and the modifying effects that can be exerted on it by social and cultural factors over time (Μακρυγιώτη, 2001). Having said that, the thesis is divided into four chapters.

Structure of the thesis

In this first chapter, I will illustrate the concepts of biopower and biopolitics, described in Michel Foucault's «*History of Sexuality, the Will to Knowledge*». As I will explain further both terms are widely used in feminist and queer studies. Biopower should be apprehended as a concept for analyzing how certain forms of power are responsible for administering life and managing bodies and populations, while biopolitics can be understood as the techniques, regimes of truth and Knowledge aiming to regulate life. Following the Foucauldian conceptualization of biopower and biopolitics, I will outline the operation of power in early modernity and modernity, underlining the transformation of power from sovereignty to life-administering power and the deployment of sexuality in the apparatus of biopower. Focusing on the deployment of sexuality in the biopower era, as Michel Foucault demonstrates in the *Will to Knowledge*. I consider Silvia

Federici's (2004) criticism of Foucault's theory on biopower too significant not to be included because it ties along with Jemima Repo's work on the biopolitics of gender. I strongly agree with Jemima Repo who suggests that rereading *Will to Knowledge* as a historical background of the deployment of sexuality from a feminist and queer theory, can work as the basis for researching the discourse of gender. Foucault's and Repo's work about the operation of biopower is of significant importance for comprehending under which circumstances sexuality and gender have been deployed as biopolitical techniques. When doctors invented the gender of normality (Repo, 2015), codes ceased to govern society and were replaced by the permanent distinction between what is normal and abnormal, and the perpetual task of restoring the system of normality (Foucault, 1976).

In the following chapter, I bring up the perceptions of German psychiatrists and sexologists of the 19th and 20th centuries in Germany about homosexuality, the connection between gender, race, sexuality, and class that was established through the dominant biomedical discourse of patriarchal colonial Western Europe and how this whole narrative worked like a sword of Damocles, to define the lives of the "abnormal". More specifically, in the first part of this chapter, based on Westphal's theories of "contrary sexual feeling" and Kraft Ebbing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, I explain how these theories construct that same-sex desire is the result of a life that is incarcerated, a life that must be disciplined through the truth of the expert. Within this context, I refer to Article 175 of the German Penal Code, which conforms to and disciplines disobedient individuals who dare to live their truth. Additionally, by examining Magnus Hirschfeld's theory about the third sex and Adolfo Brand's theory of the masculinity of homosexuals and their efforts to abolish Article 175 in pre-Nazi Germany, I hope to emphasize how these two sexological theories influenced the Nazi conception of homosexuality. In the second part of the chapter, using the methodological tool of the political analogy, I explore the triangular relationship of race, gender, and sexuality and how it relates to the Nazi final solution. In particular, by presenting the parallel development of homophobia and anti-Semitism in interwar Germany through the work of Hirschfeld and Brand's association and the relationship between Muslims and the Nazi state, an attempt is made to highlight the relationship of the Muslim community in pre-Nazi Germany with the Jewish and homosexual communities.

The third chapter explores the persecution of homosexuality under the Nazi regime. I intend to demonstrate, based on my analysis of the social environment of the Weimer Republik and Nazi views on homosexuality during the Nazi period, that the persecution of homosexual desires is more than just the obvious dichotomy between straight and homosexual, but is actually rooted deeper in human libidinous desire. Additionally, I would like to point out that the persecution and repression of homosexuality appeared at the start of modernity, and the persecution of homosexuality by the Nazi regime was just one of the beginnings of the iceberg that was postmodernism. With the Nuremberg Laws, the revision of Article 175 in 1936,

concentration camps, and the eugenic experiments conducted on the bodies of inferior degenerates, biopolitical technologies of life management became necropolitical zones for life that were no longer worth living.

Driven up by Putin's homophobic law in 2013 for the propaganda of non-traditional sexual relations as well as by the law of 2022 that prohibits any expression that is considered queer behaviour or lifestyle, in the last chapter, here we don't have gays, I present how the state saw and dealt with homosexual desire, as well as the contribution of the biomedical discourse. Creating a genealogy of homosexuality in Russia, I begin my analysis with Tsarist Russia since I consider it a crucial period for the later periods, early revolutionary Russia, the Stalinist and Putinist regimes. At the same time, I show the evolutionary path of Russia's biomedical discourse and its influence on the Western European model. My aim is to highlight that the persecution of LGBTI+ people in the Republic of Chechnya, which started in 2017, is the result of something much deeper. The emergence of Putinism as a biopolitical technology, aiming at the consolidation of new hegemonic masculinity (Τσιμπιρίδου, 2018) and the symbolization of the Chechen as a werewolf during the second Chechen war (Scicchitano, 2019), functioned as recordings of the eugenic narrative of worthy and unworthy life (Τζανάκη, 2021).

Chapter 1: Sexuality, Gender and Biopower

Michel Foucault is regarded as one of the most critical figures in biopolitics debates. While he did not come up with the terms of biopower or biopolitics, his work is a touchstone for contemporary debates about the political rationalities that underlie modern forms of governance and modes of subjectification. In his published work, these concepts are presented only in the last chapter of the first volume of the *History of Sexuality*. Biopolitics and biopower seem to fit in his Collège de France lecture series (*Society Must Defend, Security, the population of the territory and The Birth of Biopolitics*) which focused on conceptualizations and genealogies of power and governmentality. These references are considered to have been of little importance to him as analytical tools and played only secondary roles in developing his thought. However, his claim, the emergence of life as the object of politics in the late eighteenth century marked a definitive shift in political rationality. Surprisingly, however, given the influence of his work on biopolitical studies, Foucault himself spent little time directly discussing the concepts of biopower and biopolitics. Mils (2018) states in her book *Bio-Politics*, that Timothy Campbell, and Adam Sitze (2013:7) note that Foucault's thinking on biopower is full of "shifts, pretences, changes in focus and direction".

Furthermore, the place occupied by the concept of biopower in Foucault's work is itself ambivalent as it builds on earlier threads and turns them into new goals, which is probably fair to say, that he had never fully realized. Rather than taking these concepts as autonomous and independent theoretical contributions, it is more productive to understand biopolitics and biopower as they work alongside some of the other ideas related to power and governance that Foucault develops in his overall work. Until the end of the 18th century inside European societies, power was a sovereign power, in Foucauldian terms. The sovereign power, or the power of early modernity had the privilege of the right of life and death, a right that was essentially the right to impose death or to allow life, as the French Philosopher put it. The roots of this right go back to Roman law, the pater familias had the right to take the lives of his children and slaves because by law he owned them – he gave his children life, so he had the right to take it. However, it should be noted that the sovereign power in this type of society exercised the right of death as a right of retaliation in cases where there was a danger to the monarch's power from internal or external enemies. Thus, at the same time, pre-modern power imposes itself on life through death. A "grab" of life for its subtraction, as Foucault notes, the power of early modernity was privileged to seize the time, bodies, and lives of its subjects, operating as a "subtraction mechanism" (Foucault, 1976, pp. 135-136). The power of early modernity within European societies is framed within a mediaeval religious environment, though the king's monarchical power is considered "transcendent and sacred" (Preciado, 2015).

Nevertheless, with society's entry into modernity, a change in the right to life and death occurs. The once-known right to die is transformed into power over life, a power whose purpose is to manage life, discipline bodies and regulate the population (Foucault, 1976). This new "power to manage life" incorporated death into its operation, transforming its political significance in the process (Mills, 2018). Thus, Foucault writes, 'the ancient right to take life or let live was replaced by a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death (Foucault 1990, 138). While death does not disappear from the horizon of power's operation, its status is profoundly transformed from being the emblem and right of power to a mere 'counterpart' of a power that administers and fosters life. In *Society Must Be Defended*, Foucault rejects the idea that the sovereign right was replaced, suggesting that it 'came to be complemented by a new right which does not erase the old right but penetrates it. This new right is formulated as 'the right to make life and to let die (Mills, 2018). As Thanasis Lagios has correctly noted that Foucault does not speak of a replacement of powers but of coexistence, a triangle of power, i.e. where sovereign power, disciplinary power and governmentality coexist and complement each other. «*Therefore, we do not have a Hegelian scheme of transcendence and undoing of one form of power relations by a higher one, there is no progress but only the emergence of differences*» (Λάγιος, 2013).

Biopower started in the 17th century and consists of two basic forms simultaneously as poles of development, tied together with a "bundle of relationships". The first pole aimed at the control and discipline of the body, through various technologies of control (training, capacity building, development of utility, inclusion in effective economic systems of control), the so-called "anatomopolitics of the human body". The second pole came to complete anatomopolitics, and focused on the "body-species", aiming at the multiplication of life (births, deaths, health, life span) through interventions and regulatory controls, i.e., a "biopolitics of the population". The development and establishment of the two poles that held and organized the power over life, anatomopolitics and biopolitics, the discipline of the body and the regulation of the population, do not speak of the power of death, but of a power that encompasses life and investments the life of itself. At the beginning of the biopower regime, various control mechanisms were established - disciplines, such as educational institutions, barracks, and laboratories, and at the same time the eye of modern power monitors fertility, public health, longevity, immigration, and housing. Various power technologies are born that aim to enslave the body and control the population; therefore, power begets power (Foucault, 1976, pp. 139-140).

Sex (in a sense of sexuality), as a political stake, is the meeting point of biopolitical, disciplinary power and governmentality which opens the way to a series of micropower of the body and interventions from the state in the social body. Although Foucauldian analysis of sexuality as an apparatus of biopower has been a unique perspective of how power operates, according to Silvia Federici, the French philosopher does not

consider "sexual differentiation" in his analysis (Federici,2004, p.35-36). He [Foucault] mentioned that biopower is an essential element for the development of capitalism because it [capitalism] could not exist "without the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population to economic processes" (Foucault, 1976, p.140-141). As stated in *Caliban and the Witch*, by Silvia Federici (2004, p. 35-36), Foucault was fascinated by the "productive" nature of the "power techniques" that the body is endowed with excluding any criticism of power relations. Foucault's theory of the body underscores his belief that "the body is constituted by purely discursive practices" and is more interested in describing how power is used than identifying its sources.

Moreover, Federici says that the witch-hunting study disputes the Foucauldian theory of the emergence of biopower. As described above, Foucault in the *History of Sexuality* describes the transition from the right of death to the life-administrating power. For Federici, it does not provide any information on the reasons why this transition is happening, but [she] suggests that if the transition of power is placed under the framework of the development of capitalism, it becomes clear that the promotion of life forces is the result of the accumulated and reproductive labour power, as well as the destruction of life. Moreover, I agree with Federici's criticism of Foucauldian analysis of biopower that, If Foucault were to analyze the witch hunt against confession, he would see that his analysis cannot be written based on a "universal, abstract, and asexual subject". (Federici, 2004, p. 35-36). In the same context, paraphrasing Paul Preciado (2015), the French philosopher would comprehend the transition of power regimes as, from the necropolitical father who withholds bodies and life, power turns to the womb to the biopolitical western modern mother who regulates, controls, and manages life.¹

However, Foucault carefully points out that the transition from consanguinity to sexuality is not a clear break, but involves a series of "overlaps, interactions and reverberations" (Mills, 2018). *"This is why in the nineteenth century sexuality was sought out in the smallest details of individual existences; it was tracked down in behaviour, pursued in dreams; it was suspected of underlying the least follies, it was traced back into the earliest years of childhood; it became the stamp of individuality.* » Additionally, sexuality turns into the subject of political operation, economical intervention, and ideological campaigns, becoming society's strength, while disclosing its political energy and biological vigour. This is achieved by the "four great lines of attack" (sexualization of children, hysterization of women, birth control, and psychiatrization of perversions), which politics of sexuality has been promoted since the 18th century in order to manage life (Foucault, 1976, p.146). During the 19th century and along the four major lines, the fields of Biology and physiology normalized human corporeal sexuality. Finally, the concept of sex <<inverts the representation of power relations with sexuality>>, presenting the latter as a level where power tries to

¹ "If he had adopted a more feminist perspective, he might have noted a more extensive embodiment of monarchical power: the male (sexual) body of the father..» (Preciado, 2015)

control every aspect of life. Through the mechanism of discipline and regulation imposed by the life-administrating regime, a system of sexuality is established, shaping the idea of sex (male-female). Thus, the idea of sex dictates sexuality and at the same time aids the exercise of power over bodies and life. That is, we have the idea that the power limits sex within strict limits, and we try to escape, to escape from these limits, to have sex without restrictions. There is a normativity from which power feeds, an antagonism between sex (male-female), sexuality and power, where sex and sexuality function as a means of power to construct a regime of scientific truth of norm (Foucault, 1976, pp. 152-156), where since the late 19th century and especially after World War II, it has been assumed that the only way for progress of the Western civilization is through the medicalization of gender and sexuality. The birth of gender in the mid-twenty century marks the separation of sex into biological and cultural, creating new theories of sexuality and reorienting the way biomedical discourse and governments approach sex. Foucault in *Will to Knowledge* points out the significance of psychiatry, medicine, and education over sexuality in the Victorian period, the importance of those fields assists with the invention of gender (Repo, 2015) Gender was introduced by John Money, a sexologist and psychiatrist, in 1954, studying the genitalia of intersex people, he came up to the conclusion that sex was not biological innate, but it was influenced by social factors, therefore according to Money, gender embodies social and cultural practices, representation and behavioral control system, which "catalyze sex's anatomical phenomenology" (Τζανάκη, 2018) In a biopolitical framework, Money's work shows that gender is a life-administrating technology, which operates along with sexuality as mechanisms of the apparatus of biopower (in Foucauldian terms). It is with this background that Repo, in her book *The Biopolitics of Gender* (2015) shows how gender, a term of psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and sexology, which contains authoritative interpretations, is instrumentalized in feminist criticism. Therefore, as Repo points out, Oakley's 1972 version enables us to reinterpret gender as an integral part of feminist discourse analysis, and not simply as a conflict and confrontation with the dominant ideology of patriarchy, but with a problem that begins with the demand of the ruling class to re-signal the desire according to its needs. Furthermore, she focuses on the political consolidation measures and how the term gender is used, emphasizing the normative starting point and the cognitive, epistemological assumptions of modernist science, where it re-cyphers and reproduces gender (Τζανάκη, 2018) As Tzanaki (2018) very rightly mentions, the concept of gender, whether social or biological, in politics and science reinforces the repression of human disobedience to capitalism since they allow the establishment of a form of morality that re-signals and reproduces the classical political philosophy of valour and a feminize life. After 1954, Gender, as a transformation of Psychiatry, forming a part of political power in (late) modernity, presents biopolitics and establishes regimes of truths and Knowledge, as techniques of power over life in either marginalized places or central places, where subjects are born and blossom. Although Repo's work could be described as groundbreaking, I agree with Demetra Tzanaki's view, that her genealogy of gender began

after 1950, presenting gender as the psychological enlightenment of the mid-twenty century, it should be highlighted that sex is, also, introduced by Richard von Krafft-Ebing in his book *Psychopathia Sexualis*, making sex the secret must be revealed (by science) as Michell Foucault said (Τζανάκη, 2018).

However, at the same time, gender comes together with a biomedical discourse that classifies sexuality, bodies, and life (Τζανάκη, 2018). In the same context, and a few years later, Robert J. Stoller further developed the concept of gender through his research on transsexualism and transvestism, describing gender as the most testable term for formulating scientifically supported premises in the description of an ideal sex. Initially, Stoller's study affiliated gender with the psychoanalytical discipline of desire that was already applied to sexuality, showing gender as an extension of the sexual apparatus. Also, his work improved the biopolitical technique of gender by placing it in a gender-specific structural opposition that aligns with the biological/cultural divide. This split provides biopower with a tool to control gender by manipulating sociocultural structures. Last but not least, Stoller presented the notion of gender identity, making the confessional and self-discipline aspect of gender more profound, as Repo (2015) noted. As Tzanaki (2018) have stated, and I agree Money's and Stoller's research influenced science to focus on sexual development in intersex and transgender people, as well as gender reassignment, being essentially a machine for producing power relations under capitalism, which the last one produce "dominant social relations and control over human disobedience", because gender, as sexuality, is the political stake of modernity. In those regimes of truth, which have established biological/anatomic differences of human beings to be seen as "natural", gender identity has been shaped, through various mechanisms to try to normalize human sexuality. Therefore, anything that blurs the boundaries or does not fit in the heterosexual model, should be rejected, and excluded. Within this context, LGBTIQ+ people, migrants, Roma, Jews, disabled and other social groups have been considered as «*dangerous "Others"*» (Lekka, 2014). In other words, as Theodosia Geltis finds in a publication of AMFI magazine in 1970, «Negroes, women, children, old people, the insane and homosexuals either speak the white man's language or are exterminated, impaled, die » (Γκελτής, 2021). Thus, this specific '*human species*' is the material that, at certain points in time, was selected and used to establish a link between «*heredity, reduced intelligence, and delinquent behaviour*» (Τζανάκη, 2021).

Chapter 2: The Invisible Triangle (Psychopathia Sexualis)

2.1. Genealogy of Homosexuality

Paraphrasing Robert Beachy there have been always people who pursue having sex and/or making relationships with their own sex/gender. In the 19th century emerged the modern concept of homosexuality, Michel Foucault, and many historians (after him) have agreed that the emergence of the binarism of sexuality, heterosexuality-homosexuality, can be traced to 1869 (Beachy, 2010). As Vasia Lekka remind us in her paper *Normalizing sexuality in twentieth-century western societies: a critical reading of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, homosexuality, as a term, introduced by Karl Maria Kertbeny (1824 – 1882) in 1868, alongside heterosexuality. A year later, he referred to the term "homosexuality" during one of his public speeches, in order to enhance his efforts to reform the sodomy law (Lekka, 2014) Even though it was first introduced by Kertbeny, it spread in 1901 by Havelock Ellis (1859 -1939) with his book *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (Τζανάκη, 2018) It is also noteworthy that Ellis introduced the concept of lesbian love for the first time in the same work, as an alternative to the terms tribadism and sapphism, which had previously been used to describe the sexual relationship between two women. However, the term lesbian love is defined as a mental illness in his view (Τζανάκη, 2019).

It was only at the Paris Commune (1871) that paragraph 175 dominated German law; there were no prosecutions until then; "sodomy" meant any sexual act that was not intended for reproduction. The question is not whether homosexuality, or more broadly the "inversion" of gender and sexuality, was persecuted pre-modern, but how it was established in modernity (Τζανάκη, 2019) Germany was generally federalist in 1871, but Prussia influenced its legal institutions, resulting in Paragraph 175 being included in the Imperial Criminal Code. Initially, paragraph 175 punished sodomy, defined as acts of sexual penetration or intimacy between men and animals. The older interpretation of paragraph 175 was that it only prohibited anal penetration, but now it prohibits non-penetrative contact that approximates sexual relations. The act implied that acts between men that could be compared to heterosexual intercourse were illegal. As a result of the public debate in the 1910s, it was suggested that jurisprudence be reformed or abolished. Many sexual acts, including anal, oral, and intercrural contact, were considered sodomy because of the lack of precise definitions of "intercourse-like" acts (Beachy, 2010). For the first time in human history, "sodomy" was identified with all kinds of pathology, violence, and criminality, based on the scientific methodology/research and classification of science. Therefore, the reference to the Paris Commune is not accidental. In this period, the bourgeoisie wanted to reverse criticism by showing that, contrary to Marxism and anarchism, which conclude that wars, violence, disease, and poverty are the result of class hierarchy, sodomism is the result of human nature, which is criminal and morally degenerate (Τζανάκη, 2019).

Due to Germany's federalism and inability to agree on how to apply the law, legal scholars and medical scholars apply the law differently. In Berlin, progressive sexologists and psychiatrists exacerbated the situation as expert witnesses. Experts often identified a patient's inborn sexual orientation and demanded leniency due to reduced capacity despite criminalizing specific sexual acts. German criminalization of sodomy led to new theories of same-sex attraction. In the context of medical thinking and patient self-definition, Harry Oosterhuis said that various understandings of sexuality emerged (Beachy, 2010).

In 1870, the German psychiatrist Karl Friedrich Otto Westphal (1833-1890) referred to the "contrary sexual feeling" in his article *Die Konträre Sexualempfindung: Symptom eines neuropathologischen (psychopathischen) Zustandes* (Contrary Sexual Feeling: The Symptoms of Neuropathic (Psychopathic) Condition) (Lekka, 2014). Influenced by his work, Jean-Martin Charcot (1825-1893) and Valentin Magnan (1835-1916) would publish the article «Inversion du sens genital» in 1882, setting forth sexual feeling against nature and giving credits to Westphal who "found" the sex/gender inversion as against nature. However, Westphal did not come to the conclusion that contrary sexual feeling opposed the natural order of things, he noted in the magazine *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, that similar cases can be traced in Indigenous communities² (Τζανάκη, 2018). Even though Westphal's "contrary sexual feeling" did not build a pathological condition, his work opened the door to the pathology of the subject's sexuality constituting the psychiatric category of homosexuality (Lekka, 2014).

In other words, homosexuals have been turned into undesirable bodies by psychiatry, leaving them with two options: either compromise and conform by allowing psychiatry to cure their "ill", and "pathological" bodies, or they will be destined to remain silent forever. It proved necessary to define homosexuality as the "Other" as well as to exclude it from the heterosexual "We" in order to formulate the heterosexual "We." Vasia Lekka quotes A. Athanasiou as saying, "Representing the absolute moral threat as well as the absolute political danger, the expelled and excommunicated body of the Other must be eliminated for humanity's sake, for civilization, and for 'life' itself. In the imaginary of sovereignty, the social death and the physical extermination of the Other is imposed as a 'legitimate' means of reinforcing the security, the welfare and the pure identity of the body politic, which is composed of those worth living" (Lekka, 2014). These lives are the manifestation of the bourgeois fear of counterproductiveness, instability, and rebellion, which is the usurpation of consciousness by the feminine element, leading to crime and psychosis. In the transition to modernity, passive lives terrify and must be disciplined. They will be disciplined, "coddled", and

² Westphal was influenced by Bénédict Augustin Morel's theory on degeneration. Morel explained that inside of European Society, lower class has atavistic elements, which are not in accordance with evolutionary theory of Darwin Charles. For Morel those parts of the European population suffered from degeneration because they lived under their desires, their primal instincts controlled by their sexual instincts. Based on Morel's theory, Carl Westphal would spoke about sexual inverts, those degenerates' subjects who dare to invert the truth of their own sex (Τζανάκη, 2018).

exterminated physically and socially. This life lacks will, is a ballast of pleasures, is morally inferior, unruly, and is a troublemaker. It is the opposite of civilization, productivity, social order, and rationality. Those bodies and ideas that challenged the status quo and thought alternatively, namely, those who defined themselves and gave in to their desires, were exiled into the realm of feminine existence (Γκελή, 2019)

A few years later, the German psychiatrist Richard von Kraft Ebbing (1840-1902) established the pathological dimension of homosexuality through his research, entitled *Psychopathia Sexualis* which was published in 1886 (Lekka, 2014). Even though *Psychopathia Sexualis* had a significant impact on influencing the European way of thinking about sexuality, it should be noted that Hermann Kaan (1819-1893) was the first psychiatrist to use the term in 1844 (Τζανάκη, 2018, p. 215) A total of seventeen homosexual case studies were included in the first edition of Kraft Ebbing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, with each subsequent edition adding five or more. In 1903, shortly after Krafft-Ebing's death, the twelfth edition contained 238 same-sex case studies. (Beachy, 2010) A series of testimonies were collected by the author, mostly from men, who fled to his doctor's office after discovering they (allegedly) had been exposed to perversion. One of the differences between Kaan's and Kraft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* is that the latter understands the contrary sexual feeling was a psychosis, resulting from degeneration³. (Τζανάκη, 2018, pp. 215-216). It is significant to note that Krafft-Ebing subscribed to Morel's degeneration theory, which was based on the self-discovery described in *Psychopathia*, which in turn influenced his own views. According to Krafft-Ebing, homosexuality is an illness caused by inherited genetic factors, and it is driven by Darwinian principles. As same-sex eroticism did not serve procreation, it was a biological mistake or deformity (Beachy, 2010). As mentioned above psychiatry defined "normal" and "pathological" sexuality, "normal" heterosexual identity, and "pathological" homosexual identity, as well as a long list of "sexual perversions" and "sexual deviations" (Lekka, 2014). However, at the same time, several psychiatrists disagreed that homosexuality was a result of the degeneration-feminization, such as the English psychiatrist Havelock Ellis and Berlin's medical doctor and sexologist Iwan Bloch, both of them argued that *inversion* (term of the time, for describing the same- sex love) was an inborn condition and should not be criminalized (Beachy, 2010). According to Michel Foucault, feminization becomes a declaration and consolidation of disease as punishment because the subject dares to enter heteromorphic relations in the Foucauldian sense. This opposes the ethics of aphrodisiacs, a code of reproduction of hegemonic power. Create a technology that manipulates power to tame the population, subdue every revolutionary act and reproduce mankind. *The management of human life...is identified with the defeminization of life that causes disease* (Τζανάκη, 2021).

³ It should be highlighted that Kraft – Ebbing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* was referred on contrary sexual feeling of men, on the contrary in women was impossible for him to understand the feminization, because by their nature they were feminized. (Τζανάκη, 2018).

Before World War II, homosexual emancipation was primarily a German phenomenon. At the time, there were two strands regarding views of homosexuality (Klapholz, 2020). Even though, Kraft-Ebbing, Havelock Ellis, Iwan Bloch, and other psychiatrists and sexologists were trying to abolish paragraph 175-decriminalize sodomy- the pioneer of this movement was Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1935) with his *Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee*, WhK (Scientific Humanitarian Committee). The aim of WhK and the extent Magnus Hirschfeld was to double; to abolish paragraph 175 of the German Penal Code and change negative opinions of "*uranism*", which had been considered as seen and criminal behaviour. Of course, since the late 19th century, homosexuality has been considered an illness (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991). Hirschfeld was internationally recognized as an influential sexologist and activist by his death in 1935. Hirschfeld played a vital role in the institution of sexology as a founding editor of the world's first journal dedicated to same-sex sexuality, ethnographer of metropolitan same-sex and transgender cultures across the globe, as well as architect of the first Institute for Sexual Sciences in Berlin (Bauer, 2010). In his view, "*homosexuality was an inborn mental and physical condition of a specific minority, the so-called "third sex", which he described as an intermediate human species between full-blown men and women, comparable to androgynes, hermaphrodites and transvestites.*" (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991). Hirschfeld argued that since homosexuals were a well-defined minority, they deserved the same rights as everyone else. Persuaded that science and psychological research would guarantee tolerance from straight society, Hirschfeld embraced the concept "*per scientiam ad justiam*" (through science to justice) (Klapholz, 2020). Darwinism and embryology were influential in his theory of the third sex. The embryo, he asserted, once its development has reached its initial stage, is bisexual and reflects the evolution of humankind in its structure, which is to say that ontogeny is a reflection of the phylogeny. During the evolutionary process, maleness and femininity became differentiated following Darwin's law of natural selection. As a result, heterosexuality became more common because it was helpful for procreation. In Hirschfeld's view, "*uranism*", like other intermediate stages such as hermaphroditism and androgyny, should be considered from the perspective of both evolutionary and biological processes. The situation is comparable to other minor disorders that may occur during natural development (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991). The problem was that Hirschfeld still feared that a social, non-biological conception of homosexuality would alienate potential (male) heterosexual allies by convincing them that they could be 'caught' by homosexuality (Klapholz, 2020).

In May 1933, the institute of Sexual Science was destroyed by the Nazis, and Hirschfeld, rejected by the academic world and exiled to France, turned his interest to racism. After he died in 1935, his work titled *Racism* was published in 1938, distinguishing it from his oeuvre. *Racism* culminates in Hirschfeld's view that the emergence of sexology shows that race is an invention of normative discourse, indenting to "*naturalize scientific truths to specific political effects*". Moreover, here is the paradox of Hirschfeld's

thinking; for him, homosexuality is a biological phenomenon of sexuality, a situation in which masculinity and femininity coexist inside the human being, but "race" emerged by modern technologies of Knowledge and power, to shape the truth (Bauer, 2010). During the late 1890s, Hirschfeld began his sexological career when specific civil rights concerns dominated public sexuality discourse. Meanwhile, anti-Semitic sentiments and the emergence of the Zionist movement, partly a response to this wave of antisemitism, shaped debates regarding race in several European states, including the German Empire. The idealization of a blond muscular Aryan Nazi and its role as a cultural and political authority was created in pre-Nazi Germany, where antisemitism and homophobia coexisted (Klapholz, 2020). This idea refers to the modification or recoding of blood and sperm, which is undeniable. Throughout the era of European colonization, Paul Preciado believes that the construction of the European colonial system ensured the "*free movement of male, heterosexual sperm and blood*" while preventing the circulation of all other "*fluids in the body and all other uses of the body*" (Preciado, 2015).

Adolf Brand (1874-1945) was the leader of the organization *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen* (The Society of the Self-Determined), editor and publisher of the magazine *Der Eigenen* (The Self-Owner), which appeared between 1896-1931, and one of the most controversial activists of the gay movement (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991). On the contrary to Hirschfeld's view on the medicalization and biological conception of homosexuality, Adolf Brand and his followers, Benedict Friedlaender (1866-1908), Edwin Bab (1882-1912), and Hans Bluher (1888-1955), believed in a more muscularity approach of male homosexuality, which would reinforce masculinity through same-sex relationship. For Brand, homosexuality was *a form of social expression ... - it could be shared, developed and, promoted among men*. Interestingly, Brand's emphasis on Kultur - "*the unique "aesthetic and spiritual values...rooted in the German soul"*" - was intended in contrast to Hirschfeld's Enlightenment ideals of rationalism and humanism. As a conceptual framework for this project, Brand draws on the category of *Gemeinschaft*, the close-knit community of nature that contrasts with *Gesellschaft*, the more industrial side of life in isolated urban regions like Hirschfeld in Berlin. Brand's anarchist perspective, however, was soon replaced by a more nationalist perspective within the masculinist movement. Therefore, it is understandable why the masculinists were able to take advantage of the German nationalism of the nineteenth century so extensively. It is through this nationalism that the Nazi era, which is already characterized as having a 'shining homoeroticism', played a critical role (Klapholz, 2020). It was in 1900 that Adolf Brand published a book by a Baltic German artist, Elisar von Kupffer (1872-1942), *Lieblingminne und Freundeslove in der Weltliteratur*. As a result of Kupffer's anthology, the biomedical discourse about homosexuality at the time, especially Kraft-Ebing's and Hirschfeld's, was challenged. As he sees it, same-sex love is not about medical and biological science but ethical and cultural issues. Kupffer influenced his conceptions of male love from ancient Greece, the Renaissance, and the Germanic region in the 18th and 19th centuries (Herden, Schiller, Goethe, etc.). By

arguing that love between two men was not something to be examined through a medical lens, Kupffer instigated a different thinking about same-sex relationships, focusing on the ethical and cultural implications. In the same vein as Kupffer, physician Edwin Bab (1882-1912) also echoed the views of Kupffer and criticized Hirschfeld in 1903 in a lecture at the *Gemeinschaft*. Bab rejected the links between same-sex love and psychological hermaphroditism while refusing the idea that homosexuality was inherited and restricted to a specific group. Bab's critics of Hirschfeld's theory of the emancipation of homosexuality extend further, pointing out that even Magnus Hirschfeld did not embrace homosexuality as an illness or the result of degeneration; he considered homosexuals as patients. Edwin Bab traced the origin of Hirschfeld's and Kraft-Ebing's thinking to the dualism of "natural-unnatural". On the same wavelength, Benedict Friedlaender, with his work *Die Renaissance des Eros Uranios. Die physiologische Freundschaft, ein normaler Grundtrieb des Menschen und eine Frage der männlichen Gesellungsfreiheit. In naturwissenschaftlicher, naturrechtlicher, culturgeschichtlicher und sittenkritischer Beleuchtung*, he argued that Hirschfeld's third-sex theory and Kraft-Ebing's psychopathia sexualis are ideological outcomes of European-Christian culture (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991). Based on this concept, and I argue, he saw the dominant biomedical discourse as a recodetion of the *Decretales* and *Constitutio Criminalis Carolina*. It may be helpful to recall that Tzanaki indicates that the papal decrees (*Decretales*), an ethical code of conduct governing venereal ordinances connected with human supposedly feminine or libidinal desire, came, and submitted to prevent these forces of evil from destroying the Christian community. Under the authority of Charles V of France in 1532, these provisions were turned into state decrees in the Carolina Code (*Constitutio Criminalis Carolina*), where the expert was first to determine the truth. By introducing a sweeping array of rules about a supposed objective truth/ethics of science, the ruling class's regime of truth adopts the regime of the truth of the sciences, giving the bourgeoisie a "thanotopolitics" (Τζανάκη, 2019).

2.2 Sexualize race or Racialize sex?

Due to Berlin's sexology, the notion that homosexuality was primarily a "German" vice was unwittingly formed. It is critical to take this allegation with skepticism, however: chauvinistic national clichés are typical in European history. Moreover, since World War II, Germans have been perceived as less homosexual than other national groups. Early sexuality scholars did not ignore the issue of whether distinct cultures or national identities had higher rates of same-sex eroticism. For example, the Sotadic Zone was a groundbreaking concept proposed by Cambridge-trained explorer and gentleman scholar Richard Burton in 1885. As a generalization, Burton concluded that pederasty was more prevalent among people living between Mediterranean Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, northern India, Central Asia, China, Japan, and the South Sea Islands. Some saw Burton's work as an attempt to sexualize race, to establish an intellectual

justification for the idea that certain racial or ethnic groups were 'naturally' more prone to same-sex eroticism than others (Beachy, 2010). Western Europe dominated the rest of the world at that time, establishing Western European white supremacy with Christian moral values, aiming to civilize the atavistic part of the world. Within this context, the natural process of Charles Darwin and the degeneration theory of Bénédict Augustin Morel dominate contemporary biomedical science. According to Morel, degeneration exists within European societies, and the lower classes exhibit those physical attributes that contradict Darwin's evolutionary theory. For Morel, those parts of the European population suffered from degeneration because they lived under their desires, their primal instincts controlled by their sexual instincts (Τζανάκη, 2018).

As a part of his 19th-century treatise on homosexuality, Russian psychiatrist Marc-Andre Raffalovich dedicated a chapter to "German friendship" in his book *Uranisme et Unisexualite': Etude sur diffe'rentes manifestations de l'instinct sexuel* in 1896. For him, German friendship is "neither words, eyes, gestures, nor scandal-mongering." To support his claim on the German "*Uranian*" phenomenon, he examined the works of Schlegel, Schiller, Goethe, Hamman, Gleim, Arnim, Brentano, Kleist, and Grillparzer, among others. In a publication titled *Sexual Inversion*, Havelock Ellis confirmed the validity of Raffalovich's "literary" theory in the case studies provided by Symonds, which in turn confirmed Raffalovich's "literary" theory. Furthermore, Ellis revealed that six of the forty-nine British subjects had some German origin, which for him is not by accident, especially when the study of sexual inversion takes place in Germany, highlighting an inclination. A wider-scale debate was sparked by the assumptions of Raffalovich and Ellis, which French nationalists quickly politicized in the aftermath. In the first decade of the twentieth century, a series of high-profile scandals that originated in Berlin played an instrumental role in establishing the stereotypes associated with Germans (anti-) around the world. Sexual scandals have always been prevalent in Germany since the early 19th century (Beachy, 2010).

A series of high-profile scandals, mainly from Berlin, fuelled this (anti-)German stereotype in the first decade of the twentieth century. It appears that public accusations of homosexuality served as a powerful tool for politicizing or damaging state officials' reputations or agitating against paragraph 175. Politicians, as well as advocates for gay rights in Germany, have now begun to use the word "out" to promote the interests of their organizations (Beachy, 2010) However, even though Paul Preciado discusses the political discussions surrounding syphilis and its role at the time, I believe that public allegations about homosexuality in pre-Nazi Germany target the same issue, which is life itself. Thus, those public discussions about homosexuality were taking place inside the space of representation of a political body where the limits of the racial and Christian male body were threatened by interacting with other religions, races, and desexualized female and non-white bodies that had another blood and another sperm.

Furthermore, in this framework of sexual geopolitical iconography, slaves, migrants, refugees, homosexuals, and Jews were becoming a source of inflation- an enemy of the state (Preciado, 2015).

However, I feel Preciado's words apply and explain complementary Sidqfs thought. For the Palestinian and Communist, Muhammad Najâtî Sidqfs Plea (1905- 1979) Nazi racism is based on the idea of purity and superiority of the German Aryan race, which both notions depend on each other. He claims that racism comes from the idea of the blood, not from the culture or the "foundation of the spirit". Additionally, he argues that Nazi racial theory claims that "human races are not equal"; they have a biological hierarchy (At the top are "White", in the middle "yellow" and at the bottom "black") which some of them meant to be ruled, and other to rule (Gershoni, 2012). Even though I argue with Sidqfs's concept Nazi racial theory, he does not take into inconsideration the "sex" (male-female) and the influence of the dominant biomedical discourse, which shaped ideas on race. Hirschfeld mentioned in Racism that *racial thinking is perpetuated historically through modern technologies of Knowledge such as the educational system* and gives an example of how he was introduced at school to the theory of Friedrich Blumenbachs about the colour classification of "races": 'black', 'white', 'yellow', 'red' and 'brown'. For Hirschfeld, tutoring the colour-code categorization of human "races" in schools illustrates the normative process by which the scientific "truth" establishes a regime of power and Knowledge. Therefore, the emergence of those "truths" during modernity supports Western beliefs on racial hierarchies. It is well known that there are racial hierarchies which are inherently privileged to white people, and which are misused often - as with the Nazis - to further a policy of national expansion (Bauer, 2010).

Antisemitism and homophobia have been shared in a network of complex narratives about femininity, foreignness and being the state's enemies. At the same time, they were used to spread and establish Nazi ideology. A long-standing antisemitic view held that Jews were "pseudo women," a theory that argued that Jewish tradition reversed gender roles. The "ideal male" was the "Torah scholar" whose authority was centred on the "House of Study" (Klapholz, 2020). Meanwhile, "the estate of gaining and spending," the core of power in bourgeois society, was the proper domain of the woman. Despite attempts by "modernizing" Jews from Central Europe to reverse gender dynamics and impose secular concepts of masculinity and femininity, stigmas remained (Klapholz, 2020). Homosexuality was viewed as the result of degeneration-feminization, sexual inverts, as Westphal described them (Τζανάκη, 2018). European antisemitic culture during the 19th and 20th centuries considered Jews to be treasonous due to their status as a "nation within a nation". Jews and homosexuals developed "communities within communities" that threatened the primary national culture. The discourse of national threat included antisemitism and homophobia. In addition to being separated from the state, gays and Jews also contributed to its collapse.

Both factions recognized biological threats to Germany's reproductive capability. Jews were considered proponents of family breakdown (Klapholz, 2020).

In contrast to the Nazis' desire for procreative virility in their males, Jewish males were often portrayed as "masturbating women," and circumcision was seen as a form of "castration." Homosexual men were also the focus of a similar trope. A core concern of the Reich was that gays undercut the reproductive concept. After all, the Nazis considered sexology, a core of gay intellectualism and advocacy, to be a "Jewish science." Likewise, antisemitism and homophobia resulted in similar types of national terror, and sexological research was terminated "because it was practised mainly by Jews" (Klapholz, 2020) As I mentioned above, Hirschfeld's last work was on racism. In his after-death work *Racism*, the Jewish-German sexologist demonstrates his complex and paradoxical thoughts about identity and the identification of 'race' and sex. Furthermore, these views shed light on the politics underlying his perception of sexual and racial standards. Hirschfeld, while rejecting the concept of biological race, maintained that sexuality was universal and inborn. In other words, Hirschfeld examined race in *Racism* in a manner considerably different from his treatment of sexuality. Hirschfeld believed that the biological aspect of sexuality and the occurrence of universal homosexuality in various racial communities demonstrated that race was only a matter of custom or convention and not biological. To reject the notion that Jews and Aryans were different, he leveraged queers' biological minority status (Bauer, 2010). The ideas of the *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen* also ended up taking on an explicitly racist aspect. Surprisingly, the Jewish sexologist Benedict Friedlander originally stated that homosexuals were essential for the survival and development of the race. Nevertheless, Hans Blüher expanded Friedlander's views even further, connecting '*weak*' and '*effeminate*' homosexuals with '*the Jewish race*'. Blüher argued for his own '*racial purity and [that of] certain types of [masculine] homosexuals*' because he challenged allegations that he was a Jew because of his relationships with Sigmund Freud and Hirschfeld. He considered feminine males racially broken due to '*Jewish-liberal degeneration*.' In other words, feminization is not the result of homosexuality. Still, it is the result of being degenerated or being a Jew. From Blüher's point of view, *uranism* can be used to improve the race while also isolating Jewish femininity (Klapholz, 2020).

By saying all that, I argue with Janet Jakobsen, whose purpose is for a "*relational reading of history*" requiring the terms - homophobia and antisemitism- to be all the time present and in an active relationship. "Jews" and "homosexuals" should be considered as twins, different to each other, binding them through history, which allows substituting each other or deciding or not to "act in concert". By taking Jakobsen's approach, each group is able to maintain not only its complexity but also its autonomy, which means that it is free to decide whether or not to engage with the other group (Jakobsen, 2003). Based on the above, I consider the Muslim community in Germany should be included as a third term because as Jews and

homosexuals were tied, the Muslim community in Berlin from 1920 until the end of the Second World War is part of this multicolour mosaic. Berlin's first Mosque was built in 1920 by Muslims- South Asians of the Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at-e-Islam, an Islamic confessional minority based in British India, and German converts. The Ahmadi controlled the Mosque from 1923 to 1939, until the begging of the war; the Ahmadi "*promoted conversion as a kind of double consciousness, preaching interreligious tolerance, practising inclusion of homosexuals, and speaking out against racism, nationalism, and war*" (Baer, 2015: 145). By studying the history of Berlin's Mosque community and the life of the community, it is possible to find two interrelated themes: first, the Muslim response to Nazism and, secondly, the relationship between Muslims and Jews. Marc David Baer cites that Israeli-Palestinian politics have not entirely answered how Muslims react to Nazism and the persecution of Jews⁴ (and homosexuals, may I add) (Baer, 2015: 141). Of course, recent research on Holocaust shows that among the victims of the Nazis were Muslims, too. Hopp and Scheck note that the majority of Muslim inmates at the concentration camps were French, Soviets, Arabs, Egyptians or Jews who had converted to Islam, as Marcus Hugo (Hopp, 2004; Scheck, 2012).

One of the significant figures in the German Muslim community was Dr Hugo Marcus (1880-1966), who had a crucial role in the mosque community until the outbreak of war. His eighty-six years as a poet, philosopher, political activist, and writer led him to join several communities, movements, and ideologies. After moving to Berlin in 1898, he joined the Wissenschaftlich-Humanitäre Komitee (Scientific Humanitarian Committee). In the years following WW1, he tutored young Muslim men from the Ahmadi mission to support his family. He was hired by the Ahmadi community as editor of all German-language publications in 1923. Two years later, Marcus converted to Islam and signed Hirschfeld's Instituto petition to abolish Paragraph 175 (Baer, 2020). Throughout his career, he shaped the way Islam was expressed and presented in Germany. He edited all the Mosque's German-language publications, including the Ahmadi German Qur'an translation and commentary (1939) and worked as the chief editor of the Moslemische Revue (1924–1940). He headed the German Muslim Society from 1930 to 1935. "*At the society's "Islam Evenings" at the Mosque, he gave dozens of lectures, including two of his acquaintances from homosexual rights and literary circles.*" Islam was portrayed by Marcus and Ahmadi as a tolerant religion that surpassed national and racial boundaries (Baer, 2015). From the start, the Ahmadi stressed interreligious tolerance, stressing the unity of humanity, and highlighting similarities between Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The

⁴ «Until recently, few academic and popular responses to this question have focused on Muslims who came from Germany or had resided there for decades; most look at Muslims in the Middle East or those who were temporarily located in Berlin during World War II. In fact, research on Muslims in Nazi Germany has overwhelmingly focused on Arabs, and for that matter on a single Palestinian, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Al-Hajj Amin al-Husayni (1897–1974), who was the guest of Hitler in Berlin and whose notoriety for working closely with the Nazi regime has overshadowed the activities of all other Muslims in Germany, and indeed elsewhere as well» on Baer, M. D. (2015). *Muslim Encounters with Nazism and the Holocaust: The Ahmadi of Berlin and Jewish Convert to Islam Hugo Marcus*. *The American Historical Review*, 120(1), 140–171. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43696338>

Ahmadi opposed nationalism and racism during Weimar Germany, criticizing Europeans for being blinded by hate (Baer, 2020). In his book, *Inside the Third Reich*, Albert Speer stated Adolf Hitler's view on Muslims, Arabs and non-Arabs. For Hitler and to an extent, Nazi ideology, Islam was a religion which could be "*spread by sword and subject all nations to their faith*". Thus, for Hitler if Arabs won the battle of Tours, Islam could be the world's religion. However, he highlights that only "Islamized Germans" could dominate, and non-Germans Muslims because of their "racial inferiority." Nazi-Islamic collaboration was crucial for the expansion of the Third Reich after 1939- especially at the end of the world- in the Eastern Front, Balkans, Caucasus, North Africa and the Middle East. The Islamic-Nazi alliance started in 1941-1942 for numerous reasons; first, it helped further the implementation of the Final Solution, and second, it created the so-called Muslim war zones that supported the racial war against the Slavs. Third, due to the Nazi's encouragement of religious practice on the Eastern Front and the occupied Soviet Union's territories by Muslims, it seemed like a war against the atheist Soviet Union, presenting themselves (Nazis) as a defender of Islam against communism and atheism, as liberators from the French, British and Soviet colonies, and Hitler as a messenger sent by Allah to wreak vengeance on the "Otherness" (Jews, homosexuals, Soviets, etc.) (Wien, 2010).

In order to survive, Ahmadi started to invoke ties between Islam and Nazism. However, the Ahmadi mission failed to fulfil many of the promises made during the Weimar era, based on their claims and actions after 1933. Most of these actions were intended to curry favour with the regime to preserve the organization and the Mosque (Baer, 2015). After all, the Muslim community in Berlin was composed of Afghans, Arabs, Persians, Tatars, Turks, South Asians, Germans and other Europeans, aka refugees, migrants, or exiles from British and French colonies. So, the swiftness of the Islamic community, especially the Ahmadi as a leading group, was contradicted in many ways, as Hugo Marcus's story shows (Baer, 2015).

Chapter 3: The Pink and the Black Triangle⁵

When understanding the persecution of homosexuals in Germany, it is necessary to understand the conditions in the Interwar period of the Weimer Republic (1919-1933), such as the defeat in World War A, the presence of conservatism on the political stage, the rise of racist and xenophobic paramilitary groups throughout the country, inflation, and of course the rise of Nazi ideology. All of those contributed to a "social hurricane" in Pre-Nazi Germany that was driven by five different factors; the fear of revolution, which was caused by the Bolsheviks' success in Russia and the belief that Marxist ideas would spread throughout the country. This drove a sense of urgency among the ruling class to take action to prevent a revolution from occurring. Furthermore, the rise of racism and xenophobia was particularly concerning as it created a divide between different social classes and ethnicities, leading to further instability and fear. This fear was further exacerbated by a lack of trust in the government, which had been weakened by the Treaty of Versailles and the subsequent economic downturn. The inflation of 1922-1923 and the financial crises of 1929 destroyed a lot of economic institutions in Germany, causing unemployment to increase and the rise of conservative and far-right ideologies of the time, such as National Socialism, helped to create an environment of discrimination and intolerance towards homosexuals in Germany (Plant, 1986).

The Nazi regime systematically destroyed several scientific institutes, including the WkH of Magnus Hirschfeld, during the first phase of persecution, which lasted from 1933 until 1935. Further consequences included the persecution of sexology, considered a Jewish science, and the destruction of gay culture that developed during the Interwar period during the Weimar Republic. Also, during the Night of the Long Knives, the Nazi regime officially persecuted homosexuals, promoting racist propaganda. The Gestapo and the police, on the other hand, raided places, bars, and organizations where gay men and women gathered. In addition, it is crucial to note that the reform of paragraph 175, a crucial step in the homosexual witch hunt, completed the first stage of the cause of homosexuality. The police and the Gestapo compiled a total of 90,000 records due to the systematic prosecution and recording of gay men during stage two, which began in 1936 and ended at the beginning of World War II. Additionally, the same year Himmler established the *Central Reich Office for Combating Homosexuality and Abortion*. These two factors, combined with Nazi actions between 1933 and 1935, resulted in a dramatic increase in homosexual persecution. A

⁵ It was at Dachau that the concept of placing-colored triangles according to prisoner categories was introduced for the first time before it was adopted by other camps before it spread through the entire concentration camp system (Schlagdenhauffen, 2018). It should be noted that the pink badge was not the norm in every concentration camp, as Geoffrey Gills points out. In some camps, inmates who had been imprisoned under paragraph 175 were wearing a badge with the capital letter A, which meant *Ardfhicker* (ass-fucker). There is also a documentary from 1994 entitled *We were marked with a big A* by Elke Jeanrond and Joseph Weishaupt on <https://collections.ushmm.org/search/catalog/bib25149>

propaganda campaign against the Catholic Church culminated in the second stage, which resulted in more prosecutions and trials of monks and priests for unnatural sexual acts. As a final point, homosexuality was subjected to physical terror in concentration camps between 1939 and 1945, which was increasingly radicalized and severe; as a consequence, homosexuals were exterminated through labour, castration, death penalty by the gay officials of SS or police, and experiments on homosexuals were conducted, and few committed suicide⁶. (Röll, 1996)

During the interwar period in Europe, men were more likely to be convicted of homosexual behaviour. In contrast, female homosexuality was disapproved more subtly and less frequently. This was due to the gender hierarchy, which held that lesbians would bring less damage to the nation and the patriarchy (Schlagdenhauffen, 2018). Until 1920, homosexuality has not persecuted the way we know it today. On 30 January 1933, the Nazi party was in power, marking the beginning of the actual persecution of homosexuals. German penal code paragraph 175 was introduced in 1871 to persecute sodomy. It states: "*An unnatural sexual act committed between persons of the male sex or by humans with animals is punishable by imprisonment; the loss of civil rights might also be imposed.*" (Kaczorowski, 2015). The revised paragraph 175, on the other hand, notably did not include the word "unnatural" to broaden the law's reach beyond particular practices. Furthermore, unlike previous versions of paragraph 175, the revised version eliminated the requirement that the public prosecutor establish that penetrative sex took place between two partners. In fact, a man was convicted of homosexuality without ever touching the other person. As a result of decrees and legislation, the police and Gestapo suppressed the homosexual community and many citizens who reported gay individuals and couples. As the war progressed, a preventative program was implemented to prevent repeat offenders from committing gay crimes (Giles, 2011). As Tzanaki comments, «*when Foucault refers to 1871, it is not sodomy but the androgynous/gynandrous soul of the persecuted sodomist. The persecution of homosexuality began to take hold around the quiet criminalization of human disobedience by both men and women. It was founded behind words such as sodomism, tribadism and paedophilia throughout the 19th century. After all, this persecution is racist, sexist, and class-based; it permeates society, aiming at permanently cleansing the race from the inferior, immoral other*⁷.» (Τζανάκη, 2020).

The persecution of homosexuality targeted the human disobedience of the libidinous population, particularly of the lower class, and is not based on a disciplinary model of heteronormativity

⁶ There are not many research about deaths by suicides of homosexual inmates in the Nazi camps, although the study of Cuerda-Galindo E, LoÁpez-Muñoz F, Krischel M, Ley A (2017) *Study of deaths by suicide of homosexual prisoners in Nazi Sachsenhausen concentration camp*. PLoS ONE 12(4): e0176007. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176007> , gives a new perspective and open a discussion on this matter.

⁷ Translated by me, from Τζανάκη Δ., (2020), *Δίωξη του τριβαδισμού, σοδομισμού, ομοφυλοφιλίας, λεσβιανισμού. Διαφορετικές εκδοχές της ψυχικής δίωξης ενάντια της ανθρώπινης ανυπακοής (1834-1951)*, Κοινωνικές Επιστήμες.

that was exclusively concerned with men but is distinct from the power-knowledge relations used in specific periods in the libidinous population. In light of Eve's insubordination with God's law, the libidinous human will transform into the rebel who carries the justification for all human despair. It threatens the conditions that guarantee the species' biological survival, including sodomism as an act of the Libidinic human, which is against God's will for reproduction (Τζανάκη, 2020), in this particular case the Nazi policy for the reproduction and racial purity of the Aryan race. Regarding Michel Foucault and Paul Preciado, paragraph 175 of the German Penal Code results from the biopolitics of discipline and surveillance. This has invented the heterosexuality/homosexuality dichotomy, intending to create a body for the reproduction of the national state.

From 1933 to 1945, the Third Reich persecuted homosexuals, particularly men, as enemies of the state (Boden, 2011); many ended up in the concentration camps of Buchenwald, Dachau and Sachsenhausen, wearing the pink triangle to be recognized. Researchers have estimated that from 5000 to 15000 male homosexuals were captured and imprisoned in concentration camps (Oosterhuis, 1997). The decision not to penalize female homosexuality was made because of strongly established sexism, which devalued women's sexual agency and autonomy. Because passivity was considered a universal feminine characteristic, an assertive understanding of women's sexuality, including homosexuality, was regarded as "unfathomable." As a result, lesbians were not considered incapable of damaging the power and expansion of the Volk in a legal framework. Even though the Nazi party did not prohibit lesbianism, lesbians faced significant discrimination under the Third Reich. As a result, much of the female homosexual culture was lost, resulting in "*psychological devastation to a few*" and the ongoing prejudice against female homosexuality (Krueger, 2022).

In the 1930s, several attorneys, including Rudolf Klare, supported criminalizing lesbians because this would "re-educate" them. In the same vein, a few years later, Josef Albert Meisinger stated to his colleague: *Whether they wanted to have sex with men or not, women could still be impregnated (raped) and produce children for the Führer* (Giles, 2011). Lesbians were forced to become less conspicuous and vulnerable. This resulted in women meeting in secret, having loveless marriages, leaving the state, and being compelled to withdraw from their families to avoid detection and prosecution. Historians of Nazi persecution believe that determining the precise scope of lesbian persecution by German officials during the Third Reich was difficult. This is because female homosexuality was not solely legalized. As a result, the prohibition of lesbianism in Nazi Germany is documented in fewer judicial and police reports. The level of sanctioned persecution of lesbians was determined by intersectionality (Krueger, 2022).

Some women were detained in the concentration camp of Ravensbrück accused of lesbianism (Oosterhuis, 1997) and they were often assigned to the camp brothel during their imprisonment (Giles, 2011). According

to Schoppmann, lesbians have only been persecuted when they criticized the Nazi government or refused to comply with anti-Semitic policies. Lesbians are only listed as a secondary characteristic in concentration camps. The primary cause of these women's arrests is usually political, with "lesbian" as an addendum (Schlagdenhauffen, 2018). The Nazis' racial extermination agenda targeted Jewish and non-Aryan lesbians. Lesbians were likewise subjected to social discrimination by the Nazis. Many were prosecuted as "anti-socials," a catch-all phrase for anybody who attempted to avoid or oppose the Nazi dictatorship. Because the Volksgemeinschaft was a central element of Nazi philosophy, anyone who did not adhere to the community for any reason, even if the state justified it, was persecuted. "Anti-socials," forced to wear the black triangle, became disproportionately represented in death camps (Krueger, 2022). Such was the case of Mary Pünjer, prosecuted in Hamburg in 1940. This married woman is identified as "a highly active lesbian". According to the entry register, the grounds for her arrest were "anti-social" with "lesbian" added. On 15 March 1941, she was returned to Ravensbrück, where she was immediately put under the control of Dr Mennecke, who was one of the principal organizers of the T4 (of disabled people) and the 14f13 (of unfit people), which served as a precursor to the Holocaust. Her final known location was the Bernburg euthanasia centre, where she died on 28 May 1942 (Schlagdenhauffen, 2018).

For the nation-state, the "lesbians" and sex workers were considered enemies of the state because they did not help reproduce (Τζανάκη, 2018) the white masculinity of Aryan Germans. The persecution against sodomists, tribadism, homosexuality and lesbianism that began in the late 19th century and continues to this day is about the persecution of human libidinous human disobedience and not just the persecution of same-sex relationships (Τζανάκη, 2020). Essentially, libidinous relationships endanger the survival of the human species; as such, the act of libidinous relationships opposes the wish of the father god and the father state to reproduce healthy children. The Nazi regime had built all the rhetoric and politics of homophobia on the argument of population growth of the Aryan race. Assuming that homosexuality would be transmitted as a disease that would corrupt the body and soul of individuals and harm the entire population, destroying humanity (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991). So, according to Edward Henke in his Handbook on Penal Law and Penal Policy published in 1830, a sodomist damages the state. Henke also states that sodomites refuse to carry out their duties as citizens and corrupt the rest of society (Plant, 1986). In his book *Homosexuality and male bonding in Pre-Nazi Germany*, Oosterhuis argues that the Nazi understanding of same-sex love differs between men and women because it is based on the dualities of active/masculine-passive/feminine life (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991).

As imposed by the Nazi terror apparatus, gay men and women were to be isolated, re-educated or/and eliminated (Röll, 1996). From its implementation in 1871 till the revision of paragraph⁸ 175 by Himmler in 1936, around 1,000 men per year were sentenced and charged under paragraph 175 (Kaczorowski, 2015). Most of the victims were from the working and middle class; John Fout notes that 90% of those who were charged, incarcerated and sent to camps were lower-class members, while the 10% of those arrested at the upper end were arrested for having sex with a partner older than 15, according to subsection 175a of the Criminal Code (Fout, 2002). During 1940-45, homosexuals comprised less than 1% of all inmates in concentration camps. According to Rüdiger Lautmann, 50% of the men incarcerated in concentration camps were taken there by the police, 12% were sent by the Gestapo, and 33% were imprisoned. Accordingly, the police were more likely to send detainees to camps than to apply an arrest policy derived from accusations, raids, and betrayals (Schlagdenhauffen, 2018). Under Himmler's order in July of 1940, homosexual men were deported to concentration camps after their conviction and served their prison time (Röll, 1996). This was to prevent them from committing the same crime again. After serving their sentences, Hermann Göring ordered several homosexuals to be "put to the test". This measure resulted in the enlistment of homosexuals in the Wehrmacht during a critical time in the war (Schlagdenhauffen, 2018).

In comparison to the other "camp groups", pink triangle inmates have a higher death rate within the concentration camps. That was due to them being considered the lowest group in the camp hierarchy and exposed to the SS's terror (Röll, 1996). Furthermore, homosexual inmates were often assigned to the most difficult prison units (Kommandos), where they rarely survived more than six months. These were the deadliest sites in the Nazi regime's "extermination through work" plan for the elimination of homosexuals, including stone quarries, clay quarries, brickworks (Klinkerwerk), and bomb disposal units (Schlagdenhauffen, 2018); as Roll writes, seventy-six percent of pink-triangle death occurred within a period of six weeks of their arrival at the camp (Röll, 1996). It should be noted that *the Jewish homosexual men who face methodical persecution first, not the German homosexual men. This is due to the notion that the Jewish homosexual men represent the degenerate Jews who did not exist within the German nation-state because they were bonded by libidinous desire and imposed on the Jewish people by the German nation*⁹ (Τζανάκη, 2020), which continued in the concentration camps according to Roll mentioned that there was a classification in pink triangle blocks, the normal homosexual, the relapsed, and the Jew homosexual (Röll, 1996). Therefore, if the homosexual inmates were at the bottom of the camp hierarchy,

⁸ As Regis Schlagdenhauffen notes only in Austria there was criminalize both male and female homosexuality (Schlagdenhauffen, 2018).

⁹ Translated by me, from Τζανάκη Δ., (2020), *Δίωξη του τριβαδισμού, σοδομισμού, ομοφυλοφιλίας, λεσβιανισμού. Διαφορετικές εκδοχές της ψυχικής δίωξης ενάντια της ανθρόπινης ανυπακοής (1834-1951)*, Κοινωνικές Επιστήμες.

the Jew homosexuals were even further down. Because of those perspectives, they were rejected by the camp community, as social outsiders, in order to survive many became "toys-boys" or made sexual favours to inmates who had a certain authority in the camp (Röll, 1996).

Along the same wavelength as the Nazi policy of eradicating homosexuality, castration, and hormonal operations on the bodies of homosexuals came to complete the implementation of the Nazi biopolitical agenda of normalizing healthy sexuality and gender and sanitizing the race according to the rules of dominant biomedical discourse. By performing these operations, the Nazis were attempting to force homosexuals to conform to the gender and sexual norms of the Third Reich and to reduce the number of homosexuals in the population (Κουρουτζας, 2018). In this way, castration was seen as an important step in creating the ideal citizen in terms of social Darwinism and eugenics, a 'purified' version of humanity that could unlock the potential of the race. This process was considered necessary because it was thought that, by removing the source of sexual desire and aggression, those who were castrated would become more docile and easier to control. Furthermore, it was believed that this would help to create a more "perfect" society, as those considered "unworthy" were not allowed to reproduce (Τζανάκη, 2022). This was necessary to create a racially pure Germany, as homosexuality was seen as a threat to German nationalism. Under the influence of the genetic knowledge-power system during the 19th century, the eugenicist Galton's ideas and Mendel's inheritance laws found resonance in Nazi ideology and justified the extermination of unworthy lives (Κουρουτζας, 2018). In *The Origin of Species* (1880), Charles Darwin presented the theory of the evolution of species based on the natural selection of the fittest for survival, arguing for superior and inferior races. Within this logic, the evolutionary scale of living beings placed man before apes and noted that women had not succeeded in evolving. Three years later, Francis Galton formulated the term eugenics as a new science with the aim of eliminating the lower and undesirable social groups and races. After all, according to Galton, the reproduction of the lower people should be treated as a hostile energy towards the state, and they should be deprived of the right to reproduce. Eugenics and the theory of evolution talk to each other and influence science and politics to this day (Τζανάκη, 2016).

Thus, Germany's eugenics laws of 1905 emerged in the context of the biopolitical power of the population for the betterment of the German populace. It is an unworthy life for which the Nazi regime imposed a death policy to protect the German people from genetically deficient individuals. Mass sterilizations, medical experiments to develop typhoid vaccines, and hormone experiments conducted under the T4 program were done through laws to prevent hereditary diseases and protect blood. As Christos Kouroutzas notes in the *Εγκληματολογία της Γενετικής*, Cesare Lombroso had a catalytic effect on Nazi criminology (Κουρουτζας, 2018). The Criminalization of the Homosexual as a Criminal Soul with Article 175 It comes to constitute a biopolitical technology of race, sexuality, race, and class while consolidating the construction

of the hegemonic white male heterosexual body as the normal, in contrast with the pathological body of the homosexual.

Chapter 4: We don't have any gays¹⁰.

When Vladimir Putin passed legislation that prohibited the spreading of "propaganda of non-traditional sexual relations," the topic of sexuality in Russia came under the attention of the world press in June 2013. Putin defended the bill as a way to increase Russia's declining population and protect traditional Russian values. However, many saw it as an effort to maintain nationalist and conservative supporters and undermine his political rivals (Mole, 2018). In November 2022, Vladimir Putin signed a new law which further extended the state's rules on promoting what it calls "LGBT propaganda", effectively banning any public expression of LGBT behaviour or lifestyle in Russia (Reuters, 2022).

Same-sex relations existed in Russia within a legal and medical framework. While during the nineteenth century, Western European societies were obsessed with revealing the secret of sex (in Foucauldian terms) between men, in pre-revolution Russia, it was not the case. The French and German biomedical discourse of the 19th and 20th centuries, which emerged on sodomist bodies and introduced homosexuality as the new medical model, defined *same-sex attraction* as a mental illness. On the contrary, the Tsarist Russian forensic and psychiatric community did not accept those views immediately for two reasons; the Tsarist regime and police viewed medicine professionals as subordinate and Psychiatry- as a discipline- was not "welcomed" by the regime. As Michel Foucault points out, psychiatry is the science of the bourgeois, through which the medical understanding of the sexuality of the middle class and other social groups was deployed. In late Tsarist Russia, the middle class was a small percentage; thus, Russian psychiatrists had no political leverage to influence the juridical and political system (Healey, 2001).

Sodomy persecution in Imperial Russia is slightly different than in France, England, or Germany. The Orthodox church was less strict about homosexuality than Catholics. Aside from that, all sex was considered sinful and dangerous by the Orthodox Church, and the same punishment was imposed on anal sex and heterosexual adultery. The ecclesiastic categorization of anal sex and non-anal sex shaped the state's legislation on sodomy later. In addition, Russian Orthodox Churches attempted to maintain social hierarchies and male gender roles by regulating and disciplining sex. In pre-revolutionary Russia, the first secular regulation of male-sex relations in the army and navy was instituted by Peter I in 1716, and sodomy was considered a danger to the stability of the military hierarchy. Meanwhile, the martial law of 1716 resulted from the military revolution in Muscovy's army. This was done to extend the military's concern for hierarchy to society and organize it around religious and moral values to differentiate consensual acts from

¹⁰ On the David France's documentary *Welcome to Chechnya*, during his interview from a journalist Ramzav Kadyrov state that in Republic of Chechnya "We don't have gays".

rape. According to the penal code of 1845, consensual acts of sodomy were punished with exile in Siberia, while rape was sentenced to hard labour. The legislation for fighting sodomy in Tsarist Russia was active until the October Revolution, creating a system of regulation and discipline over the libido of the lower and working classes. This system was designed to keep the lower and working classes from engaging in sexual activities that were seen as being against the moral values of the Tsarist autocracy and the Orthodox Church (Healey, 2001).

Until the early 19th century, forensic science and psychiatry were rejected by the police and the Tsarist regime as tools for detecting and corroborating sexual crimes. Only after the Great Reformation of 1860 did forensic science become part of the procedures in Russia. In the 1850s and 1860, legal medicine in Western Europe had already shaped knowledge about sodomy and tribadism, with Casper and Tardieu as leading figures in the field. Russian medical professionals, even though they were aware of Tardieu's theories, Casper's work was more influential. As a result, legal-medical science was a fusion of the French and German biomedical discourse about same-sex attraction. One of the first who introduced Western European medical thinking about same-sex relations was Vladislav Merzheevskii with his book *Forensic Gynecology (Sudebnaia ginekologiia)* in 1878. Merzheevskii indicated that unbridled male libido is sodomy and introduced the shift from sodomy to paederasty as a personality. Influenced by Casper's, Tardieu's and Westphal's work, he examined social factors of the "vice" and focused on identifying the passive paederast through anal examination. A few years later, V.M. Tarnovskii, with his forensic-psychiatric study of the prevention of sexual feelings, tried to explain same-sex love. Inspired by Westphal's and Kraft Ebbing's work, he attempted to characterize paederasty (cognitel, acquired, and periodic) and determine which ones should be persecuted. Like Merzheevskii, Tarnovskii focused on passivity while rejecting Tardieu's claim on the deformities of the active sodomist penis as a sign of degeneration. Vladimir M. Bekhterev elaborated on Western psychiatry's ideas of perverted sexuality into the bourgeois male by emphasizing male sexual abnormality as a reflection of the dominant gender and ethnicity of the empire. Considering degeneration as a secondary biological factor, he draws attention to the environment as the cause of the sexual abnormality, tracing back to sexually traumatized childhood, negligent upbringing and later experiences (Healey, 2001).

Throughout the history of Soviet and post-Soviet Russia, political discourse has consistently played an influential role in both the legal and medical status of gays and their attitudes towards them. While Lenin deemed "transgressive sexual behaviour" to be bourgeois and declared that it had no place "in the class-conscious, fighting proletariat," the Soviets abolished the Tsarist laws of 1832 penalizing sex between men after the October Revolution and, more importantly, refrained from establishing identical provisions in the first Soviet Russian Criminal Code of 1922 (Healey, 2001). Even though homosexuality was not penalised

by Soviet Russia, the Bolsheviks prioritised ideology over sexuality, in support of the Soviet state and Communist Party, by subordinating sexuality to class interests (Mole, 2018). In other words, the Bolsheviks considered that the "sexual questions" were a superstructural issue that would be settled by establishing a collective economic and social basis. Contrary to the scepticism of the old regime about medical science, the Soviet Union embraced forensic science and psychiatry to determine healthy and pathological citizens. Putting all this together, there was an emergence of different disciplines seeking to give their explanations about sexuality and gender. Under this framework, the *Trials of Homosexuals* was published in the journal of the Commissariat Justice, mentioning two cases of homosexuality and claiming that even under the revised law, homosexual behaviour was illegal. G.R. gave a wide interpretation of hooliganism and brother-owning to ensure same-sex attraction's criminalization. Regarding this article, medical and law professionals united for the repression of homosexuality as an element that threatened society. However, this article was brought up to discuss the same thing that occurred in pre-Nazi Germany, whether homosexuality is a problem of law or medicine (Healey, 2001). Male homosexuality was punished with prison time across the Caucasian republics and the republics of Central Asia: the law specifically targeted the *Bachi*. It is noteworthy that until 1934 there was no criminalization of sexual relations between women. Lesbians and bisexual women were not treated as criminals but as mentally ill and frequently subjected to psychiatric and medical treatment. At the time, effeminacy was regarded as a sign of backwardness, whilst masculinity was deemed modern (Clech, 2008). Moreover, since homosexuality could not produce children, it was regarded as abnormal, deviant, decadent and contrary to public welfare in a society that valued collective interests above individual desires (Mole, 2018).

The re-criminalization of male homosexuality occurred under the rule of Stalin in 1934, sentencing them to five years in the Gulag to rehabilitate them. During the same period, Yagoda (head of the GPU) and Maxim Gorki (Russian scholar) viewed same-sex love as a threat to the state (i.e. spies or traitors) and as a factor leading people to degeneracy. Additionally, the re-penalization of homosexuality emerged in the context of a decreasing population due to war and the industrialization of Soviet Russia. The latter would eventually cause a purging of unwanted elements in the cities in 1933 and 1934, including gay people (Clech, 2008). Essentially, this is what Kraft Ebbing describes as psychopathia sexualis that degenerates a man, robs him of his masculinity, and transforms him into an androgynous/gynandrous being. Until the end of the Soviet Union, a homosexual man or woman was considered a criminal soul. Although in 1993, sex between men was decriminalized, queer subjects remained in a state of social life and death. Homosexuality was restricted to homes or places (gay clubs, cruising spots) under the legal-biomedical discourse. At the same time, heterosexuals dominated the public sphere, making gays, lesbians, and trans people invisible while adhering to traditional gender roles in order to exist. In other words, queer subjects find themselves in a state of captivity by the patriarchy. Thus, the question arises as to whether these captivities experienced

by queer subjects from the post-Soviet period until today are related to the limitations placed upon women and femininity by vodka masculinity? As Tsibiridou notes, «*Men and women obey a set of strict customary behaviours and techniques employed by perpetrators. However, the conditions of execution change due to time, occasion, circumstance, and practice that condenses and echoes patriarchy through heavy doses of testosterone, subordination of the younger to the elder, as well as an emphasis on producing male children*¹¹».

In the documentary *Welcome to Chechnya (2020)*, David France sheds light on the victims of the gay witch hunt of the Chechnya government and the efforts of LGBTQI+ activists to flee the survivors out of the country. The documentary follows the story of activists who risk their lives to save members of the Chechen LGBTQI+ community by smuggling them out of the country and Maxim Lupanov, one of the survivors who tried to get legal redress from Russian authorities. It also sheds light on the horrible human rights abuses that LGBTQI+ community members have faced under the Chechnya government. Since March 2017, Russian LGBTQI+ organizations have started to receive information from Chechnya about the mass detention of queer people being detained, tortured, electrocuted and even killed on orders of the Chechen authorities. To be gay, bi, lesbian or trans in the Republic of Chechnya is considered a disgrace and shame for the family, which can be washed out by blood, as one of the documentary participants said (*Welcome to Chechnya, 2020*). Chechen society has a patriarchal structure; hence, a strict division of gender roles determines the social behaviour of people. Males, for instance, are expected to exhibit toughness, power, and sexual potency, while females should behave humbly, respectfully, and sexually appropriately. Men remain the primary carriers of political power and morality; they own property and hold positions of authority. As a result, there is control over women's sexuality, as well as an interpretation of religion and custom, that contributes to primarily female punishment. therefore, the traditional masculine role concepts that support traditionally male values (e.g., avoiding femininity, toughness, and achieving recognition and respect from others) are likely to drive violence toward anybody who fails to comply with such values. From this perspective, homosexuality is seen as a breach of the gender norm and homosexuals are viewed as breaking the gendered code of honour (Lowe, et al., 2019). This system of honour code operates and mirrors in two ways, male identity and ideals of masculine behaviour. A man's sexual identity is therefore

¹¹ Translation by me, Τσιμπιρίδου Φ. (2018), *Η πατριαρχία ως αιχμαλωσία στη μετασοβιετική εποχή: «Βότκα ανδρισμός» επί της οθόνης και θυμωμένες φεμινίστριες στην κάμερα*. [Online] Available at: <https://feministiq.net/patriarchia-os-aihmalosia-metasovietiki-epohi/>

revealed through his birth sex and macho persona, which serves a variety of geopolitical and demographic reasons. A man who distances himself from such norms by choice or by "nature" dishonoured himself and brought shame to his family—a statement that speaks equally harshly to queer Chechen men. Yet honour is also ideal, creating a link between society's personalities and their replication in the individual through his desire to personify them. In honour and shame communities, men are regarded as the "active" concept, while women are viewed as the "passive" (Nye, 1993).

In the post-Stalinist era, Russian men were perceived as in a state of 'crisis'. As a result of the feminization of Soviet men, the lack of responsibility and the passive behaviour of these men are believed to have caused the crisis. The collapse of the Soviet Union came to be seen as a contributing factor to the idea that masculinity failed, along with the birth rate crisis of the seventies and the representation of emasculated men in the media (Vlaeminck, 2016) alongside the war, terror and entrance to the capitalist economy, men were seen as weak and in crisis. During the Soviet era, women held so much power over the family that men were estranged from it. Late Soviet men had no credible models of masculinity (Healay , 2018). During the Stalin era, the fatherhood and protector of the family had been replaced by the state-father-Stalin (Τσιμπιρίδου, 2018), therefore the "heroic Soviet masculinity was seen as old fashioned, the tsarist manliness has no space in the new state, and the so-called "self-made" western, capitalist and patriarchal male before 1991 was politically impossible (Healay , 2018). With the entry into capitalism, Putin committed to retouching the vodka masculinity that prevailed under Yeltsin and restoring the lost fatherhood of the Soviet period (Τσιμπιρίδου, 2018). Restoring the relationship between the Russian Orthodox Church and the state, claiming moral and traditional family values, and starting propaganda against Feminists and LGBTIQ+ community as enemies of the nationhood (Healay , 2018), achieved to enforce the paternalistic state and gender hierarchy in order to "rehabilitate" manhood (Τσιμπιρίδου, 2018). A man's sexual identity is therefore revealed through his birth sex and macho persona, which serves a variety of geopolitical and demographic reasons (Nye, 1993). During Putin's rule, a significant occurrence was the creation of the New Russian Men, a mechanism for rehabilitating masculinity in the Russian Federation in response to the rise of Islamic fundamentalism in the Republic of Caucasus (Vlaeminck, 2016). The Chechen-Russian wars had, additionally, shaped the image of the "real Chechen men" and justified violence against the LGBTIQ+ community (Scicchitano, 2019).

It was during the First Chechen War when the concept of the "real Chechen man" was created, which led to the protection of Chechen women and the feminization of nature's territory. The armed Chechen forces aimed to defend the "motherland" from the "totalitarian monster", and it vied as legitimation and acceptance of physical violence against women and femininities to secure the heteronormative procreation future of the explicitly feminized territory. After all, in the context of militarization - in which societies absorb the

principles of militarism and necessarily implicate ideas of femininity and manliness - as Cynthia Enloe points out, "*the variety of gendered ideas about how boys and men should think and behave*". Thus, the "*real Chechen man,*" who emerged in the militarized defence of a feminized territory and its women, is part of why queer men in Chechnya endure such terrible persecution today.

Moreover, as part of this image of the Caucasus's "*literary landscape,*" the Chechen people are usually depicted as "*backward savages*" or "*highlanders*" who adhere to a specific "*natural condition.*" This cultural characterisation of Chechens and their so-called "lawlessness" and "wildness" made them self-identify with the wolf as a symbol of independence and national pride. In response, the Russians tagged violent separatists as werewolves, portraying them as subhuman yet more sinister and dangerous than ordinary wolves. In contemporary Chechnya, queer men have been represented as werewolves who thread Chechen manhood. However, during the Second war, the symbol of the wolf changed. Due to the Russian animalization of werewolves, Chechen masculinity is seen as a criminal and dangerous element in colonial Russia (Scicchitano, 2019). After all, the Oriental "Other" in Russia was and is a sexually aggressive male, usually non-Christian, in that case, Muslim and Chechen (Healey, 2001), performing an insubordination and dissent masculinity (Τσιμπιρίδου, 2018). The threefold "geography of perversion" placed Russia between civilized Europe and the atavist East, allowing Russia to imagine itself as a universal, pure and heterosexual nation. In that sense, the self-imagination of Russia as a civilized, straight and male society that viewed the "Others" as primitive, feminized and passive (Healey, 2001). After all, the characterization of Chechens as subhuman, atavist and sexually aggressive can be traced in the Western European biomedical discourse of the 19th and 20th centuries. Bénédict Augustin Morel (1809 -1873) published 1857 his work *Traité des dégénérescences physiques, intellectuelles et morales de l'espèce humaine et des causes qui produisent ces variétés malades*, through which he established the theory of degeneration. For Morel, degeneration "*is a morbid invocation of an archetypal human being*". The deviation comes from any deviation in behaviour that results in disorder. This was done through heredity, passed down through generations and stopped only through intermarriage with healthy people. The degenerate-defeminized individual brings about the gradual violent death of the human species. Moreover, Morel's theory functions as a lingua franca shaping the state's policies and biomedical discourse, classifying life into human and degenerate (Τζανάκη, 2016). Rooted in the idea that there was an inherent hierarchy of nations and cultures, with Russia positioned as the pinnacle of civilization and morality. This allowed Russia to place itself at a higher level than its neighbouring countries, creating a narrative of superiority and giving power over them. In other words becoming the sovereign ruler who has the right to impose death and allow life (Foucault, 1976). Since 2017, Queers now are the werewolves (Scicchitano, 2019), '*they are UnChechen, unpeople*' (Unchechen, 2017). This unchecheness signifies the gay person's conflict with masculinity and patriarchy. In this system of patriarchy and late capitalism, when a man is feminized, he threatens the structures of a patriarchal society

(Scicchitano, 2019). He becomes a criminal, abnormal, mentally ill and an enemy of the nation-state. After all, for Kraft Ebbing, when the subjects reversed their sex, he became unconscious and without a will, the social contract was broken. He took the passive role and lost his active role, an emasculation. Tarnovskii relies on this narrative when he is looking for passive sodomists, the ones who dare to have heteromorphic relationships (in the Foucauldian term).

Conclusion: The triangle that we wear.

At one point, I was reading Maggie Nelson's book "The Argonauts", in the middle of the book, Nelson referred to Freiman's concept of sodomistic motherhood and the case of Freud's Werewolf. I was looking over and over at Nelson's pages describing the Freudian narrative of the Werewolf's relationship with his father and mother. This made me wonder if the Werewolf's relationship with his parents might reflect the late modern power relationship among LGBTI+ people, the paternalistic state, and visibility. So, do the queer subjects enjoy the castration inflicted on them by power? When Freud wrote about The Werewolf, his plat du jour was castration. Nelson summarizes the Freudian psychic bond as follows: *"If you want to be sexually satisfied by the Father," we might imagine [the werewolf] saying to himself, "you must allow yourself to be castrated like the Mother, but I don't accept this"*. As I understand it, for Freud, this is a psychic bond, and for the paternalistic state is a battle, a kind of competition for the dominance of the strongest, like a technology of power, this narrative produces a certain norm and political identities aiming to create barriers for human sexuality and transform it within the reproductive machine of docile labour. These barriers are associated with the lack of action of the cultural Other, as Tsibiridou (2018) and Federici (2004) have mentioned in their works.

With the transition from the right of death to the power over life, normality emerges, which comes to define, regulate, manage, and classify members of society into worthy and unworthy, useful and useless, and productive and non-productive. As Michel Foucault wrote: *Such a power has to qualify, measure, appraise, and hierarchize, rather than display itself in its murderous splendour? it does not have to draw the line that separates the enemies of the sovereign from his obedient subjects? it effects distributions around the norm.* In this way, norms as control technologies impose a regime of truth on subjects thereby shaping certain knowledge. Once we internalize the system of knowledge-power, we behave as the social contract dictates, belong to a community, and have an identity. The law of the sovereign/pater familias coexists with the norm and is complementary to each other. At this point, I think the law of abandonment fits, as Athena Athanasiou (2007; Αθανασίου, 2007) points out: the conceptual meaning of abandonment (based on Jean-Luc Nancy) refers to the subordination of the subject to the jurisdiction of the law of exception. When the subject is left and abandoned by the law, and conversely, when the law is abandoned, it is left by the subject. However, the force and application of the law do not cease but continue through its absence and its non-application. After all, as I mentioned, I felt unwanted and sick, I was in a state of repression. According to the Foucauldian critique of the suppression hypothesis, the narrative of neutral sexuality (on a social and political level) is a fallacy that predates the law and was built by the law itself. As a result, the human is constantly reconstructed as a temporary function of biopolitical classes and managements (see reproduction,

body, life). This political technology, as Foucault refers to it, does not correspond to the Cartesian division of the body (spirit - flesh), but rather to a set of institutional, corporeal, and mental technologies of subjectification (Αθανασίου, 2007).

Therefore, it is during the nineteenth century that has often been used to indicate the birth of contemporary queer identity. Since Michael Foucault's *The History of Sexuality* (1976), several historians of sexuality have suggested that a hetero/homosexual binarism appeared only after 1869, with the development of the term "homosexuality," which, according to Foucault, established homosexuality as a population "species". It was during the second half of the nineteenth century that the term 'homosexuals' was invented by medical experts in Berlin as well as the non-heterosexual community (Beachy, 2010). Only after the Paris Commune was paragraph 175 included in the Imperial Criminal Code, sodomy was associated with sickness, violence, and criminality, prompting the development of new theories of same-sex desire. Homosexuals have two choices: compromise and comply or be physically and socially destroyed (Τζανάκη, 2019). Despite focusing on the invention of homosexuality, as well as the work of Westphal and Kraft-Ebbing, the French philosopher neglected to mention the German political, scientific, and cultural factors that contributed to the development of new theories of same-sex attraction in biomedical science (Beachy, 2010). However, by making genealogy and historicizing the terms, it is not homosexuality that is persecuted but libidinous desire. As Michel Foucault also wrote in the *History of Sexuality*, after 1871, it was not sodomy that was persecuted. Instead, it was the androgynous/gynandrous life, i.e. the core of the individual who is subject to its sexual instincts (Τζανάκη, 2020).

From 1871 – after the end of the Paris Commune -, the sodomist was considered as moral hermaphrodite criminal. As a criminal, this not only undermines the law, but it also further destabilises normality and requires control based on the power-knowledge relationship of modernity. However, this criminal act violates the law, not the norm, as noted by Thanasis Lagios (2013). Rather, its performance is governed by a norm. In order to understand and avoid it, the source of this normalcy should be examined: the abnormal individual, the inborn criminal, who cannot be a subject of law but must be a target of preventative repression. Lombroso would identify individuals who are not born criminals but come under the category of "criminals of passion" by following the logic of the Norm rather than the logic of the Law (Λάγιος, 2013). Within this context, Tardieu and Kasper will develop their theories about active and passive sodomists in Western Europe, which will be "transferred" to pre-revolutionary Russia by Merzheevskii and Tarnovskii (Healey, 2001), while one year later Westphal, influenced by Albret Morel's theory of degeneration, would referred to "contrary sexual feeling", people [the inverts, as Westphal named them] who "dare" to go against the heteronormativity and live under the instinct of their desires, having heteromorphic relationships (in terms of Foucault). However, with Kraft Ebing's *Psychopathia sexualis*,

sodomy became a mental illness, which made it possible to classify it as a psychopathic disorder, homosexuality is considered a disease caused by inherited genetic traits driven by Darwinian principles and Morel's theory because same-sex desire does not help procreation (Τζανάκη, 2019). Whereas Hirschfeld's concept of the third sex proved to be crucial later as proof that homosexuality is restricted to a designated category. Friedlander and Bab, on the other hand, argued that homosexuality was essentially socially and historically determined against Hirschfeld's biological view of homosexuality (Oosterhuis & Kennedy, 1991).

Hirschfeld and members of Der Eigenic shed light on how Jews and queers interacted in the Nazism. Although Hirschfeld saw parallels between Jews and queers as minorities, the masculinists became blatantly antisemitic, weaponizing German homosociality against Jews. Hirschfeld, Brand, Friedlaender, and Bluher's "relational reading" explains how Nazi homophobia differed from antisemitism. Before the 1920s homosexuality was not chased like nowadays, the complex triangles among authoritarian regimes, rising capitalism and patriarchy and the Western biomedical discourse started to identify people who didn't follow the bourgeois moral code. There is a vast difference in the persecution of homosexuals of the lower working class and the ones who were in high society. The Nazi regime persecuted the lower-working homosexual libidinous population. As John Fout noted 90% of convicted homosexual men were from the lower-working class. The Nazis saw homosexuality as a sickness or epidemic that could be propagated rather than an inherent or fixed quality like Jewishness which was considered degenerated and defeminization as people. However, both of them were seen as subhuman species, a "species" population in Foucauldian terms which was damaged by the state. As imposed by the Nazi terror apparatus, gay men and women were to be isolated, re-educated or eliminated (Röll, 1996). By eradicating homosexuality, performing castrations, and performing hormonal operations on homosexuals, Nazi policy completed the implementation of the biopolitical agenda of normalizing healthy sexuality and gender and sanitizing race according to the rules of dominant biomedical discourse (Κουρουτζας, 2018).

It can be argued that these implementations are rooted in Foucauldian theories of racism, which assert racism as a central tool of biopower. Following Foucauldian genealogy, European racism emerged through the revolutionary discourse of class conflict and race conflict. The latter transformed into a matter of racial purity, which came along with the rise of state racism. There have been two major transformations of racial biopolitical technique during the twentieth century, according to Michel Foucault. On the one hand, the Nazi apparatus takes the role of protector of the racial purity of the nation, within an ideological-mythical landscape. On the other hand, the Soviet regime controls the maintenance of the health of society in racial terms (Mills, 2018). Therefore, *"in a society where all citizens are expected to put the collective interest*

above individual desire, homosexuality is gradually perceived as abnormal, decadent and deviant, as it prevents procreation and ... the common good" (Mole, 2018).

Medicine's authority over the subject of homosexuality was never total in revolutionary Russia. In the same context we see that although the Soviet regime deleted the tsarist laws of 1832 and did not introduce similar articles for the criminalization of homosexuality, it saw the freedom of sexuality as an enemy of the regime (Τσέα, 2021). Throughout the 1920s, when it came to controlling same-sex contacts and gender rebellion, "homosexuality" was not a single idea or phenomenon in the Bolshevik mentality. In the Soviet Union, class and revolutionary dedication were essential, as was nationality. Throughout the early Soviet Union, awareness of gender and sex antagonism as well as the emancipatory ethos associated with some medical theories, were restricted to industrialized, advanced regions and those with undeniable dedication. Apart from this context, the regime viewed non-traditional gender and sexual attraction from a political rather than a medical point of view. This explains why despite the oppression of homosexuals and lesbians, as perceived by the regime, it was a result of their bourgeois social position that led to their oppression rather than their sexual preference alone (Τσέα, 2021).

During the Soviet regime in Russia, doctors managed to get homosexuals to "talk about their sexual lives in tantalising detail" (Haley , 2022). In the first volume of *History of Sexuality*, Michel Foucault refers to the ring of Mangogul and its ability to make the women of the kingdom confess their sexual thoughts and experiences (Foucault, 1976). Thus, in Soviet clinics, Gulak hospitals and prisons where sex was visible, Prince Mangogul's rings were used by science to make subjects 'confess' their 'passions' and sexual experiences. Through these confessions, the Gulak doctors 'discovered' lesbianism and seized the opportunity to establish their power over women's minds and bodies (Haley , 2022). At the same time, a notable shift occurred in family dynamics, men became increasingly distanced from their roles as fathers and protectors (Healay, 2018). The state, personified by Stalin, assumed a paternalistic role, effectively replacing traditional fatherhood and family protection (Τσιμπιρίδου, 2018). This marked a departure from the image of heroic Soviet masculinity, which had once been celebrated but was now seen as outdated (Healay, 2018). In the post-Stalinist era, Russian men faced a perception of weakness and crisis. This perception was fuelled by several factors, including the feminization of Soviet men, a declining birth rate, and ultimately, the collapse of the Soviet Union. The shift in gender roles and the resulting uncertainty left many questioning the state of Russian manhood (Vlaeminck, 2016).

In the mid-1960s, the emergence of sex pathology redefined the image of homosexuality from the Stalin and Khrushchev eras, claiming that homosexuality was a medical rather than a criminal matter, and that it was the object of the new science (Healay, 2022). Actions similar to this can be traced back to the interwar

period in the Republic of Weimar. Magnus Hirschfeld, a sexologist, made an attempt to revise paragraph 175 of the German penal code, which criminalized sexual activities between men (Bauer, 2010). Although there was a shift in the 1970s, anti-decriminalisation views emerged claiming that homosexuality and lesbianism were a threat to socialist morality and harmful to society. Throughout the 1980s, homosexual desire remained on the sex-pathological agenda as a treatable syndrome and disease. With the emergence of AIDS in the Soviet Union in the late 1980s, the perception of homosexuality was magnified, it was seen as a social danger, no longer as a disease or a crime, but as a way of transmitting AIDS (Healay, 2022).

In response to these challenges, Vladimir Putin embarked on a mission to rehabilitate masculinity in Russia (Τσιμπιρίδου, 2018). His strategy involved strengthening the ties between the Russian Orthodox Church and the state, championing moral and traditional family values, and launching propaganda campaigns against feminists and the LGBTIQ+ community (Healay, 2018). Putin portrayed himself as the sovereign ruler, with the authority to determine life and death, rooted in the belief that Russia stood as the pinnacle of civilization. One significant outcome of this effort was the creation of the New Russian Men, a mechanism designed to rehabilitate masculinity throughout the Russian Federation (Vlaeminck, 2016). Feminist theorists of colour have pointed out the connection among heteropatriarchy, colonialism and white supremacy, claiming that heteropatriarchy is creator of nation-state, while in meantime supports the white supremacy & capitalism, colonialism and imperialism war, As Davydova argues that can be applied in the case of Chechnya (Davydova, 2019). Before the declaration of Republic of Chechnya in 1991, Chechens faced anticolonial struggle and indiscriminated violence by Moscow's colonial army which lasted till 1940s (Souleimanov & Aliyev, 2017). This is due to Russia's military domination, economic and political dependence on Moscow, and its cultural portrayal as an ethnic, racial, and religious Other (Davydova, 2019). During the 1950's, modernization and urbanization led to Chechen traditionalism that regulated gender and age relations. However, archaic patterns of social organization and patriarchal values remained intact, including clan identities, honour, blood feuds, and silence (Souleimanov & Aliyev, 2017). In contemporary Chechnya, the gender order is complex and patriarchal. Prolonged violent conflict and economic hardship, as well as the entrenchment of patriarchal and heterosexist norms in everyday and political life, have contributed to this situation. Under Ramzan Kadyrov's leadership, such norms appear to be deepening. Furthermore, the dominant discourse of heteropatriarchy is reinforced using language that can be interpreted as both sexist and homophobic by those in positions of power in Chechnya (Davydova, 2019).

During the First Chechen War, the concept of the "real Chechen man" was created, which led to the protection of Chechen women and the feminization of nature's territory. This image of the "real Chechen man", which came up as the cause of militarization defence, is part of the reason queer men in Chechnya

endure such terrible persecution today. This image of Chechnya, as a racialized Other of Russian national selfhood, is a recurrent theme in Russian political discourse, from imperial times through Soviet times to contemporary Russia (Davydova, 2019). Chechens self-identify with the wolf as a symbol of independence and national pride, and the Russians tag violent separatists as werewolves. Due to the Russian animalization of werewolves, Chechen masculinity was seen as a criminal and dangerous element in colonial Russia (Scicchitano, 2019). The self-imagination of Russia as a civilized, straight, and male society that viewed the "Others" as primitive, feminized and passive can be traced to the Western European biomedical discourse of the 19th and 20th centuries (Healey, 2001). Russia positioned itself as the pinnacle of civilization and morality and became the sovereign ruler with the right to impose death and allow life (Foucault, 1976). Since 2017, Queers have become werewolves, "unChechen, unpeople", symbolizing the gay person's conflict with masculinity and patriarchy. They are criminals, abnormal, mentally ill and enemies of the nation-¹²state (Scicchitano, 2019). In Davydova's words «*The result of this particular framing of the persecution of gay Chechen men is ... "the reintensification of racialization through queerness" ..., this effect is particularly visible through the way homophobic violence in Chechnya is tied to tradition and Chechen heteropatriarchal brutality. Since the ethnic Other is assumed to be straight, Chechen gay people are seen to be exceptional to Chechen culture, not because they are outside of the sexual heteronorm, but rather because they are placed outside of the racial/ethnic norm.* »

As Ann McClintock (1995) noted, the transition from fetishism to sexual deviation and then to homosexuality does not necessarily mean anything is changing. There is, however, still a need for strong male narratives, such as Hitler, Putin and Kadyrov, for nationalism to exist. Nevertheless, the narrative of fetishizing nationalism continues and is redefined today. There has been a growing tendency to use homosexuality to frame the enemy, which is the apparent cause of everything. The persecution of homosexuals in Nazi Germany and the antigay witch hunt which started in 2017 by the government of Chechnya is based on the same narrative of modernity. Many times, homosexuals become victims of state violence, nationalism, and hegemonic masculinity. This is due to the idea prevalent in many societies that homosexuality is a deviation from the norm and, therefore, a threat to the status quo. The imaginary of bourgeois society creates the "born criminal", as Cesare Lombroso has referred to it, not as a mental ill-being but as an atavistic- degenerated life (Τζανάκη, 2021). As a result, gay people are often scapegoated and used as a symbol of all that is wrong with a given society and are often targeted for violence and other forms of oppression. After all, every spectrum of sexuality should be submitted to the law and state's power

¹² Davydova Darja (2019) informs us that in his study *'Flaming Souls: Homosexuality, Homophobia, and Social Change in Barbados'*, David Murray introduces the term *'spectral sexuality'*. This term describes the perception of homosexuality as a threatening, perverted, and/or sick sexualized body or group of bodies. This perception is frequently discussed but rarely observed in reality.

(Τσέα, 2021). After all, from Koliri's point of view, the concepts of gay and queer are parallel and divided, their difference is in normality and identity-centeredness. Homonormativity of gays claims political rights but does not "break" existing rules (socially decent behaviour, marriage, family etc.). Furthermore, gay movements question binary gender, but not the social structures that reproduce it. On the contrary, queer, as strange, upside down, provocative, and outside of any norm and law, does not stop at questioning the binary gender but goes a step further in deconstructing the social structure and governmentality around binary gender and sexuality (Κολύρη, 2017).

The goal of the paper is not to find parallels and differences between Nazi Germany and Chechnya's persecutions, as I stated at the beginning. My study's purpose is not to discover how and why homosexual libidinous desire was persecuted in Nazi Germany and Chechnya. Instead, one should try to understand why and how it was persecuted in the first place. So, any comparison between the persecution of homosexuals in Nazi Germany with the anti-gay purge in Chechnya cannot be productive because the persecution of homosexual desire had begun after the end of the Paris Commune and the four lines of sex politics, as Michel Foucault notes. Thus, the persecution of the sodomite, the homosexual, the tribade and the lesbian, as a life that had not evolved and was in the atavistic stage, became one of the objects of study of 19th and 20th-century biomedical science. At the same time, this colonial scientific discourse acted as a panopticon over bodies that escaped the heterosexual-bourgeois context. Hence, through this colonial system of knowledge-power constructed by the white Western European biomedical discourse, the individual has learned to think, feel, and behave. So, are we still wearing a triangle?

Bibliography

Baer, M. D., 2015. Muslim Encounters with Nazism and the Holocaust: The Ahmadi of Berlin and Jewish Convert to Islam Hugo Marcus. *American History Review*, February, Issue 120, pp. 140-171.

Baer, M. D., 2020. *German, Jew, Muslim, Gay: The Life and Times of Hugo Marcus*. s.l.:Columbia University Press.

Balzer, M. M., 2023. Siberia, protest, and politics. Shaman Alexander in context. *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, Issue 95, pp. 30-45.

Bauer, H., 2010. 'Race', normativity and the history of sexuality: Magnus Hirschfeld's racism and the early-twentieth-century sexology. *Psychology & Sexuality*, September, Vol. 1(No. 3), p. 239–249.

Beachy, R., 2010. The German Invention of Homosexuality. *The Journal of Modern History*, December, Issue 82, pp. 801-838.

Boden, E. H., 2011. The Enemy Within: Homosexuality in the Third Reich, 1933-1945. *Constructing the Past*, 15 5, Issue 1(Article 4).

Clech, A., 2008. The Great Patriotic War – Some Respite In The USSR. In: R. Schlagdenhauffen, ed. *Queer in Europe during the Second World War*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, pp. 119-128.

Crespo, J. S. B., Arcieri, C. A. O. & Hassan , V. M., 2016. Foucault and Homosexuality: From Power Relation to Practice of Freedom. *Revista de Derecho*, pp. 111-130.

Cuerda-Galindo, E., LoÂpez-Muñoz, F., Krischel, M. & Ley, A., 2017. Study of deaths by suicide of homosexual prisoners in Nazi Sachsenhausen concentration camp. *PLoS ONE*.

Davydova, D., 2019. *Between Heteropatriarchy and Homonationalism: Codes of Gender, Sexuality, and Race/Ethnicity in Putin's Russia*. Toronto, Ontario: York University.

Federici, S., 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. s.l.:Autonomea.

Foucault, M., 1976. *History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fout, J., 2002. Neue Forschungsansätze über Alltagsleben und Verfolgung. In: R. Lautmann & B. Jellonnek, eds. *Nationalsozialistischer Terror gegen Homosexuelle. Verdrängt und ungesühnt*. Paderborn: Schöningh-Verlag.

Gershoni, I., 2012. Why the Muslims Must Fight against Nazi Germany: Muhammad Najâtî Sidqfs Plea. *Die Welt des Islam*, 52(3/4), pp. 471-498.

Giles, G., 2011. The persecution of gay men and lesbians during the Third Reich. In: J. C. Friedman, ed. *The Routledge History Of The Holocaust*. New York: Routledge, pp. 387-398.

Haeberle, E. J., 1981. Swastika, pink triangle and yellow star—the destruction of sexology and the persecution of homosexuals in Nazi Germany. *Journal of Sex Research*, August, Vol. 17(No. 3), pp. 270-287.

- Haley , D., 2022. Regulating Homosexuality in Soviet Russia, 1956–91: A Different History, by Rustam Alexander. *The English Historical Review*, August, 137(587), pp. 1292-1294.
- Healay , D., 2018. *Russian homophobia from Stalin to Sochi*. 1st Edition ed. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Healey, D., 2001. *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia: The Regulation of Sexual and Gender Dissent*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,.
- Hopp, G., 2004. In the Shadow of the Moon. Arab Inmates in Nazi Concentration Camps. In: W. G. Schwanitz, ed. *Germany and the Middle East 1871-1945*. Frankfurt: Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft, pp. 217-240.
- Jakobsen, J. R., 2003. "Queers Are Like Jews, Aren't They? Analogy and Alliance Politics." In: D. Boyarin, D. Itzkovitz & A. Pellegrini, eds. *Queer Theory and the Jewish Question*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 64-89.
- Kaczorowski, C., 2015. *Paragraph 175*, s.l.: glbtq.
- Klapholz, G., 2020. From "Pseudowomen" to the "Third Sex:" Situating Antisemitism and Homophobia in Nazi Germany. *Humanities | Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies*, October.
- Krueger, A., 2022. Lesbianism and Fascist Rule: Exploring the discrepancies between the persecution of gay men and women in Nazi Germany. *The Mirror - Undergraduate History Journal*, 9 August, pp. 56-67.
- Lekka, V., 2014. Normalizing sexuality in twentieth-century western societies: a critical reading of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. *Journal of History of Science and Technology*, pp. 9-23.
- Lowe, M. et al., 2019. Antigay "Honor" Abuse: A Multinational Attitudinal Study of Collectivist- Versus Individualist-Orientated Populations in Asia and England. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, pp. 1-20.
- McClintock, A., 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest*. New York: Routledge.
- Mendos, L. R. et al., 2020. *STATE-SPONSORED HOMOPHOBIA 2020 GLOBAL LEGISLATION OVERVIEW UPDATE*, Geneva: ILGA WORLD.
- Mills, C., 2018. A new regime of power: Foucault. In: *Biopolitics*. 1st ed. Oxon & New York: Routledge.
- Mole, R. C. M., 2018. Introduction to "Soviet and Post-Soviet Sexualities". *Slavic Review.*, Issue 77(1), pp. 1-5.
- Nye, R. A., 1993. *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oosterhuis, H., 1991. Male bonding and the persecution of homosexuals men in Nazi Germany. *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift*, Februari, jrg. 17(nr. 4).
- Oosterhuis, H., 1997. Medicine, Male Bonding and Homosexuality in Nazi Germany. *Journal of Contemporary History*, Apr, Vol. 32(No. 2), pp. 187-205.

- Oosterhuis, H. & Kennedy, H., 1991. *Homosexuality and male bonding in pre-Nazi Germany : the youth movement, the gay move ment, and male bonding before Hitler's rise : original transcripts from Der Eigene, the first gay journal in the world*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Plant, R., 1986. *The Pink Triangle The Nazi War Against Homosexuals*. 1st Edition ed. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Preciado, P. B., 2015. Restif de la Bretonne's State Brothel: Sperm, Sovereignty, and Debt in the Eighteenth-Century Utopian Construction of Europe. *South as a State of Mind*, documenta 14 #1(Issue 6).
- Repo, J., 2015. *The Biopolitics of Gender*. s.l.:Oxford University Press.
- Reuters, 2022. *Putin signs law expanding Russia's rules against 'LGBT propaganda'*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/putin-signs-law-expanding-russias-rules-against-lgbt-propaganda-2022-12-05/>
- Röll, W., 1996. Homosexual Inmates in the Buchenwald Concentration Camp. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 31(4), pp. 1-28.
- Scheck, R., 2012. Nazi Propaganda toward French Muslim Prisoners of War. *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 26(3), pp. 447---477.
- Schlagdenhauffen, R., 2018. Punishing Homosexual Men and Women Under The Third Reich. In: R. Schlagdenhauffen, ed. *Queer in Europe during the Second World War*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, pp. 21-38.
- Schlagdenhauffen, R., 2018. Queer Life in Europe during the Second World War. In: R. Schlagdenhauffen, ed. *Queer in Europe during the Second World War*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, pp. 07-20.
- Scicchitano, D., 2019. The "Real" Chechen Man: Conceptions of Religion, Nature, and Gender and the Persecution of Sexual Minorities in Postwar Chechnya. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 18 December.
- Souleimanov , E. A. & Aliyev, H., 2017. Chechnya: Ethnography and History. In: *How Socio-Cultural Codes Shaped Violent Mobilization and Pro-Insurgent Support in the Chechen Wars*. s.l.:Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Unchechen*. 2017. [Film] Directed by Stephen M. Hornby. s.l.: digitalSTAGE.
- Vlaeminck, E., 2016. Masculinity Politics in Putin's Russia. *New Eastern Europe*, 12 October .
- Welcome to Chechnya*. 2020. [Film] Directed by David France. Russia: Public Square Films.
- Wien, P., 2010. Review Article: Coming to terms with the past: German academia and historical relations between the Arab lands and Nazi Germany.. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 42(2), pp. 311-321.
- Αθανασίου, Α., 2007. Εισαγωγή: Η πολιτική της ζωής και το οριακό συμβάν της ετερότητας. In: *Ζωή στο όριο: Δοκίμια για το σώμα, το φύλο και τη βιοπολιτική*. Αθήνα: Εκκρεμές.

- Αθανασίου, Α., 2007. Τεχνολογίες του ανθρώπινου σώματος, απορίες της βιοπολιτικής και το διαμελισμένο σώμα της ανθρωπότητας. Στο: *Ζωή στο όριο. Δοκίμια για το σώμα. φύλο και τη βιοπολιτική*. Αθήνα: Εκκρεμές.
- Γκελτή, Θ., 2019. Ξεριζώνοντας το «ανθρώπινο»: Βιοπολιτική πειθάρχηση της εκθηλυσμένης ζωής. ο *αναγνώστης*, 28 Μάρτιος.
- Γκελτής, Θ., 2021. Ο ομόφυλος άνδρας μέσα από την πρώτη εκδοτική περίοδο του ΑΜΦΙ. Στο: Δ. Τζανάκη, επιμ. *Καύλα Υγεία και Επανάσταση*. Αθήνα: Ασίνη, pp. 445-470.
- Κολύρη, Χ., 2017. Το queer. Στο: *Το Φύλο Σαν Δόλωμα. Ψυχανάλυση, Πολιτική και Τέχνη*. Αθήνα: Πατάκη, pp. 61-85.
- Κουρουτζας, Χ., 2018. *Εγκληματολογία της Γενετικής*. Αθήνα: Πεδίο.
- Λάγιος, Θ., 2013. *FUTURA, ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΣΜΙΚΗ ΚΡΙΤΙΚΗ*. [Online] Available at: <https://futura-blog.blogspot.com/2013/11/blog-post.html> [Accessed 15 09 2022].
- Λάγιος, Θ., 2013. Νόμος και Κανόνας: Επιστήμη και Βιοπολιτική. *Κριτική στην Επιστήμη*, 25 April.
- Μακρυνιώτη, Δ., 2001. Εισαγωγή: ο κοινωνικός στιγματισμός του εαυτού και του σώματος. Στο: *ΣΤΙΓΜΑ*. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Αλεξάνδρεια, pp. 9-60.
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2016. *Ιστορία της [μη] κανονικότητας, Η σφίγγα πρέπει ν'αυτοκτονήσει. Ο Οιδίποδας επικρατεί..* Αθήνα: Ασίνη.
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2018. *ΦΥΛΟ & ΣΕΞΟΥΑΛΙΚΟΤΗΤΑ Ξεριζώνοντας το ανθρώπινο [1801-1925]*. Α' Έκδοση ed. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Ασίνη.
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2019. Γενεαλογία φύλου και σεξουαλικότητας. *Εφημερίδα των Συντακτών*, Issue Αόρατη Ιστορία: Διαδρομές, βιώματα, πολιτικές των ΛΟΑΤΚΙ+ στην Ελλάδα, pp. 12-13.
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2019. Η ανθρώπινη βούληση ως ψυχική διαστροφή: «Εκθηλυσμένες» και «ανάξιες» ζωές.. *Marginalia σημειώσεις στο περιθώριο*, 29 Ιούλιος, Issue 09.
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2020. Δίωξη του τριβαδισμού, σοδομισμού, ομοφυλοφιλίας, λεσβιανισμού. Διαφορετικές εκδοχές της ψυχικής δίωξης της ανθρώπινης ανυπακοής (1834-1951). *Κοινωνικές Επιστήμες*, 11, pp. 168-185.
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2021. Έγκλημα, Κοινωνία, Αστυνομία. Βλέπε, Άκουγε, Σιώπα. Στο: Τ. Δήμητρα, επιμ. *Υγεία, Καύλα και Επανάσταση*. 2η Έκδοση επιμ. Αθήνα: Ασίνη, pp. 141-226.
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2021. Εισαγωγή. Στο: Δ. Τζανάκη, επιμ. *Υγεία, Καύλα & Επανάσταση*. Αθήνα: Ασίνη, pp. 7-117.
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2021. Ευγονική, Βιοπολιτική και ο Φαλλικός Αστικός Δυτικοευρωπαϊκός Πολιτισμός. *Marginalia*, 7 Οκτώβριος, Κριτική(13).
- Τζανάκη, Δ., 2022. Ιστορικοποιώντας τον χημικό ευνουχισμό και τη δυστοπία του: Μην συνομιλούμε με την ευγονική. *Εφημερίδα των Συντακτών*.

Τσέα, Ε.-Ε., 2021. Από την ελευθερία στο ξερίζωμα του έρωτα. Το σταλινικό ιδιώνυμο και η αποδοχή της αστικής ηθικής στην εξορία του Μεσοπολέμου.. Στο: Δ. Τζανάκη, επιμ. *Υγεία, Καύλα & Επανάσταση*. Αθήνα: Ασίνη, pp. 227-256.

Τσιμπιρίδου, Φ., 2018. *Η πατριαρχία ως αιχμαλωσία στη μετασοβιετική εποχή: «Βότκα ανδρισμός» επί της οθόνης και θυμωμένες φεμινίστριες στην κάμερα*. [Online]
Available at: <https://feministiga.net/patriarchia-os-aihmalosia-metasovietiki-epohi/>