discovered three great truths: that dreams are the disguised fulfillment of unconscious, mainly infantile wishes; that all human beings have an Oedipus complex in which they wish to kill the parent of the same sex and possess the parent of the opposite one; and that children have sexual feelings. At the same time Freud felt himself despised, rejected, and misunderstood. This last attitude became part of a myth which held that Freud was universally ignored and even persecuted by his psychiatric colleagues, although it is true that the lay reception of Freud’s work was often far more sympathetic and positive than theirs.

*Maturation. Freud’s first notable publication concerning bisexuality and homosexuality was the *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality) of 1905. During the following decade Freud made other significant observations on sexuality. In 1902 he had founded the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, to be followed, in 1910, by the International Psychoanalytic Society. Promoted by an increasing number of disciples, Freud’s thought was on the way to becoming institutionalized.

In the 1920s he added two ideas to his original corpus: the tripartition of the human mind into superego, ego, and id; and the concept of the death instinct (*thanatos*). As the founder of psychoanalysis Freud attracted the rich and famous to his couch in Vienna, while a cancer of the upper jaw induced by cigar smoking undermined his health. His rise to world renown during this period was clouded by the threat of National Socialism, which finally forced him to leave Austria. Just after the outbreak of the World War II, he died in London on September 23, 1939. At this point the turmoil of world events precluded any full assessment of the value of his work.

After World War II appraisals in the English-speaking world inclined to the laudatory, following paths laid down by the psychoanalytic establishment itself; Ernest Jones’ three-volume biography is the best example of this tendency. Those who criticized Freud and his ideas were commonly accused of clinging fearfully to traditional morality and of willful resistance to his insights, while the foes of psychoanalysis branded it a mystical and dogmatic belief system that merely perpetuated in a new guise notions inherited from the idealistic thinkers of antiquity. In the 1970s and 1980s, however, more fundamental criticisms were heard, and the psychoanalytic establishment was forced on the defensive, while new therapeutic techniques took the place of prolonged and costly analyses with doubtful outcomes.


*Warren Johansson*

**Freudian Concepts**

The following discussion reviews a number of Sigmund Freud’s published writings on sexuality and homosexuality, in an attempt to isolate elements of enduring value within them. Five aspects of Freud’s *psychoanalytic* work are relevant to homosexuality, though by no means have all of them been fully appreciated in the discussion of the legal and social aspects of the subject. These include: (1) the psychology of sex; (2) the etiology of paranoia; (3) psychoanalytic anthropology; (4) the psychology of religion; and (5) the origins of Judaism and Christianity. In regard to the last two the psychoanalytic profession in the United States has notably shied away from the implications of the founder’s ideas, in no small part because of its accommodation to the norms of American culture, including popular Protestant religiosity.
Psychology of Sex. This realm was treated in a classic manner in *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality; 1905), in which Freud polemicized against Magnus Hirschfeld’s theory of homosexuality as constitutionally determined, inborn, and unmodifiable. He pointed out that these characteristics could only be ascribed to exclusive inverts, as he designated them; but to accept such an explanation would be tantamount to renouncing an understanding of homosexual attraction in its totality. He stressed the continuum that extends from the exclusive homosexual to the individual who has only fleeting experiences or merely feelings in the course of adolescence. In a footnote (conveniently overlooked by many psychoanalysts since then) Freud mentioned that in the understanding of inversion the pathological viewpoints have been replaced (abgelöst) by anthropological ones, and that this shift was the merit of Iwan Bloch in his *Beiträge zur Ätiologie der Psychopathia sexualis* (Contributions to the Etiology of Psychopathia sexualis; 1902-03), which laid particular emphasis on homosexuality among the civilized peoples of antiquity.

In this study Freud also recognized that deviations of the secondary and tertiary sexual characters in the direction of the norm for the opposite sex are independent of the homosexual orientation itself. He examined the theories that related homosexuality to a primitive or constitutional bisexuality, and pointed out that the pederast is attracted only to the male youth who has not yet lost his androgy nous quality, so that it is the blend of masculine and feminine traits in the boy that arouses and attracts the adult male; and the male prostitutes of Freud’s time seem to have affected a particularly effeminate guise to lure their customers. The disturbance in the orientation of the sexual impulse, he held, must be related to its development. In all the cases that he had analyzed he found that in the early years of their childhood future inverts had an intense but short-lived phase of intense fixation on a woman (usually the mother), which after overcoming, they identify with the woman and take themselves as sexual object. So that with a narcissistic starting point they seek youthful sexual partners resembling themselves, whom they then love as the mother loved them. He also determined that alleged inverts were not indifferent to female stimuli, but transferred their arousal to male objects. This mechanism continues to function throughout their entire lives: their compulsive quest of the male is caused by their restless flight from the female.

Freud later (1915) added to these remarks the assertion that psychoanalysis is decisively opposed to any effort at separating homosexuals from the rest of mankind as a special class. If anything, psychoanalytic study has found that all human beings are capable of a homosexual object choice and have in fact made one in the unconscious. Libidinous feelings for persons of the same sex play no less a role in normal mental life, and a greater one in the pathological, than do those for the opposite sex. Independence of the object choice from the sex of the object, the freedom to pursue male and female objects that is observed in childhood, among primitive peoples, and in early historic times, is the primitive state from which both heterosexuality and homosexuality derive through a process of restriction. Thus Freud adopted the notion of universal primary bisexuality, which had earlier been pronounced by Wilhelm Fliess, and made it a cornerstone of his thinking on all aspects of human sexuality.

Not long after the publication of the *Drei Abhandlungen*, Freud gave an interview to the editor of the Vienna newspaper *Die Zeit* (who as it chanced lived in the same apartment house at 19 Berggasse, although the two men were not acquainted socially) in connection with the trial of Professor Theodor Beer, accused of homosexual relations with two
boys whom he had used as photographic models. In a statement printed in the issue of October 27, 1905, he asserted that "like many experts, I uphold the view that the homosexual does not belong before the bar of a court of justice. I am even of the firm conviction that the homosexual cannot be regarded as sick, because the individual of an abnormal sexual orientation is for just that reason far from being sick. Should we not then have to classify many great thinkers and scholars of all ages, whose sound minds it is precisely that we admire, as sick men? Homosexual persons are not sick, but neither do they belong before the bar of a court of justice. Here in Austria, and to a greater extent in Germany, a powerful movement is on foot to abrogate the paragraph of the penal code that is directed against those of an abnormal sexual disposition. This movement will gather ever more support until it attains final success." Long ignored by orthodox psychoanalysts (though noted by Hirschfeld's committee and reprinted in several publications), this opinion reflects not just Freud's judgment as the founder of psychoanalysis, but also his political liberalism as a follower of John Stuart Mill, whose essays he had translated into German early in his career.

Etiology of Paranoia. In explaining the genesis of paranoia, Freud purloined from Wilhelm Fliess the notion that it was dependent on repressed homosexuality, but only in 1915 did he formulate this interpretation as a general rule. He believed that the paranoid withdrawal of love from its former object is always accompanied by a regression from previously sublimated homosexuality to narcissism, omitting the half-way stage of overt homosexuality. Recent investigations have sought to confirm this insight for paranoia in male subjects only, and in all likelihood it is related not just to the phenomenon of homosexual panic but to the generally higher level of societal anxiety and legal intolerance in regard to male as opposed to female homosexuality. This would also explain why lesbianism is invisible to the unconscious: the collective male psyche experiences no threat from female homosexuality.

Psychoanalytic Anthropology. Reading in manuscript the first part of Jung's *Transformations and Symbols of the Libido*, Freud became increasingly unhappy with the latter's tendency to derive conclusions from mythology and comparative religion and transfer them to clinical data, while his own method was to start with his analytic experience and to apply the conclusions to the beliefs and customs of man's early history. The outcome of Freud's explorations in this direction was *Totem and Taboo* (1913), which despite the break with his Swiss colleague in that year is the most Jungian of all his works.

The first section, on "The Horror of Incest," deals with the extraordinarily ramified precautions primitive tribes take to avoid the remotest possibility of incest, or even a relationship that might distantly resemble it. They are far more sensitive on the matter than civilized peoples, and infringement of the taboo is often punished with instant death. This observation is pertinent to the problem of intergenerational homosexuality, above all to the intense condemnation that Western society still attaches to pederasty—which ironically enough is the normative type of homosexuality in many other cultures. While Hellenic civilization could distinguish between father-son and erastes-eromenos relationships, Biblical Judaism could not, and expanded its earlier prohibition of homosexual acts with a father or uncle to a generalized taboo. It is perhaps pertinent that pedophilia (sex with prepubertal children), as distinct from pederasty, usually involves members of the same family, not total strangers. Also, extending this mode of thinking, the fascination which some homosexual men have for partners of other races may be owing to the unconscious guilt that still adheres to a sexual relationship with anyone who could
be even remotely related to them, which is to say a member of the same ethnic or racial group.

The second section is entitled "Taboo and the Ambivalence of Feelings," whose relevance to homosexuality lies in the survival of the medieval taboo in its most irrational forms down to the last third of the twentieth century. To the believer the taboo has no reason or explanation beyond itself. It is autonomous, and the fatal consequences of violating it are equally spontaneous. Its nearest parallel in modern times is the conscience, which Freud defined as that part of oneself which one knows with the most unquestioning certainty. The tabooed person is charged with prodigious powers for good or evil; anyone coming in contact with him, even accidentally, is similarly laden. These notions are relevant for the understanding of the ostracism which Christian society has traditionally inflicted upon individuals known to have had homosexual experience, and of the belief that the homosexual constantly seeks to initiate others into his own practices—for which they then ostensibly experience an irrepressible craving.

The fourth section, the most important of all, was called "The Infantile Return of Totemism." Totems were originally animals from a particular species of which the clan traced its descent, and which the clan members were strictly forbidden to kill. From studying the attitude of young children to animals Freud had found that the feared animal was an unconscious symbol of the father who was both loved and hated. Exogamy was nothing but a complicated guarantee against the possibility of incest. Totemism and exogamy are hence the two halves of the familiar Oedipus complex, the attraction to the mother and the death wishes against the rival father.

Following a suggestion of Darwin's that early man must have lived in primal hordes consisting of one powerful male, several females, and their immate offspring, Freud postulated that on the one hand the dominant male would drive away, castrate, or kill his younger challengers, on the other the growing sons would periodically band together to kill, slay, and devour the father. The clan of brothers that would be left would be ambivalent toward the slain father and prone to quarrel among themselves; this situation would lead to remorse and an internalized incest taboo. Freud then appealed to Robertson Smith's writings on sacrifice and sacrificial feasts in which the totem is ceremonially slain and eaten, thus reenacting the original deed. The rite is followed by mourning and then by triumphant rejoicing and wild excesses; the events serve to perpetuate the community and its identity with the ancestor. After thousands of years of religious evolution the totem became a god, and the complicated story of the various religions begins. This work of Freud's has been condemned by anthropologists and other specialists, yet it may throw considerable light on aspects of Judeo-Christian myth and legend that cluster around the rivalry of the father and his adolescent son—in which the homosexual aggressor is, ostensibly, seeking to destroy the masculinity of his rival by "using him as a woman."

*Psychology of Religion.* In the tradition of the *Enlightenment* Freud approached religion from the standpoint of a dogmatic atheism. As early as 1907 he published an essay on "Obsessive Acts and Religious Practices," showing that in both there is a sense of inner compulsion and a more or less vague apprehension of misfortune [= punishment] if the ceremonies are omitted. In obsessional neurosis the repressed impulses that have to be kept at bay are typically sexual ones; in religion they may extend to selfish and aggressive desires as well. Obsessional neurosis is thus a pathological counterpart of religion, while religion may be styled a collective obsessional neurosis.

Twenty years later, in *Die Zukunft einer Illusion* [The Future of an
Illusion], Freud returned to the problem of religion and its survival, albeit in attenuated forms, in modern society. He pursued the line of scientific criticism of religion which concluded that religion is the collective neurosis which, like inoculation against disease, saves the individual from his individual neurosis. Then in Das Unbehagen in der Kultur (Civilization and Its Discontents; 1929), Freud approached the problem of the conflict between instinctual drives and the demands of civilization, in particular the restrictions imposed on sexual life, which exact a heavy toll in the form of widespread neuroses with the suffering and loss of cultural energy which they entail. These writings are pertinent to the conflict experienced by many homosexuals between their religious identity acquired in childhood and the needs of the erotic side of their personality which the Judeo-Christian moral code forbids them to satisfy.

The Origins of Judaism and Christianity. The fullest treatment of this subject Freud reserved for his last major work, Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion (Moses and Monotheism; 1938). The book has two main themes: a study of the beginnings of Judaism, and secondarily of Christianity, followed by a consideration of the significance of religion in general. From the secondary sources that he had read, Freud surmised that the lawgiver Moses was an Egyptian who had opted for exile after religious counter-revolution had undone the reforms of the first monotheist, Akhenaten. His Egyptian retinue became the Levites, the elite of the new religious community which received its law code, not from him, but from the Midianite priest of a volcanic deity, Jahweh, at the shrine of Kadesh Bamea. This last site, amusingly enough, presumably took its name from the bevy of male and female cult prostitutes who ministered at its shrine. The Biblical Moses is a fusion of the two historic figures.

Freud also, on the basis of a book published by the German Semiticist Ernst Sellin, posited the death of Moses in an uprising caused by his autocratic rule and apodictic pronouncements. The whole notion was based upon a reinterpretation of some passages in the book of Hosea, which because of its early and poetic character, not to speak of the problems of textual transmission, poses enormous difficulties even for the expert.

The last part of the study treats the role of Oedipal rivalry and conflict in the myths and rites of Judaism and Christianity. Judaism is a religion of the father, Christianity a religion of the son, whose death on the cross and the institution of the eucharist are the last stage in the evolution that began with the slaying and eating of the totem animal by the primal horde. However fanciful some of Freud's interpretations may have been, given that he was a layman speculating on secondary sources, in opening the supposed Judeo-Christian revelation to the scrutiny of depth psychology, he stood squarely in favor of a critical examination of the myths and the taboos of Judaism and Christianity.

Legacy and Influence. The half-century following Freud's death in exile in London in 1939 saw the controversy over the merits of his theories continue unabated. The exodus of the German and Austrian psychoanalysts to the English-speaking world greatly enhanced their influence on the culture of the countries in which they settled. At the same time, a body of experience with psychoanalytic practice and a critical literature on Freud's life and work arose that make it possible to evaluate his contribution to the problems posed by homosexuality and the Judeo-Christian attitude toward it.

In retrospect it is clear that Freud's own strictures in regard to homosexuality have been disregarded by the psychoanalytic profession, particularly in the United States, where many analysts have been almost fanatical in their insistence that "homosexuality is a disease." The particular emphasis with which Freud contra-
dicted Magnus Hirschfeld’s notion that homosexuals were a biological third sex— together with a tendency (not confined to psychoanalysis) to deny the constitutional bases of behavior—to the assertion that homosexuality was purely the result of “fixation” in an infantile stage of sexual development provoked by the action or inaction of the parents. The corollary was that individuals with varying degrees of homosexuality were forced into prolonged therapeutic sessions, or even subjected to cruel applications of electric shock— invented only in 1938 by Ugo Cerletti—and other measures designed to “cure” them. In the popular mind the belief that homosexuality is somehow a failure of psychological development has its underpinning in the Freudian concepts.

Freud’s contribution to the psychology of the intolerance of homosexuality has, on the contrary, never been fully appreciated and utilized by the psychoanalytic profession. Yet by freeing the thinking of the educated classes from the taboos that enveloped sexuality in the Victorian era, Freud strongly promoted the demystification of the whole subject and made possible a gradual onset of rationality in place of the horror, disgust, and condemnation that had been the norm until recent times. Although seldom quoted in the continuing legal debate over gay rights, his legacy has quietly worked in favor of toleration—as Freud himself would have wished.

On his eightieth birthday Freud was honored with an address composed by Thomas Mann and signed by some two hundred European intellectuals which congratulated “the pioneer of a new and deeper knowledge of man.” It went on to say that “even should the future remould and modify one result or another of his researches, never again will the questions be stifled which Sigmund Freud put to mankind; his gains for knowledge cannot be permanently denied or obscured.” The weaknesses and shortcomings of Freud’s legacy were in no small part failings of the science of his own day. He had to study the final product of conscious and unconscious mental activity; future generations, thanks to new devices for sounding the brain and the central nervous system, will be able to correlate these with the underlying physiological processes. Pioneer that he was, he ventured at times into fields that were beyond his own command, but left footsteps which others, endowed with a surer perspective, would follow into the heart of the matter. To homosexuals he bore no ill-will, to religion he had no commitment, to intolerance of sexual expression he gave no sanction, and by tearing away the curtain of irrationality and superstitious fear that had for so long enveloped sexuality in general he set the stage for the forces of reason that must someday overcome the misunderstanding and injustice that homosexuals have endured in Western civilization.

*Warren Johansson*

**FRIEDLAENDER, BENEDICT**

(1866–1908)

German natural scientist, thinker, and leader in the homosexual emancipation movement. In 1903, he cofounded the “Gemeinschaft der Eigenen” (“The Community of the Exceptional,” but “eigene” also means “self,” “same” [sex], and, in reference to Max Stirner’s anarchist philosophy, “self-owner”), along with Wilhelm Jansen and Adolf Brand. Although also a member of Magnus Hirschfeld’s Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, he did not agree with the Committee’s exclusive emphasis on explaining homosexuals as a third sex who by their nature were creatures that exhibited the external attributes of one gender while possessing the