

a form of severe maladjustment internally, it may be that the disturbance is limited to the sexual sector alone.

REFERENCES

1. Committee on Cooperation with Governmental (Federal) Agencies of the Group for

the Advancement of Psychiatry. Report on homosexuality with particular emphasis on this problem in governmental agencies. Report No. 30, Jan., 1955. Pp. 7.

2. Ford, C. S., and Beach, F. A. *Patterns of sexual behavior* New York: Harper, 1951. Pp. 307.

Received October 20, 1956

JUNG'S ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALITY

A Review

ROBERT H. HOPCKE
(Berkeley)

A review of Jung's writings on homosexuality fails to reveal a major theory of homosexuality, never Jung's goal in writing on this subject anyway. But we can attend to his writings on homosexuality as one way of discerning how Jung provided for the understanding of homosexual individuals, both as an analyst and in his life.¹

There seem to be five major attitudes Jung takes toward homosexuality, some clearly defined in his writings, some merely implied but obvious in the course of various discussions. These five are different in emphasis certainly, but no one seems to contradict any other, and as a whole at least four of the five represent useful ways of approaching homosexuality.

The first reference to homosexuality in Jung's published writings, the review of *Homosexualität und Strafgesetz* (CW 18, §907), puts forth an attitude toward homosexuality to be echoed later in his discussion in "Love Problem of a Student" (CW 10, §§203-35). For Jung, *homosexuality ought not to be a concern of legal authorities*, and this attitude seems to rest on two points: (1) that, barring social stigma, homosexuality by itself does not reduce the "value of the individual as a member of society," and (2) laws against homosexuality as a criminal offense are useless, inhumane, and in fact themselves promote crime such as blackmail. One can hardly characterize Jung as an agent of social reform based on this review (Jung merely quotes Lowenfeld's progressive attitude here), but

Robert H. Hopcke serves as staff supervisor at Unitas Personal Counseling and is a member of the Pastoral Psychotherapy Group of Berkeley, California. A founding member of the Analytical Psychology Club of Berkeley, he maintains a private practice in Berkeley and San Francisco.

neither can one deny the underlying attitude of social tolerance for homosexuality evinced by Jung throughout his writings.

Jung's attitude here—which at first glance appears consonant with familiar liberal, politically conscious psychology—is really quite free from modern, ideological motivation. More important than his attitude of social tolerance are Jung's *reasons* for it, namely, that legal penalties against homosexual activity are basically unenforceable and potentially provocative of other criminal activities—in essence, utilitarian arguments. Jung uses no theory here, only common sense. As far as Jung's concern for “inhumane” treatment, psychiatrists often considered themselves the “protectors of deviants who had suffered at the hands of society and the more traditional forces of social control.”² Indeed, at a time when religious attitudes had greater social and political force, homosexuals themselves even welcomed their reclassification as “sick,” if only to escape the harsh legal consequences of being “criminal.” Given the date of Jung's writings, any assumption that he did not consider homosexuality “sick” seems unwarranted. His opinion that criminal penalties against homosexuals are inhumane seems more likely based on the “therapeutic vision” of early twentieth-century psychiatrists who, without scientifically objective data or a related political analysis of their role as agents of social control, could not see the psychological harm caused by even such a “progressive” view of homosexuality as pathological.

On the other hand, one cannot simply dismiss Jung as politically misguided and psychiatrically arrogant. To tolerate, to be able to tolerate, is a cornerstone of consciousness. The analytic virtues of delaying gratification, of being with the patient, of refraining from judgment—these are all tolerance. They prepare a field for real life to emerge, for our inner spirit to step out of the ego's prison of directives and directions. Tolerance neither approves nor condemns; it lets be. As a scientist Jung had no choice but to tolerate; as a seeker, he was compelled to do so.

Much of his tolerance is related to the second attitude Jung held toward homosexuality: *homosexuality is best understood when put in a historical and cultural context*. Classical Greece, in which homosexuality served a vital social and political function, is a constant point of historical reference for Jung, whether he is dealing with individual cases, as in the case of the boy who dreamed of the well at Lourdes (*CW* 7, §§ 123–27), or with larger issues of theory, as in “Love Problem of a Student” (*CW* 10, §§ 203–35) and his letter to Werblowsky (*Letters*, 2: 16–17). Jung adds to this historical perspective yet another which one might best term a

“cultural” perspective, in which the contemporary social function of homosexuality is an issue to be examined along with any psychological issues raised by the behavior. Examples of this cultural perspective can be found in “Woman in Europe” (CW 10, §246), his letter to Freud (*Freud/Jung Letters*, 297-98), and the two references to homosexuality in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (239, 263-64). With this wider historical and cultural vision, Jung was able to go beyond the concept of homosexuality as a “sickness” in a strict psychopathological sense.

Jung’s historical-cultural approach gave him a more comprehensive view of homosexuality as a psychological phenomenon. If a habitat is to be provided for our souls, tolerance and breadth are both necessary elements, psychic food and water. Homosexuality is no peculiarly modern scourge, no “French disease” from elsewhere, no insular phenomenon confined to Manhattan and San Francisco. It is an always present side of human relationships everywhere. To his credit Jung’s tremendous breadth of knowledge taught him that his homosexual clients were neither alone nor unique in time and space.

Nowhere, however, does this broader perspective result in Jung’s becoming a homophile activist in any sense. On the contrary, Jung’s continual mention of homosexuality in Greece as a point of reference leads him to identify homosexual activity with “primitive” societies, and though he and Freud might ride the “hobby-horse” of contraceptive methods in ethnology through society (*Freud/Jung Letters*, 298). Jung’s historical-cultural perspective does not keep him from speaking with considerable reservation about the so-called “masculinization” of women in contemporary society. Despite whatever positive functions homosexual relationships serve in society—for example, the educative function of homosexual relationships between older and younger men or the fostering of a true exchange of intimacies between “high-spirited, intellectual” women—Jung still appears pessimistic that such positive values can be maintained by homosexuals in such relationships within society. Pessimism is not condemnation, to be sure, but neither is it support.

The third major attitude Jung takes toward homosexuality is that *homosexuality is a result of psychological immaturity and, consequently, abnormal and disturbed*. Again this attitude appears both in his discussions of psychological theory, as in the reference from “The Theory of Psychoanalysis” (CW 4, §§237-50), and in individual case discussions, such as the woman with the crab dream (CW 7, §§123-37), or the young girl in love with her teacher (CW 17, §§221-23). It seems based in part

on the "therapeutic vision" of the early psychiatric establishment —better sick than criminal and better yet childish than sick. This view of homosexuality comes from more than just this mistaken view of psychiatry's social function. It presumes that objective psychological maturity exists and that heterosexuality represents that psychological maturity. Such a presumption is open to serious question empirically and theoretically.

Kinsey's ground-breaking and methodologically irreproachable research on human sexuality, consistently replicated by the Institute on Sex Research which he founded, showed human sexuality as a phenomenon with myriad variations, psychological and behavioral, with genital heterosexual behavior as only one of many possibilities.³ Ford and Beach's research on animal behavior showed that homosexual behavior between adult male monkeys occurred with signs of arousal and satisfaction and even in the presence of available females.⁴ Evelyn Hooker's various articles and research with non-patient homosexuals seemed to reveal considerably less than universal maladjustment on the part of homosexuals and opened the question whether the pathological agent for disturbed gay men and women was their homosexuality or (more probably) the severe social and moral prejudice against gay people.⁵ These empirical studies and many more resulted in a revision of psychoanalytic thinking on normality and abnormality by such noted practitioners as Judd Marmor, who began to understand heterosexuality as a culturally determined norm and not a biologically determined imperative.

To be sure, many psychiatrists and psychologists still hold genital heterosexual performance as the yardstick of psychological health, no longer perhaps because heterosexuality is biologically determined but because heterosexuality still represents the dominant cultural value and any deviation is sure to carry along with it a modicum of psychological distress. Believing their mission is the diminishment of such distress, they see their task as one of adjustment to the social norm. Empirical research on the lives of homosexuals, combined with the inherent reduction in that distress through the promotion of social tolerance, nowadays makes any intrinsic evaluation of heterosexual social adjustment as superior to homosexuality difficult to maintain. Certainly the American Psychiatric Association's removal of homosexuality from its list of mental disorders suggests a revision of thinking heterosexuality as exclusively normal or mature.

Jung's view of homosexuality as psychologically "immature" or "in-

fantile" is based on a rigid sexual teleology with genital heterosexual practice as the *telos*. This view is neither accurate empirically nor heuristically valuable for understanding homosexual men and women.

Telos is not a standard, a *kriterion*, a literal article of judgment. It is the mystery of the time-shrouded end, the potential, the actual-not-yet. Jung himself rescued teleology from the clutches of dogmatic religion and restored it to its rightful Aristotelian place in the natural sciences. He more than anyone showed how impossible it is to impose *telos*, how *telos* can only unfold in its own fashion and in its own time.

Jung developed, over the course of his career, a much more sophisticated understanding of "psychological maturity" than the mechanical view reflected in these early writings. His later views on the psychological development of the human being, the individuation process, do bring the question of the individual's relationship to the archetypal world to bear on the question of psychological maturity for heterosexuals and homosexuals alike. But nowhere in Jung's writings does he give an example of homosexual practice in a highly individuated human being.

The fourth attitude Jung holds toward homosexuality is to *distinguish an individual's homosexuality from other aspects of the individual's personality*. This approach is clearest in his case discussions, in which Jung goes beyond the patient's homosexual behavior and feelings to look at other aspects of the individual's psychological development. This approach is also inherent in Jung's more theoretical discussions, e.g., "Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype" (CW 9, §§ 162-66) in which he posits that a mother complex resulting in homosexuality may also foster other positive and negative personality characteristics.

This distinction for Jung is an extension of his phenomenological approach, his dedication to objectivity, for which all theoretical assumptions must be suspended. This attitude seems related to a less obvious but no less important principle of valuing the whole of an individual over any part. The result of this objectivity and dedication to wholeness for Jung at the time was to minimize the importance of an individual's homosexuality, placing this aspect of a life in perspective.

In the social and clinical climate of the early twentieth century, such a distinction functioned to Jung's benefit. Instead of being blinded to all other aspects of a homosexual patient, Jung was able to go beyond the social and clinical prejudices of the time and achieve a true understanding of an individual's whole psychology. Clearly, his case discussions of the woman with the crab dream and the boy with the well dream indicate a

distinct concern with vital aspects of these two individuals' personalities that many other clinicians would have missed in concentrating exclusively on the homosexuality as the sole focus of "treatment."

In our time, with both the pathology and social function of homosexuality debatable issues, Jung's distinction between an individual's sexual orientation and the other aspects of his or her personality may not be very helpful. If homosexuality is accepted as merely one variation on a continuum of sexual orientation, as on Kinsey's famous scale, such a distinction might actually work to the *detriment* of understanding the individual, by in effect slicing him into psychological pieces, one's homosexuality over here to be separately evaluated, religious orientation over there to be separately evaluated and so on, as if each did not interact and mutually influence all others. Even in today's climate of acceptance and growing neutrality around issues of sexual orientation, one could argue that to generalize *at all* around the positive or negative function of an individual's sexual orientation is to tread on dangerous ground. Obviously, for some people, their sexual orientation will represent a vitally important core. For others it will represent a marginally important factor in a life built around wholly other concerns. With still other individuals for whom their sexual orientation is a source of distress for whatever reason, such a distinction may enable one to see a whole individual and not simply a "case."

By far the most important attitude which Jung takes toward homosexuality and certainly the most characteristically "Jungian" is his attitude that *an individual's homosexuality has its own meaning peculiar to the individual in question and that psychological growth consists of becoming conscious of that meaning*. This attitude is explicit in the case discussion of the boy with the well dream and equally explicit in his more theoretical discussion in "Love Problem of a Student." This search for meaning leads Jung to elaborate a "two-step" process of examination: he first discerns how the homosexuality is expressed in an individual's life and then examines the effect of this expression on an individual's whole personality. This leads Jung to see that homosexuality can have both positive and negative meanings for any individual life, indeed, that there are numbers of "homosexualities."

To presume meaning is to presume the psyche is a purposive phenomenon and that *all* aspects of an individual's psychological life serve the end of psychological growth, even those which outwardly seem regressive or pathological. Obviously, this view is philosophically grounded, though

Jung found it empirically supported by his research into the ways and means of the unconscious. The very concept of science presumes a rational understanding of the universe, and Jung continually adhered to the principle that only the rigorous application of rational methods could bring one closer to an understanding of apparently irrational phenomena.

Undergirding this approach toward homosexuality, alongside the presumption of meaning, is the characteristic "individuality" of Jung's psychology, in which the unit of study is the individual soul. Where *scientia* sheers through to reveal the roots of growth, psychology deals with the in-dividual, the unsplittable, the irrational whose roots can never be fully revealed without killing the organism itself. Perhaps the nearly insuperable paradox that such a presumption of individual meaning presents is the reason that so few psychologists have matched Jung in straddling the disparate parts of this contradiction. How much easier to opt for a splitting, inhuman science over the inviolable and incomprehensible individual; how much easier to accept the clean, clear image of one's own comfortably padded individuality rather than the messy dissections that the analytic knife demands.

These two assumptions, that the proper focus of psychology is the individual soul and that the soul is a purposive phenomenon, showed Jung that "homosexuality" is as variable as each individual is from every other and that these various "homosexualities" contain the seeds of growth and the threat of deformity for any individual personality. His attitude requires every individual to face the challenge of understanding what meaning his or her own homosexuality could have and requires a moral decision concerning how to act on this meaning in day-to-day existence.

If this philosophical and clinical attitude seems almost too admirably rational to be true, in this case the appearance is not deceiving. Jung himself, though positing potentially positive aspects to homosexuality, nevertheless presents only cases in which the homosexuality is a misunderstanding of an otherwise appropriate need or has a purely regressive meaning. Further, Jung hardly refrained from making theoretical generalizations concerning the meaning of homosexuality.

Whether or not Jung remained faithful to his own assumptions is not the immediate issue. The pertinent question is whether Jung's attitudes toward homosexuality might provide a fertile place to examine the lives of gay people and our own inner homosexuality in whatever form. Clearly, they do.

1. The following comprehensive list of Jung's references to homosexuality in his published writings is organized chronologically by the date of first publication and includes the title of the work in which the reference is found:

CW 18, §907. "L. Lowenfeld: *Homosexualität und Strafgesetz*," 1909; CW 4, §§237-50, "The Theory of Psychoanalysis," 1912; CW 7, §§123-37, "On the Psychology of the Unconscious," 1917; CW 7, §§167-83, *ibid.*; CW 6, §§808-11, *Psychological Types*, 1921; CW 10, §§203-35, "The Love Problem of a Student," 1922; CW 17, §§221-23, "Analytical Psychology and Education," 1924; CW 17, §§266-81, "The Significance of the Unconscious in Individual Education," 1925; CW 17, §328, "Marriage as a Psychological Relationship," 1925; CW 10, §246, "Woman in Europe," 1927; CW 9/1, §146, "Concerning Archetypes," 1936; CW 9/1, §§162-66, "Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype," 1938; CW 9/1, §356, "Psychological Aspects of the Kore," 1940; CW 16, §357, n. 218, "The Psychology of the Transference," 1946; CW 9/2, §22, *Aion*, 1950.

Jung's references to homosexuality in his correspondence are also listed below chronologically, including the date of the letter and to whom it was written. With the exception of the one reference noted, all other references are taken from C. G. Jung, *Letters*, vols. 1 and 2, ed. G. Adler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975) and are denoted as *Letters*.

Letters, 1: 13-14, December 25, 1909, to Sandor Ferenczi; *The Freud/Jung Letters*, ed. W. McGuire (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 297-98, February 20, 1910, to Sigmund Freud; *Letters*, 1: 69, September 12, 1929, to Walter Robert Corti; *Letters*, 2: 16-17, May, 1951, to R. J. Zwi Werblowsky; *Letters*, 2: 188, October, 1954, to "a young Greek girl."

Finally, Jung discussed homosexuality twice in C. G. Jung/Aniela Jaffé, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), 239, 263-64.

2. Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 11.

3. Alfred Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: Saunders Co., 1948).

4. Cleland S. Ford and Frank A. Beach, *Patterns of Sexual Behavior* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951).

5. Evelyn Hooker, "Inverts Are Not a Distinct Personality Type," *Mattachine Review* (January 1955); Hooker, "A Preliminary Analysis of Group Behavior of Homosexuals," *Journal of Psychology* 14 (1956); Hooker, "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual," *Journal of Projective Techniques* 21 (1957); Hooker, "Male Homosexuality in the Rorschach," *Journal of Projective Techniques* 23.

Counseling Gay Adolescents

GERALD P. JONES

The literature and practice of counseling homosexuals, including adolescent homosexuals, has undergone a great deal of change, before as well as after the decision by the American Psychiatric Association that homosexuality should no longer be classified as a mental disorder. Homosexuality is regarded by some as a fixed sexual orientation in some adolescents, as distinguished from the more common homosexual phase through which many adolescents pass on their way to a heterosexual orientation. This article outlines recent developments in society and literature and suggests articles, books, and other sources that may be consulted by the counselor who serves adolescents. Potential social and legal problems are discussed, and a short annotated bibliography of additional readings is presented.

Recent events in American society have given the counseling profession a relatively new phenomenon to deal with: the gay adolescent. In the past, adolescence was regarded by many authorities as a time when sexuality was undifferentiated. When or if homosexuality occurred, it was generally regarded as a temporary phase that, if continued into adulthood, indicated pathology (Shearer 1966). Homosexuality was considered an illness that could be cured (see Karlen 1971, pp. 572ff.), and adolescence was seen as a time for possible diagnosis and prevention (Davenport 1972).

More recently, the literature has suggested that sexual orientation may

Gerald P. Jones is a counselor and teacher at the secondary school level.

in fact be imprinted (Money 1965) in early childhood and fixed by the time of puberty. Moreover, homosexuality itself is no longer classified as a mental disorder by the American Psychiatric Association (Stoller et al. 1973; see also Position statement, *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1974).

In support of this historic change of nomenclature, the American Psychological Association adopted a resolution in January 1975 that reads, in part,

the American Psychological Association urges all mental health professionals to take the lead in removing the stigma of mental illness that has long been associated with homosexual orientations. (Conger 1975, p. 633)

In a five-year follow-up to the decision of the American Psychological Association, *Time* magazine (February 20, 1978, p. 102) conducted a mail survey of the association membership. Of the 2,500 questionnaires returned, 69 percent said that "homosexuality is usually a pathological adaptation." This survey was not conducted by the association, nor has there been any change in the official APA position mentioned previously. To those counselors who concur with this new official posture, the possibility that they may encounter adolescent clients who are homosexual may present a problem.

This article presents a brief historical context for today's changing popular and professional attitudes. Some current counseling procedures used with adolescent homosexuals will be