acceptance and openness are recognized as preferable to a forced adherence to the ascetic morality once regarded as the absolute norm.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis*, 2nd ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987; Peter Conrad and Joseph W. Schneider, *Deviants and Medicalization: From Badness to Sickness*, St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1980; Martin S. Weinberg and Alan P. Bell, *Homosexuality: An Annotated Bibliography*, New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Warren Johansson

Psychoanalysis

Psychoanalysis is the movement that takes its start from the ideas set forth by Sigmund **Freud** at the turn of the present century. The movement, which has had a vast influence on many realms of modern thought, remains hard to classify. The lay public tends to confuse it with **psychology**, yet academic psychologists remain among the most determined doubters of the value of psychoanalytic techniques and concepts. Although psychoanalysis claims to be a form of mental therapy—indeed the only truly serious one—the efficacy of its procedures in promoting mental health has never been conclusively demonstrated, and indeed an increasing number of observers question whether they possess any intrinsic therapeutic value. The popular mind associates the views of Freud and his followers with sex, believing that psychoanalysis is centrally concerned with the erotic, or that it was the first discipline to discuss the matter in an ordered way. These assertions are false. Freud actually arrived as a late-comer at the crest of a period of sex research, the main center of which lay in Berlin, not in Vienna. Moreover, the views of Freud and his followers are addressed primarily to nonsexual issues. In addition to its concern with the mind, psychoanalysis also has a metapsychological side, in which it offers views and speculations on human destiny and the nature of civilization. Finally, psychoanalysis has had an enormous influence over modern literature and art, where it may be said to play a role similar to that of **mythology** in the creative work of classical Greece and Rome. Increasingly questioned by scientists, the lasting significance of psychoanalysis is now seen more and more to reside in this cultural realm.

History. Freud founded the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society in 1902 and the International Psychoanalytic Society in 1910. His organizations attracted a number of talented followers, but their history was marred by defections, notably those of Alfred **Adler** in 1911 and Carl Gustav **Jung** in 1914. Although, as has been noted, Freud's theories are not exclusively or even centrally sexual, he rightly criticized both men for their excision of the sexual element from psychoanalysis.

At first psychoanalysis was largely restricted to German-speaking countries, but it was diffused to some extent in France thanks to the work of Marie Bonaparte and in England through Freud's faithful follower Ernest Jones. Although Freud visited the United States in 1911 (in the company of Jung), he came to dislike the country, in part because of personal financial losses in World War I.

On at least two occasions, in 1905 and 1935, Freud gave statements that were remarkably sympathetic to homosexuals as individuals. The lesbian tendencies of his favorite daughter Anna (which were quietly, though discreetly acknowledged in his immediate circle) may have helped to soften his views. Yet, when all is said and done, his theory relegates homosexuals to a category of the mentally second class. Human psychosexual development Freud sees as an arduous journey through the oral and anal to the mature genital stage, which he equates with heterosexuality. Instead of obeying the summons to complete this journey, homosexuals have lingered along the way. Important psychic

developments have been "inhibited," and they remain immature.

In the 1920s professional psychoanalytic circles debated the question of whether a homosexual might be qualified to become an analyst. Freud answered that under certain conditions such a person could be accepted. Ernest Jones, however, disagreed, and this ban came to be the dominant view, so that overt homosexuals in the course of a training analysis presumably had to lie blatantly to their analyst, while the exclusion practiced by the psychoanalytic profession provided a model for discrimination in other fields calling for confidentiality and intimacy.

Ironically, in view of Freud's dislike, America seemed the nation in which psychoanalysis achieved its greatest triumphs, thanks the the large number of émigré analysts who settled there in the 1930s because of Hitler's persecutions. In fusing with the American ethos, psychoanalysis blurred some of its essential features. The notion of primordial **bisexuality** was thrown overboard (especially in a key paper by Sandor Rado), and new handicaps were discovered in homosexuality (e.g., the supposed tendency to "**injustice collecting**" promoted by Edmund **Bergler** and the "close-binding mother" of Irving Bieber). Seeing only homosexuals who came to them for help as patients, the practicing psychoanalyst is tempted to project the neuroses of this selected group on the entire homosexual population.

All too frequently American psychoanalysis seemed to wish nothing more than to acquiesce in, and even to abet, the then prevailing demands for adjustment and conformity. In this way it lost whatever emancipatory vigor it had originally possessed. In the period after World War II countless numbers of homosexuals and lesbians were analyzed at enormous expense, the result usually being misery in that they could not "adjust" to society's norms by overcoming the "neurosis" of homosexuality.

Critiques. In the 1960s discordant voices came to be heard, including those of Wilhelm **Reich** (1897–1957) and Herbert Marcuse (1898–1979), both well-informed central Europeans. Different as they were, Reich and Marcuse seemed to offer a more "revolutionary" brand of psychoanalysis which would meld personal change with radical societal reconstruction. Yet these new trends reckoned without the social pessimism of the founder, who had counseled, in effect, "repression will ye always have with you."

More damaging were challenges that went to the heart of the therapeutic claims of psychoanalysis. In the 1950s H. J. Eysenck produced a statistical study showing that psychoanalytic patients recovered no more quickly (in fact somewhat more slowly) than those who received no therapy at all. While the psychoanalytic establishment has sought to pour cold water on this and similar studies, it has yet to produce conclusive evidence that psychoanalysis has any distinctive therapeutic efficacy. Considering the length and expense of the treatment, and the increasing availability of more concise therapies, this critique has struck home. When asked to supply empirical evidence of the success of their therapeutic sessions, psychoanalysts commonly reply that the analyst–client relationship is privileged, and must not be monitored by a third party. Thus the efficacy of psychoanalytic procedures is presented as self-validating. Such defensive measures cannot be employed by any true science, which by definition must always take the risk that it will be falsified by independent tests.

Nor are self-reports even of patients who have enjoyed "successful" analyses uniformly encouraging. Some even return for a "retread" program. Forced to renounce even the claim that psychoanalysis makes one happy, its defenders have retreated into the position that prolonged analysis offers the benefit of showing the tragic ambiguity of life. This claim

would suggest that it is a poetics or lay philosophy rather than a therapy. Such assertions would seem to be buttressed rather than countered by the opaque writings of Jacques Lacan, a French "deconstructionist" psychoanalyst much in vogue in the 1980s in some circles in England and America.

In the 1980s criticism mounted. Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson and Martin Swales presented evidence that showed the personal ethics of Freud to be questionable. It has also been charged that he remained a cocaine addict through the 1890s, when he began to present his distinctive theories. Other researchers have emphasized the eclecticism of his ideas, their lack of originality: the idea of the unconscious came as part of the legacy of German romanticism; universal bisexuality derived from Freud's mentor Wilhelm Fliess; and infantile sexuality was purloined (without acknowledgement) from Albert **Moll**. Individually these critiques may not suffice to overturn psychoanalytic theory, but they have seriously eroded the popular perception, so carefully nourished by the psychoanalytic establishment over the years, that Freud was a secular saint. More generally, it has been justly remarked that psychoanalysis is culture-bound, a product of middle-class Viennese society at the end of the nineteenth century. Thus the "penis envy" that is supposed to be a universal stage of women's self-understanding is nothing more than the confluence of Victorian prudery and the subjection of women. Yet the most damaging critiques are those which challenge the very core of psychoanalysis: its logical status. Adolf Grünbaum and Morris Eagle argue that psychoanalysis works essentially as a placebo. Forming an emotional bond with the analyst ("transference"), the patient gradually internalizes the concepts of psychoanalysis. For example, patients of Freudian analysts tend to have "Freudian" dreams with "Freudian" symbols, those of Jungian analysts have "Jungian" dreams with matching symbols. This process of assimilation is then labeled therapeutic progress.

The ultimate value of psychoanalysis remains hard to assess. There can be no doubt that in the early decades its ideas, novel to the lay public, helped to undermine conventional moral certainties and to stimulate new thought. Yet once psychoanalysis was itself assimilated into the conventional wisdom this benefit was lost. The problems experienced by analysands (therapeutic clients) were compounded for gay men and lesbians. Many believed that they benefited from analysis, but a great many more have emerged with negative feelings about the process and recurrent difficulty in accepting their sexual nature.

Despite its problematic character, psychoanalysis has proved a hardy perennial through the twentieth century. Although the twenty-first is unlikely to see its final triumph, this trend in modern thought may yet have new contributions to make.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Frederick Crews, *Skeptical Engagements*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1986; Richard C. Friedman, *Male Homosexuality: A Contemporary Psychoanalytic Perspective*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988; Robert Friedman, "The Psychoanalytic Model of Male Homosexuality: A Historical and Theoretical Critique," *Psychoanalytic Review*, 73 (1986), 483–519; Adolf Grünbaum, *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis: A Philosophical Critique*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984; Richard A. Isay, *Being Homosexual: Gay Men and Their Development*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1989; Kenneth Lewes, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Male Homosexuality*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988; Timothy F. Murphy, "Freud Reconsidered: Bisexuality, Homosexuality, and Moral Judgment," *Journal of Homosexuality*, 9:2/3 (1983–84), 65–77; Paul Roazen, *Encountering Freud: The Politics and Histories of Psychoanalysis*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1989; idem, *Freud and His Followers*, New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Wayne R. Dynes