

**GEORG GRODDECK'S DEFENSE OF HOMOSEXUALITY  
IN DAS BUCH VOM ES. (\*).**

**Peter G. Christensen (\*\*)**  
Marquette University

When we think of literary treatments of homosexuality in the Weimar Republic, we do not immediately think of Georg Groddeck's autobiographical confessional novel *Das Buch vom Es*. We are more inclined to turn to Klaus Mann's *Der fromme Tanz*, John Henry MacKay's *Der Puppenjunge*, or Stephen Spender's recently published *The Temple* for open treatments of homosexuality and to the novels of Thomas Mann and Hermann Hesse for gay subtexts. Despite his importance to writers such as Thomas Mann, W-H. Auden, and Lawrence Durrell, Georg Groddeck (1866-1934) remains one of the marginal figures in the history of early psychoanalysis and an all but forgotten one in the history of German-language literature. Consequently, it is not surprising that Kenneth Lewes, in his recent detailed history, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Male Homosexuality*<sup>1</sup>, should fail to make any reference to Groddeck's defense of homosexuality in *Das Buch vom Es*, published with the encouragement of Freud in 1923 by the Psychoanalytischer Verlag in Vienna<sup>2</sup>

Since bibliographies of primary and secondary materials about him are not easy to come by, my essay will provide some background on Groddeck and how he has been received before proceeding to an analysis of his treatment of homosexuality in *Das Buch vom Es* and an examination of his theories in the context of psychoanalytical thought of the 1920s.

Because of the turbulence of the Nazi period and Groddeck's position on the periphery of the psychoanalytic movement, the spread of his ideas in Germany was disrupted. However, in the later years of his life, Groddeck was launched in England not as a leader of a sexual revolution but as a modern guru who strips away the deceits of everyday life in order to get at the truth of the unconscious and its manifold symbolizations. *Das Buch vom Es* was rendered into English in 1927, the first of four book-length translations of Groddeck's writings made by V.M.E. (Mollie) Collins, a former patient of his, for the C.W. Daniel Company of London. This publishing house also issued H.M. Taylor's sympathetic eighty-page monograph, *Life's Unknown Ruler: An Exposition of the Teaching of Georg Groddeck*, in 1935, the year after Groddeck's death. Except for *Das Buch vom Es*, the translations by Collins were haphazard cobblings of essays and parts of essays divorced from their original contexts. At times they simply distort what Groddeck was trying to do. The ecstatic treatment of Groddeck continued with Lawrence Durrell's famous preface to a reprint of *Das Buch vom Es* in 1949, leaving the analytical reader once again with little balanced reflection on Groddeck's controversial career.

Only since 1961 has there been a systematic publication of volumes of Groddeck's complete writings in German, first by the Limes Verlag in Wiesbaden and then by Stroemfeld/Roter Stern in Frankfurt. Many translations have appeared in French, but the only selection of essays available in English translation from this later period is *The Meaning of Illness* from the Hogarth Press in 1977.

The recent work on Groddeck has not been primarily concerned with his interest in homosexuality, or even sexuality for that matter, but rather with the issues of the unconscious and its structuring. For example, a series of eight highly technical articles in German on the origin of the ideas of the It and the Id appeared in the journal *Psyche: Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse und ihre Wendungen* from 1983 to 1986. For other important recent work on Groddeck the reader should see the chapters and articles on him by Martin Grotjean,<sup>3</sup> Francois Roustang,<sup>4</sup> Catherine Clement,<sup>5</sup> Maud Mannoni,<sup>6</sup> Pamela Tytell<sup>7</sup>, Jean Laplanche<sup>8</sup>, and Judith Dupont<sup>9</sup>. In addition there are full-length books by Roger Lewinter<sup>10</sup> Jacques-Antoine Malarewicz<sup>11</sup>, Michele Lalive d'Epinay<sup>12</sup>, Jacquy Chemouni<sup>13</sup>, Herbert Will,<sup>14</sup> and Laurent Le Vaguerese.<sup>15</sup>

This research has not emphasized Groddeck either as a creative writer or as a literary critic. As early as 1905, he wrote an essay on Carl Spitteler's "Olympischer Frühling." His essay of 1909 *Hin zu Gottnatur* showed the influence of Goethe's thought. In 1910 he published a study of Ibsen and the Woman Question in a separate volume. Among his functional works we find the weak story "Der Pfarrer von Langewiesche" (1909) and his one other published novel, *Der Seelensucher* (1921), an accomplished satirical and picaresque tale, still unintegrated into German literary histories.<sup>16</sup>

Through the critical literature<sup>17</sup>, however, one can make a start at drawing important connections between Groddeck and such later figures as Lacan, Deleuze, and Baudrillard. We should note that Groddeck is related to them because he called into question the "subject." What John Rajchman describes as Lacan's strangeness to readers who had interpreted Freud through Sartre or Ricoeur could also be said of Groddeck;

Under the Freudian concept of the unconscious, "the subject" was not what Aristotle had called a "psyche," a functional principle of life in the body, for it introduced a non-functional libidinal principle of the body in the way one lives one's life. It was not what Descartes had called a "thinking" or mental substance, since "it thinks where I am not," and, in particular, in the destinies of "my" body, where "I" am not. It is not something that can be inferred from a general theory of Humanity, for it is particular to each subject<sup>18</sup>.

Ironically, despite a strong link between Groddeck and current post-modernist antihumanists, the only familiar English-language reference to Groddeck for American audiences may be Susan Sontag's brief and non-technical, yet forceful denunciation of *Das Buch vom Es* from a humanitarian point of view in *Illness as Metaphor*.<sup>19</sup>

*Das Buch vom Es*, a novel of over three hundred pages in the form of thirty-three letters written by a psychotherapist named Patrik Troll to a female correspondent whose letters we do not get to read. (In 1978 it was brought to light that Sarah Plieck rather than Freud may have been the person who prompted the book by corresponding with Groddeck<sup>20</sup>. This novel incorporates autobiographical material from Groddeck's own life, particularly his relationship to his parents and siblings. Patrik Troll both is and is not Groddeck, for Troll is credited with the authorship of Groddeck's medical treatise *Nasarnecu*, whereas Groddeck is specifically mentioned as the author of the novel *Der Seelensucher*. *Das Buch vom Es* is a piece of confessional writing which attempts to justify Troll's unusual view of therapy. He has abandoned the so-called science of medicine to become a healer in the service of the It ("das Es"). Although he draws upon Freudian ideas such as repression, transference, and the Oedipus Complex, Troll goes out on his own path to defend practices often considered in a negative light: masturbation, narcissism, and homosexuality. He knows that there will be much opposition to his views, and at one point he addresses his correspondent as Faust and later refers to himself as a man who has been seen as Satan. Here we have an indirect reference to Groddeck's clinic at Baden-Baden, which he called the "satanarium," the site of much of his research into the origin of illness.

Groddeck's defense of homosexuality does not make him a longlost hero of gay liberation. He was a man who married twice, and he was not active in the gay liberation movements of the Weimar Republic.<sup>21</sup> Despite his progressive attitude toward homosexuality, we must remember that he was a right-wing racist and a monomaniacal defender of the psychological component of all illness.

Generally, *Das Buch vom Es* has not been treated as an artistic whole but rather as a quarry for ideas about the It, especially in reference to Freud's contemporaneous work on the Id. Who is really responsible for the idea of the Id: Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Freud, or Groddeck? The debate continues among German psychoanalysts, but it blocks off an overall assessment of the novel. Although *Das Buch vom Es* lacks the interesting plot and array of characters of the earlier *Der Seelensucher*,<sup>22</sup> it nevertheless holds our interest by its weaving of several themes through Patrick Troll's letters. Groddeck's treatment of homosexuality is both progressive and unenlightening. Whereas he is able to link his homosexual feelings to his abandonment of an overly patriarchal medical style, his view of the It leaves him in a position of finding gay and lesbian people complicit with whatever illnesses afflict them.

Groddeck's first concern is autobiographical. Troll tries to understand his own vocation of healer in terms of his past and his dispositions, including an acceptance of his homosexual experiences. Second, the idea of the double-sexed It as an unknown force that animates humankind and reveals itself through symbols and symptoms is presented. For Groddeck the expression, "I live," is only a small and superficial part of the fundamental principle that the individual is lived by the It (18). Third,

the reasons for his abandonment of the scientific/medical view of disease as something bad happening to the body are presented with reference to the key concept that each illness has a purpose that must be understood in order for therapy to work.

Recent writers on Groddeck as a therapist have made mention of his view of the It as double-sexed. Jacques Laplanche states that Plato's mythic androgyne was the reality of the embryo for Groddeck,<sup>23</sup> Similarly, Malarewicz points out the bisexual nature of each organ of the body in Groddeck's system of thought<sup>24</sup>. D'Epinau underlines the fact that as we grow up our sexual choices become more and more restricted.<sup>25</sup> Le Vaguerese indicates that in at least one of his other writings Groddeck finds anti-gay sentiment hypocritical because of the bisexual component of human life.<sup>26</sup> Another elaboration of Groddeck's position on human bisexuality can be found in his essay on the double sex of the human being.<sup>27</sup>

The references to homosexuality appear scattered through the early part of *Das Buch vom Es* in the form of four brief case histories before the major treatment in Letter xxvii. First, we are told that a foster-child of Troll lay ill with pericarditis, which Troll understood as a fancied pregnancy of the heart. The man later showed this womanly side of his nature in a compulsion toward homosexuality (23). A second patient's homosexuality is discussed with reference to castration anxiety. Troll writes that he probably wanted to castrate his father so as to transform him into a loved woman, or else because his dread of having his sexual parts cut off by his father was a suppressed wish to become a wife to him (100).

A third case is more complex. A man, D., would get drunk and wander through the streets of Berlin in order to seek out pick-ups, who were prone to beat him half-dead. D. was also prey to fevers springing from anxious thoughts that he would be attacked by marauders who would tie him up and sodomize him. Troll proceeds from the premise that all anxieties conceal a wish. The hatred with which D. in his drunkenness pursued men indicates suppressed homosexuality. His fear fantasy was the same, and the extent of the fever measured the fierceness of homosexual desire. Troll comments that, although in many cases male homosexuality may be caused by a boy's extreme determination to free himself from his mother's eroticism and from desires for incest with the mother, in the case of D., it is affection for the father which has been repressed. D. must have had the wish to be his father's wife (135).

The fourth case study is provided by Troll himself. He was brought up in a boy's boarding school from the time he was twelve. Troll fell in love with one of his companions and was given over to fits of jealousy and thoughts of suicide. At this time, his masturbation fantasies were almost exclusively concerned with boys. At a later age, Troll loved a fellow student at the University, but then his affection shifted to his friend's sister. He states that he unconsciously fled from his own homosexuality by keeping men at a distance, even in his professional life. Only now is he beginning to have many male patients. He remarks that it was his wish to escape from men that led to a situation in which he was seldom consulted by them. He talked with men without seeing them; even if they were for hours before his eyes, they did not reach his consciousness. Now he looks at men in the same way as he looks at women—as human beings (229-31).

The reader of the letters up to this point cannot be entirely prepared for the declaration that comes early in Letter xxviii:

Ja, ich bin der Ansicht, daß alle Menschen homosexuell sind, bin so sehr dieser Ansicht, daß es mir schwerrfällt zu begreifen, wie jemand anderer Ansicht sein kann. Der Mensch liebt sich selbst zunächst, liebt sich mit alien Leidenschaftsmöglichkeiten, sucht sich seinem Wesen nach jede denkbare Lust zu verschaffen, und da er selbst entweder Mann oder Weib ist, so ist er von vornherein der Leidenschaft zu seinem eigenen Geschlecht untertan. Das kann nicht anders sein, und jede unbefangene Prüfung

irgendeines beliebigen Menschen gibt den Beweis dafür. Die Frage ist nicht: ist die Homosexualität Ausnahme, ist sie pervers? (232)

Instead, we need to ask why it is that people come to have feelings for the opposite sex. Reason number one general societal prohibition has turned homosexuality into a shameful vice to be avoided by all. In addition, we are taught not to think seriously about homosexuality when we do encounter it, as in classical Greece, or else not to notice it, as when we read the Bible and pay no attention to the statement that there was a disciple whom Jesus loved. Noting that the Christian prohibition against homosexuality is derived from earlier Judaic ones, Troll suggests that the desire to bring all sexual activity into direct association with procreation was supplemented by the desire of the priestly class to gain control over the populace through manipulation of the conscience of the people.

In a remarkable passage, Troll expresses his belief that homosexuality is more characteristic of humans than heterosexuality:

Wir alle verbringen mindestens fünfzehn bis sechzehn Jahre, meistens unser ganzes Leben in der bewußten oder wenigstens halb bewußten Erkenntnis, homosexuell zu sein und soundso homosexuell gehandelt zu haben und noch zu handeln. Es geht alien, wie es mir gegangen ist, daß sie zu irgendeiner Zeit ihres Lebens eine übermenschliche Anstrengung machen, diese nach Wort und Schrift verachtliche Homosexualität zu ersticken. Nicht einmal die Verdrängung gelingt ihnen, und das andauernde, tägliche Sichselbstbelfigen durchzuführen, unterstützen sie die öffentliche Listerung der Homosexualität und edeichtern sich so den inneren Kampf. (233-34)

The hatred of homosexuality which stems from the refusal to accept the self is placed by Troll on a continuum with the human tendency to denounce those vices to which we ourselves most often succumb. Next, Troll states that societal disapproval of homosexuality is connected to our attitude toward masturbation. For him, the source of homosexuality is in narcissism, self-love, and self-gratification. He feels that no one has yet been born who is not prejudiced against the phenomenon of self-gratification (234).

Troll believes that to society at large lesbianism is even more invisible than homosexuality, and he points out that for most people the "homo" in "homosexuality" suggests the Latin noun for "man" rather than the Greek adjective for "same." People refuse to see female homosexuality because any woman may kiss and hug any other female person of any age, without fear. In one of the few direct political references to German life in the novel, he points out that in a debate around a proposal

to include the female sex under § 175, a highly respected woman of the Weimar Republic denounced the proposal, claiming that its enactment would shake the whole structure of society to its foundations. There could not possibly be enough jails for all the women. Troll agrees with the assessment that punishment of homosexuality indeed shakes up the foundations of human life, since it is on the sexual ties between mother and daughter, father and son, that society is built (236).

In another summarizing paragraph Troll again indicates that heterosexuality is more of a puzzle than homosexuality:

Nun kann man ja frischweg behaupten—und tatsächlich wird es behauptet—, die Menschen seien bis zur Zeit der Pubertät als Kinder also, samt und sonders bisexuell, um dann in ihrer großen Mehrzahl zugunsten des andern Geschlechts auf die Liebe zum eigenen zu verzichten. Aber das ist nicht richtig. Der Mensch ist bisexuell sein Leben lang und bleibt es sein Leben lang, und höchstens erreicht dieses oder jenes Zeitalter als Konzession für seine modische Sittlichkeit hie und da, daß bei einem Teil—einem recht kleinen Teil—die Homosexualität verdrängt wird, womit sie aber nicht vernichtet, sondern nur eingeengt ist. (vii, 236)

Since love for members of the same sex necessarily follows upon self-love, it is harder to understand why most girls become heterosexual. In the case of a boy, the mother's erotic attraction leads him toward women. He declares that all the tenderness, joys, delights and wish-fulfillments which only the mother

gives or can give him counterbalance his narcissism (237). Here Groddeck speculates that admiration for the superior size and strength of a man and the desire to have a penis are probably the crucial factors, but he admits that he really does not understand the change-over in females to heterosexuality.

Next we have a rather bizarre paragraph in which Troll does two things. First, he symbolically connects his own homosexuality to a memory of his father's hacking down a door with an axe in order to get to Troll's unconscious and naked brother lying on the floor of the bathroom. For Groddeck, breaking open a door with an axe suggests both sexual attack and castration anxiety. Groddeck's reliance on blatant sexual symbols over and over in the novel seems particularly weak because they are so often trotted out as universal interpretive tools. Nevertheless, for Groddeck it is precisely in their universality that they offer keys to understanding. Second, he finds the gay men are especially fond of using public lavatories because it is in lavatories and washrooms that they have seen older brothers and fathers expose themselves in order to relieve themselves. Groddeck never suggests any obvious social causes for this fondness for public lavatories.

Troll then resumes his discussion of female homosexuality, deciding that women's eroticism is much freer than men's in relation to the sexes. Women can transfer love from one sex to the other without much difficulty. In short, neither homosexuality nor heterosexuality is very deeply repressed, and the issue of a choice between homosexuality or hetero-sexuality has little significance in women's lives (239). Here Groddeck significantly underestimates public hostility to lesbianism.

Only in Letter xxx is the issue of homosexuality directly related to the concept of the It. Troll writes:

Diese hypothetische Es-Einheit, deren Ursprung in der Befruchtung fest-gelegt ist, enthält tatsächlich in sich zwei Es-Einheiten, eine weibliche und eine männliche. Dabei sehe ich ganz von der verwirrenden Tatsache ab, daß diese beiden Einheiten, die vom Ei and vom Samenfaden herkommen, wiederum keine Einheiten, sondern Vielheiten von Adams und der Urtierehen Zeiten her sind, in denen Weibliches und Männliches in unlösbarem Gewirr, aber wie es scheint unvermischt nebeneinanderliegen. (259)

The two principles never merge: every human It contains at least two It- beings, and they are partially independent of each other. Troll has re-course to his hypothetical It-units to bolster his contention that human beings are inherently bisexual.

Unfortunately, Troll uses the idea of the It with such abandon that he risks explaining away rather than explaining the phenomena that he seeks to understand. He declares that there are new It-beings constantly revealing themselves for all bodily functions and diseases. For him, nothing is clear in human life (261). Human beings are deluded into thinking that they have control over their lives.

In Troll's system, the idea of the "I" is a mask for human powerlessness:

Wir können nicht anders, wir müssen uns einbilden, daß wir Herren des Es sind, der vielen Es-Einheiten und des einen Gesamt-Es, ja auch Herren über Charakter und Handeln des Nebenmenschen, Herren über sein Lehen, seine Gesundheit, seinen Tod. Das sind wir gewiß nicht, aber es ist eine Notwendigkeit unserer Organisation, unsres Menschseins, daß wir es glauben... In der Tat wissen wir nichts über den Zusammenhang der Dinge, können nicht fin- vierundzwanzig Stunden voraus bestimmen, was wir tun werden (262-63)

Troll is conscious of the anti-humanistic nature of this pronouncement, and it certainly has a resonance in some post-structuralist thought. Troll implies that the choice of the so-called beloved is entirely determined by unconscious factors and that the desire to live out one's homosexuality existentially as a chosen value rather than as a given orientation is meaningless. He makes no suggestion that men and women may come to same sex relationships through the sharing of similar socialization experiences.

Knowledge of his own homosexual side must, however, be seen as a contributing factor for Troll's abandonment of traditional medical practice. He began to realize that he was a patriarchal lawgiver, and

in many ways a useless one. He writes that he had learned the method of making authoritative patriarchal suggestions from his own father and his mentor, Schweninger. In addition, he had something of it in himself from birth (266). Not only was Troll failing to help his patients, but he was also becoming what one of his medical critics called 'hysterical' (264). Now, he confesses, he is hopelessly lost in proposing helpful activities (267). Instead, he tries to free himself as quickly as possible from any unconscious opposition to the It of the patient and its wishes. Thus one can surmise that Troll will never make any attempt to turn homosexual patients away from their homosexuality.

Nevertheless, Troll's attitude toward disease is connected to something more than his passive attention to the It of the patient, namely, self-expression. The AIDS crisis only highlights the immense danger in his attitude toward disease. He writes:

Went, wie mir, Krankheit eine Lebensäußerung des Organismus ist, der sieht in ihr nicht mehr einen Feind. Es kommt ihm nicht mehr in den Sinn, die Krankheit bekämpfen zu wollen, er such sie nicht zu heilen, je er behandelt sie nicht einmal...

Mit dem Augenblick, wo ich einsehe, daß die Krankheit eine Schöpfung des Kranken ist, wird sie für mich dasselbe wie seine Art zu gehen, seine Sprechweise, das Mienenspiel seines Gesichtes, die Bewegung seiner Hände, die Zeichnung, die er entworfen, das Haus, das er gebaut, das Geschäft, das er abgeschlossen hat, oder der Gang, den seine Gedanken gehen: ein beachtenswertes Symbol der Gewalten, die ihn beherrschen und die ich zu beeinflussen suche, wenn ich es für recht halte. (xxxi, 272)

As Susan Sontag has noted in *Illness as Metaphor*, the result of this approach is to make the patient feel guilty for his/her part in the illness.<sup>28</sup> Troll represents an extreme example of those who blame the victim. Since disease has become a form of self-expression of the It.

When we finish *Das Buch vom Es* we are faced with two key questions. First, can we separate Troll's sympathy for homosexuality from both his unenlightening idea of the It and his insensitive overextension of the idea of self-expression into illness? Here I believe that the answer is yes because the key connection of masturbation—narcissism—homosexuality is based on observation of his patients rather than on an initial speculation about the It. Second, can we say that Groddeck was more progressive than the other early psychoanalysts in his view on homosexuality? Here the answer again seems to be yes. To illustrate this view we can contextualize Groddeck's work of 1923 with the contemporaneous history of psychoanalytic thinking about homosexuality provided by Kenneth Lewes.

According to Lewes:

To summarize, informed psychoanalysts by 1930 would have agreed or disagreed on several ideas on the subject of homosexuality, and were undecided about others. By that time, all would have agreed that it could only be explained by accounting for intrapsychic conflict and defense mechanisms. Although biological constitutional factors were important, they could not be used to bolster the now discredited doctrine of degenerescence, the generational deterioration of genetic stock. In addition, despite the general interest in the relationship of homosexuality to paranoia, all would have agreed that simple homosexual object choice, unconnected with other psychic disturbance, was essentially an oedipal-level phenomenon, that is, the result of defenses against castration anxiety attendant upon genital strivings toward the mother.<sup>29</sup>

Lewes continues his analysis, stating that Freud's followers would have seen homosexuality as proceeding from universal bisexuality, and they would have conceded that homosexuality might not necessarily have only one cause. Nevertheless, for Groddeck psychic defenses apply equally well in the orientation toward heterosexuality as toward homosexuality. Heterosexuality is not more "natural."

As Paul Weindling has noted in the section on “Sexual Bolshevism” in *his Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945*, the “Weimar emphasis on reproductive sexuality continued to stigmatize homosexuality as ‘unnatural’ and ‘degenerate.’<sup>30</sup> Magnus Hirschfeld’s Scientific-Humane Committee set about recruiting professional medical advocates to defend homosexuality from these charges of perversion, but apparently Groddeck did not contribute to Hirschfeld’s effort. He did believe that some groups, such as southeast Asians, were racially inferior to Europeans, and the protofascist strain in this element of his thought helps explain why he would remain politically aloof from a figure like Hirschfeld who was perceived at the time as being very liberal, and who was subject to death threats from the right wing.

*Das Buch vom Es*, while making the problems of homosexuals clear, goes in a different direction than his contemporary Wilhelm Reich does in *Die Sexualität im Kulturkampf* in analyzing compulsory heterosexuality. Unlike the more observant Reich, Groddeck has no sense of the economic interests involved in pressuring men and women to make heterosexual marriages. One could never imagine the following statement by Reich coming from Groddeck’s mouth: “Compulsory marriage, which is only one stage in the development of the institution of marriage in general, is the result of a compromise between the economic interests and sexual needs.”<sup>31</sup> In neither of Groddeck’s novels does economics play any important role.

The fact that Groddeck is not mentioned in Lewes’ study implies that Groddeck, even more than Reich, is still seen as a person on the fringe of organized psychoanalysis in the 1920s despite his lengthy published correspondences with Freud and Sandor Ferenczi. In addition, we can assume that he was not cited in the scientific literature on homosexuality, since Lewes gives particular attention to both citation and marginalization of research. This neglect may have had several causes: dismissal of the unusual form of *Das Buch vom Es*, hostile feelings toward Groddeck because of his pre-conversion denunciation of psychoanalysis in Nasamecu (1913), or an unwillingness to reach over to the limbo into which those analysts who had departed from Freud’s views were banished.

When we look at other concerns of the analysts discussed by Lewes, we can see the relatively progressive nature of Groddeck’s thought. First of all, Groddeck deserves credit for drawing on his own homosexual experiences in a novel which would be seen as autobiographical. We should recall the famous incident of 1921 in which Ernest Jones wrote to Freud, telling him that he had rejected outright the application of a gay man for admission into the psychoanalytical profession. Freud and Otto Rank cosigned a statement that indicated their disapproval of Jones’s action.<sup>32</sup> They indicated that they no more believed in exclusion than they believed in legal prosecution of homosexuality. Nevertheless, the incident does indicate the hostility of at least some analysts toward homosexuality at that time.

Psychoanalysts of the 1920s were much concerned with the degree of pathology of homosexuality. According to Lewes, “there is a shift discernible from the early period, when homosexuality was freely admitted to be nonpathological in certain cases, to the end of the twenties, when most assumed, without discussion, that the condition was pathological”<sup>33</sup> Unfortunately, the psychoanalysts’ lack of contact with healthy homosexuals may have predisposed them to look at homosexuality as pathological.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, they probably read Freud’s ambiguous essay, “On Narcissism: An Introduction” in an anti-gay way. For those who think that the essay defends anaclitic love (attachment) over narcissism, homosexuals are put on the defensive, since narcissistic love is described by Freud in terms of same-sex attraction.<sup>35</sup> Groddeck parts company with the other psychoanalysts in his belief that it is heterosexuality which is more puzzling than homosexuality. In general, he is far less inclined to label any behavior pathological than was the Freudian group.

Furthermore, we can say that Groddeck was more enlightened than Freud himself on homosexuality. Lewes writes:

If for Freud the ideal sexuality necessarily fused pleasure and procreation, homosexuality was necessarily “perverse,” “abnormal,” or “unhealthy.” Such a decision, in fact, underlay Freud’s understanding of the difference between perversion, which involved a fixation on infantile sexual aims so that procreation did not predominate in sexual striving, and inversion, whose identifying characteristic was a deflection of sexual aim away from its biologically appropriate object choice

in the opposite sex. Henceforth sexual aberrations would be thought of as a deflection of the sexual instinct away from its dual goals of pleasure and procreation.<sup>36</sup>

For Groddeck, procreation is of less interest than sexual pleasure, and he never suggests in *Das Buch vom Es* that the best kind of sexuality is connected to a procreative function. Furthermore, as Troll states, what we usually call perversions, masturbation, homosexuality, and sodomy, are innate tendencies of human beings, the common property of every-one's nature. In conclusion, we should note that *Das Buch vom Es* offers us an unusual view of ideas on homosexuality in the Weimar Republic. It asks us to temporarily set aside the notion of the homosexual subculture that we often popularly associate with Berlin during the 1920s. Groddeck does not enjoin us to look for homosexuality at the Friedrichstraße Passage, gay bars, or artistic circles of a sexual minority but rather in the behavior of everyone around us.<sup>37</sup>

**Peter G. Christensen**

(\*)

(\*\*)

## **REFERENCES**

Monatshe/ie, vol. 85, No. 2, 1993, 198 University System. pp 198 - 210

*Volver a Bibliografía Georg Groddeck*  
*Volver a Newsletter-19-ALSF-ex-73*



## Notas al final

- 1.- Kenneth Lewes, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Male Homosexuality* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988).
- 2.- All references to this novel are to the more recent reprint. See Georg Groddeck, *Das Buch vom Es: Psychoanalytische Brüche an eine Freundin* (Wiesbaden: Limes, 1961). This edition includes a German translation of a brief introduction by Lawrence Durrell
- 3.- Martin Grotjean, *The Voice of the Symbol* (Los Angeles: Mara Books, 1971).
- 4.- Francois Roustang, *Un Destin si fineste* (Paris: Minuit, 1976).
- 5.- Catherine Clement, *Les Fils de Freud sont fatigués* (Paris: Grasset, 1978).
- 6.-»Maud Mannoni, *La Théorie comme fiction: Freud. Groddeck, Winnicott, Lacan* (Paris: Sethi, 1979).
- 7.- Pamela Tylell. «Un Précurseur des fictions théoriques,» *L'Arc* 78 (1980): 92-103.
- 8.- Jean Laplanche, *Problématiques L'Inconscient et le ca* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France), 1985.
- 9.- Judith Dupont, «Entre Freud et Ferenczi: Groddeck,» *Cahiers Confrontation* 12 (1984): 33-42.
- 10.- Roger Lewinter, *Groddeck et le Royaume millénaire de Jérôme Bosch: Essai sur le paradis en psychanalyse* (Paris: Editions Champ Libre, 1974); Roger Lewinter. *L'Apparat de l'homme* (Paris: Nazarine, 1980).
- 11.- Jacques-Antoine Malarewicz, *Itinéraire d'une absence: de Groddeck à Balm: L'Émergence de la psychosomatique* (Paris: Privat, 1979).
- 12.- Michele Lalive d'Épinay, *Groddeck, ou Part de déconcerter* (Paris: Editions Universitaires, 1983).
- 13.- Jacquy Chemouni, *Georg Groddeck Psychanalyste de l'imaginaire: psychanalyse freudienne et psychanalyse groddeckienne* (Paris: Payot, 1984).
- 14.- Herbert Will, *Die Geburt der Psychosomatik: Georg Groddeck—der Mauch and Wissenschaftler* (München: Urban & Schwarzenberg, 1984).
- 15.- Laurent Le Vaguerese, *Groddeck: La Maladie et la Psychanalyse* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985).
- 16.- For the literary criticism. see Groddeck's „Ein Deutsches Gedicht im groilen Stil, *Der Osten* 31 (1905): 186-92; *Hin zu Gounatur* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1909); and *True/die oder Komadie? tine Frage an die Ibsenleser* (Leipzig: Hirzel. 1910). For the fiction, see „Der Pfarrer von Langewiesche,“ *Frankfurter Zeitung*, March-April 1909; *Der Seelensucher Ein psychoanalytischer Roman* (Zurich: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1921).
- 17.- Grotjean gives a long description of *Der Seelensucher*, but he is much less interested in *Das Buch vom Es*. Roustang analyzes the tortured relationship of Groddeck to his correspondent Freud. Clement praises Groddeck as a liberator of the spirit, a position she later abandoned when his racism became known. For Mannoni, Groddeck helped rehabilitate the imaginary. Pamela Tylell speculates that Groddeck's expression of his ideas through *Reran*, form suggested to other psychoanalysts a lack of scientific rigor which kept him on the sidelines of the movement. Laplanche concentrates on showing how Groddeck tried to get rid of the dualisms he found in Freudian metapsychology. Dupont draws attention to Groddeck's important published personal correspondence with Sandor Ferenczi. Lewinter, Groddeck's biggest champion in France, presents his hero as a great thinker and considers his psychoanalytical conferences as exercises in the knowledge of the self. Malarewicz, d'Épinay, and Will are all concerned with the way in which psychosomatic medicine has changed and/or continued from Groddeck's initial impulse. Chemouny does the best job of trying to understand the repellent aspects of Groddeck's theories and personality. Le Vaguerese tries to present in chronological fashion the development of Groddeck's thought, culminating in his work on the idea of the symbol.
- 18.- John Rajchman, *Truth and Eros: Foucault, Lacan, and the Question of Ethics* (London: Routledge, 1991), 21.
- 19.- Susan Sontag, *Illness as Metaphor* (New York: Vintage, 1979) 23, 43, 47, 54
- 20.- See Marie-Jose Baudinet, «Reflexion sur choix du pseudonyme de Trolle dans *Le Livre du ca*,» *L'Arc* 78 (1980): 73-77.
- 21.- James D. Sleakley, *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany* (New York: Arno Press, 1975),.
- 22.- Georg Groddeck, *Der Seelensucher: Ein psychoanalytischer Roman* (1921; Wiesbaden: Limes, 1971).
- 23.- See Laplanche 175
- 24.- See Malarewicz 38-39.
- 25.- See d'Épinay 97.
- 26 .- See Le Vaguerese 6]. The reference is to Groddeck's *Les Conférences psychanalytiques d'usage des malades*, trans. Roger Lewinter, 3 vols. (Paris: Editions Champ Libre, 1978) 1: 141
- 27 .- Georg Groddeck, «Le Double sexe de l'être humain,» trans. Roger Lewinter, *Nouvelle Revue de psychanalyse* 7 (1973): 193-98.
- 28.- See Sontag 23, 43, 47, 54, 191
- 29.-. Lewes 64.
- 30.- Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989) 374-75
- 31.- See the translation of *Die Sexualität im Kulturkampf. The Sexual Revolution: Toward a Self-Regulating Character Structure*, trans. Therese Poi (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1974) 122.
- 32.- See Herb Spiers and Michael Lynch, “The Gay Rights Freud,” *Body Politic*, May 1977: 8-10.
- 33.- Lewes 65.

- 34.- Perhaps the growing conservatism toward homosexuality on the part of psychoanalysts during this time is related to the increasing resistance to women's rights at the end of the Weimar Period. See, on the abortion issue, for example, Atina Grossmann, "Abortion and Economic Crisis: The 1931 Campaign against Paragraph 218," *When Biology was Destiny. Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany*, eds. Renate Bridenthal, Atina Grossmann, and Marion Kaplan: (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984), 66-86.
- 35.- Sigmund Freud, "On Narcissism: An Introduction," *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*, trans. James Strachey et al. (London: Hogarth Press, 1971) 14: 90
- 36.- Lewes 46.
- 37.- For photographs of meeting places and cruising grounds, see Verein der Freunde einer Schwulen Museum, *Eldorado: Homosexuelle Frauen und Männer in Berlin 1850- 1950: Geschichte, Alltag, und Kultur*. (Berlin: Froelich & Kaufmann, 1984).