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Katie Sutton (*The University of Melbourne*)

**Sexual Pathologies and the Violence of War: Sexological and Psychoanalytic Responses to World War I**
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Rita Felski observes that the Freudian revolution erected "a seemingly impenetrable barrier" between the physiological and congenital focus of the nineteenth-century sexologists and the "modern view of sexuality as an enigmatic and often labile psychic field rooted in unconscious desires." A key achievement of Michel Foucault's History of Sexuality, she argues, was to dissolve this barrier, revealing the essential continuity between Victorian and post-Freudian culture, including the shared conviction that sexuality holds the key to our identity (Felski, 1). Taking this assertion of continuity between sexological and psychoanalytic thought as its starting point, this article explores points of contact between these disciplines at a time and place which was marked in particular by violence and change: Germany during World War I. In a climate of industrialized warfare on an unprecedented scale, medically trained sexologists and psychoanalysts alike were faced with new situations in military hospitals where they were asked to treat hundreds—sometimes thousands—of traumatized and shell-shocked soldiers. The unique challenges and symptoms they were confronted with forced them to rethink the causes and treatment of trauma-related sexual dysfunction. This in turn opened up new avenues for scholarly exchange between two disciplines which more often than not had been at loggerheads over the naming and explaining of sexual conditions and pathologies since the publication of Freud's Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality in 1905.

Introducing the proceedings of the Fifth International Psychoanalytic Congress in Budapest in September 1918, Sigmund Freud somewhat ruefully observed that the end of the war also meant a lost opportunity for further detailed study of the so-called war neuroses, the symptoms of which had, in many cases, seemingly disappeared with the cessation of the conflict itself. Although adding that he certainly hoped that no similar opportunity would arise again in the near future, Freud's introduction highlighted the war's significance in raising the profile of psychoanalysis, as he noticed that official representatives from the Central European Powers had also been present at Budapest, looking to set up new psychoanalytic centres in military hospitals in order to research the nervous illnesses associated with violent combat (Freud, "Einleitung", 3).

However, the war's impact on psychoanalysis went beyond raising awareness of analytic methods; the treatment of soldiers who had returned from the front led analysts to revisit key theories relating to traumatic neurosis. As Freudian theories describing the neuroses within a framework of sexual aetiology were criticized as unsuitable for describing the apparently non-sexual symptoms of shell shock, leading analysts were forced to rework their theories of neurosis to account for the physical violence of war. Sexologists, who had set out to study human sexuality from a scientific perspective since the late nineteenth century, also sought to assess how the violence of war impacted upon sexual behaviour. Sexology had conventionally—although not exclusively—favoured biological and congenital explanations for sexual pathologies, but the experience of treating soldiers traumatized by trench warfare led, as with psychoanalysis, to important revisions. While sexological research in wartime did not ignore shell shock, practitioners focused their attention on more obviously "sexual" disorders and on demographic questions, such as impotence among returning soldiers, or the influence of high male mortality rates on marriage and birth statistics. The physical consequences of violent combat, which many had witnessed firsthand as military doctors, led sexologists not only to intensify their study of the so-called "internal secretions"—the early twentieth century terminology for endocrinal or hormonal influences—but also, I will argue, to cautiously increase their recognition of psychological factors in the aetiology of sexual disturbances.

This essay, then, undertakes a comparative analysis of how the two academic disciplines most invested in the study of sexual behaviour in the early twentieth century, psychoanalysis and sexology, reacted to the experience of violent mass conflict during and immediately after World War I. This is an important chapter in both the history of science and the history of sexuality, and yet the relationship between these two disciplines in the early twentieth century remains distinctly underexplored. By analysing a particular moment in this interdisciplinary conversation, I aim to show how, for sexologists as well as psychoanalysts, the war experience not only led to a reassessment of key theories, but also to new opportunities for knowledge transfer.

---

1 These congress proceedings were published in 1919 as the first volume of the Internationale Psychoanalytische Bibliothek (Zur Psychoanalyse der Kriegsneurosen). The English translation appeared as vol. 2 of the International Psychoanalytic Library in 1921 (Ferenczi et al., Psycho-analysis and the War Neuroses).

2 Other contemporaries to highlight the war's significance in drawing attention to psychoanalysis include Sándor Ferenczi, "Die Psychoanalyse der Kriegsneurosen", 10, and E. Hirschmann in a review of the proceedings in the Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse, 484.

More nuanced assessments of this impact can be found in recent scholarship (Fuechte, 19f.; Lerner, 164).
1. Psychoanalysis and the »War Tremblers«: Revisiting the Sexual Aetiology of the Neuroses

Psychoanalysts during World War I were particularly interested in what was generally referred to in the German medical literature as »war neurosis« or »war hysteria« (Kriegsneurose or Kriegshysterie), but which in English is more often described as »shell shock«, with slightly different connotations, particularly regarding causality. The war had initially been welcomed by some German leaders and intellectuals as an antidote to the nation’s perceived crisis of nerves in the face of industrial modernity. In 1914 Kaiser Wilhelm II predicted a »war of nerves«, a terminology echoed by neurologist and sex researcher Albert Eulenburg with his description of the impending conflict as a »steel bath of nerves« (qtd. in Crouthamel, Great War, 2). Soon, however, as Andreas Killen observes, industrialized warfare and rationalized slaughter produced nervous breakdowns on an industrial scale (Killen, 129f.).

While war neurosis itself was not new, the distinctive type of warfare in World War I created, as Jay Domousi argues, a particular type of condition (Domousi, 82). By the end of the First World War, doctors were diagnosing an epidemic of what Paul Lerner described as »hysterical men«, with over 600 000 German soldiers succumbing to mental disorders of various kinds (Lerner; Killen, 130). The most common physical symptom of the war neurosis was an uncontrollable shaking of the legs or the entire body, leading to the coinage of the term »war tremblers«, or Kriegszitterer (as well as the condition of »trembling neurosis«/Zitterneurose). Other physical symptoms of traumatic neurosis resembled those familiar from peacetime diagnoses of hysteria: muscle tics, blindness, convulsive attacks, mutism, and partial paralysis.4

Assessing the wider social meanings surrounding shell shock, historians emphasize that this condition should not be understood simply as a mental illness triggered by violent trauma, but as intricately bound up with culturally and temporally specific influences on subjectivity, such as ideas surrounding masculinity or normality. George Mosse describes shell shock as a »social disease« constructed by doctors, and argues that shell-shocked soldiers joined the ranks of others deemed social »outsiders« at this period, such as Jews, criminals, homosexuals, or the insane. »For the cultural historian«, he argues, »shell shock provides an excellent example of the fusion of medical diagnosis and social prejudice which had taken place during the previous century and a half« (Mosse, 101). Both Mosse and Elaine Showalter read shell shock as an inherently gendered condition; while Mosse points out that it placed its victim outside of the masculine »ideal« (101-108), Showalter argues that it constituted one of the only forms of escape from an uncontrollable reality: »If it was the essence of manliness not to complain, then shell shock was the body language of masculine complaint, a disguised male protest, not only against the war, but against the concept of manliness itself« (Showalter, 64). Jason Crouthamel’s study of Weimar Germany further highlights the specifically sexual manifestations of war trauma, arguing that sexual disorders, brutalization and violence were among the most widespread symptoms displayed by men who had returned from the front (Crouthamel, »Male Sexuality«, 60-84, esp. 62-63, 66f.).

Conventional neurological and psychiatric treatments of war neurosis included the controversial »Kaufmann method«, which combined painful electrical currents with verbal suggestion. The goal was to use electrical machines to enhance the doctor’s authority, and thereby influence the patient’s will to recover, so that he could be quickly reintegrated into the war effort. As Killen and Lerner have shown, this attention to the patient’s will reflected a larger shift in medical understandings of traumatic neurosis, as what had previously been viewed as a somatic illness involving physical changes in the nervous centres (a view associated with prominent Berlin neurologist Hermann Oppenheim), was now increasingly explained in psychological terms. Taking this process of psychologization a step further, a number of doctors and politicians began to argue that war neurotics were not affected by any genuine disability, but were simply »malingering« who suffered from so-called »pension neurosis«; in other words, that they sought »refuge« in illness in order to receive a disability pension. Then the soldiers themselves were increasingly seen as the root of the problem. While this reflected concerns

---

3 As Jay Winter observes, the term »shell shock« does not exist in the same form in French or German, and »has a set of meanings in English which may simply not be translatable«, functioning in some contexts as a simple diagnosis, but in others as »a metaphor for the nature of industrialized warfare« itself (Winter, 8). British psychoanalyst Ernest Jones was among those to reject the term »shell shock« [sic] for its focus on only one of multiple possible causal factors, preferring the term »war-shock« (Kriegschock), which he attributes to Eder (Jones, »Die Kriegsneurosen [war-shock] «, 65).

4 A wide range of symptoms is discussed in the contributions by Abraham, Ferenczi and Simmel in Zur Psychoanalyse der Kriegsneurosen; see also Killen, 130.
about the state’s ability to meet welfare payments, it also shifted attention and blame away from the traumatic context of war. The Kaufmann method was widely employed in military psychiatric units during World War I, it increasingly drew criticism for being overly brutal, contributing to a breakdown of morale, and high rates of relapse (Killen, 127f, 139-144; Lerner, 175). In response, a number of military doctors treating nervous patients began to explore the newer, less invasive techniques offered by psychoanalysis. This shift represented an important development in the treatment of traumatic neurosis, entailing, as Damousi observes, a growing scientific interest in the individual subjectivity of the soldier patients (Damousi, 7). Yet Lerner warns against assuming that psychoanalysis was either politically or medically much more progressive than orthodoxy psychiatry at this period. Its treatment methods were undoubtedly more humane than the use of electrical currents, but the ethics of psychoanalysts ‘helping’ their patients by rendering them fit to return to the front remained questionable (Lerner, 171-174).

In the German military, Berlin physician Ernst Simmel was at the forefront of doctors experimenting with psychoanalytic techniques; other doctors to incorporate psychotherapy into their treatment of ‘male hysteria’ included Fritz Stern, Willibald Sauer, and Fritz Mohr. Simmel, who later became a member of the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute and developed close links to other socialist doctors and intellectuals, including writer and doctor Alfred Döblin, was stationed in the east Prussian outpost of Posen during the war. There he achieved considerable success in relieving the symptoms of traumatic war neurosis in just two to three sessions, through a combination of hypnotic, suggestive, and psychoanalytic methods. Although an outsider to psychoanalysis’ inner circle before 1918, Simmel’s publication that year of a book on war neurosis was received enthusiastically by Freud. As a consequence, he was invited to speak at the Psychoanalytic Congress in Budapest.

While international in name and outlook, the realities of the war situation meant that the Budapest Congress was attended primarily by analysts and officials from the Central Powers, particularly the German and Austro-Hungarian empires. Before this audience, Simmel described his treatment of numerous cases of war neurosis, and his understanding of this condition as a protective psychological mechanism aimed at preventing the development of a more damaging war psychosis. Simmel saw the war neuroses as proving the correctness of Freudian views on hysteria, whereby physical symptoms were considered to be conversions of psychological conflicts, in which the unconscious played an important role, repressing events and feelings hostile to the ego (Simmel, 42-60). As Veronika Fuechtner explains, Simmel saw the repression of traumatic war events as causing a personality split, which resurfaces in debilitating physical symptoms that suggest their traumatic origin (Fuechtner, 29).

To give an example, Simmel describes how he was presented with a soldier with a paralysed arm but no obvious physical injury. Analysis revealed that at the moment of a violent grenade explosion, this soldier had believed his arm to be ripped off completely. Simmel used hypnosis to correct this unconscious belief, in what he described as a ‘reattaching’ of the arm to the consciousness. While this treatment drew on somewhat dated Freudian approaches to hysteria – Freud himself had moved on from hypnosis by this stage – Simmel also experimented with more recent psychoanalytic methods. Drawing on Freud’s influential Interpretation of Dreams, first published in German in 1900 (Die Traumdeutung), he used dream analysis, for example, to treat a patient exhibiting a right arm tremor that involved odd circular movements. This technique revealed the patient’s unconscious memory of twisting the top off a hand grenade just before he lost consciousness in an explosion. After this association was revealed, the patient’s physical symptoms disappeared (Simmel, 48, 51).

While Simmel was aware that limitations on time and resources in the context of a military hospital meant that he could focus only on specific symptoms rather than attempting a complete cure, his pioneering methods...
proved an important reference point for various members of Freud's inner circle. These included the Berlin-based Karl Abraham and Hungarian Sándor Ferenczi, both of whom were likewise serving as military doctors at the time of the Congress—a fact prominently noted on the title page of the proceedings. Whereas Simmel, as indicated above, explained the war neuroses in terms of a weakening of the soldier's personality complex within the military hierarchy—a notion that Freud also drew upon in his introduction, describing a conflict between the old "peace-time" ego and a new "warrior" ego (Freud, "Einleitung", 5; see also discussion in Fuechtmann, 20, 39)—Ferenczi and Abraham were more interested in exploring whether theories of the specifically sexual etiology of neurosis that had been developed in peacetime could also be applied to the soldier neurotics.

This emphasis on sexuality was by far the most contentious aspect of psychoanalytic approaches to the war neuroses, as several speakers at the Congress observed. Simmel himself remained ambiguous on the role of sexuality in this context, causing scepticism towards his work in certain analytical quarters (Lerner, 183f.). As a consequence, speakers at the congress were careful to emphasize that war neurosis, like other forms of traumatic neurosis, must be understood not as belonging to the area of explicitly genital sexuality, but to an earlier, narcissistic stage of development, reflecting psychoanalytic's broad, Platonic understanding of sexuality as "Eros". By advancing the concept of a "narcissistic libido"—a mass of sexual energy that attaches itself to the ego and satisfies itself with this—it has been possible, argues Freud, to extend the libido theory to the narcissistic neuroses (Freud, "Einleitung", 4ff.; see also Ferenczi, "Psychoanalyse der Kriegsnervosen", 25).

Taking up these understandings of the libido and the stages of childhood sexual development, Ferenczi and Abraham—who argue along similar lines, despite Abraham noting that they had not collaborated (Abraham, "Erstes Korreferat", 32)—each developed causal explanations of traumatic war neurosis framed in terms of infantile regression in their papers. Posing the question of why the violent trauma endured by almost all soldiers results in neurosis only in some cases—or why, as Abraham puts it, one soldier might be repeatedly injured and return to the front without any signs of neurosis, while another can fall without injury but subsequently develop the severest of symptoms—both analysts stress the importance of individual predisposition and childhood experience (33f.).

Abraham argues that even prior to going to war, many war neurotics already suffered from inhibitions of the libido, such as impotence, with their development more or less locked in the narcissistic stage. The extreme circumstances of wartime, however, demand constant self-sacrifice and the renunciation of narcissistic tendencies, and while this is something with which healthy individuals can cope, it can destabilize those with a neurotic predisposition (33f.). Other factors contributing to neurosis development include the all-male military environment (which he sees as threatening the already shaky heterosexuality of the narcissistic individual) and the war's threat to their sense of immortality (with narcissistic security giving way to a sense of powerlessness). The individual regresses in his behaviour, until, as Ferenczi describes, it is not uncommon for this increased ego-love to degenerate into a kind of infantile narcissism: "die Kranken möchten wie Kinder verhärtselt, gepflegt und bedauert werden. Man kann also von einem Rückfall in das kindliche Stadium der Selbstliebe sprechen" (Ferenczi, "Psychoanalyse der Kriegsnervosen", 27).

While I do not explore questions of homosexuality here, useful discussions of how psychoanalysts and sexologists differed in their assessments of homosexuals' and transvestites' susceptibility to war neurosis (with psychoanalysts generally viewing homosexuals as more prone to war neurosis, whereas some sexologists stressed their superior soldierly qualities) can be found in Creuthsmar, "Male Sexuality", 71ff, and Lerner, 181ff. For contemporary discussions of homosexuality in war contexts see e.g. Wilmshöfer or Burchard.

The patients would like to be pampered, cared for, and pitted like children. One can therefore speak of a reversion into the childish stage of self-love (Ferenczi et al., Psycho-Analysis and the War Neuroses, 15); see also Abraham, "Erstes Korreferat", 35f. Both analysts also address the question of "penetration neurosis" ("Entengerung"; Ferenczi argues that it is not so much a case of producing illnesses in the interests of an actual gain such as compensation or escape from the front (these are only secondary "Krankheitsgewinne")—rather, the primary motive for the illness is the pleasure itself of remaining in the secure retreat of the childish situation once so unwillingly left behind" (19f). The development of Ferenczi's ideas on this topic can be seen in an earlier article: "Über zwei Typen der Kriegsnervosen".

---

9 Lerner observes that the methods of doctors such as Simmel parted from psychoanalytic tenets in important ways, and psychoanalysts alternately downplayed and emphasized these differences (Lerner, 164).

10 Ferenczi was serving as "Honvéd-Regimentsarzt, Chefarzt der Nervenheilanstalt des Maria Valerii Barackenspitals" in Budapest; Abraham as "Z. leitender Arzt der psychiatrischen Station des XX. Armeekorps" in Allenstein; Simmel as "Z. kgl. preuß. Oberarzt und Vorsteher des Felixklinikums" in Posen.

11 Damour points out that many in the Australian context also remained sceptical about the role of sexuality in wartime trauma (Damour, 35).

12 For a detailed examination of how psychoanalysts brought homosexuality and libidinal theory into the etiological picture of the war neuroses see Lerner, 163-189.
These key advocates of psychoanalysis in the early decades of the twentieth century thus reaffirmed sexuality as a central factor even in neuroses triggered by what appeared to be obviously non-sexual violent experiences, such as grenade explosions or burial under debris. From a psychoanalytic perspective, even an absent or weak sex drive – which critics often highlighted in an effort to deny a sexual element in war neuroses – was seen as providing (repressed) proof of this sexual aetiology. Ferenczi also emphasized that no one was entirely immune from this condition, with the narcissistic stage representing an important phase in the libidinal development of every human being (Ferenczi et al., *Psycho-Analysis and the War Neuroses*, 18). By attempting a causal explanation rather than simply addressing symptoms, psychoanalysts situated theirs as the only treatment method with the potential to truly cure war neurosis. While both Freud and Abraham cautioned that this theory was still in development, Abraham quite confidently declared that:

Der Psychoanalyse, die uns weit tiefer als jede andere Betrachtungsweise in die Strukture der Kriegsneurosen blickt, wird möglicherweise auch der therapeutische Vorzug auf dem Gebiete der Kriegsneurosen zuteil werden (Ferenczi, *Zur Psychoanalyse der Kriegsneurosen*, 41). At the same time, the experience of treating war neurotics forced analysts to rework and extend their theories of traumatic neurosis, which had been developed in peacetime in contexts such as railway accidents. Notions of arrested development were now applied to new situations of violent combat in order to explain why only some individuals exposed to war violence developed the symptoms of shell shock. Such explanatory models had the problematic effect, as Lerner points out, of stigmatizing patients by locating their pathologies in constitutional deficiencies rather than the traumas of war (Lerner, 181).

As well as pushing analysts to revise their understanding of traumatic neurosis and develop new treatment methods that accelerated the traditionally lengthy "talking cure", the experience of violent conflict set the stage for several further developments in psychoanalytic thought in the interwar period. These included the concept of the ego, mentioned in Freud's introduc-

---

15 "Psycho-analysis, which enables us to penetrate deeper than any other method into the structure of the war neuroses, will perhaps take therapeutic precedence also in the sphere of the war neuroses" (Ferenczi et al., *Psycho-Analysis and the War Neuroses*, 29); see also Freud, "Einleitung", 6.

---

16 On the publication history of this journal see Pretzel, 137–142.

II. Sexology and Male Impotence: Combining Theories of Body and Mind

While the violence that war inflicted on soldiers' bodies and psyches led psychoanalysts to revisit and extend their theories of the sexual aetiology of the neuroses, sexologists defined the sexual problems associated with the war in broader terms. A survey of one of the most significant German sexological periodicals, the *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* (Journal of Sexual Science), which first appeared in April 1914, reveals contributions on war-related questions ranging from prostitution and venereal disease to the laws on sadistic crime; the impact of mass casualties and forced abstinence on population development and health; discussions about the military aptitude of homosexual or transvestite soldiers – also a popular topic in the *Jahrbiich für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (Yearbook of Sexual Intermediaries) during the war period – and the responsibilities of sexual science in times of war.16 As well as highlighting the urgent questions raised by the war across a range of academic fields, such contributions represented a means for sexual scientists to champion the wider social and political relevance of their own still fledgling discipline.
The concept of trauma was central to sexological as well as psychoanalytic assessments of the war’s impact on soldiers. Whereas psychoanalysts, as discussed above, framed their discussions around ‘traumatic neurosis’, a key avenue of sexological research in wartime was the question of ‘traumatic impotence’ – the increasing levels of sexual dysfunction among male soldiers believed to be caused by frontline violence. From a cultural history perspective, this preoccupation with the virility of male soldiers was not new, as Angus McLaren emphasizes, ‘the concern that masculinity was undermined by the stresses of the modern world preceded the war by several decades’ (McLaren, 150). It did, however, take on a new urgency in the face of the unprecedented number of soldier patients complaining of impotence and other sexual disorders.

In the war’s early stages, some sexological commentators remained optimistic about its impact on the nation’s nerves and levels of sexual potency. In a lecture held before the Medical Society for Sexual Science (Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Sexualwissenschaft) in Germany in December 1914, Berlin doctor E. Burchard declared that:

Es hat fast den Anschein als ob wenigstens eine umfangreiche Gruppe solcher [sic] Erkrankungen günstig durch die machtvolle Sublimierung im Kriege, die Eulenburg so treffend als ein ‘Stahlbad der Nerven’ bezeichnet hat, beeinflußt wird (Burchard, 375f.).

This positive assessment of the war’s impact on the nation’s mental health was echoed by left-wing female emancipist Henriette Fürth, who declared that although eleven months of conflict had caused new social problems relating to women’s marriage prospects and single motherhood, it had also served to strengthen the physically weak and rid individuals of their neuroses, with many finding new strength within themselves (Fürth, 133–137).

Such optimism soon appeared misplaced, however, for just as the number of soldiers diagnosed with traumatic neuroses increased dramatically during the next few years, so too did complaints of male sexual disorders. In a major quantitative study, the results of which were published in key German and Austrian medical journals, internist Professor Friedel Pick of the German University in Prague found widespread evidence of impotence, weakened sex drive, and premature ejaculation among soldiers under his treatment, which he attributed to causes such as exertion, poor nutrition or physical shock to the nervous system from exploding grenades. Pick’s findings were echoed by other researchers and were widely reviewed and discussed in sexological and psychoanalytical publications alike. While psychoanalysts criticized Pick’s disregard of psychogenic factors, they welcomed his evidence of the frequency of sexual disorders among soldiers. Interpreting this as confirmation that libido disturbances play a central role in the traumatic neuroses, they viewed war-related impotence as likewise having essentially Oedipal causes. Sexologists, on the other hand, resisted the psychoanalytic tendency to argue on a purely psychological level. Instead, they took Pick’s empirical evidence of the effects of violent conflict on male sexuality as an impetus to more precisely categorize the physical as well as psychological causes of traumatic impotence.

One of the key contributions on this topic was penned by the Berlin-based dermatologist Iwan Bloch, co-founder of the Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft together with Albert Eulenburg, and often referred to as the ‘father of sexology’. Bloch lamented the overwhelming neglect of impotence research within studies of traumatic neurosis (an oversight also highlighted by other researchers at this period), and insisted that although these two illnesses were often linked, traumatic impotence could also appear as an independent disease picture. He proceeded to distinguish between organic and psychic forms of traumatic impotence, placing particular emphasis on how new research into

---

17 "It almost seems as if a large group of such illnesses, at least, is being favourably influenced by the powerful sublimation of war, which Eulenburg so fittingly described as a ‘steel bath of nerves’ (my translation).

18 Both Fürth and fellow feminist Helene Stöcker (Krieg und sexuelle Abstinence) were critical of what they perceived as male sexologists’ almost exclusive focus on male sexual needs in wartime, and argued for more detailed consideration of female sexuality, including the increase in sexual neuroses in women and the effects of enforced abstinence on wives left at home. A number of male commentators did, however, consider the war’s specific impact on women, including H. Fehlinger, who observed a decided weakening of the sexual drive in wartime, particularly among men at the front (Fehlinger, 124ff.).

19 On psychoanalytic approaches to impotence after World War I, see McLaren, 150–164.

20 A few years later, V. Desogus similarly observed that while it is widely acknowledged that physical or psychic trauma can affect the sex drive, this has never been subject to a full practical, eugenic and forensic medical study. As well as citing Bloch, Desogus summarizes his own research on the impact of physical and psychic trauma of the central and peripheral nervous systems (Desogus, 177–180). On the question of impotence see also Fehlinger.
the »internal secretions« and endocrinal glands was forcing an extension of both of these categories. Greater awareness of hormonal function, he argued, was suggesting a much greater aetiological and clinical spectrum than had previously been assumed (Bloch, «Über traumatische Impotenz», 135f).

With regard to physical causes of traumatic impotence, Bloch drew on his own earlier research to argue that distinctions must be made not only between injuries to the genitals, brain, spinal cord and other parts of the body, but also between impotence caused by sensations of pain or sudden cold (Schnervähmung) and that caused by grazes, direct blows or concussion to the brain or spinal cord. Complicating this picture was the recognition that these physical injuries are often accompanied by psychological shocks (seelische Erschütterungen) (135f).

Additionally, Bloch divided impotence caused by psychic traumas into conscious and unconscious variants. This move reveals the increasing infiltration of psychoanalytic concepts into sexological discourse at this time, which is hardly surprising given that Bloch had been one of the original members of Abraham’s Berlin psychoanalytic reading group in 1908. While noting that neither form of psychic trauma is particularly well understood, Bloch suggests that the more sudden and acute the mental shock, the more severe the resulting impotence, and cites the case of a young male patient who lost sexual function after watching his mother die suddenly of a heart attack. In marked contrast to the psychoanalysts, however, Bloch argues that even psychic forms of traumatic impotence are very likely to be affected by the so-called internal secretions:

Hat man doch z.B. nach starken psychischen Erregungen einwandfrei eine starke Vermehrung des Nebennierenskreisses, des Adrenalins, im Blute nachgewiesen. So deutet alles darauf hin, daß auch das Wesen der Impotenz nach psychischem Trauma in einer uns allerdings noch unbekannten Störung im endokrinen System zu suchen ist (139).

22 In a letter to Freud, Abraham mentions Bloch’s presence, along with Magnus Hirschfeld, Otto Juliusburger, and Heinrich Köhler, at the first meeting of the Berliner Psychoanalytische Vereinigung shortly after the first international psychoanalytic congress in Salzberg in April 1908. Letter 46A, Berlin 21 August 1908 (Fereder, 75f.).

23 Bloch notes that the «Schreckimpotenz» label is also familiar in lay circles, for example, to describe the effect of a witch’s curse (Bloch, «Über traumatische Impotenz», 137f.).

24 For after intense psychic agitation it has been shown without question that there is, for example, a strong increase of the adrenal secretions, of adrenaline, in the blood. And so everything points to the fact that the nature of impotence following from psychic trauma is to be sought in a disturbance of the endocrinal system – one which, however, is still unknown to us (my translation). Bloch also explains the frequency of war-related amnesia in women using arguments of inner secretion.

25 It will now be particularly difficult to correctly ascertain the trigger factors of the war neuroses. Neurology has not yet come so far that it can completely detach the insults delivered by the war (fright, overexertion etc.) from the effects of pathological internal secretions (my translation).

26 «Die inneren neurosen» put forth by Freud and his school as a source of psychic trauma and an allegedly frequent cause of impotence later in life; that future discussions will reveal more
gruesome scenes, such as the slaughter of a chicken or heating of another child, coincides with infantile sexual arousal, this can fixate abnormal associations that later in life lead to the development of impotence (137). This brief survey of a key German sexological journal during World War I suggests that the violence of war raised more questions than it answered when it came to explaining new manifestations of sexual pathology. As such, it encouraged, and indeed necessitated, new avenues of research. In addition to the exciting new field of the internal secretions, war trauma forced sexologists to place more emphasis on psychogenic factors, as the new forms of sexual dysfunction presented by soldiers exposed the limits of biological explanations. Sexologists had, of course, also dabbled in psychoanalytic theory prior to 1914, particularly following the appearance of Freud’s *Three Essays* in 1905. This text, presented a fundamental challenge to sexological theories of congenital sexuality with its focus on infant sexual development, introducing a radically new explanation of sexual conditions and pathologies as acquired after birth. Nonetheless, in the years following its publication most sexologists were not immediately dismissive of Freudian ideas, but displayed a receptiveness towards at least certain psychoanalytic insights which was, I suggest, facilitated by the unprecedented medical problems posed by the war experience.

In Berlin, for example, Magnus Hirschfeld – another of Germany’s prominent sexologists and co-founder with Bloch of the first scientific sexological association, the Medical Society for Sexual Science – had also been among the original members of Abraham’s psychoanalytic reading group. Hirschfeld had collaborated closely with Abraham on various matters, including expert statements for court trials and a “psychobiological questionnaire.” Although he withdrew from the psychoanalytic group in 1911 (Abraham commented disparagingly in a letter to Freud that he displayed an ignorance about psychoanalysis that was outright shocking. [...] It was most probably only the emphasis on sexuality that made analysis attractive to him, especially at a time when his own sex research met with hostility”), Hirschfeld’s own publications after this date remained attuned to psychoanalytic developments. Although dismissive of the Freudian emphasis on the Oedipal complex, his major three-volume study on *Sexual Pathology (Sexualpathologie)*, published between 1917 and 1920, reveals numerous references to works of the psychoanalytic school, including those of Freud, Otto Rank, Isidor Sadger, and Wilhelm Stekel, and an acceptance of key psychoanalytic concepts such as repression (Verdrängung). Other contemporary sexologists likewise showed a distinct, if critical, interest in psychoanalytic topics, including British physician Havelock Ellis, whose writings on topics such as dreams, anxiety, auto-eroticism, and croglenous zones in the years preceding World War I contain frequent references to the likes of Freud, Stekel, or Carl Gustav Jung (Holdorff; Ellis, *Evolution of Modesty*, 81, 174, 181, 195, 205, 210, 219–239, 260; Ellis, *World of Dreams*, vi–vii).

For their part, psychoanalysts also drew on the discussions and findings of the more established discipline of sexology in these early decades. A number of scholars have pointed to Freud’s extensive, albeit under-referenced, debt to previous sexological researchers – in his *Three Essays*, acknowledgement of sexual scientists such as Richard von Krafft-Ebing, Ellis, Albert Moll, Bloch, and Hirschfeld is largely confined to an initial footnote (Freud, *Three Essays*, 1 note 1). Moll’s work, for example, can be read as anticipating in various respects Freud’s explorations of themes such as the libido or childhood sexuality (Siegusch, “The Sexologists”, 184–200; *Geschichte der Sexualwissenschaft*, 261–284). While Freud remained wary of sexological approaches – in a letter to Abraham in 1914, he expressed his “intention to go on maintaining reserves in relation to Bloch and Eulenburg’s *Zeitschrift*, and described that journal’s attitude toward psychoanalysis as “not very alluring” (Postscript to letter 203F, Vienna IX, Bergasse 19, 6 April 1914, Falzeder, 228ff.) – other psychoanalysts were somewhat warmer in their embrace of sexual science. These included Abraham and Sadger, the latter one of the most biologically-minded of Freud’s disciples at this period, who each contributed a number about the possible revelation of unconscious psychic traumas via psychoanalysis (my translation).

26 Letter 116A (Abraham to Freud), Berlin, 29 October 1911 (Falzeder, 140); on the Ärztliche Gesellschaft see also editorial note (176), and Pretzel, 137–156. On Hirschfeld’s involvement in Abraham’s psychoanalytic reading group see Euchner, 8, 12.

27 On the early sexological reception of this text, including a 1906 review by Numa Praetorius (a pseudonym of Eugen Wilhelm) in the Hirschfeld-affiliated *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Verschmutzungen* (Vol. 8: 731), see Herzer, 159–167.

28 Abraham discusses this collaboration in an early letter to Freud, noting that Hirschfeld “allegedly takes the kindest interest in me” *Letter 60A*, Berlin 13 January 1909 (Falzeder, 75f.).
of lectures and articles to sexological associations and publications in the early years of the movement. My point, then, is not merely that the discursive boundaries between these two disciplinary traditions were still quite porous at this period, but that the traumas and challenges of violent combat added a distinct momentum to these interdisciplinary conversations. In these early decades of disciplinary establishment and professionalization, the war pushed sexologists into deeper levels of engagement with the newer theories of psychoanalysis, and forced psychoanalysts to revisit some of their key assumptions surrounding sexuality and the neuroses.

III. The Legacy of World War I for the Study of Sex

With the end of the war and the birth of Germany’s Weimar Republic in 1919, sadistic violence and sexual disorders increasingly overtook the tremors of the shell-shocked soldier as the primary symptom of war trauma. These legacies of the war’s violence also shaped the cultural realm in significant ways, with sex murderers and rapists spiking in prominence in artistic and literary representations of interwar Germany (Crouthamel, «Male Sexuality», 67, 73–78; Tatar). Linking the violence of the trenches to subsequent violence on the home front was not a novel suggestion for contemporaries – Burchard’s 1915 article in the Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft had already predicted this possibility (378f.). By the time Hirschfeld published his Sittengeschichte des Weltkrieges [Sexual History of the World War] in 1930, however, he felt justified in arguing that the normalized violence of war had extended well beyond veterans themselves to shape the entire psychology of post-war German society, unleashing sadistic impulses and sexual restraints. For commentators such as Hirschfeld or criminologist Eric Wulfen, war neuroses were, as Crouthamel argues, just the tip of the iceberg for a range of psychological problems that manifested themselves in men trying to replicate the violence of the front in post-war domestic life. Consequently, Hirschfeld considered Freud’s identification of the «death instinct» as the most crucial psychoanalytic finding to arise from the violence of war (Hirschfeld, «Male Sexuality», 70).

Admittedly, in terms of the broader medical and psychiatric treatment of soldiers returning from the front, the competing disciplinary approaches examined here only had a limited impact. In World War I Germany, as Lerner observes, «only a handful of psychiatrists and neurologists showed interest in either psychoanalysis or the various sexological studies that were conducted» (Lerner, 188). From a perspective of history of sexuality, however, the growing acknowledgement among sexologists that psychoanalysis might have useful contributions to make to their own, more orthodox field, represents a significant shift, revealing the importance of interdisciplinary dialogue in the explanation and treatment of sexual problems in the early twentieth century. Despite remaining committed to the scientific study of sex on a primarily biological basis, sexologists showed a preparedness to contemplate the very different models of sexual dysfunction put forth by the newer psychoanalytic school; models that focused on early childhood experiences and psychological influences rather than hereditary, organic, or hormonal factors.

The story of war neurosis and war-related sexual dysfunction, then, is also part of a larger story about two contrasting, but intertwined, disciplinary approaches to sexuality and sexual pathologies in the early twentieth century. The conversation between sexology and psychoanalysis that began in earnest in 1905 with Freud’s Three Essays was given new momentum as a result of the mass violence experienced by soldiers in the trenches of World War I. While psychoanalysts drew on empirical studies of sexual dysfunction from practitioners working outside of, or at the edges of their field, such as Simmel, sexologists demonstrated a growing acknowledgement of psychoanalytic explanatory models in the explanation of sexual pathologies. This conversation continued and deepened into the 1920s, raising new questions about the relationship between sexuality, subjectivity, body and mind.

31 In 1908, Abraham submitted an article on «Die psychologischen Beziehungen zwischen Sexualität und Alkoholismus» to the new periodical Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft; also edited by Hirschfeld (449–458); this short-lived periodical is not to be confused with Bloch and Euckenburg’s 1914 publication of the same name. In July 1914 he presented a lecture on incest at the Medical Society for Sexual Science in Berlin: «Eigentümliche Formen der Gattenwahl, besonders Inzucht und Exogamie», qtd. in letter 224A [Abraham to Freud], Berlin 5 July 1914 (Falkzeder, 252). In the same year, Sadger published an article on psychoanalytic approaches to homosexual cases Hirschfeld’s Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenlagen (339–424).
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1. Stefan George and the Emergence of Homosexual Male Identity in Germany

Few writers have experienced the vicissitudes of celebrity and censure that poet Stefan George has since his death in Switzerland in 1933. Scholarly interest in George’s life and work has revived over the past decade, after a half century of relative obscurity. The »myth« of George the person, of his circle of disciples and the adoration of the figure of Maximian has been closely scrutinized in two recent biographies (Norton; Karlauf), (in) new approaches informed by the social history of German homosexuality (Keilson-Lauritz; Bissno; Steinhaüßen), and new approaches to George’s »aesthetic fundamentals« (Breuer), lyric modernism (von Petersdorff; Schäfer) and Wirkungsgeschichte (Bösenstein/Egyptien/Schefold/Vitzthum; Dahme/Rammstedt;