

Psychoanalysis and Homosexuality: From Pathologization to Affirmative Practice

Anastasios Charalampakis* and Stergios Kaprinis

*Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, Aristotle University of
Thessaloniki, Greece*

Abstract

The relationship between psychoanalytic theory, clinical practice, and political movements regarding homosexuality has undergone significant transformation over the past seven decades. This review examines the historical arc from Freud's ambivalent early writings through mid-20th century pathologization, the pivotal 1973 depathologization in DSM-II, and contemporary affirmative psychoanalytic frameworks informed by minority stress models. Psychoanalysis has alternately served as a tool for institutional regulation and exclusion, and more recently, as a resource for developing gay-affirmative, politically conscious clinical practice. This article traces how theoretical constructions of sexuality became entangled with legal regimes, professional power, and social movements, and argues that contemporary psychoanalysis must maintain explicit political awareness to prevent the repetition of ideological harms in therapeutic contexts. The evidence base for LGBTQ-affirmative interventions and the integration of minority stress frameworks into psychodynamic formulations represent significant advances toward ethical, non-pathologizing mental health care for sexual minorities.

Introduction

The relationship between psychoanalysis and homosexuality represents one of the most contested intersections of theory, clinical ethics, and political power in the history of mental health professions. What began as Freud's relatively neutral—if hierarchical—account of same-sex desire as an outcome of psychosexual development evolved, within decades, into an explicit pathologization model that supported legal criminalization, institutional discrimination, and “corrective” therapies [1,2]. The 1973 decision by the American Psychiatric Association (APA) to remove homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) marked a watershed moment in this history, catalyzed by scientific critique and sustained gay activism [3]. Yet the depathologization process was incomplete and contested, leaving residual diagnostic categories that continued to medicalize distress about sexual orientation [4,5].

Fifty years after depathologization, contemporary psychoanalytic theory and practice have begun to integrate minority stress frameworks, intersectional awareness, and explicit affirmative stances that position sexual and gender diversity as normative variations of human subjectivity [6,7]. Nonetheless, the discipline's legacy of complicity with heteronormative power structures remains a critical concern for clinical training and supervision. Understanding this history is essential for mental health practitioners committed to preventing the replication of ideological harms and for fostering politically conscious, affirmative therapeutic relationships with sexual minority clients.

From Freud to Pathologization: The Historical Arc

Freud's early writings on homosexuality, particularly in *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, articulated same-sex desire as one outcome of psychosexual development, distinct from but not inherently pathological [8]. This stance, while progressive for its era, remained embedded within a developmental hierarchy that implicitly privileged heterosexuality as the mature endpoint. Subsequent psychoanalytic theorists elaborated a more explicit pathology model, linking homosexuality to oedipal fixations, failed gender identification, and dysfunctional family constellations—particularly the “overbearing mother, distant father” triad popularized by Irving Bieber and Charles Socarides [2,9].

The post-World War II institutionalization of this pathology model coincided with the expansion of psychiatry's diagnostic authority and the early construction of the DSM. In DSM-I and DSM-II, homosexuality appeared as a sociopathic personality disturbance and sexual deviation, respectively, embedding psychoanalytic concepts within official nosology and granting them enormous institutional power [3,10]. This nosological framing provided a ostensibly scientific justification for employment discrimination, military exclusion, denial of custody rights, and exclusion from psychoanalytic training institutes on grounds of presumed “characterological disturbance” [2,3]. Bieber and Socarides, in particular, did not remain neutral clinicians but became explicit political advocates for heteronormative social policy, leveraging their psychoanalytic credentials to influence family law, military policy, and public health messaging [2,9].

Depathologization, Reparative Therapy, and Political Contestation

The movement to depathologize homosexuality emerged from convergent pressures: gay activists challenging the psychiatric establishment, scientists documenting the lack of empirical support for pathology models, and clinicians troubled by the ethical implications of enforced heterosexuality [3,4]. The pivotal moment came in December 1973, when the APA Board of Trustees voted to remove homosexuality from DSM-II. However, this decision was not uncontested; it was challenged by opponents and ultimately required ratification through a membership referendum in 1974 [3,11]. Critically, Spitzer's rationale for removal centered on the criterion that mental disorders should be “intrinsically” distressing—meaning the distress must originate from the condition itself, not from social persecution or internalized homophobia [11]. This distinction proved consequential: while it removed the blanket diagnostic category, it permitted the retention of “sexual orientation disturbance” (DSM-II) and later “ego-dystonic homosexuality” (DSM-III), categories that pathologized individuals distressed by their own sexual orientation [4,11].



Even as depathologization advanced, reparative or “conversion therapy” emerged as an explicit clinical and political movement, explicitly aiming to change sexual orientation through psychodynamic intervention [5,12]. Nicolosi and other conversion therapists maintained that homosexuality was inherently unstable, defensive, and modifiable, claiming scientific grounding while strategically mobilizing psychoanalytic language to resist affirmative frameworks [5,9]. By the 1990s and 2000s, reparative therapy became embedded within conservative religious and political organizations, with practitioners serving as expert witnesses in custody disputes, testifying against civil rights protections, and actively opposing marriage equality [5,12]. In this context, psychoanalytic theory about incomplete gender development and defensive homosexuality functioned as a political resource, allowing clinicians to claim scientific neutrality while advancing fundamentally ideological anti-gay agendas.

Contemporary Psychoanalysis: Minority Stress, Affirmation, and Political Consciousness

Over the past two decades, psychoanalytic theory and practice have undergone significant reorientation toward explicitly affirmative, politically conscious frameworks [6,7,13]. Contemporary scholars including Ken Corbett, Cunningham, and others have articulated a “post-heteronormative” psychoanalysis that treats sexual and gender diversity as ordinary variations of subjectivity rather than arrested development or defensive adaptation [6,13,14]. Central to this shift is the integration of minority stress theory, which conceptualizes elevated rates of depression, anxiety, substance use, and suicidality among sexual minorities as consequences of chronic social stressors—discrimination, concealment, internalized homophobia—rather than as intrinsic to homosexuality [7,15].

Recent empirical literature demonstrates the efficacy of LGBTQ-affirmative psychotherapy, including psychodynamic approaches, in reducing psychological distress, particularly by addressing internalized stigma, experiences of discrimination, and identity-related conflicts [15-17]. Professional organizations, including the American Psychological Association and increasingly psychoanalytic societies, have issued affirmative practice guidelines that explicitly validate sexual minority identities and emphasize the therapist’s responsibility to examine and resist heteronormative bias [6,7,13].

Implications and Conclusion

The history of psychoanalysis and homosexuality illustrates how theoretical constructions of sexuality are never purely intrapsychic but always embedded within legal regimes, professional hierarchies, and cultural power struggles. Psychoanalysis has simultaneously served as an instrument of oppression and, in its more reflexive contemporary iterations, as a resource for developing ethical, affirming clinical practice. The field’s movement from pathologization through depathologization to explicit affirmation reflects both intellectual progress and the impact of social movements. For contemporary practitioners, this history carries crucial implications: genuine clinical neutrality is impossible without acknowledging the discipline’s complicity with heteronormative oppression and maintaining ongoing vigilance against reproducing such oppression in therapeutic relationships. A truly affirmative psychoanalysis must interrogate its own normative assumptions, recognize the political nature of clinical practice, and foreground the social contexts that shape the inner lives of sexual minority clients [6,13,14].

References

1. Freud S (1905) Three essays on the theory of sexuality. Standard Edition 7: 123-245.
2. Socarides CW, Bieber I (1990) Homosexuality: A changing picture. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 38(4): 1207-1221.
3. Spitzer RL (1981) The diagnostic status of homosexuality in DSM-III: A reformulation of the issues. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 138(2): 210-215.
4. American Psychiatric Association (2013) *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th edn). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
5. Nicolosi J (1991) *Reparative therapy of male homosexuality: A new clinical approach*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
6. Corbett K (2009) *Boyhoods: Rethinking masculinities*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
7. Meyer IH (2003) Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations. *Psychological Bulletin* 129(5): 674-697.
8. Lewes K (1988) *The psychoanalytic theory of male homosexuality*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
9. Burr C (1996) *Separate creation: The search for the biological origins of sexual orientation*. New York: Hyperion.
10. Bayer R (1981) *Homosexuality and American psychiatry: The politics of diagnosis*. New York: Basic Books.
11. Spitzer RL (2003) Can some gay men and lesbians change their sexual orientation? *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 32(5): 403-417.
12. Haldeman DC (2002) Gay rights, patient rights: The implications of sexual orientation conversion therapy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 33(3): 260-264.
13. Blechner MJ (2009) *Sex changes: Transformations in society and psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge.
14. Corbett K (2001) Nontraditional family romance. *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 18(2): 355-372.
15. Pachankis JE (2015) The cognitive-behavioral treatment of young gay men for HIV prevention. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice* 22(4): 405-418.
16. Austin A, Craig SL, D’Souza SA (2018) An APA definition of sexual orientation. *American Psychologist* 73(8): 934-943.
17. Burger J (2024) State of the science: LGBTQ-affirmative psychotherapy. *Behavior Therapy*.