



Sexual Reform, Psychoanalysis, and the Politics of Divorce in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s

Author(s): Thomas F. Glick

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Jan., 2003), pp. 68-97

Published by: [University of Texas Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3704511>

Accessed: 04/12/2012 11:12

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Texas Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the History of Sexuality*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Sexual Reform, Psychoanalysis, and the Politics of Divorce in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s

THOMAS F. GLICK

Boston University

THE SEXUAL REFORM MOVEMENT in Spain before the Spanish civil war was the product of a loose coalition of physicians and lawyers influenced by Freudian psychology. These individuals shared concerns about gender inequality and sexual dysfunction, which they viewed as obsolete features of traditional Spanish society. Because the movement began under the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera (1923–30), it became an arena for political expression that, under conditions of democracy, might well have sought other outlets. In 1931 most of the movement's leaders were elected to the Constituent Cortes of the Second Republic, in which they were instrumental in writing the divorce statute of the Republican constitution and in lobbying for its passage. That statute, approved by the Cortes in October 1931, was written by Luis Jiménez de Asúa, a criminologist who soon after became an avowed Freudian, and was argued on the floor by two self-identified Freudian psychiatrists, César Juarros and José Sanchis Banús, an indication that Freudian psychology was not an adventitious phenomenon in Spain of the 1920s and 1930s but was part of the texture of Spanish political life.

The political atmosphere during the dictatorship was not conducive to the founding of a Spanish chapter of the World League for Sexual Reform (WLSR). When it was finally established in 1932, the Spanish chapter was the most socially conservative of the national chapters discussed in these pages. It was one of the few that did not include homosexuality in its agenda. While chapter members were not, for the most part, practicing Catholics, the leadership was sensitive to Catholic issues and sought to build a coalition around a minimalist, rather than a maximalist, social agenda, one based on simple reforms of a pronatalist variety. Even when, during the Spanish civil war, the Republic enacted some maximalist reforms, such as those addressing abortion, homosexuality remained a taboo subject. It is

Journal of the History of Sexuality, Vol. 12, No. 1, January 2003

© 2003 by the University of Texas Press, P.O. Box 7819, Austin, TX 78713-7819

my objective here to focus on the activities of leading Spanish sexual reformers in the decade before the establishment of the Spanish chapter of WLSR. It was then that all of the chapter's leaders were establishing their credentials in the reform movement.

In the 1920s and early 1930s the core issue for most sexual reformers was divorce. The coalition in favor of allowing divorce comprised sectors of the intelligentsia who were critical of traditional sexual mores in Spain and who favored equal rights for women before the law. This was not an ideologically uniform coalition by any means, and its leading spokesmen reached very different conclusions on the nature of sexual relationships and the respective social roles of men and women. All participants in the debate claimed scientific support for their conclusions, but scientific positions on sexual matters were inevitably informed by social views already formulated. Like Darwinism before it, Freudian psychology had become a creed of the Spanish Left, and elements of it were marshaled in support of long-held liberal or socialist political and social goals. Conservatives, too, were able to enlist Freudian ideas to suit their more restricted notions of women's proper place in society.

In Madrid during the 1920s and 1930s, a number of social movements converged to produce agitation in favor of permitting divorce. Groups promoting feminism, prostitution reform, sex education, mental health, and eugenics all had interests in this area. Moreover, in Spain those involved in any one of these movements tended to participate in or favor the goals of the others. The interlocking leadership of such groups was comprised of a readily identified network of doctors and lawyers that both received Freudian ideas and interpreted them for the general public.

The present discussion focuses on five individuals, all of whom were elected as deputies to the Constituent Cortes of the Republic and participated in the 1933 congress (the *Jornadas eugénicas*) on sexual reform in Madrid: Gregorio Marañón, endocrinologist; Roberto Nóvoa Santos, pathologist; César Juarros and José Sanchis Banús, psychiatrists; and Luis Jiménez de Asúa, criminologist and lawyer. This group, while frequently at odds with feminist political leaders such as Matilde Huici and Clara Campoamor, was able, nevertheless, to mold public opinion on feminist issues, even speaking from podiums provided by feminist associations.¹

The first sexual reform group to rise to prominence in Madrid in the 1920s was the *Sociedad de Abolicionismo*, whose president was the psychiatrist Juarros. The abolitionists' main interest was in the reform of codes regulating prostitution, but their public program was a broadly

¹Campoamor and Huici were lawyers, the first female members, along with Margarita Nelken, of the *Colegio de Abogados*. Possibly because of their political ambitions, they cultivated a lower profile in the more sexually explicit aspects of the reform campaign, concentrating instead on the traditional issues of political feminism.

based campaign promoting hygiene and sex education.² Juarros struck all the notes at a public meeting of the society in 1927, asserting that “the lack of a good sexual education and of a just valuation of biological roles contributes to the spread of prostitution and to the vogue of mercenary love.”³ A similar organization, with links to labor and student groups, was the Liga de Educación Social (League of Social Education), founded in 1928. At its first public meeting, attended by Marañón, Jiménez de Asúa, and other participants in the sexual reform movement, María Zambrano spoke on marriage without love. In Spain, she asserted, “love has been closed in by social formulas and conventions; the iron grate, behind which the loved one is hidden and before which the lover stands, is the material expression of social bonds. Indeed, romantic love cannot play a vital role in society owing to the falsification of the reality which produces it.”⁴

An organization with more explicitly sexual interests was the Spanish chapter of the WLSR, whose attempt to hold some Jornadas eugénicas (after the Second International Congress) was suppressed in February 1928 by the dictatorship as a “pornographic entertainment.”⁵ It was reestablished in March 1932 with Marañón as president and Juarros as vice-president with the intent to campaign for sexual reform, “given the natural environment of tolerance offered by the Republic.”⁶ The League was organized in sections and included Sanchis Banús in the feminism and marriage section; Juarros in the sections on prostitution and venereal disease; and Jiménez de Asúa in the legislative section. In 1933, the League was finally able to sponsor the postponed Eugenic Congress in which these individuals plus Nóvoa, who was also a member, all participated as speakers.⁷

Of great significance were the different arenas in which sexual reform issues were discussed. The Federación Tabaguera, the leading female union and, as such, a hub of feminist political activities, had hosted the founding meeting of the League for Social Education.⁸ At the union’s hall, in November 1927, the membership heard a lecture on sexual equality by Juarros,

²*El Sol*, June 6, 1922.

³*El Sol*, February 15, 1927.

⁴*El Sol*, November 17, 1927. On the background of the Liga de Educación Social, see Shlomo Ben-Ami, “La Rebellion universitaire en Espagne (1927–1931),” *Revue d’Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* (July–September 1979): 374–75.

⁵On *regodeo pornográfico*, see Enrique Noguera, “Cómo se yuguló la generosa idea del primer Curso eugénico español,” in Enrique Noguera and Luis Huerta, eds., *Genética, eugenesia y pedagogía sexual (Libro de las primeras Jornadas eugénicas españolas)*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1934), 2:399–412, esp. 405–6. It was Marañón who first applied the verb *yugular* (to slit the throat) to the government’s action (2:406).

⁶*El Sol*, March 3, 13, April 24, 1932.

⁷On the congress, see *El Sol*, April 18, 1933.

⁸On the Federación Nacional de Cigarreras y Tabaqueras, see Rosa María Capel Martínez, “Life and Work in the Tobacco Factories: Female Industrial Workers in the Early Twentieth Century,” in V. L. Enders and P. B. Radcliff, eds., *Constructing Spanish Womanhood: Female*

who alluded to “inattention to educating the child in his early years, leaving it for when his psychology has hardened.” Although the contrary may be believed, he cautioned (striking a firmly Freudian note), “children have sexuality.”⁹ In January 1928, Jiménez de Asúa spoke from the same podium on women and crime, basing his remarks on Marañón’s view that internal secretions, especially those of the sex glands, determined the psychological types of men and women.¹⁰ Another feminist organization that presented lectures on these topics was the Lyceum Club, which had organized a campaign to suppress article 57 of the civil code, the article mandating the subservience of wives to husbands in all legal aspects of family life.¹¹ There, in November 1928, Angel Ossorio y Gallardo, a conservative Catholic lawyer and leading male spokesman for women’s suffrage and their juridical equality with men, spoke on women and the new penal code, asserting that Spanish civil law, contrary to the prescriptions of canon law, discriminated against women. The legal profession, he added, had become rife with Don Juanism, as lawyers preyed upon the misfortunes that the civil code inflicted upon women.¹²

THE SPANISH RECEPTION OF FREUD

The public discussion of sex in the 1910s and 1920s, stimulated in particular by the writings of Havelock Ellis and Sigmund Freud, who developed similar critiques of “civilized morality,” led in Western countries to an attitudinal shift regarding a whole roster of issues from premarital intercourse to divorce.¹³ In Spain, it was Freud, not Ellis, who set much of the rationale for the reform program. Ellis was not much read in Spain, but Freud was, thanks to a Spanish edition of his collected works.

Identity in Modern Spain (Albany, 1999), 131–50, on 150 n. 32. The union was a UGT (Socialist) affiliate.

⁹*El Sol*, November 27, 1927.

¹⁰*El Sol*, January 8, 1928.

¹¹*Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada*, Apéndice 5 (1931), 130. The Lyceum Club was a high-powered, elite women’s club, established in 1926, with 115 members. Its first president was María de Maeztu. One of the club’s six sections focused on social action, such as ridding the legal code of statutes prejudicial to women. See Marie Lafitte, *Condesa de Campo Alange, La mujer en España: Cien años de su historia, 1860–1960* (Madrid, 1964), 208–9.

¹²*El Sol*, November 11, 1928. The following month, Ossorio gave a short course on family law at the Casa del Estudiante. He asserted that “today’s youth is attracted to Don Juanism and pornography” and criticized “the doleful obsession [of young men] with women.” Nevertheless, he decried the legal inequality of men and women (*El Sol*, December 8). Ossorio had been a bogeyman of the Left because he was civil governor of Barcelona during the Tragic Week killings of 1909.

¹³According to Alfred Kinsey, *The Sexual Behavior of the Human Female* (Philadelphia, 1954), preface. On the relationship between Ellis and Freud, see Phyllis Grosskurth, *Havelock Ellis: A Biography* (New York, 1980), 291–93.

The popularization of Freud in Spain coincided with the maturation of both the sexual reform movement and political feminism. Marañón had commented in 1920 that Spanish feminism (meaning, I think, the political movement on behalf of women, whether promoted by men or women) was still inorganic, amorphous, and embryonic, lacking medullae and nerves.¹⁴ By the end of the 1920s, Freudian theory had come to constitute one of those medullae.

The first major intellectual figure to comment on Freud was José Ortega y Gasset in an article entitled “Psicoanálisis, ciencia problemática” (Psychoanalysis, a problematic science), written in 1911 while Ortega was studying in Germany. In it Ortega characterized psychoanalysis as “rather than false, not true, but scientifically suggestive.”¹⁵ In spite of this apparent ambivalence, Ortega was in fact suggesting an open attitude toward Freud in the face of commonplace accusations by the German medical establishment that Freudian psychology was not scientific.¹⁶ In 1917 Ortega convinced José Ruiz Castillo, director of Biblioteca Nueva, an influential Madrid publishing house, to negotiate for the Spanish rights to Freud’s complete works—a negotiation conducted through the diplomatic pouch of the Spanish embassy in Vienna while the war was still in progress.¹⁷ The series began publication in 1922 with *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* and was the first collected works of Freud in any language. It was at this point that Freudian ideas, heretofore largely restricted in Spain to those members of the medical community who read German, began to have an explosive impact on young writers and artists, including Vicente Aleixandre, Federico García Lorca, Salvador Dalí, and Luis Buñuel.¹⁸

What made a Freudian in Spain? I regard as “Freudian” in this context anyone who accepted the validity of the sexual etiology of neurosis and infantile sexuality. Yet none of the individuals whose ideas I discuss would have characterized himself as a Freudian in the orthodox sense, because none had a psychoanalytic practice, and all viewed Freudian psychology as one useful theoretical orientation in psychiatry among many. All claimed to be eclectic. Even so, Marañón was popularly regarded as a Freudian,

¹⁴Marañón, *Obras completas*, 10 vols. (Madrid, 1968–77), 3:9 (“Biología y feminismo,” 1920).

¹⁵In *Obras completas* (Madrid, 1946), 1:218.

¹⁶On the German background, see Hannah S. Decker, *Freud in Germany: Revolution and Reaction in Science* (New York, 1977), esp. 197.

¹⁷José Ruiz-Castillo Basala, *El apasionante mundo del libro: Memorias de un editor* (Madrid, 1979), 108–13.

¹⁸The fact that *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* was widely read and appreciated laid the groundwork for the positive reception of *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, the second volume of the series (1923). (If the order of publication had been reversed, the reception of Freud’s ideas in Spain might have been quite different.) On Freud and Spanish surrealism, see C. B. Morris, *Surrealism and Spain, 1920–1936* (Cambridge, 1972), 36–37, passim.

although he repeatedly denied being one.¹⁹ What distinguished Marañón from Juarros and Sanchis Banús, all of whom accepted both concepts, was his conservative social philosophy and his assimilation of Freudian ideas to a notion of type (sexual types) reminiscent of nineteenth-century German biology or of more recent German psychiatry (Kraepelin and especially Kretschmer). The conservative social philosophy and the kind of epistemology applied to sexuality by Marañón appear to be related. They are also paired in the thought of the misogynist Nóvoa. Both read Freud looking, in part, for support of their own biological typologies of sexual conduct. While Marañón accepted many of Freud's views on sex on a point-by-point basis, he rejected the worldview that such a theory implied. By contrast, Sanchis Banús and Juarros, who were both more wholeheartedly "Freudian" and were also informed by an egalitarian social philosophy, sought something else in the Freudian corpus, namely, an explanation for dysfunctional relations between the sexes in Spain.

Meanwhile, other psychiatrists were also debating both the theory and practice of psychoanalysis. José María Villaverde, a student of Bleuler who in the 1920s became a rabid anti-Freudian, had used psychoanalytic techniques in his clinical practice in Zurich in 1915 and, later, at the Hospital del Buen Suceso in Madrid. But, as he later recalled, his repeated attempts at dream analysis and controlled Jungian associations did not produce conclusive results, and he began to lose faith.²⁰

Indeed, there were two somewhat divergent views held by Spanish psychiatrists on the role Freudian psychology played in the Spanish medical community. The response to Freud of the leadership of the Spanish psychiatric community—the disciples of Santiago Ramón y Cajal—was measured and on the whole favorable. These men had immense prestige, and their articles in Madrid dailies directly influenced public attitudes toward sex. Gonzalo Lafora, editor of the medical page of Ortega's daily, *El Sol*, was typical. Writing in the newspaper in July 1919, he noted that "[m]odern criticism has accepted many of Freud's viewpoints, such as the importance of the subconscious, the intromission of childhood reminiscences in psychic life, the reality of repressed complexes and their symbolic exteriorization in dreams, impulsive acts, jokes, distractions, and in psychoneurotic symptoms, but it does not confirm the assertion that sexuality invades all these psychological mechanisms as a unique causal factor. That is, it opposes the pansexual theory of Freud and his school."²¹

¹⁹Marañón, *Obras completas*, 3:167 ("Los estados intersexuales en la especie humana," the text of the lectures he delivered in Havana in December 1927): "I have been attacked—on some occasions quite recently—for the unspeakable sin of supposed Freudianism" (1928).

²⁰J. M. Villaverde, "Algo a propósito de la angustia," *La Medicina Ibero* 24 (1929): 773–74.

²¹*El Sol*, July 29, 1919. Lafora was later a participant in the Jornadas eugénicas of 1933 with a paper entitled "Pedagogía sexual," in *Genética, eugenesia*, 1:105–23.

By the end of the 1920s, Lafora had grown more hostile. In reviewing the psychoanalytic drama *Sinrazón*, written by the bullfighter and sometime dramatist Ignacio Sánchez Mejías, Lafora wrote that an intellectual could no longer imagine himself progressive by discovering Freud at the moment when psychoanalytic concepts were (in Lafora's view) in decline. The psychoanalyst in Sánchez Mejías's play nonetheless thought he could cure neuroses of all kinds with the analysis of repressed conflict when, in fact, psychoanalysis (according to Lafora) had become "in the majority of cases, only a means of acquaintance and repair [conocer y reformar], but not of the instant curing of the sick."²²

Enrique Fernández Sanz, who wrote numerous articles critical of Freud in the medical press, could still assert in 1923 that "[i]n Spain, as in other Latin countries, Freudianism is diffusing much more rapidly and extensively as a psychological system, as a hypothesis explanatory of mental phenomena, rather than as a therapeutic method. We physicians," he continued, "should . . . not combat this migration of psychoanalytical ideas from the field of medicine . . . because such opposition would be both untimely and sterile. Rather, we should acknowledge it so as not to lag behind the extraprofessional development of ideas on this question."²³ Disappointing cure rates, he seems to be saying, should not obscure the more general change of consciousness that Freudian debate had stimulated.

Fernández Sanz's hypothesis, that psychoanalysis had more influence as a theoretical system and less as a therapeutic one, seemingly supported by Lafora's judgment, is one that should be borne in mind when considering widespread attitudes toward the family and sexual relations. The opposite conclusion, however, was reached some years later by another non-Freudian psychiatrist, the conservative Antonio Vallejo Nágera, who observed:

The ideas of Freud about the importance of the subconscious in normal and pathological psychic life have revolutionized and affected psychologists, philosophers, psychiatrists, neurologists, physicians, teachers, writers, and artists. The ideas of the brilliant Viennese are presently influential in politics, in literature, in the theater, in the plastic arts, and in education. They are also influential, to an even greater degree, in psychotherapy, based on principles quite different from those of the old suggestive psychotherapy of [Hippolyte] Bernheim, reduced to hypnosis and suggestion in the waking state.²⁴ From the trunk of psychoanalysis leafy boughs have sprung forth, and modern

²² *El Sol*, March 29, 1928. There is a recent edition of *Sinrazón* (Madrid, 1976). Sánchez Mejías was killed in the bullring in 1935 and immortalized by Lorca's elegy, "Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías."

²³ "Le técnica del psicoanálisis como instrumento terapéutico," *El Siglo Médico* 71 (1923): 597.

²⁴ On vigilia, a mild form of hypnosis called by Bernheim "suggestion à l'état de veille," see Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (New York, 1970), 120.

psychotherapy employs, either alone or in combination, besides psychoanalysis, psychosynthesis, psychocatharsis, psychagogy, individual analysis, and other methods, to the positive gain of the sick and psychiatrists alike, who thus have ample occasion to place themselves in contact, to communicate, with their patients. The old methods that impressed the patient by, for example, simulating a rage in order to provoke an intense emotive state have disappeared. It is no longer a matter of the old conversation designed to convince. Nowadays [1930] we use the indirect method, which clears the subconscious, discovers hypercompensations, destroys the refuge of the illness, eliminates affective complexes, and . . . awakens the desire for sociability.²⁵

Vallejo, who would become the doyen of Spanish psychiatry in the early Franco years, was only too aware of the revolution in doctor-patient relations that Freud had ignited, and his statement is a good example of what I have called elsewhere the Freudianism of non-Freudians.²⁶

In the late 1920s, a school of psychiatrists emerged that was strongly Freudian in orientation, although eclectic in practice, and wholly dissociated from the neurological tradition that had dominated Spanish psychiatry ever since Cajal had won the Nobel Prize in 1906. In Madrid, Sanchis Banús and Juarros propagandized tirelessly for a psychiatry based on Freudian principles. In Barcelona in 1926, Emilio Mira y López offered the first course in psychoanalysis given in a Spanish university. One of the students, Juan Rof Carballo (later to become a leading exponent of psychosomatic medicine in Spain), was sent to attend the course by his professor in Madrid, Nôvoa Santos.²⁷

SEXUAL REFORM: THE “MINIMALIST” POSITION EMERGES

In her history of feminism in Spain, Geraldine Scanlon noted the use of ostensibly scientific arguments by antifeminists to bolster their traditional viewpoints concerning the “proper” place of women in society. Pseudoscientific antifeminism, which had drawn heavily on Darwin and Spencer in the late nineteenth century, received a fresh impulse in the 1920s, according to Scanlon, from the Spanish translation of Freud.²⁸ Her conclusion does not do justice to the rich complexity of the sexual

²⁵Antonio Vallejo Nágera, “Locuras curables y locuras incurables,” *El Siglo Médico* 86 (1930): 84–85. The reference to “simulating a rage” may be an echo of José Ingenieros, *La simulación en la lucha por la vida* (1903), 5th ed. (Buenos Aires, 1985).

²⁶See my article, “The Naked Science: Psychoanalysis in Spain, 1914–1948,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24 (1982): 533–71, on 535–36.

²⁷Juan Rof Carballo, *Biología y psicoanálisis* (Bilbao, 1972), 44. Cf. Mira y López, *La psicoanálisis* (1926) (Barcelona, 1974).

²⁸Geraldine Scanlon, *La polémica feminista en la España contemporánea (1868–1974)* (Madrid, 1976), 161–94.

reform movement and its support of a large portion of the feminist agenda. To view Freudianism purely as an antifeminist doctrine is a gross distortion. That said, we can admit the ideological antifeminism of Marañón and especially Nóvoa, whom we might label conservative Freudians. Both held that women were biologically suited for specific social functions, generally the traditional ones. But this same ideological stance weighed little in their political positions. It is true that Nóvoa opposed women's suffrage, alleging women's supposed lack of critical spirit (betraying an inability—characteristic of turn-of-the-century medicine—to distinguish clearly between physical, emotional, and supposed characterological secondary sexual characters). But Marañón, whose deterministic ideas concerning women's incapacity to carry out social functions characterized as masculine were identical to those of Nóvoa, supported both women's suffrage and divorce.

A more basic point is at issue here. In Spain during the 1920s, political feminism ("women's rights") was not the focal point in the debate over the social role of Spanish women: sexual dysfunction was. Political repression typically has the effect of shifting overtly political issues to more neutral social themes, investing them with political meaning. So it was with the sexual reform movement generally.²⁹ If this were not true, the meteoric political career of Hildegart Rodríguez, whose primary focus was sexual reform (she was the prime mover behind the Spanish chapter of the WLSR), has no explanation.³⁰

Within the sexual reform camp there were minimalists and maximalists. While the minimalists included some social conservatives (like Marañón and Ossorio y Gallardo) as well as the misogynistic Nóvoa Santos, in the politics of the day these were powerful moral voices for positions that were either abhorrent to or avoided by traditional, conservative Catholics. The minimalist position, which I have extrapolated from the literature cited in this essay, included the following points:

The liberation of sex (from conventional morality, from the Church, from discriminatory laws, from ignorance—the topos was used in a variety of ways, depending on the social or political posture of the individual concerned);

A critical exposition of Don Juanism as a kind of national neurosis;

²⁹Another such parapolitical arena in Madrid during the 1920s was the fight within the faculty for the curricular reform of the Medical School of the Central University. Most of the reform leadership, including Negrín and Sánchez Covisa, became deputies in the Constituent Cortes. Sánchez Covisa gave a paper on syphilis at the Jornadas eugénicas of 1933.

³⁰Hildegart Rodríguez was a student Socialist leader, a long-distance protégée of Havelock Ellis, and a participant in the Jornadas eugénicas of 1933 who was murdered by her mother. See Rosa Cal, *A mí no me doblega nadie. Aurora Rodríguez: Su vida y su obra (Hildegart)* (La Coruña, 1991); and Thomas F. Glick, review of R. Alvarez and R. Huertas, *¿Criminales o locos? Dos peritajes psiquiátricos del Dr Gonzalo R. Lafora* (Madrid, 1987), *Medical History* 32 (1988): 339–40.

A sharing of responsibilities between husband and wife in sexual matters (the general irresponsibility of husbands being acknowledged by all);

Sex education, particularly for men, who were seen as causing most of the problems;

The study of sexuality and the active intervention of physicians in the treatment of sexual dysfunction;

The reform of prostitution laws, which discriminated against women;

Equal opportunity for women (and sometimes preferential treatment, as in Marañón's espousal of maternity benefits);

Divorce.

Even a conservative Catholic like Ossorio y Gallardo could support the entire program, with the exception of divorce. In supporting the rest, however, he helped consolidate public opinion in favor of divorce, which he personally opposed.³¹

FIVE REFORMERS

We will now examine the ideological and scientific postures of five deputies: Gregorio Marañón, Roberto Nóvoa Santos, Luis Jiménez de Asúa, César Juarros, and José Sanchis Banús. We will do so within the double context of the sexual reform movement and the impact of Freudian theory.

Gregorio Marañón (1887–1960) was an endocrinologist whose self-described political affiliation was *Al Servicio de la República*.³² Marañón (who later became president of the short-lived Spanish chapter of the WLSR) was Spain's authoritative voice on sexual matters. He was so for three reasons. first, he was one of relatively few Spanish scientists with an international reputation. Second, he was very good at popularizing his ideas on sex endocrinology; his influential *Tres ensayos sobre la vida sexual* (Three essays on sexual life) was perceived by middle-class readers as an open attack on husbands in general and a plea on behalf of long-suffering wives.³³ For women who had witnessed the physical and

³¹Virtually all eight points of the minimalist program were in fact mentioned by speakers in the aborted first Spanish Course of Eugenics, shut down in February 1928 by Primo de Rivera's government but not before the delivery of important lectures by the pedagogue Julio Noguera, the gynecologist Sebastián Recasens, the lawyer Jiménez Asúa, and the psychiatrist José Sanchis Banús. From those lectures Enrique Noguera extracted a series of programmatic themes, including "eugenic" marriage, birth control, decriminalization of prostitution, and sex education. The only authority cited was Marañón. See Noguera, 407–11.

³²*Al Servicio de la República* was an electoral grouping of liberal intellectuals who wanted to contribute to building a new state but who had no political affiliation. On Marañón, see especially Pedro Laín Entralgo, "Vida, obra y persona de Gregorio Marañón," in Marañón, *Obras completas* (1987), 1:viii–cxxv; and Alejandra Ferrándiz and Enrique Lafuente, "El pensamiento eugénico de Marañón," *Asclepio* 51 (1999): 133–48.

³³Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1926. The book was an authentic Spanish contribution to the "repeal of reticence." Something of its reception can be gleaned from Lafitte, 199.

emotional degeneration of their multiparous mothers, Marañón was a hero and would remain so. Third, he had fought a lonely battle in the early years of the century, beginning well before World War I, on behalf of elementary measures like pregnancy leaves for women, which created a deep wellspring of gratitude among Spanish middle-class and even working-class women. In eugenic terms, Marañón was a pronatalist and a precocious champion of legislation to enhance the health hygiene of pregnant women.³⁴ By the 1920s he was more a symbol than a spokesman, and it was for his symbolic value that reformers courted him.

Marañón was the founder of endocrinology in Spain and the leading proponent of the doctrine of internal secretions.³⁵ He believed not only in the conventional endocrinological wisdom of the day that people were marionettes of their glands but that all glands were marionettes of the sex glands, which ultimately controlled metabolic function and the development of the individual in the various phases of the life-cycle. It followed that all differentiation between males and females could ultimately be explained by gonadal differentiation. Psychological differentiation between the sexes was linked to metabolic differentiation. Men were designed to spend their energy combating forces external to themselves, while women's energies were directed inward, in the service of procreation.³⁶ Marañón's concept of women's place in the world was based on what he perceived as primary and secondary sexual functions. The primary sexual function of women is procreation, and the social roles that supposedly followed from sexually differentiated physiology and metabolism were secondary. In the male, however, the primary sexual function is sporadic and therefore subordinate to secondary ones. In Marañón's view, most social activities were subsumed under the rubric of male secondary sexual characteristics. Men have greater motor and nerve capacity for carrying out such activities than women have, and their success in those roles makes them sexually attractive.³⁷

These views, which confused biology with culture, have, in their ultimate appeal to sexual selection as a rationale, a Darwinian ring. The social

³⁴On pronatalism, see N. L. Stepan, *The Hour of Eugenics: Race, Gender and Nation in Latin America* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991), 76–84; on “soft” (as opposed to hard), selectionist eugenics, see my comment on Stepan in *Quipu: Revista Latinoamericana de Historia de las Ciencias y la Tecnología* 2 (1985): 437–42. Even “matrimonial genetics” of the soft kind was banned by Pius XI's bull *Casta Connubi* in 1930 (see Stepan, 112).

³⁵See my article, “On the Diffusion of a New Specialty: Marañón and the ‘Crisis’ of Endocrinology in Spain,” *Journal of the History of Biology* 9 (1976): 287–300.

³⁶The notion (dating ultimately to the ancient Greeks) that men were by nature active, women passive was pervasive, particularly in German biomedicine. Ortega y Gasset, for example, got the idea from Otto Weininger, *Geschlecht und Charakter* (Sex and character) (1903). See Rockwell Gray, *The Imperative of Modernity: An Intellectual Biography of José Ortega y Gasset* (Berkeley, 1989), 115.

³⁷Marañón, *Obras completas*, 2:15 (“Estado actual de la doctrina de las secreciones internas” [1922]).

accomplishments of females, however, do not play the same sexual role: an intelligent woman is not attractive to men. It thus followed that a woman of genius was sexually abnormal because her primary sexual function was impeded and the secondary functions were “virile.” (Such a state was referred to by biological determinists as an “inversion.”)

Marañón admitted, however, that many individuals lack any clearly defined sexuality (i.e., they failed to fulfill the terms of the dichotomous model). Much of his original work as an endocrinologist dealt precisely with what he called “intersexuality,” and he defined the conditions under which intersexuality exists. It was in this area that he most availed himself of Freudian theory, although his views here amount to an exaggerated emphasis on the supposed pathology of inverted sexual functions, which is not the thrust of Freud’s argument on bisexuality.

For Marañón, as for Freud, the libido (which Marañón called “sexual hunger”) was a primary drive. But libido for the endocrinologist was the specific energy produced by a chemical phenomenon, the irruption into the bloodstream of internal secretions emanating from the gonads. (Freud admitted this but believed that the chemical origins of the libido were irrelevant to its psychology.) Although there is no libido until the gonads start to function, Marañón argued, the chemical differentiation of the sexes is not immediate but passes through a precocious phase of evident lack of differentiation. In childhood, therefore, there is a dormant, undifferentiated sexuality. “We owe to Freud,” Marañón wrote, “the proof of the existence of infantile sexuality and its undifferentiated character; this is one of the indisputable merits of his work.” Infantile sexuality manifests itself in social activities of a not directly erotic type (such as playing with dolls), but there also exists “an obscure libidinous activity in the infantile soul, perhaps of less significance than Freud asserts, at least for the normal life, but undeniable.”³⁸

When speaking to a lay audience, Marañón hedged on infantile sexuality, however, as a concept that offended “the patriotism of the human species. We want to believe that a child’s soul is pure.”³⁹ He questioned the utility of dealing with immature instincts. He further believed that Freudian theory was, in part, culture-bound and that the precocious sexual activities ascribed to children by Freud did not occur in Spain: “It is certain that our children are not like that,” he opined.⁴⁰

In Marañón’s theory, both sexes pass through crises of intersexuality, the male undergoing a feminoid crisis before puberty, the female suffering a viriloid crisis after menopause. Such a construction was consistent with Freudian ideas, and indeed, Marie Bonaparte (in whose house

³⁸Ibid., 8:542–43 (“La evolución de la sexualidad y los estados intersexuales,” 2nd ed. [1930]).

³⁹Ibid., 3:168.

⁴⁰Ibid., 3:171.

Marañón met Freud in 1938) recommended the endocrinologist as “one author, not in the ranks of the psychoanalysts, whose work merits their attention.”⁴¹

In spite of his biologicistic interpretation of sex roles, Marañón was a champion of legal equality between the sexes and a critic of male dominance over sex life. Thus although he believed that maternity was the primary role of women, he saw multitudes of Spanish women enslaved by it, those who, for example, had too many children for the good of their own or their children’s health. The first task of feminism, he wrote in 1920, was to protect and educate those women who had been completely submissive to the will of their husbands in sexual matters. Mothers, he thought, should not work outside the home, but for a woman not engaged in motherhood, work was a necessity. Women should therefore have free access to all fields (albeit those who achieve success in “male” fields will do so by virtue of a biological abnormality). Teaching, nursing, and laboratory work are zones of legitimate social action for women according to the only rational criterion, the biological one. As for the vote, Marañón shared the suspicions of many liberals that women would vote conservative, a disposition related, in his view, to their metabolism.⁴² The old discussion concerning the supposed superiority of one sex over another should be abandoned; each gender had biologically appropriate roles.⁴³

On sexual relations per se, Marañón was a reformer. “The tragedy of sexual reproduction,” he remarked to a largely female audience in 1926, is that for the Christian it begins with an anathema. “The noble instinct of production is converted in mankind into an interminable sum of problems.”⁴⁴ Although feminist political leaders like Clara Campoamor attacked Marañón for his assertions concerning the differential capacities of men and women, other reformers were uncertain as to how they should react to the seeming contradiction between his social and biological ideas.⁴⁵ In *El Sol*, E. Gómez Baquero once described Marañón’s thesis as the conservative, traditional view of women’s role in society dressed up with biology. Yet in another article he praised Marañón for supplying a biological basis for feminism by asserting that the sexes are not unequal, just different.⁴⁶

⁴¹Marie Bonaparte, *Female Sexuality* (New York, 1953), 7–8.

⁴²Marañón, *Obras completas*, 3:9–33, esp. 20–32. For Marañón’s evocative description of his meeting with Freud on June 5, 1938, see 3:949.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 3:33.

⁴⁴*El Sol*, January 22, 1926.

⁴⁵*El Sol*, April 16, 1925.

⁴⁶“La fuente de la vida,” *El Sol*, July 8, 1926; “El mito y la biología,” *El Sol*, February 16, 1929. Of course, Freud drew similarly ambivalent reactions to his pronouncements on women and sex roles.

Recent comment on Marañón has focused on his conservative, biologicistic construction of gender identity.⁴⁷ But there was more to Marañón than cultural conservatism and biological determinism. He spoke out against the reflexive conversion of social injustice into cultural habit. In the same 1920 lecture in which he expounded his conservative views on sex roles, he declared his discovery of a terrifying statistical law: in Spain the fecundity of mothers was directly correlated to infant mortality.⁴⁸ The basis of Marañón's leadership in the sexual reform movement had little to do with his ideology and much more to do with his tireless campaign to reform the way in which clinical services to women before, during, and after pregnancy were reconceptualized and reorganized, a history that has yet to be written.

Roberto Nóvoa Santos (1885–1933) was a pathologist whose political affiliation was Federal Republican.⁴⁹ The most original Spanish pathologist of the twentieth century, Nóvoa was, like Marañón, a biological determinist markedly influenced by Freud. At the age of nineteen, he had written a short story entitled “Lo inconsciente” (The unconscious), a good indication of his future susceptibility to Freudian arguments.⁵⁰ In 1922 he claimed to be more interested in the biological roots of consciousness than in the processes of ego integration, noting that studies emanating from World War I had brought to light psychopathological conditions in soldiers that had originated in “disturbances of the instinct of preservation, independently of any influence . . . of a psychosexual nature.”⁵¹ Nevertheless, in his influential pathology textbook, he accepted the Freudian doctrine that most sexual “perversions” should “be considered as infantile manifestations of the libido.” In the same context, he accepted Freud's concept of infantile sexuality.⁵²

⁴⁷See, for example, Mary Nash, “Un/Contested Identities: Motherhood, Sex Reform, and the Modernization of Gender Identity in Early Twentieth-Century Spain,” in Enders and Radcliff, eds., 25–49, on 33–35.

⁴⁸Marañón, *Obras completas*, 3:7.

⁴⁹On Nóvoa, see Jacinto Candela Barrios, *La antropología de Nóvoa Santos* (Barcelona, 1971); Juan José Fernández Tejeiro, *Roberto Nóvoa Santos: Una vida, una filosofía* (La Coruña, 1998); and Thomas F. Glick, “Roberto Nóvoa Santos,” in *Diccionario histórico*, 2:115–16.

⁵⁰*Revista Blanca* 7 (1904): 159–60. The article is signed with the suggestive pseudonym “Pedro Novoakow,” an amalgam of the names of two writers on evolution and Social Darwinism widely read at the time by readers of the anarchist *Revista Blanca*, Peter Kropotkin and Jacques Novicow. Juan Rof Carballo drew this article to my attention.

⁵¹Nóvoa, *Physis y psiquis. Fragmentos para una doctrina genética y energética del espíritu* (Santiago de Compostela, 1922), 109, 153.

⁵²*Manual de patología general*, 5th ed., 2 vols. (Santiago de Compostela, 1930), 2:783–85.

Much of Nóvoa's theory of sexuality was based on Marañón, but with a strong overlay of evolutionary explanation.⁵³ For Nóvoa, as for his endocrinologist colleague, the exceptionally intelligent woman was a sexually inverted person exhibiting the male type of secondary sexual characters. He recognized intersexuality as a fact, stating that the chemical messengers sent by the gonads did not have a specific character and that each sexual being contains elements of the opposite sex. In protozoa, male gametes are mobile, with active nuclei; the female gamete's preeminent nutritive function explains its passivity and scant mobility—the basis of an evolutionary argument derived from Spencer. In the course of evolution, however, there occurred a progressive segregation of the intersexual element. In the case of human evolution, this meant that with the passage of time males became more intensely masculine and females, more feminine. The greater cranial capacity of men is sex-linked and cannot be attributed to environmental factors. Building upon Darwin's observation that the mature female resembled the young male of the same species, Nóvoa concluded that the female was an infantilized being as well as a frustrated male—a notion based both on Darwin's conclusion and on Freud's castration complex.⁵⁴ A woman's psyche parallels her biology; it is infantile and hysteroid.

Nóvoa considered sexuality to be aggressive. In florid terms he described the lovers' embrace as the desire for the phagocytic absorption of the loved one. Aggressivity is the neurotic result of competition and "the pathology of scarcity." Thus sexual relations result in the permanent, institutionalized creation of unsatisfied needs.⁵⁵

A declared misogynist, Nóvoa was an improbable participant in the sexual reform movement. At the Eugenic Congress of 1933, he spoke on the neurotic nature of sexual relations and the aggressive sense of sexuality. It was this aspect of his thought that seemingly held appeal for reformers. But on a lecture tour in Cuba with Marañón in 1927, the two physicians were attacked by feminists—who threw their shoes at the podium—for uttering such "atrocities."⁵⁶ Still, Nóvoa claimed to the last that his position was exclusively biological, on which grounds he opposed social practices (specifically, political feminism) that sought to erase the natural distance separating the sexes.

⁵³See Thomas F. Glick, "El evolucionismo en la obra de Roberto Nóvoa Santos," in *Darwin a Barcelona* (Barcelona, 1984), 461–74.

⁵⁴Darwin thought that females resembled adolescent males of the same species; for the social reflection of this doctrine, see Cynthia Eagle Russett, *Sexual Science: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood* (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), 54–55.

⁵⁵Nóvoa, "La posición biológica de la mujer," in *La mujer, nuestro sexto sentido y otros esbozos* (Madrid, 1929), 15–76; see Candela Barrios, 64–74.

⁵⁶Nóvoa, "El sentido agresivo y canibalístico de la Sexualidad," in *Genética, eugenesia*, 1:17–32; "Posición biológica," 64–74.

The Socialist Luis Jiménez de Asúa (1889–1970) was one of a number of Spanish jurists and social thinkers who applied psychoanalytic theory to criminology,⁵⁷ an exercise that informed his labors on the Constitutional Commission of 1931, in which he was the major author of the constitution of the Second Republic. In the 1920s he had worked to provide a legal basis for reform in the area of family relations. His experience illustrates how any Spaniard working in this area had to come to terms with Marañón's views on sex, which dominated the reform movement owing to the tremendous prestige of their author.

In a 1928 lecture at the Federación Tabaguera, Jiménez de Asúa admitted, following Marañón, that “internal secretions, especially the sexual ones, give to man and woman their psychological types.”⁵⁸ A month later he praised Marañón as a fighter against sexual hypocrisy and Don Juanism. (Marañón had disappointed Spanish Don Juans by exposing them as “feminoid” types!) He identified Marañón as the “authentic spokesman” both of the sexual reform campaign and of “correct masculinity and femininity” and as one whose ideas had “provoked serious thought from a sector of opinion which previously was terrified when thoughts of this nature arose in their own intimacy.”⁵⁹

By 1930, however, Jiménez de Asúa had rejected Marañón's view that only women of an intermediate form of sexuality would do well in traditionally male roles. Such women, he asserted (following French data), were more frequent than was commonly thought in Spain. Indeed, professionalism is not incompatible with motherhood, no more than it is with fatherhood. Large families are socially undesirable, and one of the achievements of modern woman is, precisely, the control of maternity. Marañón (“who is not exactly a feminist,” Asúa chided) agreed: it is better to have fewer healthy children than more unhealthy ones. According to Asúa, women must work, because unproductive persons have no place in society. The new home must be based on mutual work and mutual responsibility. All professions should be accessible to women, he averred, except for law. It is one thing to have power over things (by being a chemist or fighting disease), but it would be unproductive for women to have to tangle with male judges. The working woman will be freed from petty jealousies. The woman who spends all her time in cafés, receiving flirtatious advances from men,

⁵⁷Others included Quintiliano Saldaña, “La psiquiatría y el código (Estudio de técnica legislativo),” *Revista General de Legislación y Jurisprudencia* 146 (1925): 747–829, esp. 772–77; “Lo inconsciente (Doctrina de Freud);” Saldaña and M. Ruiz-Maya, *Psiquiatria penal y civil* (Madrid, 1931), 83–98. Saldaña was a sociologist, Ruiz-Maya, a psychiatrist. Saldaña was a participant in the Jornadas eugénicas of 1933 with a paper entitled “Eugenesia y derecho,” in *Genética, eugenesia*, 2:170–80. Juarros also taught forensic psychiatry (see below).

⁵⁸*El Sol*, January 8, 1928.

⁵⁹*El Sol*, February 10, 1928.

can only imagine that her husband is also in a café flirting with other women. A working woman knows better.

Asúa then drew a picture of the generational progress of Spanish women. The mother's generation had no rights and no responsibilities except domestic ones. When her children grew up, she sublimated her anxieties by devoting herself to religion. In the present generation, the husband and wife went their separate ways, but the way of the wife was basically frivolous. Spanish women were now emancipating themselves, seeking entrance into male-dominated professions, at the same time as men retained an incomprehensible, regressive view of conjugality.

Asúa was still unclear on women's suffrage. Citing the example of politically active Catholic women, organized by Cardinal Segura in the service of reactionary men and Catholic ultras who demanded the prohibition of subsidies for unwed mothers, he stated that if women were not independent, their vote would be the instrument of regression. Husbands currently yielded all control over children's education to their wives, producing the incredible spectacle of men affiliated with parties of the extreme Left having their children sent to Jesuit schools, where they were soon made to feel guilt for the sins of their fathers!

Asúa found Marañón's doctrine of intersexuality disturbing. Was the new woman he described an intersexual being? The present social concept of femininity had to be overcome, but was that biologically possible?⁶⁰ At a later stage of his career, the substitution of Freud for Marañón would resolve many of Jiménez de Asúa's questions.⁶¹

The psychiatrist César Juarros (1879–1942), a Progressive Republican,⁶² was the most outspoken “Freudian” writing in Madrid in the 1920s. For him, the keynote of the entire reform campaign was sex education, the purpose of which could only be understood in the context of infantile sexuality. Thus Juarros declared in his popular volume on psychoanalysis, “It is not possible to confront seriously the education of a child if one lacks acquaintance with psychoanalysis.”⁶³ In his public appearances he never hesitated to broach the polemical topic. In a lecture at the Ateneo de Divulgación Social in 1929 he spoke explicitly of “infantile sexuality, sadly ignored by most or all parents, who do not perceive sexual appetites

⁶⁰Jiménez de Asúa, *Al servicio de la nueva generación* (Madrid, 1930), 71–134 (“Las nuevas mujeres”).

⁶¹See, e.g., “Valor de la psicología profundo (Psicoanálisis y psicología individual),” in *Ciencias penales* (Madrid, 1935); and *Psicoanálisis criminal*, 5th ed. (Buenos Aires, 1947; 1st ed., 1940).

⁶²See Thomas F. Glick, “César Juarros y Ortega,” in *Diccionario histórico*, 1:490.

⁶³Juarros, *Los horizontes de la psicoanálisis* (Madrid, 1929), 118. Juarros was virtually the only Spanish commentator on Freud who construed *psicoanálisis* as a feminine noun. Most assumed it to be masculine, as *análisis* was.

in children. As a result, the most deep-rooted sexual aberrations have their start in the cradle itself.”⁶⁴

Juarros was not alone in his views on sex education. Indeed, it was a commonplace in the 1920s to introduce infantile sexuality into any extended discussion of the topic. For example, in a 1927 lecture on the sexual education of females, the non-Freudian gynecologist Sebastián Recasens commented on the opinions of Freud in considering that “the first manifestation of sexual instinct is already found in the child in the period of nursing, and it reappears between three and six years. Without accepting these theories in an absolute way, he recognizes that sexual instinct, far from making its [first] appearance in puberty, manifests itself in very different degrees and conditions during the first years of life, normally or abnormally, whether through intensity or through perversion.”⁶⁵

Juarros used to teach a popular course on forensic psychiatry, which, in his version of it, was criminology considered from a Freudian perspective. He noted that an increasingly large proportion of his students were seeking in psychoanalysis the answers to a “long series of conflicts caused by sexual abnormality.”⁶⁶ By the end of the decade, Juarros had become spokesman and standard-bearer for the sexually discontented young who were to become, several years later, the rank-and-file supporters of the divorce statute. In the context of Spanish eugenics, Juarros broke cleanly with the pronatalist, “soft” position associated with Marañón and moved toward a harder, selectionist position.⁶⁷

In the writings of José Sanchis Banús (1893–1932), the Freudian analysis of sexual dysfunction united with a socialist analysis of the inequality of

⁶⁴*El Sol*, February 19, 1929.

⁶⁵*El Sol*, March 26, 1927. Note that the text on sex education submitted to the Ministerio de Gobernación by the Spanish League of Mental Hygiene in 1933 struck a similar note: “According to some psychoanalysts, children and adolescents should be treated with reference to the incestuous tendencies of that period of sexual development” (*El Sol*, January 29, 1933). This text was prepared, in part, by Emilio Mira y López, a Freud-influenced psychiatrist. Recasens had been one of the organizers of the aborted 1928 meeting and participated in the eugenic congress of 1933 with a paper entitled “Eugenesia y procreación,” in *Genética, eugenesia*, 2:327–32. On the Mental Hygiene League, another health reform group founded in the 1920s, see Ricardo Campos Marín and Rafael Huertas, “La teoría de la degeneración en España (1886–1920),” in T. F. Glick, R. Ruiz, and M. A. Puig-Samper, eds., *El darwinismo en España y Iberoamérica* (Aranjuez, 1999), 231–48, on 238.

⁶⁶*El Sol*, January 21, 1933; review of R. Vázquez Zamora and Manuel Hidalgo, *Lo inconsciente y el crimen* (Madrid, 1933), prologue by Juarros.

⁶⁷To the limited extent that it was cultivated, selectionist eugenics is correlated in Spain with the late introduction of Mendelian genetics, which made its appearance in the Jornadas eugénicas of 1933 in a presentation by Gimena F. de la Vega, “La herencia biológica en el hombre,” *Genética, eugenesia*, 2:159–81. De la Vega’s lecture was a straight presentation of Mendelian genetics; at the time, she was a student in the genetics section of Nóvoa’s general pathology department.

sexual and marital relations to make the most compelling argument for sexual reform articulated in Spain during the Second Republic.⁶⁸ Although Sanchis Banús claimed to belong to no particular psychiatric school, the Freudian coordinates of his approach are clear.⁶⁹ In 1924 he wrote that in 70 percent of the psychoneurotic patients he had treated, there was a profound gap between what they wanted in sexual matters and what they had achieved. No technique of treatment, he asserted, had yielded results comparable to those of psychotherapy practiced with the aim of aligning the sexual desires and possibilities of the patient.⁷⁰

The following year he was an expert witness in a canonical divorce case in which the woman plaintiff claimed that severe emotional problems had resulted from the practice of coitus interruptus that her husband imposed upon her.⁷¹ The clinical details are not as relevant to the present discussion as is the case's immediate social context, an ecclesiastical tribunal, and the fact that Sanchis Banús began his expert testimony with a summary of the significance of the psychoanalytic approach. Psychoanalysis was not just the capricious invention of a man of genius, Sanchis Banús told the clerics, but "a serious, systematic body of doctrine in which inductions are heavily mixed with observed facts." It did not contradict any previously known facts of proven reality, and it explained completely a certain order of phenomena: the neurotic symptoms resultant from the repression of the libido. He explicated the Freudian notion of the sexual etiology of neurosis and how this was to be understood in terms of infantile sexuality and the psychosexual stages.

In beginning a discussion of the physical mechanism of normal coitus, Sanchis Banús went on to say that the notion that sexual pleasure is less intense for women than for men is a "degrading declaration," providing the context for his next point, that coitus interruptus defrauds women and that an unsatisfied libido produces anxiety. In his discussion of the details of the case, Sanchis Banús interpreted a dream of the plaintiff in which she traversed a never-ending stairway as a clear allusion to the hoped-for orgasm that never arrived.

The notion that men and women experience differential sexual pleasure had been framed by Marañón, who argued that the female libido is weaker than the male. (Freud had claimed that greater intensity of libido was usually

⁶⁸See Thomas F. Glick, "José Sanchis Banús," in *Diccionario histórico*, 2:299–300.

⁶⁹In his lecture, "The Penal Problem from the Psychiatric Perspective," *El Sol*, May 19, 1926.

⁷⁰"La cuestión del psicoanálisis," *Archivos de Medicina, Cirugía y Especialidades* 51 (1924): 141–42. Elsewhere he stated that not all conflicts or unsatisfied desires are of sexual origin (lecture on hysteria, *El Sol*, April 12, 1926).

⁷¹"Acerca de los trastornos nerviosos originados en la mujer por la práctica sistemática del 'coitus interruptus' y su patogenia," *Los Progresos de la Clínica* 12 (1923): 210–21.

biologically linked to masculinity, but not always so. Each individual has a mix of active and passive characteristics.) Sanchis Banús broke, therefore, with the biologically determined model of libido. In the context of the sexual debate in Spain, this was a stance that constituted a decisive benchmark in the reform movement, indicative of the transfer of hegemony from the Freudian Right (Marañón) to the Freudian Left (Sanchis Banús, Juarros, Jiménez de Asúa). It anticipates the beginning of a maximalist program, first articulated in a series of unsuccessful motions introduced by Juarros in the course of the Cortes debate on divorce.

Jiménez de Asúa, in his 1930 volume cited above, referred approvingly to a critique of Marañonian determinism made from a psychological perspective by Antonio Abaunza, a disciple of Sanchis Banús.⁷² Inasmuch as the latter's premature death in 1932 aborted the publication of most of his later writings, it is appropriate to examine Abaunza's views for the perspective that they lend to Sanchis Banús's participation in the divorce debate.

In Abaunza's view, the sexual division of labor was the product of social rather than biological evolution. Primitive women, having to support the necessities of childbirth periodically, could not undertake any function that required constant activity. Thus men developed intellectually to handle functions from which women were successively eliminated. Philosophers legitimized this state of affairs by arguing that such activities as women traditionally pursued were compatible with feminine psychology. In Spain, there was but one destination for women, marriage, attainable by two roads: either a strict conformity to traditional norms or neurosis, in either the Freudian or Adlerian sense. Indeed, neurosis was the only possible way to reconcile the bimodal tendencies of duty and desire—the indissoluble bond of marriage and the pleasure principle. While men might escape this trap in various ways, women could not, since they had been deprived of intellectual weapons. Marañón had tried “in the name of biology to make the integral intellectual development of the female incompatible with its biological end. Either virility or maternity.”⁷³ In doing so, Marañón had revived the old antagonism between intelligence and instinct.

Those who speak in the name of biology err, Abaunza continued. If at present women do in fact occupy an inferior social status, this does not authorize us to condemn them in the name of biology to an inferior level of evolution. Nor did he agree with Marañón's assertions that woman's biological role is an inhibitor of her morphological evolution and that the

⁷²After the civil war Abaunza practiced psychiatry in Mexico, where he published *Los valores psicológicos de la personalidad (y fenómenos psíquicos de adaptación al ambiente)* (Mexico City, 1940). See Francisco Giral, *Ciencia española en el exilio (1939–1989)* (Barcelona, 1994), 260.

⁷³Antonio Abaunza, *Psicogenia de los celos* (Madrid, 1930), 117.

social progress of women is a measure of virility. Marañón had been wrong to equate intellect and biology.⁷⁴

I believe that Abaunza's critique of Marañón is a fair statement of Sanchis Banús's position as well. In 1927, the latter, in a lecture at the Sociedad Ginecológica of Madrid, "declared his radical disagreement with contemporary sexual mores, filled with hypocrisy and which, in Spain at least, weighs upon women with a true tyranny, according her all the duties, and only duties, while it gives to men all the pleasures, and only pleasures."⁷⁵

SEXUAL REFORM IN THE SECOND REPUBLIC

Discussions of sexuality, matrimonial dysfunction, Freudian psychology, and sexual reform by the protagonists of the reform movement, leavened by increasing social protest and dissatisfaction under the dictatorship, gave form, especially among the young in Spain, to popular expressions of discontent with the structure of sexuality. In the winter of 1929–30, *El Sol* conducted a survey of mainly university students in their twenties and thirties, inquiring into opinions on, among other topics, the "sexual problems of youth." Uniform discontent was expressed over the "morbidity of our sexual relations." One respondent asserted that "90 percent of our young men carry into marriage the menace or the reality of a repugnant pathological burden." Several respondents stressed the inadequacy of sex education: "My sexual education has been noneducation," said one. Another said that his sex education had come from his friends, a situation that he deemed "a tragedy." Another remarked that there could be no sex education in a country where all was concealed under the rubric "mysteries of sex." Still another concluded that "in sexuality, we need to build the foundations of sex education. . . . This African [i.e., Muslim] vice of ours of the separation of the sexes is responsible for so many troubles."

Views concerning the social role of women made clear Juarros's tremendous influence among younger Spaniards. One said, "Women must seek their economic independence. I am a communist. . . . I agree with Dr. Juarros that the woman is neither superior nor inferior to the man; she is 'different' and, we might say, his equivalent."⁷⁶ Another, asserting that youth favored divorce, added that "we do not believe that maternity is a function general to all [women]." This response was somewhat atypical, inasmuch as other respondents followed Marañón's line that women should

⁷⁴Ibid., 75–122. In spite of this progressive statement, Abaunza was pessimistic about the future of feminism. Women lacked the preparation acquired by men through centuries of historical evolution; as a result, their intellect was in the latent stage and would require several centuries to catch up.

⁷⁵*El Sol*, November 17, 1927.

⁷⁶In this instance, the respondent may be attributing to Juarros a position associated with Marañón.

be the social equal of men within the limits of their particular biological function. Both men and women agreed that considerable prejudice against women existed in Spain and that, given such a society, marriage was destructive of love. One viewed marriage as “a conflict without solution. The sexual problem in Spain is the tragedy of youth. . . . Sexual morality in Spain is purely materialist and is based on the materialist cult of virginity and Calderonian honor.” The student leader and future socialist deputy, Antonio Maria Sbert, concluded that “not only does a sexual problem exist among our young people, but it is one of the greatest causes of disturbance in Spanish social life.”⁷⁷

The original draft of article 43 of the Republican Constitution that contained the statement on divorce had been drafted by Jiménez de Asúa on the model of the Uruguayan divorce law. It read: “Marriage is founded on the equality of rights of both sexes and can be dissolved through mutual dissent, through the free volition of the wife, or upon the request of the husband, with assertion—in this case—of just cause.” Jiménez de Asúa did not regard this measure as “feminist daring” but simply a prudent measure in keeping with Spanish social realities. Men must give cause; there were too many Don Juans in Spain. But there was no risk in giving women the right to divorce without giving cause. Many women, he argued, were too timid to present the proofs required in a divorce case. They would fear to make their husband’s vices public and, in order not to shame their children, would resign themselves to staying married to unfaithful husbands. The divorce law would not be effective until and unless women solicited divorce. If only men availed themselves, it would be like Hebraic repudiation.⁷⁸

By the time article 43 reached the floor of the Cortes on October 15, 1931, however, the wording had been changed to permit divorce by mutual consent or by the solicitation of either spouse, with assertion of just cause. Sanchis Banús then moved to reinstate the original wording and rose to speak. According to one journalist present, the psychiatrist “plunged his certain scalpel into a magisterial lesson, which the entire chamber heard religiously.”⁷⁹

From our perspective, Sanchis Banús’s speech was the culminating moment of the sexual reform movement. His words constituted a reasoned defense of divorce in which he explained the relationship between married life and the psychosexual development of children in terms of the healthy completion of the Oedipal transition.

⁷⁷All survey quotes from *El Sol*, December 26, 28, 1929, January 15, 18, 21, 1930, February 4, 5, 1930.

⁷⁸Luis Jiménez de Asúa, *Proceso histórico de la Constitución de la República Española* (Madrid, 1932), 275–76, 279.

⁷⁹Luis Sirval, *Huellas de las Constituyentes* (Madrid, 1931), 100. For a conservative commentary on the participation of both Sanchis Banús and Juarros in the divorce debate, see José de Medina y Togores, *Un año de Cortes Constituyentes* (Madrid, n.d.), 102.

Sanchis Banús opened by declaring that the most perfect form of social organization was based on “monogamous and stable union.”⁸⁰ In order to achieve this ideal, it was necessary to “bend this criterion to the circumstantial exigencies of the moment,” because divorce was the only way to align the ideal situation with reality. The happiness of spouses is the basic condition for the effective formation of citizens. The lack of such a condition gives rise to pathological states, which the psychiatrist then explained in the now-familiar Freudian context of psychosexual stages and Oedipal conflict.

In the view that Sanchis Banús presented to the deputies, “the life of a man is one of progressive separation from his own parents,” whose focal point was the “intrafamilial crisis of the renunciation of the mother.” He who is unable “to dispense with his mother as the sole source of his sustenance” cannot learn to share his mother with his siblings or to respect his father. A man who preserves an affective fixation to his mother will be incapable of loving another woman because “the figure of his mother will interpose itself in the path of his affections, staining it with the coloration of incest; and so these unfortunate persons go through the world without the spirit of sacrifice, without love of work, without obedience to authority, and even without the supreme sweetness of love, which in them has become totally impossible.” finishing this exposition of the relation between conjugal unhappiness, maternal fixation, and the social role of the citizen, the psychiatrist paused to received the applause of the deputies.

The right wing, in the person of the priest Basilio Álvarez, had attacked the amendment on the grounds that to permit a woman to divorce without giving just cause would be tantamount to enthroning hysteria in Spanish law. As noted in the discussion of Nóvoa above, the notion that women were hysteroid by nature was widely entertained. But hysteria, Sanchis Banús rejoined, is a defense against a menacing attack. One who fights another with equal means will not react hysterically. If he fights one hundred men, he will indeed so react the moment he becomes aware of his lack of defenses. Given the social conspiracy against the rights of women (and he pointed out that the texts of the Church indicate that the man must be believed in a case where he says one thing and his wife, the contrary), “how can we be surprised when a woman reacts in a hysterical way, if we close off the normal road of reaction to her? I maintain not that we are enthroning hysteria but that we are annulling hysteria by reason of marriage when we give women the legal means of destroying the conjugal bond.”⁸¹

⁸⁰In another debate the same day, Sanchis Banús had declared that he did not share Marx and Engels’s view of the inherent contradictions of bourgeois monogamy; *Diario de sesiones de las Cortes Constituyentes de la II República*, no. 57 (October 15, 1931), 1766.

⁸¹Here, Sanchis Banús was echoing Freud’s prediction that once there was equality between men and women in sexual relations, hysteria would disappear.

All this he had stated as a psychiatrist, as one who had labored in “the obscure sewer [cloaca] of the unconscious.” But speaking as a socialist, his objective was to establish economic equality between men and women. For economic reasons, divorce would be more difficult for women, and, hence, he continued to assert that “divorce ought to be made easier for the woman than for the man.”⁸²

Juarros had opposed the amendment. The sexual act, he argued, should not have a value superior to any other physiological act. fighting the libido, though, was a fruitless venture. When it is denied normal satisfaction, in a small number of cases it is sublimated, but in the majority such denial gives rise to disturbances of the whole psychic system. Nevertheless, he believed it was admitting the inferiority of women to grant this privileged right. The psychology of Spanish women was undergoing a profound change. If a woman were given a status equal to that of a man, she would acquire a different view of life, more like a man’s view, and would then be able to allege just cause without shame. We must suppress the proposed anomaly whereby women would end up superior to men. Thus he concluded: “We will not make a revolution by flipping the omelet over.”⁸³

Sanchis Banús’s amendment passed, 169 to 153, but the Radical-Socialists had only supported it as a parliamentary maneuver in order to reintroduce and pass the revised wording, which provided equal procedures in divorce for men and women.⁸⁴ Article 43 itself passed overwhelmingly on February 25, 1932, by a vote of 260 to 23.⁸⁵

The forces of sexual reform lost several other battles as well. José Luis Martín Antonio, physician and Radical-Socialist, introduced an amendment permitting abortion for social and economic reasons (the penal code of 1870 had allowed therapeutic abortions). Jiménez de Asúa explained the rejection of this amendment by stating that the norms of Spanish culture at present regarded abortion as a crime. Asúa was an avowed admirer of the family law of the Soviet Union, where abortion was legal, but he did not see that such a measure could be applied to Spain in 1931. One cannot have full liberty to love and the right to abortion, as in the Soviet

⁸²Sanchis Banús’s speech can be found in *Diario de sesiones*, 1759–64; and Arturo Mori, *Crónica de las Cortes Constituyentes de la II República* (Madrid, 1932–33), 3:243–52; and Enrique López Sevilla, *El Partido Socialista Obrero Español en las Cortes Constituyentes de la Segunda República* (Mexico City, 1969), 349–56.

⁸³*Diario de sesiones*, 1757–58. Jesús M. de Miguel, *El mito de la imaculada concepción* (Barcelona, 1979), 35–36, mistakenly presented Juarros as a defender of conservative values, with reference to the biological and psychological differentiation of the sexes. He reproduced a chart from Juarros, *La crianza del hijo* (Madrid, 1929), in which Juarros indicated in italics sexual values commonly attributed to sexual physiology. But de Miguel was unaware that Juarros had signaled those values because he opposed them.

⁸⁴Jiménez de Asúa, *Proceso histórico*, 280. The Radical-Socialists were a centrist Republican party.

⁸⁵*Diario de sesiones*, 4034–36.

Union, unless there is a fully socialized society, he argued. If such measures are grafted onto a capitalistic regime, then only the rich and powerful will be able to avail themselves of them.⁸⁶

In a debate on November 27, 1931, Dr. Juarros asserted that eugenic abortion should be permitted. For him, this was not an immoral stance but rather a scientifically valid promotion of the end that parents not have children if they lack the physiological capacity to have them. Everyone knows, he pointed out, that there is a growing voluntary limitation of parenthood in the “accommodated classes,” while the working class remains faithful to instinct. The law should right this imbalance. Malthusianism (the euphemism then used for contraception) ought not to be invoked in favor of the rich, forgetting the poor. Juarros wanted additional amendments: one mandating the periodical medical examination of prostitutes, “women who have committed no crime other than being poor and unlucky.” The Spanish law is inhumane, letting one of the parties to mercenary love go completely free to continue infecting others, “with no other reason than that the law was written by men, that women are oppressed and a license of piracy is granted to men.” He also wanted the constitution to mandate premarital medical certification. All these amendments were in the service of greater sexual education, which he characterized as “another of Spain’s abandoned problems. The problem of sexual education in Spain, land of priggishness and hypocrisy, possesses fundamental value. The majority of the laws approved will not be effective if the sexual structure of the country and the [current] conception of sexuality are not modified.”⁸⁷

The fight for divorce in the Constituent Cortes was the result of a general climate of agitation in favor of sexual reform during the 1920s. Although there was an ample breadth of opinion among the protagonists of reform, in both social and psychological spheres, the debate was conditioned by the diffusion of Freudian ideas. As Marañón was quick to note: “Even the same people who combat Freudianism are, without knowing it, caught in its talons.”⁸⁸ I have noted the use of Freudian arguments to explain dysfunction in the conjugal family. Neither Marañón nor Nóvoa were present for the vote on divorce or for that on women’s suffrage, but their ideas, colored by other Freudian notions suggesting the deficiencies of women with respect to men, appeared in the arguments of conservative deputies.⁸⁹ We must note as well that when Juarros spoke of sublimation

⁸⁶Jiménez de Asúa, *Proceso histórico*, 287–88, 290.

⁸⁷*Diario de sesiones*, 2728–30 (November 27, 1931).

⁸⁸Marañón, *Obras completas*, 3:168.

⁸⁹In the debate on women’s suffrage, Juarros intervened in order to combat an idea of Marañón’s, poorly understood. Manuel Ayuso, glossing the concept of “critical age” (that is, the climacteric), suggested that women should not vote until they reached the age of forty-five. “Until that moment, psychic equilibrium, mental maturity, and control of the will is not reached by the female sex.” Juarros observed that “it is precisely at that age when

or when Sanchis Banús described the development of children based on a Freudian concept, the deputies understood these ideas.

With the approval of divorce, the sexual reform movement entered a new phase, in which “a postpsychoanalytic sexual morality” (in the words of a young psychiatrist) was the order of the day.⁹⁰ The abolitionist program was approved by the Cortes in June 1936, and, after the outbreak of the civil war, many of the other reforms proposed by Juarros were put into law. An example was the legalization of therapeutic, eugenic, and “ethical” abortions by the regional government (Generalitat) of Catalonia in December 1936.⁹¹ The passage from a minimalist to a maximalist position in sexual reform was accelerated, logically, by political radicalization and social revolution on the Republican side after July 1936.

APPENDIX 1: REPRESENTATIVE FIGURES

Listed below are nine representative figures of the Madrid elite—all medical doctors or lawyers—who acted publicly in sexual reform circles during the 1920s and the Second Republic. Under each entry is a sample of the public reformist, political, advocacy, or related professional activities undertaken by each individual during the period 1921–32 in order to illustrate the interpenetration of related interests by members of this group and to indicate the institutional framework of these activities. Included in a footnote is a bibliography of relevant articles and books written by these individuals in the same period. Except for Vital Aza, all the figures were elected to the Constituent Cortes of the Second Republic, a measure of the centrality of sexual reform issues among Spanish reformers of the period. The dates refer to articles in *El Sol* for the issue cited.

1. Vital Aza, gynecologist. Activities: lectures on whether women’s organic conditions invalidate their social development (March 16, 1921); lectures on feminism and sex at the Royal Academy of Medicine (March 5, 1926); lectures on sterility and female sterilization at the Faculty of Medicine (January 29, 1928); member of WLSR (March 8, 1932); member of the section on feminism and marriage of the WLSR (April 24, 1932).⁹²

the female psychic equilibrium is in greatest danger, owing to phenomena of involution.” He recommended that women achieve the vote at the same age as men. See Rosa M. Capel, *El sufragio femenino en la 2a República española* (Granada, 1975), 168. It is interesting to note that the distinction between biological and psychological phenomena was not clearly perceived. For example, Jiménez de Asúa, *Proceso histórico*, 278, 282, refers to “the mixed arguments of biology [not psychology] and law” in the debate on divorce and alluded to the “magnificent biological foundation” that Sanchis Banús contributed to the debate.

⁹⁰Angel Suils, “Consideraciones eugénicas prácticas según la psicopatología del subconsciente,” in *Genética, eugenesia*, 2:91–116.

⁹¹Scanlon, 265.

⁹²Vital Aza’s published work: “El coito doloroso en ginecología,” *El Siglo Médico* 74 (1924): 569–73; *Feminismo y sexo* (Madrid, 1928); “Esterilidad fisiológica femenina y continencia periódica,” *El Siglo Médico* 95 (1935): 150–56.

2. Clara Campoamor, lawyer. Activities: lectures on the new woman and the law at the Academy of Jurisprudence (April 16, 1925); lectures on the protection of young women from prostitution at the Dispensario Martínez Anido (November 21, 1928); receives homage from feminist leaders for her efforts in the Cortes on behalf of women (October 8, 1931).

3. Matilde Huici, lawyer. Activities: lectures on practical abolitionism (June 21 and 28, 1928); lectures on the problem of prostitution at Dispensario Martínez Anido (January 27, 1929); signs letter of homage for Clara Campoamor on behalf of the Lyceum Club; participant in the first Spanish Eugenics Congress (April 18, 1933).

4. Luis Jiménez de Asúa, lawyer. Activities: lectures on the sexual problems of youth ("Misión de la juventud," March 6, 1925); lectures on penal legislation concerning the crime of venereal disease (March 17, 1925); lectures on women and crime at the Centro de Cigarreras y Tabaceras (January 8, 1928); lectures on the juridical aspects of eugenics and conscientious maternity in a course on eugenics at the Faculty of Medicine (February 10, 1928); attends first public meeting of the League of Social Education at the Federación Tabacera (November 17, 1928); named as member of the WLSR (March 8, 1932); named as member of the legislation section of the WLSR (April 24, 1932).⁹³

5. Cesar Juarros, psychiatrist. Activities: addresses Spanish Abolitionist Society (January 23, 1923); lectures on sexual education at a prostitution reform meeting (Acto Abolicionista) at the Teatro Eslava (February 15, 1927); lectures on the psychiatry of the libido during a course on forensic medicine at the Institute of Criminology (February 23, 1927); lectures on sexual equality at the Centro de Cigarreras y Tabaceras (November 27, 1927); lectures on an offensive (*lanza*) in favor of psychoanalysis at the Professional Association of Medical Students (January 15, 1928);⁹⁴ lectures at the Academy of Jurisprudence on psychoanalysis (May 3, 1928) and psychoanalysis and morality (May 7, 1928);⁹⁵ attends lecture by Pedro Malrata on psychiatry in the penal code at the Academy of Jurisprudence (December 2, 1928); lectures on "forbidden pleasure" at the Ateneo de Divulgación Social (February 19, 1929); gives lecture on psychoanalysis and auxiliary diagnostic methods in his course on forensic psychiatry (April 15, 1931); is vice-president of the Spanish

⁹³Luis Jimenez de Asua's published work: *La lucha contra el delito de contagio venéreo* (Madrid, 1925); *Endocrinología y derecho penal* (Montevideo, 1927); *Libertad de amar y derecho a morir: Ensayos de un criminalista sobre eugenesia, eutanasia y endocrinología* (Madrid, 1928); *Al servicio de la nueva generación* (Madrid, 1930); *As novas mulheres* (Porto, 1933); "Aspecto jurídico de la maternidad consciente," in *Genética, eugenesia*, 2:333–41; *Valor de la psicología profunda (psicoanálisis y psicología individual) en ciencias penales* (Madrid, 1935; 2nd ed. under title *Psicoanálisis criminal*, Buenos Aires, 1940).

⁹⁴Lecture published in *El Siglo Médico* 81 (1928): 74–75.

⁹⁵See *El Siglo Médico* 81 (1928): 530–31.

chapter of the WLSR and a member of its section on prostitution and venereal disease (April 24, 1932).⁹⁶

6. Gregorio Marañón, endocrinologist. Activities: lectures on sex to female audience at the Escuela de Estudios Superiores del Magisterio (January 22, 1926); attends first public meeting of the League of Social Education at the Federación Tabaquera (November 17, 1928); attends the fourth congress of the WLSR in Vienna (July 26, 1930); announced as lecturer in series at Psychotechnical Institute (February 17, 1932); president of Spanish section of the WLSR (March 3, 1932); lecturer at first Spanish Eugenics Congress (April 18, 1933).⁹⁷

7. Roberto Nóvoa Santos, pathologist. Activities: lectures on the biological position of women (November 25, 1928); member of the WLSR (March 8, 1932); lectures on the aggressive and cannibalistic sense of sexuality, first Spanish Eugenics Congress (April 18, 1933).⁹⁸

8. Angel Ossorio y Gallardo, lawyer. Activities: lectures on the new penal code and women at the Lyceum Club (November 11, 1928); lectures on family law at the Casa de Estudiantes (December 8, 1928); gives two lectures on love, marriage, and divorce at the Residencia de Señoritas (March 11 and 18, 1931); lecturer at first Spanish Eugenics Congress (April 18, 1933).⁹⁹

9. Jose Sanchis Banús, psychiatrist. Activities: lectures on hysteria at the Faculty of Medicine, Madrid (April 12, 1926); lectures on the penal problem from the psychiatric perspective at the Academy of Jurisprudence (May 19, 1926); lectures on the problem of sterilization for the perspective of psychiatric practice at the Gynecological Society (November 17, 1927); attends lecture by Pedro Malrata on psychiatry in the penal code at the Academy of Jurisprudence (December 2, 1928); lectures at the Casa del Pueblo (November 19, 1929); lectures on hysteria at the Professional Association of Medical Students (April 3, 1930); lecture "From Student to Professional: A Crisis" at the Ateneo of Madrid (April 12, 1930); lectures on

⁹⁶Cesar Juarros's published work: *Normas de educación sexual y física* (Madrid, 1925); *El amor en España* (Madrid, 1927); "Teoría sexual del carácter," *El Siglo Médico* 79 (1927): 129–31; *Los horizontes de la psicoanálisis* (Madrid, 1928); *La sexualidad encadenada* (Madrid, 1931); "El amor venal," in *Genética, eugenesia*, 1:245–72.

⁹⁷Gregorio Marañón's published work: "Psicopatología del donjuanismo," *Anales de la Real Academia de la Medicina* 44; "Notas para la biología de don Juan," *Revista de Occidente* (1924); *Sexo, trabajo, deporte* (Madrid, 1925); *Tres ensayos sobre la vida sexual* (Madrid, 1926); *Amor, convivencia y eugenesia* (Madrid, 1929); *Los estados intersexuales en la especie humana* (Madrid, 1929); "Sex and Religion in Spain," *Birth Control Review* 13 (1929): 157–59.

⁹⁸Roberto Novoa Santos's published work: *La mujer, nuestro sexto sentido y otros esbozos* (Madrid, 1929); *Los orígenes del sexo* (Madrid, 1931); *El sentido canibalístico de la sexualidad* (Madrid, 1931); "El sentido agresivo y canibalístico de la Sexualidad," in *Genética, eugenesia*, 1:17–32.

⁹⁹Angel Ossorio y Gallardo's published work: "Amor, matrimonio, divorcio," in *Genética, eugenesia*, 1:138–55.

psychiatry, divorce, and its prophylactic advantages at Ateneo Mercantil, Valencia; member, Spanish chapter of the WLSR's section on feminism and marriage (April 24, 1932); lectures on the consciousness of disease at the Psychotechnic Institute (May 25, 1932).¹⁰⁰

APPENDIX 2: THE NEWSPAPER METHOD

The present essay is one of a number of related studies on Spanish science in the 1920s that emerged from a reading of the Madrid daily *El Sol* throughout its entire run, from 1917 to 1936. *El Sol* was directed through most of that period by José Ortega y Gasset and was the “newspaper of record,” particularly for the intellectual life of the capital. By reading through a newspaper or a set of newspapers over such a lengthy period, it becomes possible to construct a time line that can serve as a kind of armature on which to build specific pieces of research. This is particularly useful in reception studies because of the distinctive S-curve described by the diffusion of an idea or other innovation. Based on such an exercise one could, of course, conduct a content analysis of all articles, recording the incidence of mentions of Freud, Einstein, and so forth (which I did not do) or of articles devoted to their ideas (which I did).¹⁰¹ In any case, the mere act of turning the pages and scanning provides a subjective, cumulative perception of what was going on in that particular intellectual world.

I undertook this reading (in 1974–75) in preparation for what I thought would be a book on the impact of Freud in Spain in this period. But by the time my survey had reached the mid-1920s, it was clear enough that Freud—as an object of news—had been swamped by Einstein. That was surprising, because Spain had a worthy medical tradition and virtually none in physics. My desire to resolve this paradox led to *Einstein y los españoles* (Alianza, 1986), published in English as *Einstein in Spain* (Princeton, 1988). My account of the reception of psychoanalysis, the core of whose narrative was based on the sequence of *El Sol* articles, was published in 1982.¹⁰² Both the Einstein and Freud pieces were based on substantive accounts of the ideas in question as published in scientific and other journals. But the armature originally acquired from *El Sol* can be followed through the footnotes of those studies.

¹⁰⁰Jose Sanchis Banús's published work: “La cuestión del psicoanálisis,” *Archivos de Medicina, Cirugía y Especialidades* 15 (1924): 136–42, 311–18; “Acerca de los trastornos nerviosos originados en la mujer por la práctica sistemática del coitus interruptus y su patogenia (Informe médico legal en una causa por demanda de divorcio),” *Progresos de la Clínica* (1924): 196–230; “Los estudios psiquiátricos y la eugenia,” *El Sol*, April 30, 1932; “Neuropatías producidas o influenciadas por la procreación excesiva o patológica en la pobreza del ambiente,” in *Genética, eugenesia*, 2:377–98.

¹⁰¹See Thomas F. Glick, *Einstein in Spain* (Princeton, N.J., 1988), 84, fig. 1.

¹⁰²Glick, “The Naked Science.”

The use of newspapers as a source for the history of science may be unconventional, but it supplies fine texture that may otherwise be unavailable. For example, *El Sol* tracked important or interesting lectures, providing either an announcement, a brief summary, or even excerpts from the text—important because many lectures were not subsequently published. Such notices also provide incidental information, such as the location of the lecture and sometimes information about the audience. By reading a newspaper in this painstaking fashion, the coincidence and interaction among sets of ideas and the overlap of their protagonists becomes obvious. The Spanish scientific community was heavily centered in Madrid, very small in number, and its members interacted on a daily basis. The resultant high conductivity of ideas is apparent in the newspaper accounts of who attended what lecture and so forth.

Newspapers have, of course, been used to document popular attitudes toward science, an example being Michel Biezunski's *Einstein à Paris* (Paris, 1991), a masterful analysis of popular attitudes toward Einstein and relativity based on an examination of the Parisian press in and around Einstein's 1922 lecture tour in the French capital. But Biezunski's study transcends its ostensible focus and is able to make a number of insightful observations on French science (for example, the way it interacted with both the perception and the reality of German science), made possible by the rich interplay of commentary on Einstein and relativity emanating from all levels of interest: scientists (with varying disciplinary perspectives), litterateurs, politicians, the "man in the street." Newspapers—at least those of European capitals of the 1920s—make possible the study of science within a broader cultural system.

What was true of Madrid and Paris in the 1920s may not be true today. Madrid dailies are now national in scope and their coverage of the local cultural scene is not nearly as inclusive as it was in the days of *El Sol*. For one thing, the scale of culture has changed; for another, Madrid no longer dominates the Spanish science scene to the extent it once did. The style of journalism was quite different in English-speaking countries. It is doubtful that any New York or London daily ever provided the kind of cultural coverage that permitted the construction of my narrative frames.