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One hundred and twenty years after his birth the interest in Wilhelm Reich’s legacy is still going strong. On the one hand, Reich’s seminal psychoanalytic 1933 book, *Character Analysis*, is still a staple of psychoanalytic therapy (Lothane, 2009). On the other hand, Reich’s anti-Nazi stance and his other 1933 book, *Mass Psychology of Fascism*, published in the USA in 1970, is his political, psychosocial, and psychoanalytic interpretation of National-Socialism of Adolf Hitler, dictator and war criminal who started WW II and who, with the help of his executioners (Goldhagen, 1996), carried out the genocide of European Jews (Hilberg, 1961) and culturecide, the destruction of East European Jewish culture. At a further remove, Nazi rule and policies also affected the fate of organized psychoanalysis in Germany, Austria, the other lands occupied by Hitler—and in America as well—before, during and after WW II.

**Psychoanalysis and the Holocaust**

Two recent books, Andreas Peglau’s (2013) *Unpolitische Wissenschaft? Wilhelm Reich und die Psychoanalyse im Nationalsozialismus* (unpolitical science? W.R. and psychoanalysis in National Socialism) and Anthony D. Kauders’ (2014) *Eine Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Deutschland* (a history of psychoanalysis in Germany) narrate the history of psychoanalysis in Germany before, during, after the Third Reich. While Peglau places Reich at the center of this story Kauders’ felicitous phrase “the Freud complex,” is also fitting for Reich’s complex, the tragic life of the most gifted, original and controversial of second generation Freudians. A question raised by Peglau in connection with Reich’s life and work is whether psychoanalysis is a political or a nonpolitical science. Behind these themes is hidden the continuing history of the German Angst and soul-searching about WW II and the Shoah, or Holocaust, the anti-Semitic Nazi persecution and genocide of the Jews, including the Nazi engineered expulsion of Jewish
psychoanalysts from Germany and from the German Psychoanalytic Society (Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft, or DPG), founded by Karl Abraham in 1910. The further reason for this larger context is that not only were victims, survivors and their children traumatized by WW II and the Holocaust – the Germans were traumatized as well: the soldiers who bled and died on two fronts, the defeated survivors who came home, and their children. Saying this I do not intend to suggest moral equivalence between the perpetrators and the victims, or minimize the horrors of the Holocaust as crimes against humanity, a tabooed topic for both victims and perpetrators for decades after WW II ended for both the Jewish and German survivors. In Germany, even after the 1946 Nuremberg trials and convictions of the leading Nazi architects of the genocidal “Final Solution” and the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem, the Holocaust and the history of psychoanalysis from 1933 to 1951 were themes veiled by a curtain of denial and silence. However, no less astounding had been the widespread denial by psychoanalysts of the growing Nazi menace from 1933 on after Hitler’s seizure of power. Reich „remained the only psychoanalyst who for years publicly and exhaustively criticized National Socialism“ (Peglau, 2013, p. 506).

Psychoanalysis and the Holocaust after 1985

For psychoanalysts, the post-war silence about the Holocaust was shattered during the 1985 IPA Congress in Hamburg and the publication of two books: Brecht et al.(1985) about psychoanalysis under the Nazis and by Geoffrey Cocks (1985) about psychotherapy in the Third Reich. Kauders (2014) reported that prior to the 1985 Congress sociologist and psychoanalyst Helmut „Dahmer and his coworkers intended to organize a parallel conference with the aim of „overcoming of the past“ in the contemporary political situation, with discussions of such topics as „psychoanalysis under Hitler, Reagan, and Kohl, or psychoanalysis and conformism“; but it never happened“ (p. 277; all translations by HZL). Small wonder: in 1983 Dahmer had been removed as editor of Psyche, the official journal of the German Psychoanalytic Association (DPV Deutsche Psychoanalytische Vereinigung), founded in 1950 by Carl Müller-Braunschweig as splinter group from the DPG, after Dahmer exposed the latter’s
compromising pro-Nazi article published in 1933 in the Nazi sheet *Reichswart* (Nitzschke, 2002), seen as a defamation of the DPV and its members. Years of discord between the DPG and the DPV from 1951 on ended recently in a reconciliation so that now the DPG is a component society of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA). Similarly, for years there was alienation between the orthodox American Psychoanalytic Association and the neo-Freudian American Academy of Psychoanalysis and the William Alanson White Institute. Today we are happily all neo-Freudian.

After 1945 two historiographies have developed in Germany, one orthodox, represented by DPV members, e.g. Werner Bohleber, Ludger Hermanns, and Michael Schröter, and the other revisionist, represented by Helmut Dahmer, Karl Fallend, and Bernd Nitzschke, paralleling the historical political split between the DPG and the DPV. Another question that emerged regarding the history of psychoanalysis under the Nazis was this: was there a break in 1933 because as “Jewish science” psychoanalysis died in the Third Reich as claimed by Goggin & Goggin (2001) and the DPV, or was there a continuity, as argued by the DPG, e.g., by Nitzschke (2002, 2003) and Lothane (2001b, cited by Peglau on p. 29; Lothane, 2003). Peglau has provided additional research demonstrating this continuity with unpublished documentation. Kauders made no reference to these two historiographies.

**Nature vs. culture: Is psychoanalysis a science? Is it a political science?**

The question of whether psychoanalysis is, or can be, nonpolitical is more rhetorical than real for the more basic question is: what is science? Derived from the Latin *scientia*, science, generally speaking, means knowledge, *Wissen*, same as in Greek: *episteme*, that is validated knowledge, as contrasted with *doxa*, or opinion. Strictly speaking, science means studying something material, or tangible. So which science do people have in mind when they say psychoanalysis is or is not science—chemistry, mathematics, physics? And what about social science, once seen as an oxymoron and well established alongside anthropology. Thus, in an all-inclusive sense, science means a systematically accumulated body of observation and knowledge: it applies to natural sciences (*Naturwissenschaften*), involving matter, measurement and quantification, as
well as to cultural or social sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*), the latter concerned with the mind’s immeasurable manifestations such as love, language, beauty, freedom and happiness. But, as Hamlet says, therein lies the rub and a source of frictions among people espousing different opinions, ideas, ideologies and moral values. The concern of the human or social sciences is with the person that lives, loves, and suffers, both as an individual and as a member of a collective, family, society, nation, and the masses, or large groups. If so, here is a related question: is psychology a science? Many answers have been given down the decades.

Now, in the course of the history in the last two centuries, sciences such as chemistry and physics, applied to technology in the production of industrial or military instruments, became *politicized* among nations engaged in economic competition and warfare. A recent example is the science of climatology. On the one hand, experts are often divided in their interpretations of observed facts and theories *intrinsic* to them. The extrinsic factor is the decision what people should do about facts, a choice generally affected by vested interests of industry, finance, and government politics. So far, the only non-controversial, and perhaps non-political, science is mathematics whereas other sciences are prone to becoming infected by politics, ideology, and mythology, as Freud wrote to Einstein in 1933(b):

> It may perhaps seem to you as though our theories are a kind of mythology and, in the present case, not even an agreeable one. But does not every science come in the end to a kind of mythology like this? Cannot the same be said to-day of your own Physics? (p. 211).

In 1933(a) Freud claimed that psychoanalysis, as compared with Marxism, is not a Weltanschauung, i.e., an ideology, for ideology is an almost universal characteristic of these „secessionist movements“ (*Abfallsbewegungen*) that each one of them takes hold of one fragment out of themes in psycho-analysis and makes itself independent of the basis of selecting
the instinct of mastery (*Machtrieb*) [Adler], or ethical conflict, of the mother, or genitality [Reich], and so on (pp. 143-144).

Clearly, such secessions, or heresies, and especially the heresies of Adler and Jung from the libido doctrine, were matters of opinion and ideology, i.e., intrinsic politics. The mutual internal hostility and infighting between the orthodox and the revisionists in psychoanalysis was matched by the extrinsic hostility to psychoanalysis by its psychiatric and other critics. Since Reich is a major focus, the relevant question is how did Reich view the connection between science and politics? The short answer is that he led a double life: on the one hand, intrinsically, as psychoanalyst, he developed his own theory of the psychoanalytic method of treatment, character analysis; on the other hand, extrinsically, he applied these to theories to social and political action.

Already in the *first* decade of the 20th century, and not in the second decade as dated by the two authors, there were already hostile critics of psychoanalysis among psychiatrists, e.g., Richard von Krafft-Ebing in Austria and Gustav Aschaffenburg in Germany, who claimed psychoanalysis is not a science. Freud anticipated this criticism in the 1895 *Studies on Hysteria*:

> It still strikes me myself as strange that the case histories I write should read like short stories [*Novellen*] and that, as one might say, they lack the serious stamp of science. I must console myself with the reflection that the nature of the subject is evidently responsible for this rather than any preference of my own (Freud, 1895, p.160)

Thus, as an empirical science based on observation, Freud’s psychoanalysis was doubly conceived and born: by medicine and by literature (Brandell, 1976, Lothane, 2009, Lothane, 2010a) and forever remained a hybrid of nature and culture, of natural sciences and social sciences. By comparison, Makari’s (2011) history of psychoanalysis is more oriented towards scientism, with an omission of literature.

**Freud’s transition from psychology to sociology**
In addition, there is a need to differentiate psychoanalysis of the individual from psychoanalysis dealing with society. Three alternative perspectives come to mind: society’s needs determine the individual; the needs of individual are primary and society serves the individual; but since both exist, society and individuals must serve each other’s needs. From the beginning, as a healer of the sick soul, Freud was concerned with therapeutic psychoanalysis of the individual, not just starting with the 1916-1917 *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*, as Peglau dates it. As a therapy of society, its findings gradually coalesced with philosophical and sociological concepts and were applied to philosophy itself, to psychology, philology, biology, art, literature, and education (Freud, 1913). After a first step in *Totem and Taboo* Freud turned explicitly sociological in his 1921 *Group Psychology and Ego Analysis*: he meant large groups, called masses, *Massen* in German as defined in the first paragraph:

The contrast between individual psychology and social or group psychology (*Massenpsychologie*), which at first glance may seem to be full of significance, loses a great deal of its sharpness when it is examined more closely. It is true that individual psychology is concerned with the individual man and explores the paths by which he seeks to find satisfaction for his instinctual impulses; but only rarely and under certain exceptional conditions is individual psychology in a position to disregard the relations of the individual to others. It the individual’s mental life someone else is invariably involved, as a model, as an object, as a helper, as an opponent; and so from the very first individual psychology, in the extended and justifiable sense of the words, is at the same time social psychology as well (SE, 18:69).

Other sociological works by Freud followed in 1920, 1927 and 1930 (Rieff, 1959, Roazen, 1971, Lothane, 2012). And here is where Reich comes in: he too moved from individual psychology to mass psychology and was a pioneer of psychoanalysis as a social science before Fromm, Adorno, and Horkheimer.

In defining the Freud Komplex as a “cluster of feelings, pictures, and thoughts“ Kauders is perplexed by the “German special way (*Sonderweg*) of handling the role of Romanticism in German thinking about the psyche“ (p. 16) and by the lack of consensus about instincts and free association. Kauders’ perplexity reflects the lack of a clear demarcation and differentiation, a longstanding problem of psychoanalysts themselves (Lothane, 2001c) between: (1) the psychoanalytic *method* of healing (*Heilen*) and
research (*Forschung*) and the exploration of unconscious processes with the technique of free association, as the fundamental methodological instrument and (2) the psychoanalytic theories of the cause of disorders, i.e., Freud’s doctrines of the sexual libidinal drives and the death instinct. Healing is not properly practiced the way Kauders describes it, as “illuminating the secrets of the instincts, the unconscious, repression, and the Oedipus complex by means of free association with a trained analyst” (p. 17). This description by Kauders refers to healing by formulas, whereas the genuine psychoanalyst encourages the patient to free associate so as to discover his own personal meanings of dreams, traumas, transferences, and defenses related to his individual’s history of his own life dramas and interactions with others (Lothane, 2009, 2010). Kauders made a passing reference to Reich’s *Massenpsychologie*: „actually the capitalistic economic system ... has suppressed the instincts in order to direct all energy to making profits... [Reich’s] solution of these problems implied abolishing capitalism in order to restore the primacy of sexuality“ (p. 215), a sweeping summary unsupported by citing pages from the 1933 edition of the *Massenpsychologie* in a footnote. Moreover, Kauders’ equating “National-Socialism with emotional surges and ecstatic or intoxicating experiences” (S. 130) fails to do justice to Reich’s complex analysis of the Nazism.

This brings us back to the aforementioned differentiation between factors that are intrinsic to psychoanalysis and those that are extrinsic to it. The intrinsic choice to be Freudian (or Freudist, as in Marxist), focused on sexuality, or neo-Freudian, emphasizing social feelings and emotions hatred, envy and jealousy, played out in the arena of intrinsic theories of psychoanalysis (Lothane, 2003). The latter can easily turn into extrinsic psychoanalytic politics, as happened in the long history of schisms and splits (Freud, 1914), of discord and damage done by rivalry, malicious gossip and character assassination. In these confrontations it was forgotten what applies to patients as well as analysts: that generalizations and patterns are not per se causes of human actions and interactions in concreted historical situations, to individuals as drámatíus personaæ in real life, with their appearance, character, style, emotional makeup, at a particular time and place and culture, motivated a pursuit of popularity, power, prestige—and profit.

Such dramas of complexes and conflicts were enacted by psychoanalysts both intra muros and extra muros, within the psychoanalytic establishment and in the arena of
society at large. Examples from the history of psychoanalysis were the wars between Melanie Klein and Anna Freud, or Freud’s dislike of Harald Schultz-Hencke, who was removed from the IPA 1951 even as he asserted that same year that he had never denied Freud. Similarly, his student Karen Horney was kicked out of the New York Psychoanalytic Society by “true” Freudsians in 1941 and also from the American Psychoanalytic Association and to found the American Institute for Psychoanalysis and the the journal the American Journal of Psychoanalysis, still going strong. But who is a “true” Freudian today, seeing how Kleinians, Bionians, Lacanians, relationals and many other group now share the analytic stage? Aren’t we all neo-Freudian today? (Lothane, 2016a)

Moreover, it is noteworthy that Freud (1914) not only saw psychoanalysis as a new science but also as an establishment, a movement (psychoanalytische Bewegung) of people grouped around him and working together to advance their shared professional ideas, a term usually linked to a political movement, e.g., die zionist Bewegung, or a political party, with its ideology, politics, and practical platform. It is not just what an ideology is but what an ideology does (Mannheim, 1952). Moreover, Bewegung also implies group loyalty as demonstrated by ideological adherence to a ruling doctrine such that deviating from the doctrine can result in excommunication and expulsion from the movement, as happened to Adler and Jung and Stekel, even though the latter was not a heretic but whom Freud detested personally, as expressed in such puns as “Stekel ist ein Ekel” (a disgust), or “St. Ekel.”

Wilhelm Reich’s tragic complex

The most notorious—and tragic—case of expulsion turned out to be Wilhelm Reich. From the time of his meteoric rise to fame in Vienna as gifted analyst, teacher and thinker, and later other parts of Europe and in the USA as therapist and discoverer of orgone energy, Reich was met with distrust and defamation as schizophrenic and paranoid, branded as a trouble maker, and eventually destroyed in the USA. There were five reasons for Reich getting in trouble, and, ironically, it started with Freud’s icy
gesture of rejection when in 1926 Reich handed Freud the manuscript of his future book of 1927, *Die Funktion des Orgasmus*.

(1) *Too much sex*: Freud’s could-shouldered Reich with the remark: “That thick?” Parenthetically, it should be noted that the word orgasm does appear in Freud’s canonical 1905 *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. Even more surprisingly, Freud had forgot how much of a Reichian, i.e., sexologically and sociologically oriented, he had been in an 1908 essay on sexuality, not cited by Peglau. In that 1908 essay on „Civilized sexual morality,“ influenced by the Prague philosopher von Ehrenfels, Freud stated:

> The differentiation between the sexes makes it necessary…to admit a *double* morality standard for them. But a society which accepts this double morality is bound to induce concealment of truth, false optimism, self-deception [causing] an increase…of modern nervous illness (p. 182). Unconscious complexes (repressed) ideational complexes …have a sexual content. They spring from the sexual needs of people who are unsatisfied and thus represent a kind of substitutive satisfaction. We must therefore view all factors which impair sexual life, suppress its activity and distort its aims as being pathogenic factors in the psychoneuroses (p. 186; emphasis Freud’s).

Freud’s rejecting attitude, I submit, caused Reich to become acutely depressed which apparently reactivated an old tuberculous lesion, as told by Reich’s first wife Annie to her daughter Lore Reich Rubin (2003). It is known that the Koch bacillus is only a necessary but not a sufficient cause of falling ill with tuberculosis. Reich made a good recovery in Davos, Switzerland. At that time Reich was 30 years old and sexually vigorous while Freud was 71 and sexually inactive since his forties. In their theories, both Freud and the older first generation Freudians were turning from the libido theory towards ego psychology so that Reich’s interest in the Aktual-Neurosen, genitality and orgasm appeared both off-putting and anti-psychoanalytic. Reich’s second analyst, Paul Federn (1871-1950) slandered Reich to Freud as schizophrenic but Freud still defended Reich at this stage.

(2) *Individual psychology vs. sociology: sex and Marxism*. The second bone of contention between Reich and Freud was Reich’s stress on sociology and social reform vs. Freud’s abiding interest in individual psychology, in spite of transitioning to sociology in 1921. Freud focused on sex as cause of neurosis in the individual, whereas
Reich made a transition to the sexual hygiene as crucial to the cure and prevention of neurosis in society.

In 1942 Reich reminisced: “On December 12, 1929 I gave my talk on the prophylaxis of the neuroses in Freud’s inner circle” (S 165). The fight was against the increasing attempts to do away with the psychoanalytic theory of sex, and to evade its social consequences (S. 168). In the course of these evenings, […] Freud for the first time clearly stated those views which in 1931 [actually 1930] were published in “Civilization and its Discontents”. In that essay, in contrast to views espoused in 1908, Freud maintained that both the individual and society at large are destined to renounce the hope of gratifying the sexual instinct and accept sublimation as a solution, a pessimistic view of mankind that stood in opposition to Reich’s reformist optimism and revolutionary programs.

The second source of friction was Reich’s espousal of Marxism. In 1930 Reich’s published an article proposing an integration of Marx, Hegel, and Freud, an extract “from a longer study of „dialectical materialism and psychoanalysis“ which Reich published in 1929 in the Moscow journal Pod Snaminjem Marxisma (in Russian: znameniem: under the banner of Marxism), both in Russian and German. Reich strove to combine Hegel and Freud in „the attempt to show the dialectics of certain typical processes in human psychic life as which according to our conception could not have been achieved without applying the psychoanalytic method“ (p. 235). Unfortunately, according to Reich, Freud (1933a) misunderstood philosophical Marxism: “Karl Marx’s investigations into the economic structure of society and into the influence of different economic systems upon every department of human life have in our days acquired an undeniable authority (176). …The assertions contained in Marx’s theory that struck me as strange: such that the development of forms of society is a process of natural history, or that the changes in social strarification arise from none another in the manner or a dialectical process“ (p. 177), for „the strength of Marxism clearly lies not in not its view of history or its prophecies the future that are based on it“ (p. 178). However, Freud also attempted to find a balance between nothing-but versus this-as-well-as-that approach in Marxism:
If anyone were in a position to show in detail the way in which these different factors—the general inherited human disposition, its racial variations and its cultural transformations—inhibit and promote one another under the conditions of social rank, profession and earning capacity—if anyone were able to do this, he would have supplemented Marxism so that it was made into a genuine social science (p. 179)

This passage was immediately followed by the aforecited quotation on page 4 above.

Isaiah Berlin (1963) showed that „dialectical“ actually meant Marx’s repressive historical materialism: “the history of society is the history of the inventive labors that alters man, alters his desires, habits, outlook, relationship both to other men and to physical nature, with which man is in perpetual physical and technical metabolism” (p. 106).

Even the Nazis understood this, quoting Marx himself, in the nazified Philosophisches Wörterbuch (Schmidt, 1934):

**Historical materialism**: The mode of production of material life generally conditions the social, political, and spiritual life processes. It is not the consciousness of the person that determines being (Sein), but, on the contrary, it is their social being that determines a person’s consciousness” (Marx). However, it should not be overlooked that the development of ethics, law, philosophy, religion, literature, and art are based on economy. National Socialism has for all intents and purposes disposed of Marxism and historical materialism both theoretically and practically (p. 394).

Actually, my main purpose is to show that both systems, the Marxists and the Nazis, subjugated the individual to the dictatorship of the state.

It is curious that Marx’s word “economic” was adopted by Freud to formulate his sexual theory as the economic, or energetic, definition of the sexual instinct. Later Reich applied the word to his concept of “sex economy.” For Marxism the reductionist essence of sociology was production economy, for Freudism the reductive factor was the economy/energy of sexual libido, for Reichism, sex economy would eventually come to mean orgone energy, experimental proof of cosmic and orgasmic sexual energy.

Above all, Freud was greatly outraged by Reich’s political revolutionary Marxism. Between 1928 and 1933 Reich became a member first of the Austrian Socialist and then of the Austrian Communist Party, acting as political agitator (Fallend, 2002). At
that time, after his trip to the Soviet Union in 1929, Reich still saw Lenin’s 1917 revolution as having liberated Russia from the Czar and a new dawn for Russia and for mankind, a guarantee for democracy and sexual freedom for the masses (see below).

(3) An attack on the death instinct: In 1920 Freud introduced a far-reaching innovation, the theory of the death instinct. Peglau writes: “on 19.12.1931 Reich read a paper at a meeting of Berliner Psychoanalysts on The sexual economy of the masochistic character, which he then submitted for publication in Internationalen Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse [IZP] under the title „The masochistic character A sex-economic refutation of the death instinct and the compulsion to repeat. “...Like [Erich] Fromm, Reich did this without attacking Freud“ personally (S. 131). Erich Fromm was another prominent Marx sympathizer and like Reich was expelled from the IPV in 1956 (Roazen, 2001). Reich’s daughter Lore Reich Rubin (2003) wrote that her father was kicked out of the IPA due to the hostile maneuvering by Anna Freud.

Freud’s reaction to Reich’s paper on the death instinct was vehement and hostile: he demanded that the article be preceded by a footnote from Otto Fenichel, IZP’s editor, that “This journal grants full freedom of expressing ideas. In the case of Herr Reich the reader should be forewarned that the author is a member of the Bolshevist Party. It is however well known that the Bolshevism sets the same limits to the freedom of scientific research as the Church. Obedience to the Party demands the anything that contradicts its own doctrines of salvation should be rejected” (Nitaschke, 2002, p. 122-123). This footnote was not printed and the paper was published along with a rebuttal article by Siegfried Bernfeld which Reich found unsatisfactory. As Peglau cited, “On 1.1.1932 Freud made a note in his diary: „Protracted stomach bout—Action against Reich“ (p. 133). On Jan. 17, 1932 Freud wrote to Jeanne Lampl-de Groot: “I have begun the battle against the Bolshevistic aggressors Reich, Fenichel” (cited in Roazen, 2001). Reacting to Freud’s aforementioned footnote Reich had protested to the IZP in 1932 and told the following to Kurt Eissler when he was interviewed by him in 1952:

My criticism of the doctrine of the death instinct has nothing whatever to do with the Communist Party...At my specific request they informed that they assumed no responsibility for my scientific struggle within the Association, that such polemics would entirely at my own risk. ...At the same time I was requested by Dr. Eitingon not to bring up any sociological aspects in the Association [after] my
transfer to the Berlin local group…The paper “The Masochistic Character” [Reich, 1932] is basically an analytic critique which is not one step removed from analytic empiricism. It is in the nature of things that the direction of my psychoanalytic research, which is consistent with the basic elements of analytic doctrine and carries them further, should have political consequences, and the recently developed instinctual theories are intended to avoid these consequences. For the record let me note that I criticized the doctrine of the death instinct at a time when I knew nothing about Marxism except that it existed (see discussion with Alexander, written down in 1926). It was not Marxism that caused me to criticize the empirically unproven hypotheses leading to horrendous conclusions (death instinct, repetition compulsion), but it was analytic empiricism that brought me to Marxism. After all, aside from individual psychological motives, the question why psychoanalysis deviated from its initial biological path could essentially be explained in sociological terms alone (Reich, 1967, S. 156-157).

Note Reich’s polite response, avoiding any criticism of Freud as head of a movement that demanded obedience to the party line, i.e., psychoanalytic orthodoxy as defined by Freud himself or any of his followers.

(4) The Sex-Pol movement: In 1927, still in Vienna, Reich became active in the sex hygiene movement that promoted sex education for young people and counseling about contraception and abortion, both in outpatient clinics and in public lectures. After moving to Berlin, Reich proposed to the KPD (German Communist Party) to consolidate the various organizations, with a membership of 350,000 and fighting for free birth control and abortions. The KPD agreed and made Reich head of the German Federation for Proletarian Sexual Politics (Reichsverband für Proletarische Sexualpolitik) (Boadella, 1974) which held its first congress in Düsseldorf in 1931. The program Reich organized for that meeting seemed to him in harmony with the 1919 Soviet reforms. Even though Reich joined his sex-pol (sexual politics) activities with the KPD and brought in new members, as time went on, the party bosses were against Reich’s reformist sexual hygiene activities and kicked him out of the party. Reich was also opposed by the Soviets under Stalin, by the aforementioned Zalkind, and by his elder colleagues in Freud’s inner circle, e.g., Paul Federn. Interestingly, Reich and Arthur Koestler had belonged to the same cell in the KPD. Koestler would abjure communism in The God that Failed of 1952 and Reich in 1969.

(5) Reich as enemy of the people: Reich crossed the Rubicon when in 1933 when his contract to publish Character Analysis by the IPA publishing company was canceled,
forcing him to publish the book privately and also publish his next book, / On the sexual economy of the political reaction and proletarian sexual politics (Massenpsychologie des Faschismus Zur Sexualökonomie der politischen Reaktion und zur proletarischen Sexualpolitik) published by the Verlag für Sexualpolitik, in Copenhagen (henceforth referred to as Massenpsychologie). Moreover, Reich got under the radar of the Nazi police as a communistic anti-fascist. Rather than risk imprisonment in the newly opened Dachau concentration camp, Reich fled in time to Denmark.

In 1933 Reich became a persona non grata for Freud for the same reason he had been for the Nazi rulers of Germany, namely, Reich’s opposition to the Nazi regime. The analysts viewed Reich’s anti-Nazi stance as endangering the negotiations between Freud, his daughter Anna, Jones, and Felix Boehm to save psychoanalysis as represented by a judenrein DPG and thus acceptable to the Deutsches Institut für psychologische Forschung und Psychotherapie, the so-called Göring Institute, whose wartime history was studied prior to Peglau by Brecht at al. 1985; Dahmer, 1997; Lockot, 1994, 2002; Lockot & Bernhardt, 2000; Lothane, 2001a, 2001b, 2003; Nitzschke, 1997, 1999, 2003). The expulsion of Reich, first from the DPG and then from the IPA was an extrinsic policy dictated by the appeasement politics of the IPA towards the Nazi state so as to “save” psychoanalysis (Lothane, 2001b).

Peglau’s linking Reich with the fates of psychoanalysis in National-Socialism, in agreement with Nitzschke, Dahmer and Lothane, counts as an effort to rehabilitate both Reich and the psychoanalytic establishment (IPA, DPG) struggling to survive in a world ruled by Nazi terror from 1933 on and later, when Auschwitz and other extermination camps were a hell that nobody could as yet have imagined. As noted above, Reich was the only one who saw the writing on the wall and Cassandra-like warned his colleagues of the impending catastrophe (Peglau, p. 505) despite the widespread denial and dismissal of the Nazi menace by Jewish intellectuals and ordinary people alike. But the furore over Reich’s Marxism and communism and Massenpsychologie were actually an intramural matter, more important to Freud and the IPA and other leftist Freudians, in the effort to accommodate the Nazi-controlled DPG, than to the Nazi-Regime as a whole. (Incidentally, a propos leftist Freudians and Reich, it has recently been revealed that a number of leading American analysts had been members of the American Communist
Party.) Freud urged Felix Boehm to rid him of Harald Schultz-Hencke for his dissident theories and of Reich for his political agitation, an embarrassment at a time when Max Eitingon, daughter Anna, and Ernest Jones were negotiating to “save” psychoanalysis in Nazi Germany. However, as Nitzchke and Peglau have shown, “Psychoanalysis as a whole was never persecuted by the Nazis...A substantive corpus of psychoanalytic therepeutic science was accepted and used for practical“ (p. 502); „the bulk of psychoanalytic publications was not put on an index and both Freud’s theories and terminology were often openly and positively evaluated and utilized“ (p. 503). This was also the spirit of the objective entries „Freud, Sigmund“ (p. 192) and “Psychoanalyse” (p. 518) in the aforementioned Schmidt’s *Philosophisches Wörterbuch*, where the following reservation was added: „P.[sychoanalysis]—as whole—is being combated more and more as an „alien,“ “mechanistic-materialistic” thinking, even though certain discoveries of Freud can be recognized as progress“(p. 519).

In summary: the whole Reich sandal in the DPG and the IPA had neither a negative impact on the functioning of the Göring Institute nor was it of great consequence for the Nazi state and the expulsion of Jewish psychoanalysts and other doctors who were maligned, jailed, or murdered (Eckart, 2000). Reich was only one of many undesirables; anyway, his infuriating and indexed books were published after he escaped from Germany. What is truly welcome is the contribution Peglau makes to a “new reappraisal, a new appreciation of of Wilhelm Reich in the body of the history of science“ (p. 505), citing Helmut Dahmer’s work. Here I would also like to call attention to the 1984 book by Reich’s German-Israeli colleague and admirer Walter Hoppe (1900-1981, München) whom I met in Israel in 1955. Hoppe who worked as a psychiatrist in Berlin in the 1920’s and left Germany in 1932 to settle in Palestine, corresponded with Reich for years. Hoppe and Norwegian Ola Raknes (1970), another Reich admirer, attended the First International Orgonomic Conference in 1948 in Orgonon, in Rangeley, Maine. In his book Hoppe collected appreciations and defamations of Reich and stories of scientists down the ages who, like Reich, were either misunderstood or persecuted.

Kauders discusses Reich mostly in connection with the post-war West German student revolt while and mentions Hitler only in passing and not even in his Register: once or twice in the text, e.g., when citing the British historian Kershaw; otherwise
Kauders has nothing to say about Hitler as a Führer of the masses. I can neither understand nor accept Kauders’ view of anti-Semitism as a problem of “emotions” (p. 131), as “differentiating a „rational“ antisemitism from and „emotional“ one, as was asserted by Hitler” (p. 134). For Reich antisemitism was completely irrational; to the judges in Nuremberg was a matter of crimes against humanity; for Goldhagen (1996) it was a blood-thirsty eliminationist antisemitism with deep roots in German history.

In this connection Kauders formulated the following romantic thesis about Nazi emotions:

When we take a look at the last years of the Weimar Republic and the first years of the „Third Reich“, with their street fights and parades, outbursts of violence, and torch rallies, we are confronted with a diametrically opposed emotional culture, that was as much a part of National-Socialism as the implacable harshness of the SS-elites...The reactions to Freud and the Jews as carriers of an allegedly contrary emotional culture that was cold, rational, and intellectual (p. 136).

This is a confused and naive argument based on mixing up historical facts: gang street violent outbursts were premeditated actions aided and abetted by the Nazis culture of violence, a dress rehearsal for the reign of terror of the Third Reich and the Holocaust to come after 1933, by Hitler and the cruel Nazis elites as the dictators of a nazified Germany. The German students, members of the various violent fraternities, who burned Freud’s books were not just reacting to what they perceived as the cold and rational Freud—they couldn’t have cared less—were young fanatics who shared Nazi racist policies, set up their own Nazi party and its radical political platform, and supported the exclusion of Jewish students from universities based on race and religion. The students performed accordingly on the streets of Berlin: „Against the mind-frazzling overvaluation of the instincts, for the nobility of the human soul! I deliver to fire the writings of Sigmund Freud.“

Peglau, on the other hand, discusses Hitler and cites numerous past and recent secondary reactions to Reich but leaves out presenting Hitler’s own ideas as expressed in Mein Kampf and cited by Reich in Massenpsychologie but has not quotations from Mein Kampf, due to a long-standing government ban on Hitler’s book (even though it was
available on the internet), allegedly to prevent a resurgence of neo-Nazis. It is doubtful that this ban made any difference but the population was prevented from debating Hitler’s delusions and lies in homes, schools, churches, town meetings, mass meetings, in the press, academic articles and books.

Reich used ‘Faschismus’ and ‘Nationalsozialismus’ interchangeably, which calls for a clarification. The aforementioned nazified Schmidt dictionary defined Faschimus as a creation of Benito Mussolini for whom

Fascism: The individual has the duty—including the use of external violence that gradually seeks to reassure the person’s internality—ultimately to serve the community with his thinking, feeling, willing, and acting. In fascism, the liberty of the individual is merged completely with the omnipotence of the State: the latter is concentrated in the dictatorship of the ‘Duce’ (the leader) and the hierarchically structured system of subordinate leaders established by him. Fascism is thus nationalistic, imperialistic, aristocratic, and with an absolutist pinnacle (p.178-179).

While this definition also applies to National Socialism, the latter has these added features:

Nationalism, is the self-consciousness of the political unity of a nation feeling its own politico-cultural values. The care for its people is its most urgent task. „The care for its own people is its most urgent task“, like the „sacro egoismo“ of the Italians.

Nationalsocialism is a „Volkspolitik (national politics) carried out by Adolf Hitler based on the new and yet ancient securely established world outlook of the worth of the blood...implying essentially that a certain type of a creative soul, a certain specific character, a special spiritual stance is paired with a specific racial shape“ (Alfred Rosenberg). N is „a revival of the idea the all men of German blood, German fate, German history have the same relationship to the world“ (Eschweiler). The Jewish-Roman worldview is replaced by the north-western soul faith, is the inner side of the German mankind, the nordic race. ... N. is an absolute opponent of semitism, basically of any corporal or psychological mixing of races, of liberalism, democratism, individualism, parliamentarism, marxism, pacifism, intellectualism, and rationalism. Contrary to these „isms“ N. insists on purity of the race (the blood), eugenics, totality of the Nazi outlook, socialism (national solidarity, common good, breaking up interest loans), carrying out the Führer-principle in its hierarchical structure (pp. 431-432).
And the Nazi definition of

**Völkisch** is the German translation of the word national. Ernst Krieck defines as völkisch the outlook that is characterized by an interpenetration by the organic (i.e., holistic) heroic worldview. This view knows and acknowledges a higher whole over the individual...that is superior over everything as a space of life and fate, a historically evolved situation and direction, preparing for political revolution and war. Therefore it has to be strengthened and completed by the heroic worldview that contains everything. No longer education of the spirit, no longer humanity, no longer culture as the highest goal and fulfillment of life but the education of the will, formation of character, justification of acting in the service of völkisch-historical becoming (S. 706).

Finally,

**Values** [invoking] Nietzsche’s “transvaluation of values,” National-Socialism also strives to achieve a complete and radical reversal of values: race a primary biological value, race theory as a moral value, as the highest value of the State, as the political unity of the völkisch Nation (p. 726). The Nazi authority cited was Rosenberg’s *Myth of the 20th Century*.

This dictionary also defined

**Antisemitism**, a movement directed against the leadership and hegemony of the Jews on the spiritual, economic, and political realm, that perceives the Jews as an alien, culture-destroying race, as a foreign body in the German traditional folklore (Volkstum), and wants to have it treated as such...Based on biological and racial principles, is antisemitism one of the most important programs of National-Socialism (p. 31).

These ideas were written as laws into the Nazi Constitution (Huber, 1937), resulting in the disenfranchising the Jews as German citizens, that were drummed into the ears of the young and the old during every public event and and ever-present in every political or social domain.

Finally, Schmidt also defined

**Mass psychology**: scientific investigation of the psychological behavior of masses. “Under certain conditions, and only in those, a gathering of people acquires new characteristics. Die conscious personality is wiped out, the feelings and thoughts of individuals are oriented in the same. A collective soul is formed. Especially conspicuous manifestations of the mass psyche are mass suggestion and mass psychosis. See Massenpsychologie und Ichanalyse, 1921 (pp. 392-393).
This is a remarkable citation of Freud by the Nazis despite the public burning of his books.

**Reich’s Mass Psychology of Fascism**

There were three German editions of the *Massenpsychologie*, the first two in 1933 and 1934, the third in 1969. In the “Preface” to the 1933 original edition Reich wrote: “This book was written in the course of the growth of the reactionary tide in Germany from 1930 to 1933. Its purpose is to offer the young and developing sex-political movement a certain theoretical foundation (1933, p.10). After he settled in America, from 1942 to 1944, Reich worked on the text, a typescript of 421 pages, showing numerous corrections in Reich’s handwriting, plus a new 22 page long “Preface” to the “III. Revised and enlarged edition” dated “Maine, August 1942.” In the “Preface” Reich wrote: “The „Mass Psychology of Fascism“ was written in the crisis years 1930-1933. It was written down in 1933 and appeared in the first edition in September 1933 and the second edition in 1934 in Denmark. The Fascists banned the book and the entire political psychology literature in 1935. Since then 10 years have passed” (Reich, 1969, p. XI). In 1969 Mary Boyd Higgins gave permission to Kiepenheuer & Witsch to publish the 1969 German typescript (personal communication) and sent them her own “Foreword” which was translated into German by Graf. The book was printed twice: in 1971 (351 pages) and 1972 (384 pages), with identical texts differently arranged. The 1933 had 8 Chapters, I to VIII and was 283 pages long; the 1970 had 13 chapters, Chapter IX, “The Masses and the State,” a reprint of an earlier text, dated 1944, and Chapters X to XIII, the enlarged part of the book, with added remarks dated “1944.” In 1970 Higgins published the English translation of the German original, 400 pages long.

Surprisingly, whereas Peglau lists the 1971 edition in his bibliography as “Reich, Wilhelm (1986 [1971]), all his citations are actually taken from the original 283 long 1933 edition, reprinted by Junius Verlag in 1972, and there are no citations from either the new “Preface” or the added chapters. This manner of citing has created a number of gaps, because the additions or corrections do not alter the original ideas but only make them clearer and also show how Reich’s ideas have kept evolving. The third edition thus
gives us a more complete portrait of the man in his historical continuity. Here are some examples.

Already in the 1933 “Preface” (cited by Peglau), Reich stated that his was a call to German working-class youth to reverse the „harsh defeat of the German working class,“ to counteract the organized “hourly warlike transformation of its youth“ and to secure the „victory of international socialism“ (p. 4): „not with polite phrases...not with appeals, but by arousing genuine revolutionary excitement...with real democratic workers‘ organizations giving space to initiative and troops fighting with conviction“ (pp. 5-6). To be victorious in this struggle between the revolutionary socialists against the reactionary national-socialists, the latter have to be beaten at their own game: “Precisely the subjective conviction of the many millions of Hitler supporters regarding the socialist mission of National-Socialism, in spite of the very cruelty and suffering it brought upon Germany, is a powerful asset for a socialist future“ (p. 6). One fights fire with fire, enthusiasm with enthusiasm: the conviction of the „mortal enemy“ (p. 7) is capable “of filling the masses with a deeper conviction...that the fighting will of youth is indeed on our side; the will of youth for the joy of life will be the most powerful energy of the revolution“ (p. 8). Therefore a scientist may not remain „unpolitical“ – he must become political and socially committed, as Reich himself was all his life.

The definitive 1970 third English edition of The Mass Psychology of Fascism

In the “Preface” and in the new Chapter IX Reich characterized National-Socialism as an organized political expression of the average man’s character...the basic emotional attitude of the suppressed man of our authoritarian machine civilization and its mechanistic-mystical conception of life. It is the mechanistic-mystical character of the modern man that produces fascism, and not vice versa (p. xiii, italics Reich’s)...As a political movement, fascism...is borne and championed masses of people...the toiling masses should be just as clear about their responsibility for fascism...The fascist racial theory...is not a product of fascism. On the contrary: it is fascism that is a product of racial hatred and is its politically organized expression. It follows from this that there is a German, Italian, Spanish, Anglo-Saxon, Jewish, and Arabian fascism. Race ideology is a pure biopathic expression of the character structure of the orgastically impotent man (p. xiv; his italics). The word fascism is not a word of abuse any more than
the word capitalism is. It is a concept denoting a very definite kind of mass leadership and mass influence; authoritarian, one party system, hence totalitarian, a system in which power takes priority over objective interests, and facts are distorted for political purposes. Hence there are “fascist Jews” just as there are “fascist Democrats” (IX. *The Masses and the State*, p. 214).

Reich’s analysis of fascism and National-Socialism gives pause for thought as prescient of the current resurgence of neo-Nazism, populism, and racism in the world and the polarization between right-wing and left-wing ideologies. What also comes to mind are proxy confrontations between the superpowers, as predicted by George Owerll in *1984* and happening now in Syria; the ongoing conflict between Israel and the Palestinianans and their proxies; the West vs. militant Islam; and last but not least, the perceived menace of the Trump government—many of these entities have been branded as or compared with Hitler and his regime but neither were the USA or Israel ever fascistic in the manner of the Lenin, Stalin, or Hitler regimes. There is a difference between Hitler’s and Trump’s belligerent militarism, nationalism, and racism: Hitler, the most hated fiend of mankind, implemented these to destroy Jews and many parts of Europe, including Germany, Trump used them as self-serving propaganda that energized large groups to elect him.

At the beginning of “Chapter I. Ideology as a material force,” Reich added the following passage: “The German freedom movement prior to Hitler was inspired by Karl Marx’s economic and social theory. Hence, an understanding of German fascism must proceed from the understanding of Marxism” (1970, p. 3).

Reich described how this situation evolved:

As so many works of great thinkers, Marxism also degenerated to follow formulas and lost its scientific revolutionary potency in the hands of Marxist politicians. They were so entangled in everyday political struggles that they failed to develop the principles of a vital philosophy of life handed down by Marx and Engels. To confirm this, one need merely compare Sauerland [the German spelling, HZL], Salkind [Russian spelling: Zalkind] and Pieck’s books with Marx’s and Engels’ books (names omitted). Scientific Marxism degenerated into “vulgar Marxism (1970, p. 7).
The name to remember is Russian-Jewish neurologist and psychiatrist Aron Borisovich Zalkind (1888-1936), first, one of the founders of psychoanalysis in czarist Russia, later, Soviet functionary who became a dogged critic of Reich’s sexual theories and practices.

Reich reasoned as follows:

Rationally considered, one would expect economically wretched masses of workers to develop a keen consciousness of their social situation; one would further expect this consciousness to harden into a determination to rid themselves of their social misery. In short, one would expected the socially wretched working man to revolt against the abuses to which he was subjected and to say: „After all, I perform responsible social work. It is upon me and those like me that the weal and ill of society rests. I myself assume the responsibility for the work that must be done.“ In such a case, the thinking („consciousness“) of the worker would be in keeping with the social situation. The Marxist called it „class consciousness.“ We want to call it „consciousness of one’s skills,“ or „consciousness of one’s own responsibility.“ The cleavage [split] between the social situation of the working masses and their consciousness of the situation implies that instead of improving their social position, the working masses worsen it. It is precisely the wretched masses who helped to put fascism, extreme political reaction, into power (p. 10).

Reich was shocked by this split: the workers did not seek redress and support from either the socialists or the communists but voted for Hitler and the Nazi party who gained a third of the seats in the Reichstag. Losing to Trump, Hillary Clinton was similarly shocked to loose to Trump as the blue collar workers‘ savior getting their vote. I am not suggesting that Trump’s ideology is like Hitler’s ideology, but that they are similar in their method of appealing to the masses: addressing feelings and emotions, the emotional brain, seducing the crowds with vague generalities along with calumnies, lies, and false facts and promises. Clinton addressed the frontal cortex, reason and responsibility, operating with rational arguments about economic facts and needed remedies. As the proverb has it, a lie can travel halfway around the world while the truth is putting on its shoes. Swift wrote in The Examiner, Nov. 9, 1710: “Falsehood flies, and the truth comes limping after it” (the internet).

In 1970 Reich also made changes in his terminology; in the 1933 edition Reich stated that Marx’s theory left „a gap filled by analytic psychology“ (p. 29) which in 1970 was changed to „by character analysis“(p. xi). Transitioning from individual psychology to social and mass psychology Reich devotes two chapters, “II. The Authoritarian
Ideology in the Mass Psychology of Fascism“ and „III. The Race Theory,” to an analysis of Hitler and his interactions with the masses.

In Chapter II, addressing the long-standing question who makes history, the leader or the masses, Reich’s answer is: “Only when the structure of the führer’s personality is in harmony with the structures of the broad groups can a ‘führer’ make history” (p. 35, his italics).

Reich cited Hitler’s description of his demagogy of addressing the masses in the “broadness of outline…a steady consistent emphasis,…[such]perseverance leads to results that are almost beyond our understanding” (p. 35). Reich attributed Hitler’s success to “man’s authoritarian freedom-fearing structure that enabled his propaganda to take root” and this in spite “of the fact that Hitler held the masses, with whose help he wanted to carry out his imperialism, in complete contempt” (p. 40). Hitler seduced that proletariat, the low, and the middle class (p. 41), “the butlers, valets, and other employees of the aristocratic families,”…an “identification with authority, firm, state, nation etc. which can be formulated “I am the state, the authority, the firm, the nation, a psychic reality and is one of the best illustrations of an ideology that becomes a material force” (p. 47). Does not this sound like Trump seducing the blue collar workers?

In the renamed section “Family Ties and Nationalistic Feeling,” Reich underscores „the patriarchal sexual morality“ enabling a “far-reaching sexual suppression and repression“ (p. 48) of normal infantile and adolescent sexuality. The family becomes the microcosm of society. On the one hand, the „political and economic position of the father is reflected in the patriarchal relationship to the remainder of the family“ and is „reproduces the subservient attitude toward authority in his children, particularly his sons“ (p. 53). On the other hand, „the strictest suppression of the women and the children“ (p. 53) is combined with the mother cult as a foundation of family such that „the tie to the mother...[and the] subjective emotional core [of] the notions of homeland and nation are notions of mother and family“ (p. 57; italics Reich’s). As a result, „the affective anchoring of these structures by means of unconscious anxiety, their concealment by character traits that appear completely asexual, are responsible for the fact that these deep layers of the personality cannot be reached with rational arguments alone“ (p. 55).
Finally Reich shows how the family in Nazi Germany is connected with the calumny of Goebbels, Hitler’s propaganda minister, with things the Jew has inflicted upon our mother Germany [italics mine, WR] and still inflicts upon her! He [the Jew] has debauched our race, sapped our energy, undermined our customs and broken our strength...The Jew is the graphic demon of decay...begins his criminal butchery of people (p. 59).

In another context in Mein Kampf Hitler disparaged the masses as womanly:

The psyche of the great masses is not receptive to half measures or weakness.

Like a woman, whose psychic feeling is influenced less by abstract reasoning than by an indefinable, sentimental longing for complementary strength, who will submit to the strong man rather than dominate the weakling, thus the masses love the ruler rather than the supplicant, and inwardly they are far more satisfied by a doctrine which tolerates no rival than by a grant of liberal freedom; they often feel at a loss what to do with it, and even easily feel themselves deserted. They neither realize the impudence with which they are spiritually terrorized, not the outrageous curtailment of their human liberties, for in no way does the delusion of this doctrine dawn on them. Thus they see only the inconsiderate force, the brutality and the aim of its manifestations to which they finally always submit (p. 56).

The great mass of a people consists neither of professors nor of diplomats. The small abstract knowledge it possesses directs its sentiments rather to the world of feeling. In this is rooted either its negative or positive attitude.It is open only to the expression of force in one of these direactions, and never to a half-measure swaying between them. The sentimental attitude, however, is caused by their exceeding stability. It is more difficult to undermine faith than knowledge, love succumbs to change less than to respect, hatred is more durable than aversion, and at all times the driving force of the most important changes in this world has been found less in a scientific knowledge animating the masses, but rather in a fantacism dominating them and in a hysteria which drove them forward.

He who would win the great masses must know the key which opens the door to their hearts. Its name is not objectivity, that is, weakness, but will power and strength (pp. 467-468).

Reich cited another statement by Hitler from Mein Kampf, that „The people in their overwhelming majority are so feminine by nature and attitude that sober reasoning determines their thoughts and actions far less than emotion and feeling“ (1970, p. 53).
This leads us into Chapter III, “The race theory.” There Reich sees Hitler’s ideology “solely as an expedient to intended to improve the Germanic race genetically and to protect it against racial interbreeding”—blood mixing, racial defilement, racial poisoning of the Aryans—with “inferior” peoples [that] always results in the degeneration of the founders of civilization” (p. 76), elaborated by quotations from _Mein Kampf:_ „running parallel to the political ethical and moral contamination of the people there had been...a no less terrible poisoning...[through] syphilis“; „the cause lies, primarily, in our prostitution of love...This Jewification of our spiritual life and mammonization of our mating instinct will...destroy our offspring“ (p. 81). And Reich concludes: „The irrational fear of syphilis constitutes of the major sources of National Socialism’s political views and anti-Semitism“ (p. 82). After quoting some „nebulous and mystical ideas“ from the book _Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts_ (the myths of the 20th century) by Hitler’s chief ideologue Alfred Rosenberg, convicted for crimes against humanity at the Nuremberg trial, Reich concludes: “Blood poisoning,” “Jewish world plague,” are all part and parcel of the same line that begins with “fight of the blood” and ends the bloody terror against the “Jewish materialism” of Marx and the genocide of the Jews” (pp. 83-84).

One more dynamics is introduced in the renamed VI, „Organized Mysticism as an International Anti-Sexual Organization“ as related to sexual repression of the masses, and especially of young people, by the religious mysticism of the church:

We showed earlier that nationalistic sentiments are a direct continuation of the sentiments of the authoritarian family. But mystical feelings are also a source of nationalistic ideology. Hence, patriarchal family attitudes and a mystical frame of mind are the basic psychological elements of fascism and imperialist nationalism in the masses. In short, it is psychologically confirmed on a mass basis that a mystical upbringing becomes the foundation of fascism when a social catastrophe sets the masses in motion (p. 131).

Furthermore, Reich argued,

The sentimentalism and religious mysticism... are intimately related to... sadistic cruelty... The cohesion of sadistic brutality and mystical sentiments is usually to be met with wherever the normal capacity to experience orgasm is disturbed. And
this is true of a mass murderer of our time as it was of the inquisitor of the Middle Ages or the brutality and mysticism of Philip II of Spain (p. 137).

In both editions of *Mass Psychology* the theory of pathological mysticism as due to sexual dysfunction is not an observation but a hypothesis. It can be countered by another observation that there can be fully orgastically potent men who are willing and able to engage in acts of brutality and violence or that there are orgastically impotent men who do not succumb to mysticism. Historically, the mysticism of the arch-Nazi Heinrich Himmler and his followers had its roots in the revival and practice of a form of pagan religion based on 19th and early 20th century occultist and racialist ideas of occultists and racial theorists like Madame Blavatsky, Guido von List, and Jörg Lanz von Libenfels and their influence on Hitler, Himmler, and Rosenberg (Webb, 1976, Goodrick-Clark, 1992).

Another difference is that Reich predominantly theorized about sex but did not formulate a similarly comprehensive theory of aggression and violence as separate from sex. Thus Reich debated a fellow psychoanalyst and social psychologist, the marxistically-oriented Freudian Erich Fromm, as one of those who failed to draw practical consequences from sex-economic sociology...and to advocate them. More than any other it was Erich Fromm who later managed to disregard completely the sexual problem of masses of people and its relationship to fear of freedom and craving of authority. I was never able to understand this, for I had my reason to doubt the basic honesty of Fromm’s position. But sexual negation in both social and personal life plays many a tick that is inaccessible to rational understanding“ (p. 219).

But there is no trick here, no either-or but rather his-as-well-as that: both sex and aggression play an important role in the psychology of the individual and the masses. There was another cause of the anti-sexual turn among workers and the middle class alike: a reaction to the sexual freedom and a transvaluation of sexual morality in the Weimar Republic, similar to the American reaction to the “roaring twenties” that had been triggered by the sexual revolution that started already during World War I. That sexual revolution was described by the great German doctor, sexologist, and homosexual reformer Magnus Hirschfeld in his 1930 book *Die Sittengeschichte des Weltkrieges* (the moral history of the world war): Hirschfeld noted that reforms inspired by the “activity of
the Weltliga für Sexualreform (world league for sexual reform), whose aims, formulated by its three presidents, [Auguste] Forel, [Havelock] Ellis and Hirschfeld, had already been realized in Russia. The following ten points were formulated in a proclamation at the second congress of the league in Copenhagen, July 1928 (1930, S. 350). Reich’s suggestions were rejected because of his “Communism.” After WW II a new sexual freedom and a strong conservative reaction to it would also develop in Europe and in the United States. Reich would be ensnared as a scapegoat and martyr in the latter, discussed below.

Reich did not discuss homosexuality and its persecution in the Third Reich, although he did discuss the return to anti-homosexual laws in the Soviet Union. Hans Blüher, a prominent figure in the Wandervogel movement between the two world wars, of the idea of a Männerbund, or male bonding with homosexual expressions of mutual admiration and affection, attitudes that were later espoused by the Hitler Jugend (Hitler youth) of the Nazis (Geuter, 1994). Blüher’s teachings “has been systematically inculcated by the Nazi Press, especially Himmler’s official organ, Das Schwarze Korps, and has been adopted in practice as the basis of German social organization. The Nazi élite are being brought up in segregated male communities called Ordensburgen. These are to replace the family as the groundwork on which the state is to rest” (see Hitler Jugend and homosexuality, the internet). Autocracies have been traditionally hostile to LBGT people, democracies were open-minded and tolerant. Donald Trump’s trumping of Clinton with calumnies was enhanced by Trump’s appeal to reactionary attitudes among voters opposed to same-sex marriage and the other variants of sexual fantasy and gratification.

Reich’s sexual theory, or any psychoanalytic theorizing for that matter, calls for a caveat based on these facts: there is a (1) clinical psychoanalysis of the individual and an (2) applied psychoanalysis of living or dead persons who are not patients and of social groups, and neither kind can yield a definitive analysis of a life or a social group. Thus Reich’s sexual energetics and exegetics offer only an approximate analysis of the totality of economic, financial, military political, social, ideological and religious causal factors at any place and time of historical dramas and developments. Thus Reich’s or Fromm’s or any other theories illuminate rather than fully explain how Hitler and the Nazis were
able to become a political, industrial, and military juggernaut that first swallowed all of Germany and went on to conquer most of Europe and parts of North Africa during WW II.

The new Chapter IX, “The Masses and the State,” updated in 1944, is an extremely rich text and there is only space for a few highlights. Here Reich reviewed the history and ideology of the Weimar Republic between the two world wars, of the Russian Revolution, of Leninism and Stalinism, developments in Europe and the United States, and more. He also told here the story of his disillusionment with Soviet communism already in 1929, at the height of his romancing Marxism: “The prediction in 1929 that Soviet democracy would deteriorate into a totalitarian dictatorship was based on the fact that the sexual revolution in the Soviet Union was not only checked but almost intentionally suppressed. Sexual suppression serves...to mechanize and enslave the masses” (p. 215, italics Reich’s). Lenin’s political platform was delineated in the “Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Eighth Party Congress, 1919), “proof of the genuine democratic character of its efforts...[guaranteeing] the free, self-determination of the masses of people”(p. 248; Reich’s italics). Whereas Reich first praised the Soviets for having promulgated, already during the 1917 revolution, such progressive ideas as legal equality of men and women, sexual freedom, ease of secular divorce, abortion and children born out of wedlock, decriminalization of homosexuality, and a total rejection of religion, he also warned that “they got stuck in legal formalism...it founndered,...No program advocating freedom has any chance of success unless also effected in man’s present biopathic sexual structure”(p. 249; his italics).

However, the eyebrows-raising part of Reich’s portrait of Lenin is his lack of awareness of the hidden authoritarian aspect of political Leninism. While he liberated the Russian from the czarist oppression, Lenin camouflaged his real dictatorship with such slogans as dictatorship of the proletariat and the withering (Absterben) of the state. But Reich remained completely oblivious of Lenin acting as a “red terror” dictator in a campaign of mass killings, torture, and systematic political repression conducted by the Bolshevik CheKa, the Emergency Committee, the secret police for combating counter-revolution, speculation and sabotage, of which the chief and executioner was the Polish aristocrat turned communist, Felix Edmundowich Dzherschinski, known as the infamous
Iron Felix, who ordered untold number of people tortured or killed for any expression of opposition to the Soviet state. Reich’s naiveté can be understood as a proselytizing for social activism, as a means to maintain an ongoing contact with the masses for whom he wanted a better future, thus as an opportunity to be in touch with great numbers of young people whose poverty and sexual misery he sought to alleviate. Reich also rhapsodized about Lenin’s 1923 “New Economic Policy” (NEP), a return to bourgeois economy, as showing “insight and openness” when actually it was Lenin’s opportunism, as he had stated himself: “The economy imposed upon communism by the war has confronted us with unforeseen difficulties. We have to go back a step…we are giving private enterprise a bit of freedom—we have no other choice—but we know exactly what we are doing” (p. 261). Similarly, following the outbreak of WW II Stalin would relax his hostility to the Russian Orthodox Church in order to get popular support for his war effort. After Lenin’s death in 1924 Stalin began to consolidate his power with the help of Jewish comrades Lev Kamenev, Grigory Zinoviev and Leon Trotsky. Following the murder of Sergei Kirov, Stalin launched massive purges against patriots viewed as enemies of the state, his erstwhile helpers Kamenev and Zinoviev were tried and imprisoned in a Siberian Gulag and then convicted in a show trial and executed. This was also the fate of two of Sabina Spielrein’s brothers, active in the revolution, who were exiled and executed in 1937 (Lothane, 2016c). Stalin went on to build a secret state police spying on the population and on many European countries and the USA and had Jew Leon Trotsky murdered in Mexico in 1940.

The imperialist, genocidal and culturecidal goals of the Third Reich

Hitler’s Third Reich goals were (1) conquest of the the Slavic states of Poland, Ukraine and Russia to create a Lebensraum, or living space for Nazi Germany which meant converting these lands into agrarian colonies: eradicating their cultures and killing, deporting or enslaving the populations for the benefit of the master race; (2) conquest of Western Europe and eradicating its culture of democracy, the rights of man, liberalism and humanism, and respect of the rights of the individual, as reflected in the aforecited entries in Schmid’t dictionary; (3) Hitler’s anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism, the Final
Solution, the genocide and culturecide of the Jewish people in all the conquered territories: an *overriding* goal, such that „the exigencies of the Holocaust were given priority even over the war effort itself, reflecting Hitler’s resolve that, whatever the outcome of the war, the European Jews would not survive it“ (Johnson, 1987, p. 497); (4) to plunder Jewish property, bank accounts, art, to rob the corpses of gold, to use hair to make wool and turn fat tissues into soap.

Racism and anti-Semitism were written into the Nazi constitution (Huber, 1937):

Point 4 of the [Nazi] Party Program legally established the following principle: “Only those who are of Geman blood [i.e., race] can be citizens of the German state, regardless of religion. Therefore no Jew can be a member of the German nation. This requirement in compliance with the Civil Code Law of the 15th of September 1935“ (p.71). The first decree of the Civil Code Law of the 14th of November stipulates that a Jew can no longer be a citizen of the Reich (p. 72). Jewish Civil Service employees will be retired as of the 31st December 1935 (p. 73). The voting law is in effect as of the 7th of March, 1936...Jews are therefore not permitted to vote (p. 99). The Law of the Protection of German Blood and German Honor of 15 September 1935 is the basic law of the new völkisch regime. It prohibits marriage between Jews and German citizens or people of similar blood“ (p. 220). In particular, according to § 4 of the first decree, of 14.11.1935) no Jew can hold public office (p. 245).

It has been often asked how many Germans knew about the Holocaust and a rough estimate can be gleaned from some known facts. The 1935-1936 laws and decrees were common knowledge, and so was the boycott of Jewish commerce or the burning of Jewish synagogues during the Kristallnacht. An elderly German woman whom I visited in Bad Homburg remembered trains filled with screaming Jews rolling through the night. People saw daily disappearance of their former neighbors, of whole families with their children. About a million civil service personnel were employed in the logistics of finding, collecting, and transporting the Jews to the camps. The current documentary series „The Evolution of Evil“ and „The Rise and Fall of Adolf Hitler,“ repeated on the American Heroes Channel and on YouTube, show colossal deliriously ecstatic cheering masses in the „Heil Hitler“ watching the Führer’s motorcades or his speeches at the Nuremberg mass rallies, let alone Leni Riefenstahl's propaganda film „Triumph of the Will,“ or having to read and recite *Mein Kampf* published in millions of copies.
In 1951 Hannah Arendt saw the Soviet and Nazi camps as a manifestation of radical evil:

Totalitarian terror achieved its most terrible triumph when it succeeded in cutting the moral person off from the individualist escape and in making the decisions of conscience absolutely questionable and equivocal. When a man is faced with the alternative of betraying and thus murdering his friend or of sending his wife and children, for whom he is in some sense responsible, to their death; when even suicide would mean the immediate murder of his own family—how is one to decide: The alternative is no longer between good and evil, but between murder and murder (pp. 446-452).

Unfortunately, in her famous report on the Eichmann trial Arendt abandoned the idea of radical evil (Lothane, 2016a) and became infamous as a result of applying to Eichmann the catchphrase banality of evil, which she plagiarized from Karl Jaspers (Lothane, 2014, Lothane, 2016b).

**Alarm bells before 1939**

Hitler and the masses were on the minds of two other writers in Germany: the author and journalist Konrad Heiden (1901-1966, New York City), who criticized Hitler and National-Socialism in 1933; and Hermann Rauschning (1887-1982, Portland, Oregon), at first NSDAP member, then Hitler’s head of state of the Free City of Danzig who finally defected and published a book critical of the Nazis in 1938.

In a section entitled “The elite against the Masses“ Heiden cites Hitler writing in the newspaper *Völkische Beobachter* of 23.1.1933: “Marxism must inevitably become a movement of people, who, working manually only, do not have clarity of thinking...an colossal body of work animals without a leader.“ Two weeks later the *Völkische Beobachter* printed a poem by Bogislaw von Selchow:

```
Ich hasse
die Masse
die kleine
gemeine
den Nacken gebeugt,
die ißt und schläft und Kinder zeugt.
Ich hasse
die Masse
```
According to Konrad

On the one hand, Hitler attempts to prove that the great mass of Jews was first degraded to being a class, first inoculated with class hatred, first branded as subhuman and, on the other hand, he believes in the natural differences between people and in a biological aristocracy (p. 94).

The significant fact in this passage is the existence of a Nazi elite, the future Nazi aristocracy. Not only dictatorships but democracies too have their elites and ruling classes that stand behind an elected president or a dictator who never acts alone but with the support of an elite, an army and a police acting in unison with the elite. Hitler was not only victorious at polls but was also backed by the NSDAP and its militant arm the SA, which then became the elite that ruled Nazi Germany. So did Lenin until 1924 and so did Stalin, both in Russia before WW II. The same happened in the former soviet backed DDR until the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989, in other east bloc countries. In both Soviet and Nazi dictatoships the elites enriched themselves while exploiting the subjugated classes of the population and also liquidated their opponents in show trials or in bloody purges.(On the formation of elites in totalitarian states see also Arendt, 1951).

In 1936-1937 Heiden offered this assessment of Hitler as a propagandist:

The usual conception of the great propagandist is the commanding, purposive mind, who by magic suggestion subjects an empty animal mass to his will. […] that he dominates the minds of millions by tirelessly hammering the same simple statements into them. … [O]n the contrary, he played with the masses and titillated them with with the most contradictory assertions. It is the art of contradiction which makes him the greatest and and most successful propagandist of his time. He does not dominate the mind of millions, his mind
belongs to them. Like a piece of wood floating on the waves, he follows the shifting currents of public opinion. This is his true strength” (p. 140).

In one area Hitler had expressed no contradictions: in his anti-Semitic rants. Here, Hitler’s propaganda made emotional contact with and was a continuation of the traditional anti-Semitism and the mass murders of Jews from the crusades of the Middle Ages to the 1938 Kristallnacht (night of the broken glass). (See Sievers, 1997).

The actual political manifestations the “bloody terror” were not discussed by Reich, nor are these a theme in Peglau or Kauders. No matter how electrifying were Hitler’s public speeches, the torch-lit rallies in Nuremberg with ecstatic masses raising their hands in the Heil Hitler salute, the goose-stepping SS troops, and Hitler on the podium. The masses not only acquiesced voluntarily but were also vulnerable to Hitler’s terror state and threats from the SA, the SS and the Gestapo (Heiden, 1936/1937, Shirer, 1960). The opening of Dachau in 1933, followed by Sachsenhausen and Oranienburg, of Auschwitz as an extermination camp in 1940—all these were a standing warning to the population that critics or opponents of the regime would be arrested and punished to the camps.

The earliest warning of the coming Hitler catastrophe was by Fedor Vergin (1931). This thought-provoking book was reviewed by two Jews: Tucholsky positively, Erich Fromm negatively. Another alarm was sounded by Jewish Aurel Kolnai (1938).

In his 1938 book Hermann Rauschning warned Europe about Hitler but nobody listened. He described the relationship between Hitler and the masses as follows:

Hitler is a revolutionary, fascinating like a spiritistic medium, and a self-made mob leader (59). He is overtly and systematically deified by the masses...The Führer’s messianic figure is the centerpiece of its propaganda, was deliberately staged as was the entire power apparatus (60). This process of bewitching the masses is deeply rooted in the overall revolutionary dissolution of the genuine values and components of law and order (61). The myth of blood and soil...is nothing but the apparatus for the total control and management of agricultural production and producing society (62).

Rauschning criticized the Nazi anti-Semitic actions as follows:

The coopting of faith maxims based racist, völkisch, and other typical motives and the disenfranchisement and destruction of German Jews...the methodical
releasing of brutal destructive instincts in the masses... in order to maintain the revolutionary tension (pp. 147-148). The actions of the Third Reich taken against the Jews is a preparation for the coming revolutionary cataclysm (148). This too is a ‘grand illusion’... The German Lebensraum (living space) will not be increased by the destruction of the Jewish one, on the contrary, it will shrink (149).

Rauschning emphasised the power of the ideology and violence as a strategy of subjugation:

The nationalistic doctrine is meant for the masses. This doctrine is an instrument of dominating the masses. The ruling elite itself is above the doctrine. It uses the doctrine to obtain its own ends in a goal-directed fashion (37). The irrational drive of National-Socialism is the actual source of its power (42). What the Nazi reform socialism, the moderate marxism wanted to secure was the barbaric power of violence, the very means of changing the social order (49). Carl Schmitt, with his friend-foe distinction theory has perfectly defined politics as the sphere of „victorious violence“... Violence is the only adequate weapon against the enemy (50).

And he went on to describe the „machinery of the measures of violent control and destruction of the existing law and order efforts“:

Concentration camps, police acts of terror, the system of secret police, the deployment of special intimidation units of the Nazi party, and other refined methods of spreading fear, of breaking down character and independence... the modern methods of refinement and invention in the realm of destruction (70). The domination maxim is: everyone is the other’s devil, everyone observes the other, everyone is a spy and denouncer to the other—this was so tremendously successful in Germany and to which the goal of totally destroying morality is indebted. The completely immoral German regime does not want to assume any responsibility that by the wholesale espousal of the worst human instincts, of brutality, extreme violence, hatred, revenge, envy, jealousy, excessses, plunder, constant lying—that all these method will bring about the internal destruction of the nation of on a hitherto unimaginable (73-74). In this process is the culture of the individual obliterated (107). The German working class as seen from the outside has been completely depoliticized. It is no longer a political factor... The takeover of the workers’ party apparatus amounts to a discarding of the old political language and the adoption of a völkisch one (116) ... What the masses today got in exchange for the previous marxist ideology is that today marxism is dead in Germany and that in spite of that a socialist upheaval is in progress(117) Ludendorff’s idea of total war and the Nazi ideal that „war is the highest expression of the völkisch life will“ is the decisive anchor point of the nihilistic revolution with its goal of total war preparedness. National Socialism derives this from comes from the idea of a permanent revolution (160-161)
And Rauschning concluded that this totale Politik there came der Übergang „von der Reichswehr zum Wehrreich,“ as detailed in part “II. Diktatur in der Diktatur, die politische Rolle der Wehrmacht im Dritten Reich” (S. 213ff).

**Coda: Reich the politician versus Reich the poet**

Curiously, Reich did not apply his *Massenpsychologie* to post-war Soviet Russia, Soviet-occupied DDR, China, or even to McCarthyism in the USA. Curiously, he did not mention the Holocaust, reported in the New York Times between in 1943-1944, or the creation of the State of Israel in 1948.

*Nemo propheta in patria sua*, one is not prophet in one’s own country: there has been no comprehensive German biography of Reich comparable to the books by David Boadella (1974), Colin Wilson (1981), and Myron Sharaf (1983), as there has been no full scale German biography of Schreber either (Lothane, 1992, 2004). Life, seen as an itinerary from birth to death, is an unbroken chain of crises and dramas of the Reich the man, the psychoanalyst, scientist, politician, and visionary, who loved and suffered.

Reich’s happy childhood in a prosperous manorial estate, set in bucolic nature, was first shattered by the catastrophic family drama in which he played the fateful part of an adolescent Oedipus, discovering his mother adultery, telling his father, and becoming an indirect cause of the suicide a mother he loved and the death of a father he feared. The second was the cataclysm of WW I, that shattered European societies and nations. As remembered by his daughter Lore Reich Rubin (2003), he was a difficult person to live with but he was endowed with a vitality that enabled him to rise again from every life crisis, to gather new new friends, and develop new projects to work on. He was sensitive, domineering jealous and suspicious to a paranoid degree, as recalled by his third wife, Ilse Ollendorff, but not hostile or persecutory towards others.

His professional itinerary as psychoanalyst began in 1920 when as a 23-year-old medical student he read a long paper on on the “Libidinal Conflicts and Delusions in Ibsen’s *Peer Gynt*” (Reich, 1975) whereupon he was admitted as a guest member to the Vienna Psychoanalytic Association. On October 23 he read a clinical paper and became a regular member. It was a profound and sophisticated analysis, inspired by Freud’s ideas:
about the relationship between “poetic and psychotic phenomena” (S. 4), based on Freud’s Schreber analysis and the paper on narcissism, “with the assistance of experiences based on dreams, fantasies, neuroses and psychoses,” hinting Freud’s dynamics in the Schreber analysis and the paper on narcissism (S. 9); connecting these experiences with Peer’s “life as a prophet” (p. 15); issues of Oedipal attachments and guilt (S. 24, 35). A touching self-portrait emerges in his 1988 autobiography.

Reich’s analysis of Ibsen dramaturgy and life offers a glimpse into Reich’s soul and the seed of his future Massenpsychologie: “Ibsen was an intellectual revolutionary who had been taught a lesson by physical hardship. As such, he did not see salvation in material revolution alone. He strove for awareness, self-identity, and spiritual maturity (S. 57; italics Reich’s). And more explicitly:

Perhaps Ibsen, who was shaken by the upheavals in his era, made the same observation we make time and again in our day and age, namely namely that the spiritual phylogenesis of mankind has not yet reached the stage of the mature man who is “himself” (the ideal leadership type) as thousands have succeeded in doing, each in his own individual ontogenesis. Mankind as a whole, in other words, has remained in the infantile stage of needing protection and being entirely open to suggestion. The analogy is clear in the individual child’s rebellion and in his simultaneous need for discipline, which account for the contradictory tendencies in infantile humanity in general. From this viewpoint, socialistic progress (by which I mean the attaining of spiritual individuality, immanent in the concept of a material community), means becoming human, maturing phylogenetically, and having the capability to take on total responsibility, the lack of which accounts for the propensity for reaction that we in the masses (S. 58).

Twenty two years later Reich (1942) reminisced: “He who deviates from the well-trodden path may easily become a Peer Gynt, a dreamer, a lunatic [who] wanted to divulge a great secret to me[...about] an individual who gets out of step with the marching column of the human herd. He is not understood. They laugh at him when he is weak; they try to destroy him when he is strong (S. 21). [...] When I met Freud I grasped his meaning, I felt an outsider [...] out of line with official science and traditional thinking” (S. 21). Like Peer Gynt, Reich was a dreamer and a prophet about whom Hosea says:

The prophet is a fool,
The spiritual man is mad (9:7).
On the contrary: the prophet, the poet, and the psychotic are in this world but not of it: they dream the truth and see more than the “Babbits, the practical man, [who] does not cogitate about life, who does one’s duty and keeps one’s mouth shut” (p. 24-25). Reich was a dreamer and a prophet. Ethical prophecy was a Hebrew idea: teaching morals to humanmankind, as expressed by Isaiah: „For from Zion shall go forth teaching (Torah) And the word of the Lord from Jerusalem“ (2:3). Marx, Freud and Reich, I submit, were either consciously or unconsciously influenced by such Hebraic ideas and also by Christianity, which added the idea of redemption through martyrdom and sacrifice: they dreamt of healing or saving suffering humanity.

The complete Reich tragic complex also contains the story of his flights from persecution in Austria, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, to finally find a haven in America, the promised land of freedom. But like the man in the story who saw Death in the marketplace in Baghdad and fled to Samarra, believing he was safe only to meet Death again there, so Reich found himself confronted by the emotional plague once again in the USA, as incarnated in the figure of journalist Mildred Edie Brady. Preceded by an 1946 calumny of Reich by Frederic Wertham, in the left-leaning New Republic, as a “psychofashist and Reich’s Massenpsychologie as “fashist sermons,” Brady, whom he suspected of being a Stalinist (Hoppe, 1984) published two attacks on Reich in 1947: in Harper’s Magazine, “The New Cult of Sex and Anarchy,” followed in The New Republic by “The Strange Case of Wilhelm Reich.” Bradys’ venom spread like a virus both in the popular and professional caricatures of Reich as an orchestrating group sex orgies or a peddling across state lines a box touted as an aphrodisiac and a fake treatment for cancer. The articles ultimately awakened the dragons of the Food and Drug Administration and a criminal investigation was launched. This led to Reich being tried and sentenced to two years in prison and an injunction to have all the orgone accumulators destroyed and all his journals and books, including Character Analysys, burned. Freud reacted to his book burning in 1933 with his biting Jewish irony: “What progress we are making. In the Middle Ages they would have burned me. Now they are content with burning my books”; that a book burning should have happened in democratic USA in 1956 was a monstrous scandal. The protest by the Union of Civil Liberties and press releases by intellectuals were not printed in newspapers. As told by Boadella (1974), his friend Dr. Victor Sobey,
who loaded over a ton of journals and books into a big truck, “wrote an eye-witness report in which he compared his feelings to those of concentration camp victims who were required to dig their own graves before being shot and thrown in” (S. 313).

When in the final days of his life in prison Reich talked of UFO’s he was not clinically insane, as stated by the psychiatrists who examined him. Rather, he was telling daydreams and fantasies to soothe the pain of the last supreme trauma, the disgrace of the trial and imprisonment: both broke his heart. With his hope and energies steadily ebbing, he died of heart failure in his sleep, which in in the Jewish tradition is called mitat neshika, death by a kiss, which is how Moses dies in an old Rabbinic legend. However, similar to Christ with whom Reich identified, he was crucified, too, a prophet who died as a martyr for his beliefs.
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