

# THE RISE OF THE

*The following is excerpts "from the Preface to the Third Edition, Mass Psychology of Fascism, written in Nazi Germany in 1933, by Wilhelm Reich. Because of the suppression of all of Reich's works and because of the pretinence of his description of the rise of the fascist state, this valuable preface has been reprinted, fuck copyrights."*

The MASSENPSYCHOLOGIE DES FASCHISMUS took shape during the years of the German crisis of 1930 to 1933. It was written in 1933. The first edition appeared in September 1933 and the second in April 1934 in Denmark.

Sex-economic sociology was born out of the attempts to harmonize the depth psychology of Freud with the economic theory of Marx. Human existence is determined by instinctual and socio-economic processes. But we must refute any eclectic attempts at an arbitrary combination of "instinct" and "economy." Sex-economic sociology dissolves the fateful contradiction which made psychoanalysis forget the social factor and made Marxism forget the animal origin of man. As I once put it, psychoanalysis is the father and sociology the mother of sex-economy. But a child is more than the sum of its parents. It is a new, independent being with a future of its own.

## CENSORSHIP OF WORK

Really one would have expected that parties which pretended to be fighting for human freedom would have welcomed my political-psychological work. As the archives of our Institute prove abundantly, the exact opposite was the case. The greater the social effects of the mass-psychological work, the more violent were the counter-measures of the party politicians. As early as 1932, the Socialist as well as the Communist organizations, over the vigorous protest of their own members, prohibited the distribution of the works published by the Verlag for Sexualpolitik, then in Berlin. I was threatened with execution as soon as Marxism should gain power in Germany. In 1932, against the explicit wish of their members, the Communist organizations in Germany banned sex-economic physicians from their meetings, as the Social Democrats in Austria had done as early as 1929 and 1930. I was expelled from both organizations because I introduced sociology into sociology and pointed out its implications for human structure formation. Between 1934 and 1937, it was again and again the officials of the Communist parties who reminded the fascist circles in Europe of the "dangerousness" of sex-economy. The sex-economic publications were turned back at the Soviet Russian border as were the masses of fugitives who tried to escape German fascism. These are facts which cannot be countered by any argument.

## Misinterpreted Marxism

Today it has become absolutely clear that fascism is not the deed of a Hitler or Mussolini, but the expression of the irrational structure of the mass individual. Today it is clearer than ten years ago that the race theory is biological mysticism. Today, one is closer to an understanding of the orgasmic longing as a mass phenomenon than ten years ago; there is more of a general inkling of the fact that **fascist mysticism is orgasmic longing under the conditions of mystification and inhibition of natural sexuality.** The sex-economic statements in the book showed themselves to be as true as ten years ago, and to be further confirmed by the experiences of the past ten years. The Marxist party slogans in the book, on the other hand, were all shown to be erroneous; they all had to be replaced.

The change in terminology takes into account an important fact: today it is no longer the Communist and Socialist parties but, in opposition to them, many unpolitical people and groups of people of all shades of political opinion who are developing more and more a revolutionary attitude, who, in other words, are striving for a basically new, rational social order. There is a rather

general awareness of the fact that the world, in its fight against the fascist pestilence, has entered a phase of a gigantic international revolution. The concept "proletarian" was coined more than a hundred years ago to connote a stratum of society which was deprived of all rights. True, there are still such groups, but the great-grandchildren of the proletarians of the 19th century have developed into specialized, technically trained industrial workers who are socially responsible and conscious of their skills. The term "class consciousness" has to be replaced by "work consciousness" or "social responsibility."

Marxist sociology, out of its ignorance of mass psychology, contrasted the "bourgeois" with the "proletarian." This is erroneous. A certain character structure is not limited to the capitalist, but pervades the working people in all professions. There are revolutionary capitalists and reactionary workers. There are no characterological class distinctions in the biophysical depth of human structure. The fascist pestilence makes it clear that the economic concepts of "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" have to be replaced by the characterological concepts of "reactionary" and "revolutionary."

The vulgar-Marxist concept of "private enterprise" was irrationally misinterpreted to mean that the revolutionary development of society would bring about the abolition of all private property. Of course, the political reaction made capital of this misinterpretation. As a matter of fact, the development of social and individual freedom has nothing to do with the so-called "abolition of private property." The Marxist concept of private property did not pertain to people's hirts, pants, typewriters, toilet paper, books, beds, savings, residences or plots of land. It referred, exclusively, to the private possession of the social means of production which determine the social process, such as railroads, power plants, mines, etc. The "socialization of the means of production" became a bogey because it was confused with the "expropriation of private property" such as chickens, shirts, books, residences, etc. During the past hundred years, socialization of the means of production has reduced their private ownership in all capitalist countries, in varying degrees.

Because the structure and the incapacity for freedom of the working people made them unable to adapt to the tremendous development of the social organizations, it came to pass that the "state" exercised functions which properly would have been those of the "society" of the working people. In Soviet Russia, the alleged acropolis of Marxism, there is no trace of a "socialization of the means of production." The Marxist parties had failed to distinguish "socialization." The

present war has shown that the American government, e.g., has the right and the means to nationalize poorly functioning industrial plants. A socialization of the means of production, their transfer from the private ownership of individuals to society is a much less frightening concept if one begins to realize that today, as a result of the war, there are in the capitalist countries only few independent private owners left while there are a great many collective owners responsible to the government; and if one further realizes that in Soviet Russia the state factories are in no way at the disposal of the workers, but of groups of government officials. **The socialization of the means of production will not be possible until the masses of the working people become structurally capable of administering it, that is, not until they are conscious of their responsibility.**

This is the main sociological reason why the private economy of the 19th century changes everywhere to an increasing degree into a state-capitalistic economy. In the strictly Marxist sense, there is not even in Soviet Russia a state socialism but a state capitalism. According to Marx, the social condition "capitalism" does not consist in the existence of individual capitalists, but in the existence of the specific "capitalist mode of production," that is, in the production of exchange values instead of use values, in wage work of the masses and in the production of surplus value, which is appropriated by the state or the private owners, and not by the society of the working people. If this strictly Marxist sense, the capitalistic system continues to exist in Russia. And it will continue to exist as long as the masses of people continue to lack responsibility to crave authority.

Sex-economic structural psychology adds the characterological and biological to the purely economic comprehension of society. The elimination of individual capitalists and the replacement of private capitalism by state capitalism in Russia has not in the least altered the typical helpless and authoritarian character structure of the masses of people.

Furthermore, the political ideology of the European Marxist parties operated with purely economic conditions characteristic of a span of about two hundred years of mechanical development from the end of the 17th to the 19th century. Fascism of the 20th century, on the other hand, threw into focus the basic questions of the human character, of mysticism and the craving for authority, problems pertaining to a span of 4-6000 years.

From all this it is obvious that the fascist mass pestilence, with its background of thousands of years, cannot be mastered with social measures corresponding to the past three hundred years.

## Freudian Contribution

Extensive and conscientious therapeutic work on the human character has taught me that, in judging human reactions, we have to take into account three different layers of the biopsychic structure. As I have shown in my book, CHARACTER-ANALYSIS, these layers are autonomously functioning representations of social development. In the superficial layer, the average individual is restrained, polite, compassionate and conscientious. There would be no social tragedy of the animal, man, if this superficial layer were in immediate contact with his deep natural core. His tragedy is that such is not the

case. The superficial layer of social cooperation is not in contact with the biological core of the person, but separated from it by a second, intermediary character layer consisting of cruel, sadistic, lascivious, predatory and envious impulses. This is the Freudian "unconscious" or "repressed"; in sex-economic language, it is the sum total of the "secondary impulses." Orgone biophysics has shown that the Freudian unconscious is the antisocial element in the human structure, is a secondary result of the repression of primary biological impulses. If one penetrates through this second, perverse and-antisocial layer, one arrives regularly at a third, the deepest layer, which we call the biological core. In this deepest layer, man, under favorable social conditions, is an honest, industrious, cooperative animal capable of love and also of rational hatred. In character-analytic work, one cannot penetrate to this deep, promising layer without first eliminating the false, sham-social surface. What makes its appearance when this cultivated mask falls away, however, is not natural sociality, but the perverse antisocial layer of the character.

As a result of this unfortunate structure, every natural social or libidinous impulse from the biological core must, on its way to action, pass the layer of the perverse secondary impulses where it becomes deflected. This deflection changes the originally social character of the natural impulse into a perverse impulse and thus inhibits any natural life manifestation.

## The Biological Nucleus

We can now apply our insights into human structure to the social and political field. It is not difficult to see that the diverse political and ideological groups in human society correspond to the various layers of human character structure. We do, of course, not follow idealistic philosophy in its belief that this human structure is eternal and unalterable. After social conditions and changes have formed the original biological needs into the character structure, the latter, in the form of ideologies, reproduces the social structure.

Since the decline of the primitive work-democratic organization, the biological core of man has remained without social representation. That which is "natural" in man, which makes him one with the cosmos, has found its genuine expression only in the arts, particularly in music and painting. Until now, however, it has remained without any essential influence upon the form of human society, if by society is meant not the culture of a small rich upper crust but the community of all people.

In the ethical and social ideals of liberalism we recognize the representation of the superficial layer of the character, of self-control and tolerance. The ethics of this liberalism serve to keep down "the beast" in man, the second layer, our "secondary impulses," the Freudian "unconscious." The natural sociality of the deepest, nuclear layer is alien to the liberal. He deplores the perversion of human character and fights it with ethical norms, but the social catastrophes of this century show the inadequacy of this approach.

All that which is genuinely revolutionary, all genuine art and science stems from the natural biological nucleus. Neither the genuine revolutionary nor the