

REICH'S "MASS PSYCHOLOGY OF FASCISM"
IN MARXIST PERSPECTIVE

JAAP van GINNEKEN
Vakgroep Theoretische Psychologie
Rijksuniversiteit Leiden
Hooigracht 15
2312 KM Leiden
The Netherlands

REICH'S "MASS PSYCHOLOGY OF FASCISM" IN MARXIST
PERSPECTIVE

"We do not know who the politicians of Europe, America or Asia will be in 1960 or 1984. Our attitude has been determined by the political machinations which we experienced in the years between 1914 and 1944" (1)

Wilhelm Reich was one of the most fascinating personalities in the history of the psycho-social sciences. Yet his true contribution is frequently ignored. The 1975 edition of the authoritative Encyclopaedia Britannica, for example, had no entry in his name.

The reason for such omissions seems to be a widespread misunderstanding of his theories and their development - especially in the Anglo-American world. Standard works in the English language often mispresent the nature of his early European works, which made a major contribution to Freudian, Freudomarxist and Marxist thinking. They often refer only to the radically changed versions dating from the American period - which are widely considered dubious today.

A clear example is the rendering of his "Mass psychology of fascism" in some overviews of theories about fascism. Excellent British studies such as Martin Kitchen's "Fascism" (1976) and Michael Billig's "Fascists" (1978) suggest that its central concept is the controversial notion of "orgone energy" (2). In fact, the original German editions of 1933 and 1934 contained no such concept, and their emphasis is entirely on education, sexuality and personality; on class, politics and ideology - notions more compatible with other intellectual traditions.

Unfortunately, both the elder Reich and the trustees of his heritage, promoted only the publication of the later revised edition. As far as I know, the original edition was never published in English, nor was it "officially" reprinted in other languages (3). This obviously prevents a correct understanding of their original contribution to the psycho-social sciences: not only of their contribution to a psycho-analytic theory of political personality, but maybe even more of their contribution to a marxist psychology of authoritarian ideologies. I hope to show that the strengths and weaknesses of this latter contribution can only be understood within the context of new developments in marxist theory which arose at that precise moment in time.

REICH AND FREUDISM

Wilhelm Reich was born in 1897 in Galicia, and spent most of his childhood and youth in Bukovina. He was an officer in the Austrian army during the First World War, and subsequently studied medicine in Vienna (4). There he got to know Sigmund Freud, who was just working on his "Massenpsychologie und Ich-analyse" (1921, incorrectly translated as "Group Psychology and Egoanalysis") (5). It showed that the longing of the masses for a strong leader has deep libidinal roots, and goes back to the infantile identification with the father. It did not show however, how the character formation of the masses is mediated by class, culture or epoch - and it was Reich who was to develop these themes.

After obtaining his degree in 1922, Reich became a full member of the Psychoanalytic Society, but soon occupied a rather special position in it. His gradual theoretical deviation was intimately connected with his different therapeutic practice. At least three elements can be identified.

In the first place Freud (especially in this critical postwar period) openly preferred a wealthy clientele (6). Within this group, he was mostly confronted with neuroses based on a strong repression, which were manifested in hysteria or obsessions. Reich, on the contrary, went to work in a polyclinic for poorer patients. Within this group he was mostly confronted with patients with a weak ego, which was manifested in criminal or destructive behavior. His observations led him to write several articles and a book on "The Impulsive Character", which was acknowledged by Freud and others as a major contribution to psychoanalysis.

Secondly, Reich helped to start a technical seminar, intended to discuss the theoretical problems which novice analysts encountered in therapeutic practice. His own interest was in new forms of negative transference - in which patients cooperated verbally, but in which non-verbal resistance was noticeable. He felt that certain anxieties formed a kind of "character armour", which could not be penetrated by the conventional cool and distant approach, but only by an unconventionally warm and concerned approach. These more controversial observations led to his book on "Character Analysis" - which was published only later.

Thirdly, Reich felt that the important role of sexuality had somehow

gradually been forgotten in the postwar works of Freud and his disciples. Freud and especially Abraham had not only put forward the notions of neurotic characters fixated in the oral or anal stages, but also of a "healthy" genitality. They had not specified however, exactly what this meant. According to Reich it was crucial that people achieve full satisfaction. If they did not, residual sexual energy would lead to recurrent neurotic symptoms. These opinions led him to write several articles and a book on "The Function of Orgasm", which met with serious reservations on the side of the aging Freud and especially of some of the more Victorian key-figures within the movement (such as Federn and Jones).

Thus between 1927 and 1934 there was a gradual alienation between Reich and the Freudians, which finally resulted in his expulsion. Some of his former friends and colleagues went so far as to openly declare him insane - a procedure which is unfortunately far from unique in the annals of psychoanalysis (7). It remains unclear however, when and where mistaken obstinacy faded into full-scale delusion in Reich's work. One can only be sure for his last few years, which he spent in an American prison, and which ended in his tragic death in 1957 (8).

REICH AND MARXISM

Reich's psychoanalytic theories were, however, less of a cause for the break than his political activities. In 1927 he witnessed troops firing on a crowd, killing a hundred and wounding one thousand - an unprecedented massacre. "I had the feeling of watching a "senseless machine", nothing more. A stupid, idiotic automaton lacking reason and judgment . . .", he was to write later. "Machine men! This thought was clear and irrefutable. Since then it has never left me; it became the nucleus for all my later investigations of man as a political being" (9).

That same day Reich, the Social democrat, enlisted in the medical section of the Arbeiterhilfe - an organization linked to the Communist Party. He regularly drove into the suburbs with several colleagues in a van to provide both sexual counseling and political information. In 1929 he helped found a Sozialistische Gesellschaft für Sexualberatung und Sexualforschung (10) and some special clinics for "workers and employees". Their liberal approach to contraception and abortion however, was soon opposed by the fearful leaders of the Social Democratic party of Catholic Austria. He was expelled and moved to Berlin, where he adhered to the Communist Party.

That same year he visited the Soviet Union, where his first attempt to reconcile Marxist and Freudian theory provoked heated debates. His essay on "Dialectical Materialism and Psychoanalysis" claimed that both philosophies had similar starting points: determinism and materialism, a historical and dialectical approach. Both tried to show that free will is to some extent an illusion, he said, and that man's life is largely shaped by invisible forces. Marxism would have to learn to make ideological analyses in terms of unconscious motivation. And the Freudians would have to learn to make

cultural analyses in terms of social classes. In spite of intense opposition from two sides, Reich further tried to combine both methods in the theory and practice of the sex-pol movement.

On the one hand, he severely criticized the unpolitical approach to sexual reform in his next book (11). He therefore helped to found a "Deutscher Reichsverband für proletarische Sexualpolitik" (12) which soon had numerous branches and 40.000 members. It emphasized that both sexual and political questions were closely related to housing and child care, educational and medical facilities, employment and leisure time activities. It claimed these were neglected by the more "bourgeois" tendencies within the sexual reform movement, which had altogether 350.000 members.

On the other hand, he also criticized the unpersonal approach to political struggle - in a booklet written for communist youngsters. He quoted complaints that they felt "squeezed dry like lemons" for party work and encountered little understanding for their personal problems. He advocated a radically different approach: ". . . we must politicize the issue, and transform the secret or open sexual rebellion of youth into revolutionary struggle against the capitalist social order" (13). Late in 1932 Reich attended a youth conference in Dresden, and supported a resolution calling for a more liberal attitude towards sexuality within the communist movement. The party leaders struck back immediately.

MARXISM AND SEXUALITY

Reich's trouble with the socialist and communist parties was closely related to the ambiguous attitude which the marxist movement had always taken towards sex and the family (14). It is true that pre-marxist authors such as Saint Simon and Fourier had already linked the emancipation of workers and women. It is also true that Marx and Engels had already severely criticized the bourgeois family in their early writings and in the Communist Manifesto. In *Capital* and later writings on political economy Marx frequently pointed out that material exploitation disturbed sexual relations too. Yet there were contradictory statements as to what the real consequences were for the personal life of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Towards the end of his life Marx started to gather ethnographic material on kinship patterns. After his death Engels used this for his book on "The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State". It claimed that primitive society had known mother-right or matriarchy. This had supposedly been characterized by a larger degree of sexual freedom and collective property. It also claimed, that various intermediate stages had led to father-right or patriarchy. This was characterized by more limited notions of monogamous marriage and private property. These theoretical speculations had several practical implications.

On the one hand they suggested that the disturbed relation between the sexes was deeply embedded in capitalist society, and that socialism was the natural ally of feminism. Within the German social democratic party this claim played a major role. This is illustrated by the book which its leader Bebel wrote

almost simultaneously on "Die Frau und der Socialismus" (incorrectly translated as "Woman under Socialism") - which became a long time bestseller (15).

On the other hand they suggested, that the liberation of labour would coincide with the liberation of lust. Within the French socialist party this claim played a minor role. This is illustrated by the fact that the booklet which one of its leaders Lafargue (Marx's son-in-law) wrote almost simultaneously on "The Right to be lazy" ("Le Droit à la Paresse"), was controversial from the start. The reason for this was twofold. Reformists thought that lust and laziness were not respectable enough, while revolutionaries thought that struggle and self-denial should have priority.

Thus it was not surprising that these same dilemmas cropped up again after the Russian Revolution. It is true that the Bolsheviks immediately took a number of concrete measures to improve the situation of women. In Lenin's well-known conversation with German communist-feminist Clara Zetkin however, he "sharply criticized the discussions and debates on sex taking place in workers' and youth associations and said that there were more important things to be done" - as Reich was to recall (16). It is true that Trotsky showed some understanding of the need to revolutionize personal relations and daily life. But after his expulsion from the party in 1927 and the start of the five year plans in 1928 a notable restoration of petty morality took place (17).

After 1930 this anti-libertarian tendency clearly spread to other communist parties. The lively movement froze into a bureaucratic apparatus: personal and sexual freedom lost out to spartan and authoritarian discipline. In December 1932 the communist youth magazine "Roter Sport" demanded that the distribution of Reich's "anti-marxist brochures" be stopped. The next month Hitler became chancellor.

MARXISM AND FASCISM

From its very first manifestations on, Marxists had exhibited great trouble in understanding the true nature of fascism. Italian authors had mainly related Mussolini's coming to power after the March on Rome to the underdevelopment of the country, and to specific national factors. Among socialists, this held for reformist Zibordi and syndicalist Labriola, among communists for the elder Gramsci and the younger Togliatti (18). Hitler's early abortive putsch in Munich however had already given an indication that these tendencies were present in more highly developed countries as well, and thus were also related to general international factors.

In her report to the Executive Commission of the Communist International in Moscow in 1923 "Der Kampf gegen den Faschismus", Clara Zetkin had claimed that the reactionary offensive punished the European working class for its failure to follow the example of the Russian Revolution. She also pointed out though, that fascism found support in all social classes, and that it was a complex phenomenon which could not be analyzed in simple formulas. After her death and that of Lenin, after the expulsion of Trotsky and

the tightening of Stalin's hold on the International, this was exactly what happened however.

German party leaders Thälmann and Pieck claimed that fascism was simply an instrument of big capital and that it would not be able to fool many people for long (19). They refused to acknowledge the power of the fascist appeal until it was too late. The 1929 crisis drove many ordinary people into the arms of the nazi's. In 1930 they won more than a hundred seats in parliament, in 1932 around twohundred. The orthodox Marxists had failed in their analysis of fascism. Heterodox Marxists would have to develop new approaches. Reich was among them.

FASCISM AND IDEOLOGY

In the years between 1930 and 1933, three major shifts can be identified in Marxist approaches to fascism. In the first place, there was a shift from explanations in terms of heteronomy to explanations in terms of autonomy. This means that fascism was now seen by some as an independent political force: tolerated but not manipulated by big business. This theory was advanced by August Thalheimer, who belonged to the communist opposition (20). He was the first who returned to the texts of Marx in search for new elements. He found them in "The eighteenth Brumaire": Marx' analysis of, the coup d'état by Louis Bonaparte. According to this analysis, the capitalist class was quite willing to leave political power to others under certain conditions as long as it retained economic power itself (21).

The second important shift was the recognition that these political movements not only rested on the support of a small elite, but on broad masses of people. In the case of bonapartism these had primarily been the small farmers, in the case of fascism these were primarily the middle classes. A further important change was that scientific research into this question had become possible. The census of 1928 had provided material for an empirical class analysis by socialists like Geiger (22) and communists like Kunik - which Reich used as a starting point in his "Mass psychology". The election results of 1930 and 1932 were compared to this sociographic analysis by communists like Jäger - which Reich also used as a starting point. It made possible a more precise identification of the social bases of fascism.

The third important shift was that - once again following the example of Marx and Engels - a more detailed analysis of the outlook and aspirations of these groups was undertaken. In this respect, Reich based himself primarily on the "German Ideology". But once again it should be pointed out that the use of this specific text at this precise moment had a special significance. In its attempts to claim their intellectual heritage, Moscow had undertaken the publication of the complete Marx-Engels Werke, including the early works. Thus the "German Ideology" was for the first time published in its entirety in 1932 (23).

Yet, it was to become one of the main instruments for the critique of vulgar Marxism. Up to this day its interpretation stands at the centre of the

debate on the possibility or impossibility of a Marxist (social) psychology: in France between Althusser and Sève (24), in Germany around the Holzkamp Group.

IDEOLOGY AND SEXUALITY

Reich used the "German Ideology" to show that Marx and Engels had never meant man to be determined by economic conditions alone, but by material conditions in a much wider sense. These not only included natural conditions but also bodily drives. Reich also argued that the Marxists had focussed too much on basic drives such as hunger, while Freudians had shown that (especially in advanced societies) basic drives such as sex had a much greater plasticity and thus psychological influence.

The trouble was however, that Marxism had no theory of sex. The only related text was Engels' study on the "Origin of the Family" which we have already mentioned. Subsequent authors such as Kautsky, Cunow and Müller-Lyer had already tried to work out its anthropological implications. But Reich tried to work out its psychological implications. According to him, matriarchal and patriarchal society must have differed in their dominant personality type, just as capitalism and communism should differ in that respect. Once again this claim must be understood within the precise context of that moment.

In the second half of the twenties, the theory of matriarchy had received a major boost through the fieldwork which the anthropologist Malinowski had done among the Trobrianders in Melanesia. He reported to have found entirely different kinship and sex relations among them and different social and psychological structures. This led him to deny the universality of the Oedipus complex, which invited immediate opposition by Jones. Freud thereupon reconfirmed the inevitability of sexual repression in "Das Unbehagen in der Kultur", 1930 (incorrectly translated as "Civilization and its Discontents"). But Reich in turn denied the inevitability of sexual repression in "Der Einbruch der Sexualmoral" (1932, "The Imposition of Sexual morality"). It was in this book that the outline of his political psychology finally took form. According to him, sexual repression in capitalist society had an ideological function. This was most clearly demonstrable in the taboo on sexual play of children, for which no good reason could be given. This taboo served no other purpose than an arbitrary imposition of outside authority. It led to a vicious circle of guilt feelings and sexual obsessions, which made youngsters fearful and submissive, absorbed their psychic energy and kept them from social rebellion. "In sum, this represents nothing less than the ideological mooring of the dominant economic system in the psychic structure of the members of the oppressed class; in this manner political reaction is served" (25). Reich was convinced that this type of approach not only made possible an analysis of capitalism in general, but also of fascism in particular.

FASCISM AND SEXUALITY

The Reichstag fire had been followed by large scale razzia's in which 1500 left wing officials and intellectuals were arrested. A few days later the nazi newspaper "Der Völkische Beobachter" published a violent attack on Reich's work, and he thereupon fled to Copenhagen. The publication of his "Mass psychology of fascism" in Denmark was soon followed by a ban on his books in Germany, their seizure and burning. Somehow his analysis was not only seen as an insult, but also as a threat.

Reich claimed that sexual repression and authoritarian education were especially pronounced among the middle classes: small farmers and shopholders, civil servants and employees - although they extended both into the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. These phenomena produced the domineering/submissive traits which were obviously prominent in the nazi-movement. Fascism further exacerbated these attitudes in order to exploit them in an imperialist sense.

The pleasure anxiety of men was channeled into overwrought ideas about honour and duty. Uniforms and drills provided opportunities for an exhibition of virility. Violence and terror provided means of abreacting resentment and frustration. The pleasure anxiety of women was used in order to repress sexuality in favour of reproduction. Birth control and family planning were banned in order to encourage population growth. This would enlarge the labour reserve and the recruit's potential for industry and army in a war economy.

The disturbed relations with the fathers were translated into the Führer-principle and an extremely hierarchical organization: Befehl ist Befehl. Hitler himself showed the typical authority complex in a pronounced sense. The disturbed relations with the mothers and the disturbed identification with the family were translated into the Volksgemeinschaft-principle and nationalism. The fear of the external world and "the others" were translated into aggression against minorities and racism.

Emotional excitation was used to obstruct rational deliberation. Torch-light processions, and massive marches, rythmic music and collective shouting provoked a libidinal arousal which was veiled by moral appeals. According to Reich , it was more than a coincidence that the nazi flag used white, red and black - the symbols of purity, blood and death; and the Swastika - which was an ancient symbol of the sexual act. It revealed that the mass psychology of fascism was largely based on the redirection of unconscious forces.

The reception of Reich's analysis was mixed. According to some, he had hit upon some deep insights. But according to most, his theory was wide off the mark. In Denmark, he was expelled from the Communist Party. He adopted the pseudonym Ernst Parell and wrote an article "What is class consciousness" in which he linked the hostility to sexual and personal freedom to the failure of the left. He published it in his newly founded "Zeitschrift für Politische Psychologie und Sexualökonomie" - probably the first periodical to

carry the title "political psychology" (26).

REICH AND THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY

In conclusion one can say, that Reich's work between 1929 and 1934 must be understood: 1) as an attempt at a further development of psychoanalytic theories on sex and education; 2) as the first major attempt to combine the Freudian and Marxist approaches; 3) as an attempt at a further development of Marxist theories on ideology and politics; and 4) not so much as an early version of his subsequent orgone theories.

This latter misunderstanding had been promoted by the self-censorship which Reich imposed on his European work in the U.S. Words like "communist" and "socialist" were replaced by the more neutral "revolutionary". "Proletariat" was replaced by "working man", "bourgeois" was replaced by "reactionary". "Class-conscious" was replaced by "socially responsible" or "scientific", "consciousness" was replaced by "dynamic structure". Furthermore the original text was extended with another one of similar length, in which the later notion of "orgone energy" became the central concept (27). No wonder that few people recognize the book as an originally Freudo-Marxist theory.

The introduction of these more extravagant ideas furthermore prevented the recognition of Reich's influence on mainstream psychology, for example on the development of the well-known theory of the "Authoritarian personality". It should be noted however, that Reich was in touch with the so-called Frankfurt School in these years - some of whose members were working in a similar direction (28). Especially Fromm's early articles are important in this respect, while Marcuse was to emphasize closely related ideas only later. Together with Horkheimer they published the theoretical part of the "Studien über Autorität und Familie" in Paris in 1936, which are among the most interesting texts written on this subject.

It is remarkable though, that the Frankfurt School too fell impelled to impose self-censorship on its ideas when emigrating from Europe to America (29). Director Horkheimer dissuaded the use of marxist terminology. Left wingers like Marcuse and Neumann sought other employment. Adorno was asked to drop the Wiesengrund from his name (because there were too many "Jewish-sounding names" on the Institut's roster) - before he joined a major research project on anti-semitism (30).

In this perspective it is not surprising that the final study on "The Authoritarian Personality" (1930) retained little of the original social criticism. Meanwhile, the Cold War had broken out. The originally anti-capitalist concepts of Reich and the Frankfurt School were now transformed into anti communist concepts. This could only be accomplished by narrowing the analysis of fascism to the social-psychological superstructure, in which Hitlerism as a totalitarian ideology showed certain similarities to Stalinism. On the other side of the "Iron Curtain" a mirror-like ideological operation took place. There the analysis of fascism was fixated on the political-economic infrastructure, in which fascism as an imperialism showed certain similarities to

capitalism. Thus, the ignoring and misrepresentation of the early work of Reich and the Frankfurt School is part of a larger and more significant falsification in the history of ideas (31).

RESUMEN

El artículo examina algunas omisiones y malas interpretaciones de la aportación de W. Reich a las ciencias psicosociales que han tenido lugar recientemente, y, tras ofrecer una sucinta revisión de su biografía y su actividad política, evalúa sus ideas como el primer gran intento de combinar las teorías de Freud y de Marx acerca del hombre.

SUMMARY

Misunderstandings and omissions in recent social works about Reich's contributions to psychosocial sciences are here examined. Reich's life and political activities are taken into account in order to fully understand his theories that can be viewed as the first major attempt to combine the Freudian and the Marxist approaches to man.

NOTES

1. W. Reich, *People in Trouble*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux 1976 (1953), p. 13.
2. London: Macmillan 1976 (Baarn, Neth.: Wereldvenster 1977, p. 26/27); and London: Academic Press 1978, p. 25/26 respectively.
3. I have used the revised English edition published in Harmondsworth (U.K.) by Penguin in 1975, and a probably illegal reprint of the original German edition published in Frankfurt by Junius in 1972.
4. Of the various biographical studies the best, most complete and most balanced was published last year - Myron Sharaf's "Fury on Earth", New York: St. Martin's/marek 1983.
5. See: J. van Ginneken, *The Killing of the Father*, paper presented at the 6th Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Oxford (U.K.), July 1983. To be published in: "Psyche" (FRG).
6. See: Ernest Jones, *The life and work of Sigmund Freud*. Abr. ed. Harmondsworth (U.K.): Penguin 1964, p. 483 a.f.
7. In this early period, Freudians also declared "difficult" people like Tausk, Ferenczi, Zilboorg and Harnik to be "madmen" (See Paul Roazen, *Freud and his followers*. Harmondsworth, U.K.: 1979, p. 370). In a later period, psychoanalysts also dismissed people like Moreno and Laing as "psychotic" (see Myron Sharaf, *op. cit.* in note 4, p. 8).
8. Both Reich's personality and preoccupations are often related to a traumatic event in his youth. He supposedly noticed his mother having an affair with his tutor, hinted of this to his father. His mother thereupon drank a household cleanser and died a few days later. His father walked into a cold pond, contracted pneumonia and died from

tuberculosis a few years later. Reich related the story in his first published article as if it had been told to him by a patient.

9. People in Trouble, op. cit. in note 1, p. 27. It is noteworthy that Reich emphasizes the unfeeling irrationality of the repressive apparatus, while previous mass psychologists had emphasized the unreasonable emotionality of the rebellious crowds. See J. van Ginneken, "The 1895 Debate on the Origins of the Crowd Psychology", paper presented at the second European Cheiron Meeting in Heidelberg (FRG), September 1983. To be published in the Journal for the History of the Behavioral Sciences (U.S.).
10. Socialist Association for Sexual Counseling and Sexual Research.
11. Geschlechtsreife, Enthaltensamkeit, Ehemoral - Kritik der bürgerlichen Sexualreform, Wien: Münster Verlag 1930.
12. National German Association for Proletarian Sexual Politics.
13. The sexual Struggle of Youth. Quoted after W.R. "Sex-pol Essays 1929-1934", ed. by Lee Baxandall and intr. by Bertell Ollmann, New York: Vintage 1972. As far as I know, this is the only English collection of Reich's work from this period in its original version.
14. See Eli Zaretsky, Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life: London: Pluto 1976; Ann Foreman, Feminity as Alienation - Women and the family in Marxism and Psychoanalysis, London: Pluto 1977; Rosalind Coward, Patriarchal Precedents - Sexuality and Social Relations, London: RKP 1983.
15. "Woman and Socialism" (und der = and, under = unter) had 50 reprints in 30 years and was translated in many other languages.
16. W.R., Sex-pol essays, op. cit. in note 13, p. 225.
17. In "The Sexual Revolution" (1936) Reich claimed that this would inevitably lead to submission to one leader (2nd Neth. ed. Groningen: Plutarchus 1949) p. 282.
18. See Ernest Nolte (hrsg.), Theorien über den Faschismus, Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch 1972.
19. The communists emphasized the "diversionary" similarities between fascist and social democrats, just as the socialists emphasized the "underdemocratic" similarities between fascists and communists.
20. In: Wolfgang Abendroth (hrsg.) Faschismus und Kapitalismus, Frankfurt: E.V.A. 1972. And in: Reinhard Kühnl (hrsg.) Texte zur Faschismus diskussion, Reinbek/Hamburg: Rowohlt 1974.
21. Marx also applied this theory to his "class struggle in France" and Engels applied it to Bismarck. The theory is discussed in Mihaly Vajda, Fascism as a mass movement, London: Allison & Busby 1976, Ch. XII. And in more detail by Rüdiger Griepenburg and K.H. Tjaden in "Das Argument", Dec. 1966, p. 461-472. Trotsky used the theory in a modified form.
22. Theodor Geiger, Die Soziale Schichtung des deutschen Volkes - Soziographischer Versuch auf statistischer Grundlage, Stuttgart: Enke 1932. The next year Geiger left party and country, and fled to Copenhagen - just like Reich. See: Renate Mayntz (ed./intr.). Theodor Geiger on social Order and Mass Society, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969.
23. Leszek Kolakowski, Main Currents of Marxism, Oxford: Univ. Press 1981, Vol. I, ch. VIII.

24. See especially the postscript to the third edition of Lucien Sève, *Man in Marxist theory and the psychology of personality*, Hassocks (Sussex, U.K.): Harvester 1978, p. 439-503.
25. Sex-pol essays, op. cit. (note 13) p. 246.
26. J. van Ginneken. Over de zogenoemde politieke psychologie en haar achtergronden, *Psychologie en Maatschappij* (Neth.) no. 22, March 1983.
27. See Penguin-edition, op. cit. (note 3), p. 27 a.f.
28. He wrote a review of two American books on social pathology for their "Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung", while Landauer and Fromm reviewed some of his books mentioned here. Fromm's articles in the first volumes of the *Zeitschrift* deal with closely related matters.
29. Self censorship is of course only one aspect of a more complicated process. On the one hand there is no doubt in my mind that both Reich and certain members of the Frankfurt School partly suppressed Marxist vocabulary because they thought it would facilitate their insertion into American intellectual life. On the other hand, it is obvious that they were gradually turning away from Marxism anyway. Both aspects reinforced each other.
30. See e.g. M. Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination - A History of the Frankfurt School*, Boston: Little & Brown 1973 (pp. 34, 44). And H. Hughes, *The Sea Change - The Migration of Social Thought*, New York: Harper & Row 1975 (pp. 149, 174) etc.
31. See also: Pierre Aycoberry, *The Nazi Question - An Essay on the Interpretation of National Socialism 1922-1975*, New York: Pantheon 1981-ch. 8.