

# Lucerne, August 1934 An Emotional Plague Victory

*Alberto Foglia, M.D.*

---

## **Abstract**

*At the 13th International Psychoanalytic Congress, held in Lucerne, Switzerland in August 1934, psychoanalysis arrived at its epilogue. Several conflicts came to an end, revealing the unconscious plan to destroy the epochal discovery of Freud and impede its further development in the form of Wilhelm Reich's new theory. This is a historical example of a successful operation of the Emotional Plague.*

---

## **Introduction**

In Lucerne in 1934 the emotional plague delivered the last blow in its victory against the functional truth of a revolutionary, epochal discovery of human knowledge.<sup>1</sup> Sigmund Freud, for the first time in history, had recognized that human beings possess unconscious desires, emotions and ideas. These are mostly of a sexual nature and present from infancy, but are impeded by the outer world. Neuroses, mental disorders and emotional suffering are the consequences of this conflict between inner sexual drives and external prohibitions. In Lucerne 1934 every one of the problems facing psychoanalysis and its authoritative representatives came to a definitive resolution and every resolution stood in contrast to the functional truth of Freud's original discovery. Wilhelm Reich was the most prominent opponent of these resolutions, even up to the point of his exclusion from the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA). Rightly, he felt he was the legitimate representative of Freud's scientific theory based on sexuality and that his orgasm theory was a natural development from the first assumptions of Freud. As such, it was also a step toward an expansion of psychoanalytic theory into the social and biological realms. As the true natural heir of Freud and psychoanalysis, Reich

<sup>1</sup>For a thorough understanding of the importance of Freud's discovery, see Harman, pages 32-35.

knew that eliminating him meant eliminating this discovery and killing the real core of psychoanalysis. He lost the battle, developed sex-economy and sex-politics, which in turn allowed him to discover vegetotherapy. Later, he discovered the existence of orgone energy and with it medical orgone therapy, a much more effective therapeutic tool compared with psychoanalysis.<sup>2</sup> Psychoanalysis, on the other hand, died definitively and was transformed into the empty, castrated, psychologically oriented, ineffective ego psychology of Anna Freud, that would later influence all other psychological psychotherapies.

### The 13th International Psychoanalytic Conference

At the 13th International Psychoanalytic Congress, held in Lucerne, Switzerland from Monday, August 27 to Friday, August 31, 1934, Wilhelm Reich, MD, member of the German Psychoanalytic Society (*Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft, DPG*) and of the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA), senior analyst, supervisor and director of the Technical Seminar in Vienna from 1924 until 1930, author of renowned books like *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, *Character Analysis* and *The Function of the Orgasm*, was expelled from the IPA after being asked to resign from the German Psychoanalytic Society (Konia 1995, pages 97-99; Nitzschke, pages 2-23; Mühlleitner 2008, pages 240-244). "It is not too much to say that the whole Congress was under the impress of this painful affair" (Reich 1967, page 260).

Meanwhile, other crucial events were evolving during this historical time, of which "The Case of Wilhelm Reich" (Fallend-Nitzschke, pages 68-130) was but one piece of the puzzle.

The Lucerne Congress of the IPA was the 13th since 1908, when the first informal congress was held in Salzburg, Germany (Gifford, page 9). More importantly, it was the first since Hitler's nomination as Chancellor of Germany, on January 30, 1933. Speeches included in the scientific program were on masochism by Sandor Rado, MD; on anxiety by Otto Fenichel, MD; on ego-psychology by Paul Federn, MD; on the manic-depressive disorder by Melanie Klein; on quixotism by

<sup>2</sup>The preoccupation to ameliorate the "therapeutic misery" of psychoanalysis was always a central interest in Reich's research (Laska, page 42).

Helene Deutsch, MD; on self-destruction by Karl A. Menninger, MD; on character analysis by Wilhelm Reich, MD; and on the problem of puberty, the last day of the Congress, by Anna Freud, to mention only the most famous psychoanalysts of that time (Brainin, pages 48-57). The scientific content of the papers presented didn't reveal the importance of the conflicts that were occurring contemporaneously in the organization. These conflicts, in fact, were kept under the surface and handled in an ambivalent, intriguing way (Mühlleitner 2008, page 243).

Let us consider the various elements that crystallized out in Lucerne.

### Psychoanalysis and the Nazi Regime

At the time of the Lucerne Congress, most of German psychoanalysis was already "aryanized" (Brainin, page 10). Soon after Hitler's nomination as Chancellor of Germany in January 1933, the Nazi regime officially decreed, on April 9, 1933, that Jewish people were to be removed from any position of responsibility in medical organizations. Psychoanalysis, considered to be "Jewish-Marxist trash," was especially under scrutiny (Brecht, pages 94, 103). Books of Freud were burned during the May 10, 1933 book burning of 25,000 "un-German" books (Nitzschke, pages 5-6; Gay, pages 592-593). Psychoanalytic authorities, including the always-consulted Freud,<sup>3</sup> made every effort to help their association survive (Jones, pages 619-621) by assuming ambivalent attitudes toward Jewish members such as Max Eitingon, MD, who were asked to resign voluntarily (Brainin, page 12; Nitzschke, page 14), and Marxist members like Otto Fenichel, MD and Wilhelm Reich, MD, who expected a more courageous stand against the Nazi regime from the leaders of the IPA. On the other side, this ambivalent attitude was expressed by supporting people like Felix Boehm, MD and Carl Müller-Braunschweig, MD, who actively worked to find a way to appease, if not openly collaborate and identify with the German regime. This led to the ignominious article of Müller-

<sup>3</sup>"But in truth, all strings were held together in his firm hand and none of the others, not even the International president, would have dared to decree anything without first asking Freud" (Sadger, pages 41, 128). See also the letters of Boehm, Jones, and Federn to Freud, Sigmund and Anna, in the exhaustive references in Fallend-Nitzschke 1997 and Laska 1981.

Braunschweig on the "Reichswart," the "Organ of the European Racist Alliance," of October 22, 1933, in which Freudian psychoanalysis was distorted in such a way as to render it acceptable to the Nazis.

All this happened prior to or contemporaneous with the Congress of Lucerne, a turning point in the history of psychoanalysis and human knowledge. As John F. Rittmeister, MD wrote, "Life goes on here in a most peculiar way" (Brainin, page 23; Brecht, pages 1, 4).

The accomodation, in fact, advanced to such lengths that in 1936 the Berlin Institute was incorporated into the Göring Institute, the German Institute for Psychological Research and Psychotherapy led by Mathias Heinrich Göring, MD, cousin of Hermann Göring (Brecht, pages 97, 136; Fallend-Nitzschke, page 74). The German Psychoanalytic Society, itself, was dissolved in 1938 and its members entered the Göring Institute as the so-called "Group A" (Brecht, page 130).

### The Question of Lay Analysis

Around the time of the Lucerne Congress another conflict between psychoanalysts was reaching its solution: the question of lay analysts, the non-physician analysts (Brainin, page 13). In 1914, non-physicians were not allowed to practice psychoanalysis (Sadger, page 103) and non-physicians among the Wednesday Psychological Society, later called the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society (Mühlleitner 1992), did not exceed 15% of the total membership. This rose to 46% in 1922 and a remarkable 54-56% in 1924 and 1926. All of these non-physician analysts were, by then, in their own private practices. In 1934, during the Lucerne Congress, the percentage of lay analysts was constant at around 50%. The reason for the sharp rise from 1922 to 1927 was certainly a consequence of the growing influence of Freud's daughter, Anna, (Young-Bruehl, pages 147, 149) and Freud's open support of lay analysis, publicly advanced with the publication in 1926 of *The Question of Lay Analysis*. Freud wrote this paper on the occasion of the Austrian authorities' investigation of the illegal practice of medicine by Theodor

Reik, PhD, one of the earliest lay analysts. Freud, using his prestige and authority, turned the decision in favor of Reik's position (Wallerstein, page 9; Gay, pages 490-492; Jones, pages 583-584). In July 1926, Freud had also written to the *New Free Press* (*Neue Freie Presse*) in favor of lay analysis, referring to Reik and his daughter, Anna (Freud, 1926).

Nevertheless, not all psychoanalysts accepted this view (Gay, page 495; Young-Bruehl, page 173; Reich 1967, pages 251-255). In fact, "90 percent of the psychoanalytic medical community would have rejected treatment by lay analysts had not Freud and a few blind followers been at work" (Sadger, page 121). Only the British, the Dutch and, especially, the Americans (Brainin, page 13; Mühlleitner 2008 page 163; Young-Bruehl, page 262; Wallerstein, page 20) resisted this development, which explains why the prestige of psychoanalysis and psychotherapeutic psychiatry declined later in America than in Europe.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, at the Lucerne Congress the psychoanalytic world was deeply transformed. In reality, it was dying: "[I]t was the last night of the old Freudian guard" (Brainin, page 45).

### "Thanatos," the Theoretical Shift

At the time of the Lucerne Conference, a third irreconcilable conflict raged within the psychoanalytic community. It was the debate over a theoretical, far from insignificant problem: the "death instinct." It began in 1920 with Freud's publications of *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, continued in 1923 with *The Ego and the Id* and ended in 1926 with *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety*. These works presented a major shift in Freud's theory of psychoanalysis away from the discovery of the unconscious with the relevance of the sexual drive and its energy, the libido, and its social repression in the etiology of neurosis. After this shift, the human mind was seen as divided into three structural parts, the Id, the Ego and the Super-Ego. Anxiety was no longer felt to be the result of repression of sexual drives but a "warning signal" of the Ego.

<sup>4</sup>The American Psychoanalytic Society definitively abandoned its defensive position against lay analysis in 1988, following a lawsuit by three psychologists (Gifford, page 179; Wallerstein, pages ix-x).

Libido became *Eros*, a biologically-rooted drive, counteracted by the likewise biologically-rooted *Thanatos*,<sup>5</sup> the death instinct (Freud 1989, page 53).

This theoretical change of direction did not occur without resistance. Even Anna Freud adopted it cautiously (Young-Bruehl, pages 161-162). Of the opponents, however, Wilhelm Reich was clearly the most resolute (Brainin, pages 23-24). In his paper, "The Masochistic Character. A Sexual-Economic Refutation of the Death Instinct and the Compulsion to Repeat," published in 1932, Reich demonstrated that masochism is not a primary but a secondary neurotic drive. He showed that because it is not due to a death instinct but rather to a specific form of orgasm anxiety, there is no biological striving for unpleasure (Reich 1972, page 225). This manuscript elicited a vehemently negative reaction from Freud (Mühlleitner 2008, page 196), who first intended to add an addendum to Reich's article, identifying Reich as a member of the Communist Party (Sharaf, page 183). Instead, S. Bernfeld, PhD, exhorted by Freud, published that same year a 30-page reply (Mühlleitner 2008, page 197; Jones, page 608) criticizing Reich's political activism without discussing the clinical argument Reich had put forth (Fallend-Nitzschke, page 139; Reich 1967, pages 155-158).

Here in Lucerne in the summer of 1934 psychoanalysis was preparing the final blow against what was left of its own scientific foundations.

### The "Case of Wilhelm Reich," the Final Blow

Long supported by Freud himself (Jones, page 622)—who may have considered him as "the best head" among the analysts (Sharaf, pages 82-84; Roazen, page 503)—Wilhelm Reich began to experience mounting criticism by his colleagues following his discoveries of the function of the orgasm and orgasmic potency. The first negative comment by Freud came in 1926, when Reich presented a manuscript on the function of the orgasm at Freud's 70th birthday party (Sharaf,

<sup>5</sup>Freud used the term "death instinct." The term "Thanatos" was introduced in psychoanalysis by Stekel (Roazen, page 218).

pages 98-100; Fallend-Nitzschke, page 136). This continued in 1927 with Freud stating, "There is no single cause for the neuroses," referring to Reich's theory of the orgasm disturbance. In 1929, Freud opined: "Your opinion lies outside the middle road of psychoanalysis," (Fallend-Nitzschke, page 138) which was the definitive sign of the rupture with the venerated master. Freud's hostility toward Reich increased with the Nazi threat to psychoanalysis after January 1933 (Nitzschke, page 7). Anna Freud wrote, "My father cannot wait to get rid of Reich as a member, he is offended by his forcing analysis into politics, where analysis doesn't belong" (Fallend-Nitzschke, page 141). On April 17, 1933, Freud himself expressed his clear desire to distance himself from Reich by saying to Böhm, "*Free me from Reich*" ("*Befreien Sie mich von Reich*") (Brecht, pages 100-101, italics in the original). In 1931, Eitingon, president of the German Psychoanalytic Society, told Reich that he should no longer hold talks with "sociological contents." In 1933, Reich lost the right to enter the offices of the institutes of the IPA, for fear he might be arrested with negative consequences for the Association. That same year, Freud's son, Martin, lawyer and director of the editing house of the IPA that had previously published Reich's works, officially communicated to Reich that he would not publish his new book, *Character Analysis*, for political reasons, forcing Reich to do so privately (Fallend-Nitzschke, pages 69, 142; Sharaf, page 171). On August 1, 1934, Reich was informed by Müller-Braunschweig, Secretary of the German Psychoanalytic Society (GPS), that, because of the political situation, he was no longer considered a member of the GPS and consequently of the IPA, but could be enrolled as a member of the Norwegian Society (in 1933 Reich had moved to Denmark, then Sweden and later Norway), which would have been recognized at the Congress in Lucerne (Reich 1976, pages 243-244; 1967, page 189). But this was not in actuality the case and Reich was asked to resign "voluntarily," the same tactic used with the Jewish members. At his refusal, he was informed at the beginning of the Lucerne Congress that he was no longer a member of any recognized psychoanalytic association belonging to the IPA (Sharaf, pages 186-188; Fallend-

Nitzschke, pages 85-94; Mühlleitner 2008, pages 241-242; Reich 1976, pages 224-253; 1967, pages 255-261; 1994, page 3).

In August 1934, at their 13th International Congress, in an underhanded, power-political way, psychoanalysts got rid of a troublesome colleague, Wilhelm Reich, indelibly marking their history forever.

### The Given and the Real Motives

In these seemingly separate facts, so fatefully crystallized in the summer of 1934 in Lucerne, one is struck by the presence of a red thread that connects them: a constant divergence between the given and the real motives behind the different positions assumed by the psychoanalytic community and its leaders. Once the real motives are revealed, a unitary plan appears: an *unconscious destructive* one.

The appeasement of the Nazi regime with the anguished departure of its Jewish members was explained by the psychoanalytic authority as a pure survival tactic (Nitzschke, page 15; Mühlleitner 2008, page 240; Jones, pages 619-621). In reality, it was at least a sign of profound weakness if not of total blindness and an alliance with a destructive force intending to “annihilate European Jewry,” (Stewart-Steinberg, page 12) an essential component of German and Austrian society. Jews, in fact, were prominent in the most productive ranks of society of that time (Brainin, page 11). In regard to psychoanalysis, 96% of its early members were Jews (Sadger, page 96) and the role of Jewish culture for psychoanalysis cannot be underestimated. Some authors assert that Judaism’s more positive attitude toward natural sexuality—in contrast to the Christian vision of sexuality as sinful—contributed to Freud’s epochal discovery (Brainin, page 41; Sadger, pages 46-47 and 79).

Wilhelm Reich stood as a clear opponent of the adaptation maneuvers of the analysts and an obstacle to their fulfillment. Fenichel, also a member of the Marxist oppositional group in the IPA, later admitted his mistake of not having followed the intransigent position of Reich in this regard (Mühlleitner 2008, page 243; Fallend-

Nitzschke, page 75). Appeasement of such a regime meant appeasement of the killers of psychoanalytic knowledge (Reich 1976, page 251), exactly the opposite of what was consciously intended.

The progressive expansion of the number of lay analysts among the psychoanalysts was explained as an attempt to counteract the “medicalization” of psychoanalysis and the danger of the mechanization of Freud’s discoveries, as happened in Britain and more so in the United States. Also, there was the desire to avoid any regimentation or submission to the authority of the medical and psychiatric establishment (Freud 1990, pages 86, 89; Stewart-Steinberg, page 40; Wallerstein, page 10; Gay, pages 492-493). If one carefully reads Freud’s *The Question of Lay Analysis*, however, one cannot find a convincing argument in favor of lay analysis, apart from a remarkable hostility toward physicians.<sup>6</sup> Here, too, we see a change in direction of Freud’s thought: Lay analysis was viewed as an application of psychoanalysis to the fields of education, history, sociology and mythology, but without a therapeutic function.<sup>7</sup> This limitation began to change until it was removed altogether starting in the early 1920s (Jones, pages 580-586; Sadger, pages 102-103).

Several authors suggest that Freud had always been in favor of non-physician analysts (Jones, page 584; Gay, pages 189-190 and 492; Wallertsein, pages 1-4 and 9). In this author’s opinion, this is only partly true. Freud had always suffered from the rejection of psychoanalysis by the medical and psychiatric establishments (Sadger, page 25 and pages 38-39; Wallertsein, page 3; Jones, pages 311-312 and 380-385; Roazen, pages 224-225). In his search for an heir, the “crown prince,” (Gay, page 197; Roazen, page 227) he chose C.G. Jung, MD, a psychiatrist (Jones, page 329; Fallend-Nitzschke, page 149) working under Eugen Bleuler, MD, head of the world-renowned Burghölzli psychiatric hospital. With Jung, Freud thought that psychoanalysis could have been linked to the clinic where it belonged (Freud 2013, pages 28-29; Sadger, pages 71,78). The profound disappointment with Jung’s betrayal in 1914 (Jung had abandoned the theory of the libido

<sup>6</sup>See also Sadger, pages 101-123; Wallerstein, pages 1-21; Reich 1967, pages 251-255.

<sup>7</sup>“Psychoanalysis is a procedure for the medical treatment of neurotic patients” wrote Freud in 1919” (Roazen, page 441).

for a more mystical approach) and the reaction of the medical world in favor of Jung's "conversion to a saner view of life," as written in the *British Medical Journal* (Jones, page 414), explain the increase of Freud's hostility toward the medical profession. Moreover, his open support of lay analysis for therapeutic purposes in 1926-7 coincided with the establishment of his youngest daughter, Anna, as an unchallenged heir (Roazen, page 441). A graduate school teacher, Anna had participated in the Vienna Psychoanalytic seminars since 1918, became an official member in 1922, entered the Committee in 1925, became Secretary in 1927 (Young-Bruehl, page 173) and Director of the Vienna Training Institute in 1935 (Young-Bruehl, pages 11, 112, and 140-141; Mühlleitner 1992, pages 101-103).<sup>8</sup> Starting in 1924, Anna brought a number of non-medical students into psychoanalytic institutions, who began practicing adult therapeutic psychoanalysis (Stewart-Steinberg, page 34), hence the sharp rise of lay-analysts in the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society in the following years. In America, the resistance to lay analysis allowed the psychiatric community to continue its domination of psychoanalysis for many more years, concretizing Freud's old dream of uniting psychoanalysis with the clinic. "With the analytical trained physician, the curse of somatic prejudice is at least compensated for by the blessing of natural-scientific and clinical thought. If medicine is caught in the meshes of mechanical-chemical thinking, then psychoanalysis is called upon to liberate it from its errors," wrote Reich in 1927 (Reich 1967, page 254).

However, the lack of a real scientific basis and the technical therapeutic insufficiency of psychoanalysis in treating human emotional problems and major mental disorders decreed the decline of psychoanalytic psychiatry in favor of today's mechano-mystical psychiatry (Konia 2007, pages 6-17; Paris, pages 92-98). Nevertheless, the American resistance to lay analysis slowed the death of

<sup>8</sup>Describing lay analysts with the right to treat patients, Freud wrote that they are "people of academic education, doctors of philosophy, educationists, together with a few women of great experience in life and outstanding personality" (Freud 1990, page 79). One is struck by such an affirmation: to treat human neuroses you need not be a doctor, but any academic or a *woman of outstanding personality*, implying a woman without an academic degree like his daughter.

psychoanalysis and the decline of psychiatry, at least in the U.S. This is exactly the opposite of what was feared with the given, stated motives.

The introduction of the concept of the death instinct, the new structuralization of the psychic apparatus with the predominancy of the Ego, the interpretation of anxiety as a signal of danger, were all rationalized as new attempts to explain unresolved clinical facts: the failure of psychoanalysis to cure many neurotic symptoms, the unresolved clinical problem of masochism (Jones, page 509) and its theoretical consequences in the social realm (Stewart-Steinberg, pages 20-21), the compulsive quality of war neurosis—an almost overwhelming practical problem after 1919—and the "compulsion to repeat" as seen in child play (Freud 1989, pages 13-17). All these "resistances to get well," "self destructive tendencies," and "negative therapeutic reactions" were explained by the "need for punishment," the death instinct. Hence, in Freud's thinking, masochism became a primary drive. "The whole concept of the neurosis was made upside down... up to that time, a neurosis was considered to be the result of a conflict between sexuality and *fear* of punishment... such a formulation meant a complete liquidation of the psychoanalytic theory of neuroses" (Reich 1967, pages 248-249). In reality, this new theoretical approach of Freud reveals his pessimistic, resigned attitude. Freud wrote in 1927: "This is a book of an old man" (Laska, page 24). Psychoanalysis was in crisis, its effectiveness was in doubt, the debate on the sociological origin of neurosis was inflamed, and its theoretical foundations were unable to hold up to these new challenges (Laska, pages 24-25 and 42-44). The solution proposed by Freud deprived psychoanalysis of its original unconscious, instinctual, biological roots, confining it in an "ego-psychology" of social adaptation, in the more superficial conscious realm. The political attitude of psychoanalysis mirrored its theoretical assumptions: "I had the feeling that the IPA had excluded the sexual theory, the vital nerve of psychoanalysis" (Reich 1976, page 249).

In 1934, psychoanalysis was splitting apart. Freud and his new superficial, psychological, ego-centered approach based upon a vague

immovable biological determinism opposed Reich's character- and musculature-centered approach based upon an increasingly studied, objectifiable biological energy (the old concept of libido) whose metabolism is impeded by the outer world. The first implied a resigned and retiring attitude toward society and its role in the determination of human suffering, the second a clear and active expansion into the social realm to find the origin of the same suffering with a new epochal discovery: the *emotional plague*. In Lucerne, psychoanalysis had opted for its own social and scientific death, exactly the opposite of what was consciously intended.

The reasons given for the expulsion of Reich from the IPA were related to his political activism aggravated by the particular tenacity and "fanatism" of his "difficult character... in part because of his Bolshevism and in greater part because the Freuds felt he had become quite unstable" (Young-Bruehl, page 202). His activism was seen as a danger for an institution under threat of extinction by an inimical regime (Nitzschke, page 15). Ernest Jones, MD, however, thought that Reich was not a good analyst (Fallend-Nitzschke, page 91; Brainin, page 12), while Rado and Federn, early analysts of Reich, had already begun to spread rumors about his sanity in the 1920s and early 1930s (Sharaf, pages 193-194; Reich-Rubin, pages 24, 30). These rumors increased during the Congress of Lucerne involving a clear sexual defamation (Reich-Rubin, page 29). *In reality, Reich had to be expelled.*

Not one of the planned solutions to the problems facing the psychoanalytic establishment was in accord with Reich's work. His scientific development from the early assumptions of Freud were taking him outside the restricted realm of psychic functions, expanding into the social realm, and simultaneously into the biological as well. This was incompatible with the direction psychoanalysis was taking after 1920. "The organization had not based my exclusion on either my scientific views or my political sympathies. There were many in the IPA with diverse scientific views, and many Communists as well. The incompatibility with IPA membership lay in my *having derived social consequences from scientific findings*, i.e. the

development of sex-politics from scientific sex-economy" (Reich 1976, page 250, italics in the original).

The compromise with the Nazi regime was unacceptable to Reich not only on political grounds but for scientific reasons: "I had written a three-hundred-page book on the mass psychology of fascism" (Reich 1976, page 251). In his open scientific and political criticism of Freud's *The Question of Lay Analysis* at the 1927 Congress of Innsbruck, Reich took the position in favor of a medical, natural-scientific grounded psychoanalysis (Reich 1967, 251-255). The theory of the death instinct was incompatible with the function of the orgasm, not only on psychodynamic grounds, but also with respect to the sociological meaning of sexual impotence in the armored masses and their relationship with society. A "voluntary" resignation from the IPA was out of the question for Reich (Fallend-Nitzschke, page 89). His intention was functional and in accordance with his characteranalytic technique, in particular, in his approach to the emotional plague: exposing the real motives behind the destructive behavior. Therefore, he was expelled, even if psychoanalysis still denied it in the 1950s: "It was on this occasion that Wilhelm Reich resigned from the Association," wrote Jones referring to the 1934 Lucerne Congress in his Freud biography (Jones, page 622; Fallend-Nitzschke, page 14). Reich's name "simply disappeared without leaving a trace in the annals of the IPA" (Nitzschke, page 10; Fallend-Nitzschke, pages 88-89). In the voluminous Freud biography of Paul Gay, Reich's name is not even mentioned (Brainin, page 38).

With the expulsion of Reich, the path to a new asexual, superficial, ego-centered, "politically neutral," "demedicalized" psychoanalysis was finally open. With one final blow, Wilhelm Reich was out; the grotesque, indirect, political maneuvering and intrigue of the IPA took over. This became the psychoanalysis of Anna Freud (Stewart-Steinberg, page 96).

### The Operation of the Emotional Plague

A marked incongruence between the given and real motives—the real motives are always hidden and camouflaged by highly rationalized, socially acceptable reasons, often “for the good of others”—is a characteristic manifestation of the human disorder discovered by Reich which he called “the Emotional Plague.” The emotional plague is an infectious emotional disease that manifests itself in the social realm in the form of destructiveness (Reich 1972, pages 504-510; Baker 2000, pages 158-165; Konia 2008, pages xxi-xxii, 23-29 and 84-91). “Cruelty, criminality, nasty gossip, resentment of other’s good fortune, all are examples of plague behavior, behavior not just unhealthy but destructive of the health of others” (Baker, page 154). “Sexual feelings are intolerable for them [emotional plague characters], and they do not have access to the usual defense mechanisms of ordinary neurotics, such as reaction formation, flight, and contactlessness. Instead, they handle their sexuality by attacking and attempting to destroy especially those elements in their environment they perceive as lively and exciting.... For such individuals, natural, spontaneous expression of any kind excites intolerable longing, driving them to behave in a hateful, life-negative manner toward others...” (Konia 2008, page 86).

Reich distinguishes emotional plague characters, those individuals that function according to this biopathy, from the emotional plague attack—destructive social behavior originating in every armored individual and always “produced by a disturbance in the person’s love life” (Reich 1972, page 505). There are specific symptoms of this disease: it is infectious, transmissible to others, with epidemic outbursts and endemic courses; it is characterized by a sadistic or pornographic sexuality; the presence of healthy natural sexuality causes intolerable longing and must be moralistically stopped or pornographically soiled (sexual defamation is a typical manifestation); it is ego-syntonic and therefore strongly defended; exposure results in anxiety or rage. Emotional plague characters hate productive, creative work and tend to control others’ work. They also have a strong tendency to form

organizations or take over existing ones. Biophysically, they possess a high energy level and an insuperable pelvic block.

### The Vector and the Transmission

The emotional plague is an emotional infectious disease transmissible to human beings through a vector organism. If the pathogenic agent of the bubonic plague is a bacteria, the vector is the flea that carries this microorganism to human beings making them sick and simultaneously becoming carriers themselves. In the case of the emotional plague, the pathogenic agent is an individual or emotional plague character that infects and excites others with hatred and destructiveness, who become carriers to spread the pestilence. The vector of the emotional plague is “the still undetected germ carrier of the emotional plague,” “the tight, hardened, squeezed, miserable, impotent, love-starved little man” (Reich 1990, page 96).

### The Role of Anna Freud

Some authors suggest that behind the plot at the Lucerne Congress there could have been Anna Freud (Reich-Rubin, pages 25, 31-32), also seen as a “betrayal of her father’s fundamental discovery...” (Stewart-Steinberg, page 4).<sup>9</sup> Anna Freud had taken over psychoanalysis shortly before Lucerne (Young-Bruehl, page 200). She was identified with ego-psychology (Roazen, pages 453-460) introduced by her father and had neurotic motives to be hostile to Reich (Reich-Rubin, pages 33-35), even if she never expressed it overtly. (Reich naively thought she was sympathetic to him; see Reich 1976, page 248). Anna Freud was an emotionally unhealthy person (Young-Bruehl, pages 137, 196; Stewart-Steinberg, page 4) and had developed a highly neurotic interdependence with her father (Young-Bruehl, pages 55, 59, 67, 71-72, 82, 116-117, 120, 122 and 196). She seemed to have actively participated in the character and sexual defamation of Reich that continued even after Lucerne (Reich-Rubin, pages 31-32

<sup>9</sup>Some others suggest Ernst Jones (Fallend-Nitzschke, pages 101-102), but he was not so influential with Freud. In fact, he was in conflict with him on several issues: the question of lay analysis and the rising power of Anna Freud (Young-Bruehl, pages 171, 173; Stewart-Steinberg, pages 33-34).



and 34-35). Characterologically, she is described as a masculine, authoritarian person (Young-Bruehl, pages 76-77 and 149), in fact a high-energy individual,<sup>10</sup> without “appearing to be so” (Young-Bruehl, page 200; Reich-Rubin, page 31). She was involved in the tragic and grotesque intrigue and participated in every one of the above-mentioned destructive actions of the psychoanalytic establishment: appeasement of the Nazis, the “demedicalization” and “denaturalization” of psychoanalysis, the theoretical shift to what became her “ego-psychology,” and finally the expulsion of psychoanalysis’s natural heir, Wilhem Reich. Anna Freud possessed all the criteria to be defined as an emotional plague character (Reich 1972, pages 504-510), a medical diagnosis that is not a “derogatory phrase,” nor does it imply any “conscious malevolence, moral or biological degeneracy, immorality, etc.” (Reich 1972, page 504). Therefore, she could have been the pathogenic agent that infected Sigmund Freud and the psychoanalytic movement to accomplish the unconscious goal of destroying the “vital core” of psychoanalysis.

However, in this author’s opinion, Anna Freud couldn’t have had so predominant a role in the emotional plague behavior of the psychoanalytic movement before WWII. In contrast with the opinion of some authors,<sup>11</sup> she could not have had such a degree of influence over her father to cause the profound change in Freud’s thinking seen between 1919 and 1927. Moreover, this change of mind began earlier than 1919 (Young-Bruehl, page 92; Gay, page 395) when Anna was too young to have had such effect on her father’s opinions. Nevertheless, as any individual with a “disturbance in love life,” (Reich 1972, page 505) she, herself, was the victim of the emotional plague and became infected, carrying and further spreading the plague.

<sup>10</sup>“Anna ist stärker wie ich” (“Anna is stronger than me”) (Stewart-Steinberg, pages 47-48), a famous lapsus of Freud referring to his daughter. In fact, the phrase is at least ambiguous and can be translated as “Anna is stronger, like me.”

<sup>11</sup>Melanie Klein wrote in her statements about Freud: “[I]n his later contributions to theory some of his great findings were weakened or left aside... That might have had many reasons in himself, such as age, his illness... I am convinced though that Anna’s influence was one of the factors that held him back...” (Grosskurth, page 386).

### The Role of Sigmund Freud

On the other side of the equation we know that Freud was sexually dissatisfied<sup>12</sup> (Gay, pages 163-164; Jones, page 453; Reich 1976, page 20; 1967, pages 129-130; Roazen, pages 49-55). He was also profoundly disappointed by his disciples and colleagues (Gay, page 177; Reich 1967, page 19) and worried about the future of psychoanalysis. In the fall of 1923, Freud was diagnosed with a cancer of the upper jaw and began a long and painful ordeal of surgical interventions lasting fourteen years (Sadger, page 124; Gay, pages 418-419), during which he pathologically clung to his daughter, Anna (Young-Bruehl, page 118; Gay, page 428).

We know from Reich that a cancer biopathy relies on a deep emotional resignation that begins years or decades before the actual appearance and diagnosis of cancer (Reich 1973, pages 210-211). Freud’s theoretical change of mind starting in 1919 or even earlier is a clear manifestation of a profound transformation in his bioenergetic health: “Freud had to give up, as a person. He had to give up his personal pleasures, his personal delights, in his middle years... he smoked very much, very much. I always had the feeling he smoked—not nervousness, not nervousness—but because he wanted to say something which never came over his lips” (Reich 1967, pages 20-21). Freud’s deep resignation explains every action he took. They were all unconscious-driven attempts to stop the unbearable longing caused by his creation, psychoanalysis. In fact, he was behind every one of the decisions of the IPA and this explains the grotesque and indirect handling of the many actors involved. Freud was the ultimate authority and no decision could be taken without his approval. He decided the passive attitude toward the Nazis, he imposed lay analysis on his medical colleagues, he changed the fundamental basis of his theory in favor of a pessimistic, resigned vision. Finally, he was behind every action against Reich and wanted his expulsion. Reich was his natural heir, not Jung and not Anna, but Freud had grown too hostile toward him<sup>13</sup> and chose the wrong heir, condemning psychoanalysis to its death.

<sup>12</sup>In 1915, Freud wrote that he stood “for an infinitely freer sexual life, although I myself have made very little use of such freedom” (Roazen, page 49).

<sup>13</sup>“Fenichel, with his amenability for that dangerous fool Reich, has lost all value for me,” wrote Freud to Eitingon (Mühlleitner 2008, page 198).

Freud's mind, however, had remained brilliant (Reich, 1967, page 73): he never gave up his "obstinate dualism," his "firm dualist" theory of drives (Jones, page 475; Gay, page 397); he wanted psychoanalysis to reach psychosis and the clinic (Stewart-Steinberg, page 33); he saw child analysis as his future main research objective (Young-Bruehl, page 101); he was seeking a way to reach the social realm, "the wider social strata" (Young-Bruehl, pages 81, 102; Stewart-Steinberg, pages 14-49). According to Reich, with his concept of the "death instinct," Freud somehow foresaw the transformation of orgone energy into its stagnant counterpart, DOR (Deadly Orgone Energy) (Reich 1967, page 89). However, his Life Force was shrinking, dying, and all these bright ideas remained ideas without soul, products of the superficial realm of psychology, incapable of reaching the deeper realms of sociology and biology. Simultaneously, his new "ego psychology" became a philosophical art with little or no therapeutic efficacy. Sigmund Freud had transformed his brilliant discovery into empty words.

If Freud was a carrier of the emotional plague destroying psychoanalysis, he nevertheless wasn't an emotional plague character. Beyond his recognized genius, his "incredible love of truth" (Sadger, page 32) and "his simplicity," (Jones, pages 465 and 478-479) Freud had neurotic character traits: he was described as a "tyrant," a "sadist," had "moods and unpredictable temper," (Sadger, pages 32-44) was "distinctly indiscreet" (Jones, page 467) and "fatally addicted" to his cigars (Gay, page 169). Nevertheless, these traits don't satisfy the set of criteria necessary to objectify the above diagnosis (Reich 1972, pages 504-510).

In this author's opinion, the source of the emotional plague that initiated the long process of the destruction of psychoanalysis, in which even its founder took part, was the spreading gigantic emotional plague epidemic in Germany and Austria in the years preceding WWII. As an Austrian and a Jew, Freud was ambivalent himself about his origins (Sadger, pages 90-100; Gay, page 448) and remained entangled in the plague-ridden ideology of anti-semitism prevalent during those years. Here, too, the specific anti-sexual character of the plague-

ridden Nazi ideology against Jews cannot be underestimated (Reich 1971, pages 75-97). Freud himself had anti-semitic preconceptions (Sadger, page 97). His choice of Jung as heir in 1911 was not only due to his medical and psychiatric role but also to the fact that Jung wasn't Viennese and, moreover, was not Jewish (Sadger, pages 75-81; Gay, pages 201-204; Jones, pages 351-352 and 406).

Freud's "disturbance in love life" didn't allow him to ward off this continuous emotional plague attack (Nitzschke, page 7). Infected, he turned against the "Jewish-Marxist trash," the "vital nerve" of psychoanalysis and the work of his natural heir, Wilhelm Reich, who had further developed that "nerve" and even described its greatest enemy with its operational mode: the Emotional Plague.<sup>14</sup>

### Conclusion: The Consequences for Psychiatry

The Lucerne Congress of 1934 marked the death of the institutions (psychoanalysis and the IPA) that had been created to safeguard and administer one of the greatest scientific discoveries of human history. After several years of theoretical and political conflicts, psychoanalysis was deprived of its functional truth: sexuality. What remained became the ineffective psychology of Anna Freud with all its modern psychological psychotherapeutic variations. Reich, on the other side, moved alone toward his future science of orgonomy. "The consequences of this for psychiatry have been devastating" (Konia 1995, page 97). Freud's desired marriage between psychoanalysis and psychiatry failed. Its functional value was demonstrated in the U.S. where, despite its castrated character, it was advantageous for both for many years more (Konia 2007, pages 6-9; Paris, pages 38-50). However, its insufficient scientific basis, made worse after the loss of the "vital nerve," without the opportunity to find a biological foundation, gave rise to its definitive failure in the 1970s. Under the mounting assault of the mechanistic approach of modern anti-authoritarian society and modern molecular biological medicine, psychiatry, without an effective biologically founded psychotherapeutic technique, became

<sup>14</sup>Wilhelm Reich, himself, died in a U.S. Federal penitentiary under the final attack of the emotional plague against him in 1957.

trapped in the antithesis between the mechanistic and the mystical approach. The first, called “biological” (in reality, it should be called “pharmacological”) is based on the symptomatic relief of anxiety with drugs, sustained by a meaningless “cookbook” diagnostic procedure.<sup>15</sup> The latter, the “psychosocial” approach, is basically superficial, “psychological” counseling taken over by psychologists and social workers:<sup>16</sup> “Both evade the essential, the underlying bioenergetic basis of psychic as well as somatic processes” (Konia 1995, page 98). Both have dismissed the psychoanalytic diagnostic system based on psychosexual development and the classical psychiatric diagnostic system based on one hundred years of clinical observations. Both diagnostic systems were incomplete but, nevertheless, deeply rooted in the biological nature of human drives. Modern psychiatry, instead of unifying them, has eliminated both and embraced a superficial,<sup>17</sup> useless, symptom-based diagnostic system, a clumsy imitation of the mechanistic diagnostic system of somatic medicine. With the rejection of Reich’s theory in Lucerne in 1934, to the detriment of countless millions of people worldwide, the emotional plague prevented the marriage between psychoanalysis and psychiatry and the incorporation into medicine of:

- The theory of armor: character and muscular armor as a chronic reaction of the infantile organism to the hostility of the outer world. The specific timing and way of armoring coincide with Freud’s psychosexual theory of neurosis and psychiatric classical diagnostics with the identification of their biological origin (Baker, page 38; Konia 2007, pages 12-13). The creation of a more effective therapeutic technique was a natural consequence.
- The recognition of the three layers of the human bioemotional

<sup>15</sup>For a better understanding of the modern psychiatric diagnostic procedures and their inadequacy, see Iacobello, pages 84-96.

<sup>16</sup>For an in-depth description of the profound degradation of modern psychiatry, see Konia 2007, pages 6-17.

<sup>17</sup>Psychoanalysis and psychiatry today are locked up in treating exclusively the superficial layer of the human bioemotional structure, the social façade, the realm of the “personality.” (Crist, page 57) Here lies the many “personality disorders” found in the modern psychiatric diagnostic system, a sign of its lack of theoretical understanding and its consequent lack of effectiveness.

structure: the biological core—the abdominal and pelvic autonomic vegetative centers from which natural biological excitation and emotions arise; the secondary (great middle) layer—where armor obstructs and diverts these excitations to become harsh and destructive (Freud’s “unconscious” before 1923); and finally, the superficial layer—the social façade (Baker, page 61). This recognition would have allowed psychiatry to make the fundamental distinction between healthy and neurotic and destructive behaviors (Reich 1972, pages 510-522). Failure to make this distinction has had catastrophic consequences not only for psychiatry, but for modern Western and world societies.

- The identification of the function of the orgasm (with its intrinsic four-beat pattern of mechanical tension, bioenergetic charge, bioenergetic discharge, and convulsion) as the ultimate regulator of organismic bioenergy (Freud’s “libido”) (Baker, pages 7-10). This energy was objectified in 1939-1940 and called “orgone energy” (Reich 1973, page 14). The natural evolution of the definition of “health” as the presence of orgasmic potency, the capacity to fully discharge energy in the sexual embrace despite conflicts, was and is a crucial understanding for the medical organomist (Konia 2007, pages 14-15).

These discoveries were the prerequisite for Elsworth Baker’s identification of the ocular segment as an erogenous zone, and its “fixation” or block as the central locus specifically of schizophrenia and, generally, of all psychoses (Baker, pages xii and 141-142; Harman, pages 44-47), one of psychiatry’s main preoccupations. Today, the medical organomist possesses a formidable therapeutic tool to treat neuroses and psychoses, the dream of Freud. Furthermore, Baker’s second major discovery, the sociopolitical character types (Baker, pages 153-198), allows for a deeper understanding of the emotional plague’s operations in the social realm. From here came Konia’s identification of its modern epochal manifestation in the form of the anti-authoritarian transformation of Western societies (Konia 2008, pages 215-260). This

historic epidemic manifestation of the emotional plague will be the most dangerous threat to the undistorted preservation of Reich's discoveries. The task of the American College of Orgonomy is to confront this threat to orgonomy to prevent a recurrence of what happened to psychoanalysis in the summer of 1934 in Lucerne, Switzerland during another historic epidemic manifestation of the emotional plague.

### References

- Baker, E. 2000. *Man in the Trap*. Princeton, NJ: ACO Press (originally published 1967).
- Brainin, E. 1994. *Die Freudianer. Fotografien von Nachum T. Gidal*. Wien: Hrsg. Jüdischen Museum der Stadt Wien.
- Brecht, K. et al. 1985. "Hier geht das Leben auf eine sehr merkwürdige Weise weiter...". *Zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Deutschland*. Hamburg: Verlag Michael Kellner.
- Crist, P.A. 1993. Nature, Character, and Personality (I). *Journal of Orgonomy* 27(1): 48-60.
- Fallend, K., Nitzschke, B. 1997. *Der "Fall" Wilhelm Reich: Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Psychoanalyse und Politik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Freud, S. 1926. *Dr. Reik und die Kurpfuschereifrage*. Eine Zuschrift des Professors Freud an die "Neue Freie Presse". Erstveröffentlichung: Neue Freie Presse, 18 Juli 1926. <http://www.analisilaica.it>
- . 1989. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. The Standard Edition. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co. (originally published 1961).
- . 1990. *The Question of Lay Analysis*. The Standard Edition. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co. (originally published 1967).
- . 2013. *On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement*. The Standard Edition. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co. (originally published in 1966).
- Gay, P. 2006. *A Life for Our Time*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co. (originally published 1988).
- Gifford, S. et al. 2005. *Edward Bibring Fotografiert die Psychoanalytiker seiner Zeit (1932-1938)*. D-Giessen: Bibliothek der Psychoanalyse, Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Grosskurth, P. 1986. *Melanie Klein: Her World and Her Work*. New York, NY: Knopf Edition.
- Harman, R. 2007. Sigmund Freud, Wilhelm Reich and Elsworth Baker. *Journal of Orgonomy* 41(2): 30-52.
- Iacobello, S. 2011. The DSM-V Dilemma and the Crisis of Modern Psychiatry. *Journal of Orgonomy* 45(1): 84-96.
- Jones, E. 1987. *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*. London: Penguin Books (originally published 1953).
- Konia, C. 1995. Editor's Page: A Fateful Event. *Journal of Orgonomy* 29(2): 97-99.
- . 2007. The Decline and Fall of Modern Psychiatry. *Journal of Orgonomy* 41(2): 6-17.
- . 2008. *The Emotional Plague. The Root of Human Evil*. Princeton, NJ: ACO Press.
- Laska, B. 2008. *Wilhelm Reich*. Reinbek: Rowohlt Taschenbuch, (originally published 1981).
- Mülleitner, E. 1992. *Biographisches Lexikon der Psychoanalyse. Die Mitglieder der Psychologischen Mittwoch-Gesellschaft und der Wiener Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung 1902-1938*. Tübingen: Ed. Diskord.
- . 2008. *Ich-Fenichel. Das Leben eines Psychoanalytikers im 20. Jahrhundert*. Wien: Paul Zsolnay Verlag.
- Nitzschke, B. 2005. Psychoanalysis during National Socialism: Present Day Consequences of a Historical Controversy in the "Case of Wilhelm Reich." *Journal of Orgonomy* 39(2): 2-23.
- Paris, J. 2005. *The Fall of an Icon: Psychoanalysis and Academic Psychiatry*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Reich, W. 1967. *Reich Speaks of Freud*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux (originally published 1954).
- . 1971. *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, (originally published 1946).

- . 1972. *Character Analysis*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux (originally published 1949).
- . 1973. *The Cancer Biopathy*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux (originally published 1947).
- . 1976. *People in Trouble*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. (originally published 1937).
- . 1990. *The Silent Observer. Orgonomic Functionalism 1*. pages 83-99 (originally published 1952).
- . 1994. *Beyond Psychology. Letters and Journals 1934-1939*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Reich-Rubin, L. 1997. Wilhelm Reich and Anna Freud: His Expulsion from Psychoanalysis. *Journal of Orgonomy* 31(1): 22-35.
- Roazen, P. 1992. *Freud and His Followers*. New York, NY: Da Capo Press (originally published 1971).
- Sadger, I. 2005. *Recollecting Freud*. Ed. by Alan Dundes. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press (originally published in German 1930).
- Sharaf, M. 1983. *Fury on Earth. A Biography of Wilhelm Reich*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press/Marek.
- Stewart-Steinberg, S. 2011. *Impious Fidelity. Anna Freud, Psychoanalysis, Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Young-Bruehl, E. 2008. *Anna Freud. A Biography*. Ann Arbor, MI: Sheridan Books (originally published 1988).
- Wallerstein, R.S. 1998. *Lay Analysis: Life Inside the Controversy*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.