The history of sex-economy illustrates again and again the operating of irrational argumentation. Hardly any other scientific discoveries have so thoroughly shaken well-established scientific beliefs or aroused such violent anxieties. Thus it is small wonder that Reich had to experience many times over what other scientific pioneers such as Pasteur, Einstein or Freud had to suffer before him. In the following pages I shall try to give an account of one particularly violent phase of the irrational fight against sex-economy, the Fascist newspaper campaign in Norway in 1938, and some of the events that preceded it. Hardly ever did the fight against his findings take the form of scientific discussion. The main weapons in this fight were lies, distortions, and defamation. It would be impossible to understand the extent to which such weapons were put to use were it not for the fact that the findings themselves aroused violent anxieties and thus provoked all kinds of irrational reactions.

One of the main points of divergency from psychoanalysis was the sex-economic differentiation of genital and pregenital pleasure and the recognition of the importance of orgastic potency. Another was the emphasis on the prevention of the neuroses instead of on their individual therapy, and therefore on sexual education and sexual hygiene. It was for this reason that Reich founded and directed sex-hygiene clinics in which thousands and thousands of adolescents and adults sought advice about their sexual disturbances. In order to make this work possible on a mass scale it was carried out within the framework of the socialist party of Austria. However, the dominating clique of that party soon began to oppose Reich’s views as being too radical. In particular, his booklet, “Zur Kritik der Sexualreform,” published in 1930, criticizing the usual shallow and ineffective sexual reform movement, to which the Socialist Party also adhered, provoked the wrath of the party bureaucrats. One of them, Karl Kautsky, son of the well-known socialist theorist, wrote a review of Reich’s booklet, which in many respects foreshadowed the later slandering campaigns against Reich (“Gleichheit” No. 7, 1931). Without even entering into a discussion of the factual problems he made a preposterous accusation on purely political grounds, accusing Reich of “having used the sex-hygiene clinics as a shop for communist propaganda after a short guest-role in the Socialist Party.” The truth of the matter was that a few Communist physicians who had greater insight into the necessity of prophylactic measures than the Socialist party leaders had collaborated with Reich and the other Socialist physicians. This seems indeed a flimsy excuse for such an accusation as that made by Kautsky.

There could be no doubt, however, that on the whole the Communists had a better comprehension of the relevant problems than the Socialists. Thus, a few years later the German Society for Sex Education, founded by Reich, became the largest
mass organization affiliated with the German Communist Party. But this only aroused the opposition of the Communists, again on political grounds. They had to admit that Reich, with his social and medical handling of sexual problems, reached far greater numbers of people and much more effectively than did the party with its boring economistic twaddle. But just this success made them jealous and uncomfortable. History repeated itself. Just as a few years before the Austrian Socialists had done, so the dominant group of the German Communists now started a campaign against Reich which finally led to his expulsion from the party. While the Austrian Socialists had accused him of “opening a Communist propaganda-shop,” the Communists now branded him a “counter-revolutionary.” First they turned against him for being a psychoanalyst. Psychoanalysis, they said, was a “phenomenon of bourgeois decay,” “untenable scientifically,” or at least “un-Marxistic,” since no allusion to it could be found in the writings of Marx and Engels, both of whom had died long before Freud published his discoveries. They censured Reich for trying to revise Engels, saying that, “while Lenin called ‘the Origin of the Family’ one of the best Marxist treatises, Reich, like all counter-revolutionists and revisionists, attempted to improve upon and to forge Marxism.” Reich’s finding that sexual frustration affected all classes, they said, was preposterous. Disturbances of the orgasm, they maintained, were a “bourgeois affair,” and if Reich thought otherwise he simply “denied the existence of class differences.” His books, they said, “only caused confusion” and they thought it was “high time to put an end to this damned sex-philosophy.”

Reich’s fight for the sexual health of German youth caused the Red liberators to accuse him of “turning our gyms into brothels” and to call his educational pamphlets “spitting at the proletarian girls.” His theories and findings were condemned as “un-Marxistic rubbish,” and “bourgeois ideology” and as “an attempt to obliterate the party line by sexual questions.” In addition, the Communists considered sex education unnecessary because, as they said, “the sexual problem solved itself.”

The Communists, however, were not the only ones to attack Reich at that time. The Nazis were no less shocked. But while the Communists called his activities counter-revolutionary, the Nazis, on their part, considered them a “Communist plot.” At the very time when the Communist agitation against Reich was at its height the Nazis’ “Völkischer Beobachter” wrote the following about Reich’s book, “The Sexual Struggle of Youth”: “It is the Communists’ call to German youth to revolt against all moral regulations which they consider mere shackles of Capitalism.”

When Hitler came to power Reich had to flee Germany. He went to Denmark and there wrote and published his book, “Die Massenpsychologie des Faschismus.” In this he gave the world what had hitherto been so fatefuly lacking: an understanding of the mass-psychological factors which underlie Fascism and made Hitler’s success possible. One would have thought that the Communists, after their defeat in Germany, would have been the first to appreciate the scientific study of their own defeat and their enemies’ success. But nothing of the kind. The party line, proclaimed from Moscow, denied that there had been any defeat at all and stated that Hitler’s regime would soon collapse and be replaced by a Communist regime in Germany.

Under these circumstances a book which not only pointed out the defeat but also inquired into its causes was considered a nuisance. This all the more, since a great many party members failed to see the logic
of the party line and eagerly sought for a true explanation of the defeat. The fact that Reich had dared to question the wisdom of the party line was considered sufficient not only to ban the book as dangerous but also to expel its author from the party.¹

When Reich came to Denmark, this country seemed to offer particularly good chances for teaching psychoanalysis. True, as a foreigner, he was not allowed to practise. But a number of people were eager to study the practice and theory of character-analysis with him. Peculiarly enough, this small, highly cultivated country had, up to that time, ignored psychoanalysis almost completely. At a time when psychoanalysis had already been taught for many years at special institutes both in Europe and in America, it was not even mentioned in Danish universities.

Under these circumstances one would have expected Danish scientists and authorities to welcome an outstanding representative of psychoanalysis who would make it possible for Danish students to study this field at home instead of having to travel abroad in order to do so.

Far from it. Irrational reactions prevailed and what had happened to Freud thirty years earlier now happened to Reich. Official medicine could not tolerate a man who questioned the very basis of traditional psychiatric thinking. When the police authorities asked the Department of Health whether Reich's admission to the country as a teacher was considered of value for Danish science, Clemmenson and Schroeder, two psychiatrists of the old hereditarian school, answered the question in the negative. They justified this judgment with the remarkable statement that psychoanalysis was not needed in Denmark, because, as one of them put it, "our old methods of mental treatment are good enough."

Such a standpoint was not easy to maintain with regard to an internationally established branch of science, particularly in a country which tried to uphold a reputation for scientific pioneer work, and especially with such a weak argument as, "our old methods are good enough." Then an incident occurred which, in itself innocent, gave these worthy psychiatrists the hoped-for chance for an oblique attack on Reich. A young woman suffering from hysteria had been imploring Reich for some time to take her on for analytic treatment and had threatened to commit suicide should he refuse. In order to prevent a disaster, Reich finally agreed to see her for a few sessions, without pay, only in order to make a diagnosis and to advise as to what should be done. Having

¹ Editor's note: Reich was connected with the German Communist Party through the Communist fraction of the "Sozialistischer Aerzteverband" (Socialist Medical Association) in Germany. He was engaged in mental hygiene work in large organizations which were not party organizations and counted Liberals, Socialists and Communists among their members. Later he founded the "Verband für Sexualpolitik" which also was not a party organization and which, within a few months, had tens of thousands of unpolitical members, that is, people belonging to no party, Christian Socialists and even National Socialists. This large membership developed mainly in the industrial cities of Western Germany. Reich's work was based on his sex-economic concepts and for this reason led again and again to conflicts with the functionaries of the Communist party who believed they solved sexual problems with purely economic-political slogans, without entering on the real problems of the sex life of the masses. Reich never was a political or paid functionary of the Communist party, nor was he ever politically active in the usual sense of the word. Considering the far-reaching sexual reforms which had originally taken place in Soviet Russia, the Communist party seemed the most favorable framework for making sex-economic concepts comprehensible to large masses of people. However, as it turned out later, not only did the Soviet Russian laws (after 1934) regress to authoritarian, anti-sexual, even reactionary measures; more than that, it was the Communists who turned into the most violent opponents of sex-economy. Reich's expulsion from the party was the result of the publication of his book, "Massenpsychologie des Faschismus", which for the first time disclosed the sex-economic content of the Fascist ideology.— T. P. W.
no license to practise, Reich could not take her on for treatment. To this the girl reacted with an attempt at suicide.

As it happened, the girl was sent to the very hospital where Dr. Schroeder was senior physician. Thus the head psychiatrist of the Department of Health had placed in his hands an unfortunate situation which he immediately made use of as a weapon to defend his own prejudices. He accused Reich in public of "having driven the girl to suicide by a treatment which he had practised unlawfully." In these public utterances, Dr. Schroeder carefully avoided mentioning such facts as that the girl had been suicidal long before coming to see Dr. Reich and that, in fact, she had previously made a suicidal attempt; and that her recent attempt at suicide was not the result of any treatment by Reich, but of the fact that he had to refuse treatment.

These sensational accusations were of course eagerly taken up by the daily press and soon a fight was on between the friends and foes of psychoanalysis. In this fight, the latter had the upper hand, largely because of the generally prevailing ignorance of psychoanalysis. In an article in the Berlinske Tidende, the most prominent daily paper in the country, Reich was accused of "psychoanalytic quackery." This judgment referred less to Reich than to psychoanalysis as such which the writer considered "a kind of scientific quackery." As to Reich, he suggested expelling him from the country, in order to "prevent one of these German so-called sexologists from fooling around with our young men and women and converting them to this perverse pseudo-science." It is noteworthy that this article appeared anonymously; years before its writer had been involved in a spiritualist scandal.

As a result of this campaign Reich had to leave the country because the authorities refused to extend his permit to stay. However this did not terminate his teaching. Reich settled in Malmö, Sweden, only two hours across the sound from Copenhagen, and his Danish pupils crossed the sound several times a week in order to continue their training.

Then Reich's Danish opponents attempted another attack on his reputation by filing a charge of pornography against Edvard Heiberg who had published an article of Reich's in a magazine edited by him. This was an article which had previously been published in the "Zeitschr. f. psychoanalyst. Pädagogik." Heiberg was sentenced to 40 days in prison. The incident is worth mentioning because it gave rise to all kinds of irrational contentions. For example, the Copenhagen Arbejderbladet, a Communist paper, accused Reich, of all people, of having collaborated with the police in the case against Heiberg, the very man who was charged with pornography for having published an article of Reich's. The paper added that Reich, "in return for a job well done," had had his permission to stay in Denmark extended. As we know, and as they knew, this was a lie.

Reich did not stay long in Sweden. One of his students, Prof. Schjelderup from Oslo, arranged for his being invited to the University of Oslo to teach character-analysis. There, at the Psychological Institute, Reich was to have the opportunity of carrying out his bio-electrical experiments. He moved to Oslo in October 1934.

For about three years, he continued his research and his teaching peacefully. Occasional attacks by the Nazis or the Communists had little effect, since neither party had much influence in Norway. As long as the research results were not published, the official world of science had little to say, and in the meantime Reich's influence and reputation grew steadily as a result of his teaching. Several psychoanalysts resigned from the International Psychoanalytic Association to join Reich's organization.
Things changed after the first publication of the bion research in the “Zeitschr. f. Polit. Psychol. und Sexualökonomie” in 1937. The newspapers got wind of it and published a number of sensational articles. This was the beginning of a campaign of irrationalism which was to last for many months. Immediately, no less than three professors of medicine and physiology at the University of Oslo, Langfeldt, Mohr and Hansen, gave the press their “expert” opinion on the bion experiments, calling the whole thing utterly unbelievable and impossible. They had only read the report and were ignorant of the experiments. This did not keep them from giving detailed explanations of their own for the phenomena described. This attitude, and the use of such expressions as “rubbish” and “nonsense” in judging a scientific report, was severely criticized by part of the daily press.

This first attack was soon followed by one from another quarter, that of the psychoanalysts. In 1934, Reich had been expelled from the International Psychoanalytic Association, because of his continued insistence that psychoanalysis did have social consequences and that they could not be evaded. In order to maintain his independence, he had not availed himself of the opportunity to join the Scandinavian group of psychoanalysts. Between then and 1937, sex-economy had developed to such an extent that it no longer could be called psychoanalysis. As most psychoanalysts realized that sex-economy was the first development beyond Freud (in contradistinction to all other “unorthodox” movements within psychoanalysis, all of which had been away from or against Freud), they felt uncomfortable for a number of reasons. None of them had ever been able to disprove a single one of Reich’s scientific statements. So they had to take recourse to other means.

An attack of the vilest sort was launched on October 27, 1937, by the Norwegian psychoanalyst Ingjald Nissen, who declared in a newspaper interview: “Psychoanalysis in this country has become sort of a weedy garden, where all sorts of parasites and climbers strike root and almost choke what is of value.” He complained about the “quackery” of “psychoanalytic sectarians” who “not even call themselves psychoanalysts any longer” and practice “some sort of quasi-medicinal relaxation analysis” which “only leads to sexual excitement.” Something must be done about it, Nissen felt. He suggested that the physicians (who were completely untrained in psychoanalysis) and the orthodox Freudians should get together to decide who should be allowed to practise “psychoanalysis.”

Who was this Nissen, who not only started the psychoanalysts’ attack on Reich, but carried it on in a series of newspaper articles? It was the same Nissen who, a few years before, had highly welcomed Reich’s move to Norway and had reviewed his books with the greatest enthusiasm. As long as Reich stayed within the general framework of psychoanalysis, Nissen called him “one of the greatest psychoanalysts.” Now that Reich had gone beyond the confines of psychoanalysis, and, in addition, was getting into a heated public controversy because of his findings concerning biogenesis, now, Nissen suddenly felt Reich “lacking the broad knowledge of the subject (psychoanalysis), without which, we feel, no analyst can do.” A good example of irrational inconsistency.

The newspaper campaign took on new violence after the publication of the book, “Die Bione,” the first comprehensive presentation of the findings concerning biogenesis. The leader of the campaign became the psychiatrist Johan Scharffenberg.¹ He never tried to disprove Reich's

¹ According to reports from Norway, Scharffenberg took a very courageous stand against the Nazis during the early occupation. Unfortunately, this does not absolve him from the actions we have to describe here.
findings. He simply misused the authority of his official position to make statements which were such that nobody would have taken them seriously had they not come from the great psychiatrist Scharffenberg. Thus, he declared Reich to be a “psychopath.” Some months before, he had already chipped in with Nissen. In a newspaper article, headlined “Psychopathic Quackery,” published in January 1938, he had called Reich—by implication—a quack. Now, in April 1938, he launched a series of newspaper articles under the heading, “Are the experiments of Dr. Reich scientifically valid?” In these articles, he did not advance one single objective argument; instead, he threw into doubt Reich’s integrity, even his sanity, by all kinds of insinuations.

The public reaction was that, after all, Scharffenberg had a right to disagree with Reich, but, as some people pointed out in letters to the Editor, the fair thing to do would have been to carry on a discussion in some scientific publication, instead of using the whole authority of a famous psychiatrist with a lay public which was in no position to judge the issue.

Scharffenberg began his campaign of defamation—for such was what pretended to be a discussion of scientific findings—by mentioning that Reich’s permit to stay in Denmark had not been extended. He failed to say why—so the reader could imply anything he wanted. In the next article he added to the information that Reich had an M.D. from the University of Vienna the little remark, “according to Mrs. So-and-So.” He thus started the rumor that Reich was not a physician at all. He spread the further rumor that Reich had wished to arrange sexual intercourse between patients at the Dikemark psychiatric hospital for experimental purposes. “It has been said,” wrote Dr. Scharffenberg, “that Dr. Reich uttered the wish to make his ‘main experiment’ during sexual intercourse between psycho-
they did not even have microscopes powerful enough (2000-4000x) to make the phenomena in question visible. But how was the public to know that? All they knew was that Kreyberg and Thjotta were "authorities." Kreyberg kept referring to Reich as "Mr." instead of "Dr." He finally had to admit that his purpose in this had been that of making the public doubt that Reich held the degree of M.D. This and more of its kind was, of course, grist for the mill of all kinds of Fascist writers who thus were given new ammunition against this "Jewish pornographer of the worst kind," etc. Papers such as Morgenbladet and Tidens Tegn began to ridicule Reich, now that "Professor Kreyberg has not left him a penny's worth of reputation and that Professor Thjotta showed his experiments to be mere dilettantism." Reich's repeated statement that he had never said he "created life," but that he was only demonstrating in the laboratory a process which was going on in nature all the time, was to no avail. His opponents kept referring to him as "self-styled creator"; the influential Fascist Tidens Tegn even carried an editorial headlined "God Reich."

A few days later, the same paper let the cat out of the bag: Reich's permit to stay in Norway had expired, and, according to authoritative sources it seemed doubtful whether it would be renewed. The whole campaign turned out to have the purpose of compromising Reich to such an extent in the public eye that, should his permit not be renewed people would think it had happened to an imposter and charlatan, and rightly so. That being public opinion, nobody would protest against an expulsion. Yet, this attempt was all too clumsy. It backfired.

Scharffenberg himself brought about this reaction with a new series of articles headlined, "Is Dr. Reich a serious scientist?" With these, he aroused the average Norwegian's sense of justice and fair play. It was at the time when the faculty of medicine of the Oslo University had to answer the state authorities' question whether Dr. Reich's presence in Norway was to be considered an asset to Norwegian science. As soon as Scharffenberg renewed his attacks, there appeared in the daily papers an open letter to the faculty, signed by a great number of well-known writers, scientists and artists, asking the faculty not to be influenced in their decision by senseless statements being made in the press. At the same time a letter from the well-known anthropologist Malinowski, then teaching in London, was published, in which he stated most emphatically that he would consider it a great loss to science if an "original and sound thinker" like Reich were not allowed to carry on his research. One of Norway's most prominent writers pointed out that all the excitement about the bion experiments was only a smoke-screen for machinations to get Reich out of the country. He also pointed out some of the
irrational features in the campaign: Reich was being attacked as a psychoanalyst though he had long since ceased to be one; as a “Red” though he had long since been branded as an enemy by the Communists; and, last but not least, he pointed out, Reich had incurred the wrath of all kinds of reactionaries and neurotics because his science dealt with the subject of sexuality.

One of Scharffenberg’s colleagues revealed the fact that Scharffenberg’s admitted aim in writing these articles was that of getting Reich out of the country. Public opinion turned more and more against Scharffenberg; the “Friends of the Right of Asylum,” an organization of which he was one of the founders, even considered his expulsion from the organization.1

However, the whole feud was sidetracked by the authorities who had to decide about the renewal of Reich’s permit of residence. They found themselves in a dilemma. On the one hand, there was the verdict of such an important body as the faculty of medicine, who, in spite of the facts and the appeals made to them, had decided that there was no need for having Reich in the country. On the other hand, there was public opinion which was such as to make it difficult for them to expel a well-known scientist. In this dilemma, someone had a bright idea. Reich was allowed to stay, but there suddenly appeared a Royal decree to the effect that anybody who practised psychoanalysis had to have a special license from the Government. It was generally understood that such a license would be refused to Reich.

What made the position of Scharffenberg and his friends even more difficult was Reich’s attitude in the whole matter. He refused to enter into any kind of irrational fighting and simply went on with his work. Only twice did he enter the discussion at all: Once, in the very beginning of the campaign, he made a public appeal to be left alone until his experiments had advanced to a point where a detailed report could be published; and later, he suggested a public investigation of his bion experiments (a challenge which his opponents wisely refused to take up). The licensing of psychoanalytic practice did not have the desired effect. The authorities had no chance to refuse Reich a license, because he never asked for one. Character-analytic vegetotherapy, at that time, had already progressed so far beyond psychoanalysis that it no longer could be considered psychoanalysis; thus, the practice of vegetotherapy had nothing to do with a license to practice psychoanalysis. In addition, because the constant publicity over almost a year and the hostile attitude of some key-men in the medical profession made the continuation of the research increasingly difficult, Reich decided to leave the country to continue his work in a more hospitable and broadminded America.

To that extent, Reich’s opponents had attained their goal. But, while they had made it practically impossible for Reich to go on with his work in Norway, and while his bion experiments had been publicly called charlatanism, the work kept progressing: in the beginning of the campaign in 1937, the T-bacilli were discovered; while the campaign was raging in 1938, the first findings with regard to cancer in mice were made; in January 1939 the orgone radiation was discovered in the SAPA bions, and in 1940 in the atmosphere. Though the emotional pest was raging, the work went ahead.

---

1 Editor’s note: A woman teacher out in the Norwegian country who had followed the press campaign against Reich, wrote an article against Scharffenberg in which she hit the nail on the head and named Scharffenberg’s real motive, which, although known to those trained in sex-economy, had never been mentioned in the press. “She had heard rumors,” she wrote (thus taking off Scharffenberg’s method of defamation by “hearsay”), “that Scharffenberg was an ascetic and, furthermore, at an age when even the devil himself takes to the monastery.” This hit home. Shortly thereafter, admitting publicly his incompetence, Scharffenberg gave up his campaign.
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Infelizmente, no que se refere à orgonomia, seguir os passos de Wilhelm Reich e de sua equipe de investigadores é uma questão bastante difícil, polêmica e contraditória, cheia de diferentes interpretações que mais confundem do que ajudam. Por isto, nós decidimos trabalhar com o material bibliográfico presente nos microfilmes (Wilhelm Reich Collected Works Microfilms) em forma de PDF, disponibilizados por Eva Reich que já se encontra circulado pela internet, e que abarca o desenvolvimento da orgonomia de 1941 a 1957.

Dividimos este “material” de acordo com as revistas publicadas pelo instituto de orgonomia do qual o Reich era o diretor.
01- International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research (1942-1945).
02- Orgone Energy Bulletin (1949-1953)
03- CORE Cosmic Orgone Engineering (1954-1956)

E logo dividimos estas revistas de acordo com seus artigos, apresentando-os de forma separada (em PDF), o que facilita a organizá-los por assunto ou temas. Assim, cada qual pode seguir o rumo de suas leituras de acordo com os temas de seu interesse. Todo o material estará disponível em inglês na nuvem e poderá ser acessado a partir de nossas páginas Web.

Sendo que nosso intuito aqui é simplesmente divulgar a orgonomia, e as questões que a ela se refere, de acordo com o próprio Reich e seus colaboradores diretos relativos e restritos ao tempo e momento do próprio Reich.
Quanto ao caminho e as postulações de cada um destes colaboradores depois da morte de Reich, já é uma questão que extrapola nossas possibilidades e nossos interesses. Sendo que aqui somente podemos ser responsáveis por nós mesmos e com muitas restrições.

Alguns destes artigos, de acordo com nossas possibilidades e interesse, já estamos traduzindo. Não somos tradutores especializados e, portanto, pedimos a sua compreensão para possíveis erros que venham a encontrar.
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