

# IS REICH STILL RELEVANT ?

**Yes, yes and yes!**

**Dott. Genovino Ferri**

Direttore UOC Psichiatria Ospedale Atri ASL Teramo

Direttore Scuola Italiana Analisi Reichiana Roma

E-mail: [genovino.ferri@aslteramo.it](mailto:genovino.ferri@aslteramo.it)

[siar@analisi-reichiana .it](mailto:siar@analisi-reichiana.it)

[www.analisi-reichiana.it](http://www.analisi-reichiana.it)

*Paris, 8th November 2008*

# The first “Yes”

*Comes from a conference on Psychoanalytical Psychotherapy in which I participated in October, speaking about the “Relationship between object and corporeity”*

*Here are 2 definitions:*

The object **RELATIONSHIP** is a psychoanalytical expression used to define the “**how**” of the relationship between an individual and his or her world, which is the complex result of a specific organisation of the personality

The **RELATIONSHIP** should be understood in its full sense, as an inter-relation, as “**reciprocity**” and, therefore, not only in the way in which the individual establishes his or her objects, but also how the objects act upon the individual in return (*persecutory, accepting, including, excluding, etc.*)

*The “how” of the relationship of a person with his or her world*

## What is the “*how*”?

HOW



COMMUNICATION

COMMUNICATION

is a “conditio sine qua non” - an essential condition - of life

***Cum munis = exchange together***

Communication is interaction and nourishes relationships over time. It is impossible not to communicate and it is impossible not to have behaviour

Man has **2 ways** to communicate:

**NUMERICAL**

**ANALOGICAL**

**NUMERICAL** has an aspect of content and serves to transmit information about objects and knowledge

**ANALOGICAL** has an aspect of relationship, originated in a very early phase of human evolution and is practically every non-verbal communication

***therefore***

***Body language*** orders and classifies what we say. It really communicates about communication, that is to say it meta-communicates, laying out the guidelines of the relationship

***Corporeity is fully "incorporated" in how we communicate***

*The term “relationship” should be interpreted as expressing the concept of **reciprocity**, which is evident in the etymology of*

***Character = incised mark***

***A mark incised by whom?***

**By the object relationships**  
experienced along the whole arrow of time of our evolutionary history, through logical and, especially, analogical communication which nourish and build giving shape to the relationship in its reality



## ***A mark incised where?***

The concept of reciprocity should be interpreted in its fullest possible sense. There is a place **the body** and there are places in the body which carry the marks incised by object relationships. These interactions are incised at the various **bodily levels** which were dominant at that specific time of exchange of languages, and the actions (*persecutory, excluding or accepting, including*) are also intended as expressive bodily movements with the corresponding charge of energy

***Bodily Level*** as a peripheral face of an evolutionary phase, peripheral memory of trait and first receiver of the object relationship with other than self in time

# ELEMENTARY BODY SEMIOTICS

*Some semiotics on the bodily expression of language on the **7 Reichian levels** to reinforce my first “Yes”:*

How many eyes no longer see, are empty, distant, elsewhere, and how many are astonished and terrified by panic?

How many are evasive, unfocussed, incapable of converging on a fixed point?

How many glances are entreating, how many others are suspicious, how many are furtive, others icy or tearful, yet others luminous and enthusiastic?

How many mouths are full of anger, how many are sweet and persuasive?

How many words remain unspoken behind sealed lips?

How many others never get out, stopping in the chest or further up in the throat?

How many words are swallowed for fear of being authentic or so as not to come out from an inferior position in a relationship?



How many mouths are closed, but how many others are ready to bite?

How many hypertonic masseters are there and how much suppressed crying behind?

How much dissociation is there in unheard words and how much vibration is there in profound expression?

How many words are poor or shrieked, how many are intense and whispered in a tiny voice?

How many are ***for*** and how many ***against*** and beyond the content?

What ***story of object relationship*** do they tell?

Which ***bodily level*** are they on on the arrow of internal time?

Which ***architecture of thought*** do they translate?

Which ***charge of energy*** have they changed and structured?

How many necks are straight, challenging greater height?

How many are imprisoned in narcissistic self-proposition?

How many are blocked on the atlanto-axial joint incapable of looking sideways?

How many are so rigid as to separate head and heart, knowledge and feeling, reason and reasonableness, height and depth?

How many superego yokes are there on the neck?

How many necks are bent in adhesion to others' projects?

How many lean back distantly “with their noses in the air”?

How many are set between the shoulders from the castrating threats received?

How much crying is there in the oppression of the thorax and how much desire for affection from ungiven hugs does it show?

How many shoulders are curved from unbearable loads and how much aggression is trapped in the shoulder blades?

How much breathlessness in unsustainability and how often is breath held so as not to feel?

How many chests are inspiratory and anxious?

How many others are expiratory and depressed?

How much strength is there in the chest to confront the reality of things? How much anguish is there in its pain?

How much strength is there in warm hands, how much fragility in cold hands?



What ***story of object relationship*** do they tell?

Which ***bodily level*** are they on on the arrow of internal time?

Which ***architecture of thought*** do they translate?

Which ***energies*** have they exchanged and structured?

How often does “no” remain inexpressed in the stomach?

How much light is there in the lightness of the diaphragm in love?

How much separation anguish is there in the umbilical area?

How much fury is there in the belly from old rejection?

How much castration anguish is in the pelvis and how much potency in the genitals in love?

How much contact is there on the skin?

How much panic is in the stomach from deep threat?

How many legs are paralysed with fear?

How many others are ready to flee?

How many are firmly planted on the ground?



# The second “Yes”

*Is also born from considering “the object relationship”*

*The term “**object relationship**”  
is not exactly Freudian.*

The object **RELATIONSHIP** found space in psycho-analytical literature in co-evolution with a movement which led to considering the organism in interaction with the environment *in the 30s.*

W. Riech published “Character Analysis” in 1933, he too putting emphasis on the **how** of communication

*Two **phenotypic indicators** of a period*

*What was happening at that time?*

***Scientific-cultural history could be represented by a single question***

**Who was right - *Darwin or Carnot* ?**

Before the 40s the term “system” - **the whole is greater than the sum of its parts** – was used by many scientists, but it was the concepts of open system and the theory of **Bertalanffy** which gave systemic thought recognition as an important scientific movement. He focussed attention on a

**dilemma** which had disconcerted scientists since the 19th century, when Newtonian mechanics had been integrated by two diametrically opposed visions of **evolution**



## ON ONE HAND

*Entropy is the second law of thermodynamics as stated by **Carnot***

Physical phenomena tend to move from order towards disorder and every closed or isolated physical system will spontaneously proceed in the direction of ever-increasing disorder”

## ON THE OTHER

*Evolutionary beliefs of 19th century biologists **Darwin***

“The living universe evolves from disorder towards order and towards states of increasing complexity”

**Bertalanffy** did not succeed in resolving this dilemma, but he did make the crucial step:

*“Living organisms are open systems, because they need to feed on a continual supply of material and energy from their surroundings to remain alive”*

It was not until the 70s that **Prigogine** re-examined the second law using a new form of mathematics and resolved the contradiction between the two 19th-century visions of evolution. In reality it only appears to be a contradiction:

*“The entropic balance considered must be global and must include both the organisms (plants, animals and mankind) and the surrounding environment with which the organism is constantly exchanging energy and material”*

For open systems it is fundamental to calculate the

**NEGHENTROPY** and the **ENTROPY**

In this way it is clear that the increase in neghentropy is at the expense of external order and, further, that the overall disorder increases -

***both Darwin and Carnot were right***

***Neghentropy***

***negative variation in entropy from an original value  
(the birth of an individual, the origin of life, the start of biological  
evolution)***

E. Schroedinger

In the last few decades a new  
**paradigm** of **complexity** has emerged...

***A mutation in the visual gestalt***

Kuhn would say

***Modified mental architecture of observation  
has emerged from a different way of feeling***

I might add

Central nodes of this become: *chaotic attractors, dissipative structures, fractals, auto-poietic webs, entropy, negentropy, forking points, arrow of time etc.*

***This paradigm is of great relevance today and  
W.Reich is in this paradigm!***

***Listen to what he says about vital energy:***

It is **negatively entropic.** That is to say that the highest concentrations attract more energy than the weaker surrounding concentrations. This negative entropy is in opposition to mechanical entropy and is *essential for the creation of and for sustaining life*

The natural concentrations of orgone tend to form systems which develop, reach a peak and then decline until they dissolve. *Galaxies, stars, planets* and, in the earth's atmosphere, *hurricanes and other cyclonic systems*, may be such systems, as may single *clouds*. Even living organisms are orgonic energy **systems**



The free flow of orgone within the living organism is indispensable for the healthy functioning of the organism. If this flow is blocked, it is transformed into DOR “*deadly orgone*”.

The orgonic metabolism of the organism therefore also depends on the external orgonic field

**open systems**

(from “W.Reich and Orgonomy” *Ola Raknes*)

# The third “Yes”

*Comes from considering the new paradigm of*

**Character Analysis**

*meaning its architecture should be extrapolated  
and identified as*

**a fractal**

*or rather as a functional pattern which repeats  
with the same basic characteristics on larger and  
smaller scales and can be progressively applied to  
various sub-systems in the setting. This is the  
current state of development in the Italian School of  
Reichian Analysis*

***then:***

# CHARACTER ANALYSIS

## REPRESENTS

- The *point of separation* between Freud and Reich
- The neghentropic-systemic *gene* in Reich
- Identifying a personality *trait* and exploring its *origin*
- Locating the trait in *time* and in the *body*
- Showing the connection between *symptoms, trait, body and history*

# CHARACTER ANALYSIS

## REPRESENTS

- A holistic, *systemic and sub-systemic* view
- An analysis of the *marks incised* by the history of object relationships
- An analysis of the expressive *how* of a person
- The widening of the analysis to include *marked corporeity*
- The leap in paradigm and entrance of *W.Reich in complexity*

***Character Analysis, in its 4 fractallic declinations,  
also takes on the current challenge in psycho-pathology***

## **CHARACTER ANALYSIS**

**IS TODAY**

1. The analysis of the Character of *verbal language* and of the architecture of thought which is expressed by the trait
2. The analysis of the Character of *bodily language* and of the underlying expressive movements, with character-analysis **Vegetotherapy** on the 7 bodily levels, or rather a re-proposition of prototypical movements of stage, but not only



# CHARACTER ANALYSIS

TODAY IS

3. The Analysis of the Character of the *relational language* and of the transfert and **counter-transfert of trait** and of bodily level which they produce
4. Analysis of the character of the relationship in the setting with validation of its *neghentropy* over time

# COMPLEX BODY SEMIOTICS

*Some psico-pathological semiotics on the counter-transfert in Reichian levels to reinforce the third “Yes”:*

Which traits “meet” in a setting with a person?

What type of bodily level resonates?

Is the chest, solar plexus, pelvis or are the eyes involved?

Does it make us extend our necks or seal our lips or contract our shoulders?

Is it a phallic-narcissistic, oral, anal, hysterical, intra-uterine or genital trait?

Which trait is the most “therapeutic” in the structural coupling of the relationship?

When encountering a psychotic state which trait and which bodily level resonate?

Where is the psychotic void? Isn't it also rooted in the gut?

Which trait counter-transfert do we use and on which bodily level? Is the most therapeutic in the relationship?

When we encounter a depressive state which bodily level and which trait resonate?

Isn't depressive withdrawal also seen in the crushed chest of an unbearable Atlas complex?

Isn't the anger of the borderline also in the chin thrust provocatively forward to constantly challenge others?

Isn't the persecutory alarm of paranoia also in the persecutory terror of the shoulders?

Isn't the fixedness of the obsessive also to be seen in his eyes?

Even simply, when we encounter a phallic-narcissistic trait, which trait and bodily level is activated by the hardening and erection of his neck and which counter-transfert of trait and bodily level should we utilise?

Is it the most neghentropic in the structural coupling of the relationship?