SEX-ECONOMIC "UPBRINGING"†

By Paul Martin,* M.D.

What is a sex-economic upbringing? The answer to this question will not be found in sex-economic literature. There are a few minor articles which give an idea of the sex-economic concepts according to which children should be brought up but hardly more than that.

However, a sex-economic pedagogy does exist; or, rather, there is the beginning of a sex-economic pedagogy in practice as well as in theory. Parents, kindergarten teachers, child psychologists and other educators have extended their interest in sex-economy to the practical application of sex-economic teaching. And we have, in addition, study groups in which the manifold problems of sex-economic upbringing are constantly being discussed.

In this article, I shall not enter into the details of our procedure, but shall limit myself to the attempt to sketch briefly those aspects of our work which have yielded the most significant results to date. Many problems have had, of necessity, to be omitted; they will be discussed in later articles.

At the outset, I should like to say a few words about the theoretical background of sex-economic upbringing. The word "up-bringing" is misleading. Our basic principle is not to "bring up" but, to the extent to which circumstances permit, to replace education by the principle of self-regulation.

In biology, it is a well-known fact that all living organisms have a tendency to self-regulation. Our experience shows that children, too, have this tendency to self-regulation, with regard to their immediate needs as well as to those pertaining to their general development. They show it in all essential matters, such as eating, sleeping, and cleanliness if, but only if, the children themselves are given the opportunity to regulate the gratification of their needs. The most important task of the "educator," therefore, is that of cooperating with the child in the satisfaction of its needs. For example, the mother must sense when the infant is hungry, give it the breast and let the infant have it until it lets go of the nipple by itself. The child must have adequate facilities for the satisfaction of its developmental needs: sufficient space to move around in, toys which absorb its interest, other children among whom it can choose its playmates. But one should not be afraid to make reasonable demands on the child. It is part of the needs of a child to solve tasks which, however, must be in accord with its development, capacities and inclinations. That is, the child must have every opportunity for free development.

Among the conditions which have to be fulfilled to make possible such a development, I have mentioned several external circumstances, space to play in, etc. But the people around the child must, also, further this development. They must act and react in an alive manner; they must be able to tolerate the child's emotional outbursts. They must be able to feel when the child needs help and when it simply tries to boss. Infants as young as 6 to 8 weeks try to force the mother, by crying, to be around all the time. Nevertheless, most mothers soon learn to distinguish whether the child cries because there is something wrong or just in order to get attention.

† Translated by the Editor.
* Editor's note: This is a pseudonym. Present conditions force us, unfortunately, to withhold the names of our European co-workers.
The most essential need of children is, without doubt, their need for love, physical as well as psychic. How important this factor is can be seen from the following situation: Poor children from large cities who are taken to the country on vacation, placed in beautiful surroundings, and given the best of care will, frequently, out of boredom and homesickness, make plans for a flight back to the backyard playground and father and mother. They may even make actual attempts in this direction, while the whole personnel of the camp believes that they are as happy as fish in water. This illustration provides, in part, the explanation for what one hears all the time about the importance of the family. The decisive factor, however, is not the family as such; it is the amount of love which the environment offers and whether it provides enough love to satisfy the growing child's intense need. If we consider conditions in kindergartens and similar places where children are brought up, with little or no opportunity for personal development, it is easy to see why the family is regarded as the best place for the child. But in reality, the family, in its present form, is most often a breeding place for quarrels, suppressions, and inhibitions; a place where the children—in spite of the best of intentions—cannot be brought up lovingly enough; but where, on the contrary, they are exposed to ignorance and hatreds; where the parents, unsatisfied in their own emotional needs and incapable of real contact, gush out a substitute affection over the children. And I repeat: in spite of the best of intentions.

A good upbringing is a loving upbringing. The child's need for affection is immense, and it is not only psychic. In this as well as in other respects, the child's needs are tied up with bodily pleasure and the urge for sexual gratification.

Children of all ages like to pet and to be petted, and they will in every way possible combine their affection with their urge for sexual pleasure. The infant will satisfy its desire at its mother's breast. The older child will masturbate and will try in other ways to obtain as much pleasure as possible from those it loves, parents as well as playmates.

As is well known, Freud believed that between these two phases, the oral and the genital phase, there is a third, the anal phase, which he considered to have a biological basis like the others. We doubt this very much. We believe this anal phase to be an artifact, strongly developed as it often is. The customary upbringing requires of the child a very strict control of the sphincter functions at a time when the child can meet this requirement only by holding back the excrement because of fear. The children accept this holding back because they discover that the retained excreta, particularly the feces, stimulate the respective zones strongly and thus produce a new kind of pleasurable excitation to make up for the one lost in the natural function.

What is to us of utmost importance is that the child's pleasure in its own body and its capacity for sexual gratification be not destroyed. The experiencing of pleasure plays a central and decisive role in the whole structural development of the individual. This means that physical pleasure is the basis for all bodily functions. It is pleasure which makes the wheels go round. If, then, the experiencing of pleasure is interfered with, the bodily functions become disturbed. This disturbance of function, localized at first at the place where the original interference with pleasure occurred, later involves all other functions which hang together with the first one.

In a healthy individual, it is appetite and not hunger which makes him take food; genital pleasure and not the wish for offspring which makes him engage in the sexual act. If the way to sexual gratification is open, the individual will stay vege-
tatively mobile and he will retain his capacity for work and his orgasmic potency. If the way to sexual gratification is blocked, the basis is laid for a pathological character structure with corresponding disturbances of work and potency. Life energy and sexual energy are identical.

A further, and important, inhibition occurs when anxiety and aggression are suppressed. Yet these emotions are being suppressed, consciously and unconsciously, to a far-reaching extent, by all the existing modes of upbringing. Education in its present form is not only ruinous for the individual but it also develops the passivity of character which strengthens the suppressions of family and society so much that it has assumed the social function of being an essential prop in the maintenance of the patriarchal, sex-suppressing family as well as the present life-negating form of society.

The individual's ability to defend himself against this kind of upbringing is reduced—to a varying degree—by the fact that he has practically all the authorities arrayed against him. Not only are school and church essentially authoritarian, but this upbringing also has the support of all medical and practically all educational authorities. As far as the latter are concerned, this is true to varying degrees, and with the adherents of modern educational concepts, very much against their own intentions. One may mention, as an example, the larger part of the Montessori school. The reason for this lies in their neglect or avoidance of the sexual problem. Another example of misdirection in education is psychoanalytic pedagogy (Anna Freud, Aichhorn, Bernfeld) which utilizes its knowledge of sexuality in order to repress it all the more. In fact, up to now a pedagogy with both the intention of and ability for a real affirmation of life has not been in existence.

Given the fulfillment of all needs, there is one thing which more than any other characterizes the healthy child and the healthy human being in general. This one thing is the ability to give oneself. If a child has this ability, it gives itself over completely to whatever it is doing. This is true of its play as well as of its sexuality, of the infant's suckling at the breast or the older child's masturbation. Whatever the child does, it does fully. The psychologist's observation of a decreasing intensity of feeling with advancing age is but the reflection of the gradual emotional stagnation under the powerful life-negating pressure to which everyone is subjected: first by their early upbringing and later by their life experiences. We try, therefore, not to disturb the child in whatever it is engrossed; partly, in order that it can live fully in its own rhythm, partly out of respect for the individuality of the child. We force the child only when it is absolutely necessary: when, for example, the child exposes itself or others to danger.

And just as we fully respect the child's play and other activities, so, too, do we fully respect its feelings. Nothing could be more mistaken than to regard them as merely "childish." Most adults have good reason to envy children their intensity and spontaneity of feeling. Without compelling reasons, we never hinder the fullest expression of the child's emotions. This applies primarily to what we call the basic emotions: the child should be allowed to experience freely pleasure, anxiety, anger and sorrow (except that too vehement anger should not be directed against smaller children). In other words, the child should be allowed to like what it likes and to be angry at and to hate that which it cannot stand. It is of particular importance not to force the child to love anybody against its will.

Given the fulfillment of all needs, there is one thing which more than any other characterizes the healthy child and the healthy human being in general. This one thing is the ability to give oneself. If a child has this ability, it gives itself over completely to whatever it is doing. This is true of its play as well as of its sexuality, of the infant's suckling at the breast or the older child's masturbation. Whatever the child does, it does fully. The psychologist's observation of a decreasing intensity of feeling with advancing age is but the reflection of the gradual emotional stagnation under the powerful life-negating pressure to which everyone is subjected: first by their early upbringing and later by their life experiences. We try, therefore, not to disturb the child in whatever it is engrossed; partly, in order that it can live fully in its own rhythm, partly out of respect for the individuality of the child. We force the child only when it is absolutely necessary: when, for example, the child exposes itself or others to danger.

And just as we fully respect the child's play and other activities, so, too, do we fully respect its feelings. Nothing could be more mistaken than to regard them as merely "childish." Most adults have good reason to envy children their intensity and spontaneity of feeling. Without compelling reasons, we never hinder the fullest expression of the child's emotions. This applies primarily to what we call the basic emotions: the child should be allowed to experience freely pleasure, anxiety, anger and sorrow (except that too vehement anger should not be directed against smaller children). In other words, the child should be allowed to like what it likes and to be angry at and to hate that which it cannot stand. It is of particular importance not to force the child to love anybody against its
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1 Translator's note: In German: Hingabe. In view of the decisive importance of this characteristic, the lack of a corresponding word in the English language is highly regrettable. The term "surrender" which I have used elsewhere, specifically in the sense of orgasmic Hingabe, unfortunately carries the implication of "capitulating," "relinquishing."
wishes—not even parents. Love cannot be compelled! And the right to weep, too, belongs to the basic rights everyone should have.

We may epitomize these observations in one statement: we treat the child, right from birth, as an individual personality. It is an independent personality, budding, it is true, but forthwith a complete entity with a way of being all its own. In the expressions and movements of the newborn child, we see developing interests. Even small motions are not meaningless to us; we see them as inadequate and unsuccessful attempts in one or another direction. I trust that in the discussion of our practice I shall succeed in showing that in every respect in which we deal with children, we treat them as individual personalities with rights equal to our own. It follows from this that we never consider any response of the child, including pathological manifestations, merely as an isolated phenomenon, but we always view it in the light of its significance for the personality of the child as a whole, for the whole vegetative organism.

Well—the reader will say—is this anything new? No, definitely not—all of these things have been said many times before. What, then, is new in sex-economic pedagogy? In part, it lies in the particular emphasis on and the elucidation of the principles of self-regulation and pleasure gratification and in the integration of these points of view. And partly, it lies in the consistency with which these principles are put into practice. But primarily, the contribution of sex-economic pedagogy lies in the fact that it has but one goal: the development of individuals who are healthy, vital, and as capable of love as possible.

We do not look askance at other goals of education, such as orderliness, morality, cleanliness, good behavior, etc. But we know from our experience (from the treatment of adults and from the study of certain primitive societies) that an upbringing according to the principles of sex-economy leads to a deeper and more genuine morality, to a more honest approach to the problems of life, and to a deeper love for and understanding of people than is possible under any other kind of upbringing. At the same time, the sex-economic study of the human structure shows us the forces which negate life and those which promote it; and by showing us the pathogenic factors, it enables us to eliminate the basis for pathological developments, to eliminate the inhibitions without creating new suppressions.

Of fundamental importance here is Reich’s differentiation of primary and secondary drives: Reich showed that where a primary (natural) drive is suppressed, there develops a secondary, pathological, often antisocial drive. To give a few simple examples: An individual with a natural sex life will never be able to commit rape. Such a crime presupposes that the sex drive is inhibited and thus has become both intensified and qualitatively altered (i.e., has become a secondary drive). Conversely, a particularly cunning and deceitful child will never be able to get angry in the same way that a healthy child does. These considerations apply also to that often misunderstood concept of freedom. Whatever its limitations, there can be no limit upon the freedom of the individual to express his primary drives and tendencies, such as the craving for love and bodily pleasure, and the tendency

2 Translator’s note: This statement may sound platitudinous, but its importance can hardly be overestimated. During vegetotherapeutic treatment (of adults) one experiences again and again the central significance of a suppressed impulse to cry. It often takes considerable work on character attitudes and muscular attitudes—particularly spasms of the throat, the jaws and the mouth—to liberate such a chronically suppressed impulse. It is often found to be linked up with a central infantile trauma to which the patient, as a child, was not able—or not allowed—to react with crying. In such a case, only the release of this impulse to cry will really dissolve the repression of the corresponding trauma.
to get angry at (unjustified) restrictions of motility. Sex-economic knowledge, therefore, does not lead to a lukewarm tolerance, but to freedom for everything that is healthy, and to the elimination and prevention of those things which cause illness.

We can summarize our conclusions as follows: The upbringing should not really be a bringing up, but a matter of safeguarding, to the highest possible degree, the child's natural ability to give itself fully in all its functions, particularly to pleasure and activity, and to protect the natural self-regulation of all vital actions. In addition, it is a matter of providing all possible opportunities for the child's independent development in every respect. This must be done without fear of and, indeed, through the gratification of the child's enormous craving for love. The prerequisite is that one should be able to identify oneself fully with the child's personality. The result will be a child with lively demands but one who will be harmonious and content if the demands which correspond to his own rhythm are fulfilled.

**OPPOSITION AND TASKS**

If one can really give to children what they need and ask for, there is hardly a more pleasing task than taking care of them. In many cases, one meets with a deep and genuine gratitude from the parents. Often, however, one meets with all possible resistances on the part of the environment: the parents lack time, means, space, and—to a varying degree—the ability to understand the child's demands sufficiently not to inhibit them. And, too, one meets with envy and jealousy, lack of understanding, and conscious or unconscious obstruction from parents and authorities. Very often, the work with parents and the removal of their resistances is the biggest and most difficult task, because the structure of the parents and their personal and social difficulties are reflected to an amazing degree in the behavior of their children. On the other hand, if the parents realize that it is possible to save the children from those difficulties against which they themselves have had to struggle all their lives, their thankfulness may know no bounds.

This socially and structurally conditioned influence of the immediate environment, with its continually inhibiting pressures, is supported in all possible ways by educational ideals such as politeness, cleanliness, "good behavior," and by all kinds of authorities, medical and pedagogical among them.

Our task, then, is to fight the inhibiting ideals, to show the way to a better understanding of the demands of life and health, and to point out the inhibiting and ruinous effect of other demands. With the latter demands, it is necessary to show that they are propounded without any justification in fact and that they destroy happiness in childhood and later life for all, to the advantage of a few or none. We seek an understanding of the child's needs, but not merely a passive sympathetic understanding, rather one that leads us to make

---

8 I hope to be able to demonstrate this in detail in later articles. Whatever the parents' and educators' intentions may be, the structural inhibitions and the social limitations under which they are forced to live, must of necessity be reflected in the children's structure. From direct observation and from clinical experience, both psychosanalytic and characteranalytic-vegetotherapeutic, we know two ways in which the children come to reflect their environment: In part as a result of direct inhibitions, due to the fact that the child was unable to uphold his original demands in the face of the environment's disinclination to fulfill them. In part it is on the basis of their conflicts, particularly those of ambivalence, by the identification with the adults and their demands. The children have to adjust themselves to them and finally make them their own.

The understanding of these reactions in the children is also of decisive importance for an evaluation of all the theories of constitution, and of the way in which ideologies are transplanted from generation to generation. One also has to remember that these factors are at work from the very first day of the upbringing, i.e., from the first day of life.
an active fight for the happiness of children—and through them for all human beings. This active understanding makes great demands upon the personality of the educator, but it offers a much richer relationship with the children; and, in fact, only such an understanding can provide the foundation for a relationship with children which is based on mutual respect. The result: happy children with good friends and joyful helpers in their immediate environment.

I can proceed, now, to set forth some aspects of our practice. We are confronted with two tasks. The first is that of helping more or less inhibited children to become fully alive again. This is the job of the educational counselor and often that of the active teacher. In difficult cases, the problem can be solved only by actual treatment. The second task, which I shall take up specifically here, is that of developing the healthy child and of helping him to remain healthy. We begin with the infant.

The most gratifying field for sex-economic pedagogy is undoubtedly the one which deals with infants. Here, our task is relatively simple. It is exclusively a matter of letting self-regulation and self-development take their own course to the highest possible degree. Since the first days are of great importance, it is a matter of preventing any disturbing intervention from the very moment of birth. As things now are, there is no doubt that a great many suppressions and disturbances begin in the lying-in hospitals, for there, children are usually treated in a very impersonal and schematic manner. (I hope soon to publish a paper on this subject.) It is just with the infants that what we mean by self-regulation becomes readily apparent. First, with regard to feeding, we succeed in letting children determine for themselves when, how often, and how long they will lie at the breast. Perhaps even more than the pediatricians, we emphasize the importance of breast-feeding.

We ask the mother to watch for the time when the child is hungry and to nurse it then. We ask her to leave the child at the breast until it lets go of the nipple by itself; if, afterwards, it starts to lick, we believe it is best to let it do so until it becomes tired. Therefore, we do not decide when the child is to have the next feeding, but ask the mother to let the child decide. If one continues this procedure, the child, as a rule, establishes what we call its own regularity or rhythm. This will mean, generally, four or five feedings a day; only once have I seen it to be six. An example of the importance of allowing the infant to lie at the breast until satisfied was given to me by a woman colleague. She found, by weighing, that her child obtained the greatest amount of milk after having been nursed for twenty minutes.

Also, for the sake of the child's sex-economy in the first few years, we would like to have the nursing period last as long as possible (see below, the "almost healthy child"). Of course, this does not mean that the child should not, at the proper age, receive other food than breast milk. Prof. Malinowski informed me that with all primitive peoples, the nursing period lasts at least several years. We recognize that it is impossible to introduce anything like that under present social conditions. The child's pleasure is further reduced by the modern requirement that the feedings should be given "on the dot" at a certain hour and should not last longer than ten to twenty minutes. And the mother usually does not have enough milk. All of this is why we consider it of extreme importance to increase the pleasure possibilities of nursing and other forms of feeding as much as possible and to promote in the small child all pleasure possibilities derived from the mouth. For

4 To consider only the child's pleasure is really an inadmissible oversimplification of the nursing problem. It involves, inherently, two individuals, mother and child, and—quite particularly from the standpoint of pleasure—we are dealing with
this reason, too, we do not interfere with the use of the pacifier or with the sucking of the fingers by children. Nor do we take their bottle away as long as they hold on to it. On the other hand, there are special reasons for allowing children to go around with their mouths open: it has to do with the fact—which is confirmed in every therapeutic case—that a spasm of the muscles which close the mouth severely inhibits the ability to give oneself. (Details of this are as yet unpublished.)

I think that nursing provides the best illustration of the difference between the regularity we strive for and that which is generally indorsed by pediatric authorities. Our regularity is derived from the child itself; it is alive and unschematic and in constant harmony with the child; and as a result, it changes as the child changes and develops. The other regularity proceeds according to a schema which is imposed upon the child from without and stifles the child's own rhythm, forcing something alien upon it which can only have the effect of a strait-jacket. We adjust ourselves to the child who is completely dependent on our help; and we do this without limiting our own existence more than is necessary, fully aware that there are always conflicts between our own interests and those of the children. These conflicts one must solve in everyday life as best one can, and we will try to show that it can be done to a far-reaching degree without making either of the two parties suffer. A satisfactory solution on a social scale, however, presupposes a society which aims to make people happy. The others force the child to adjust to their lives, their demands, their rules. If, under such a regime, no more conflicts are apparent, it merely means that the child has succumbed to his environment, or that the struggle has become an internal one. In either case, the adult has merely shifted the burden on to the child.

In other respects, too, we let the child regulate its life. We let it sleep when it is sleepy, we do not disturb its sleep, and we do not try to force it to sleep before it lies down itself. It is our experience that the children's sleeping habits are no less regular under our management than under that of others. In fact, the majority of our children soon established the habit of sleeping through the night.

Disturbances of sleep may be due to direct causes, to direct encroachment from the outside upon the self-regulatory sleep mechanism, usually in the form of a demand that the child shall sleep ("Now, go to sleep!"). Another factor is the child's fear of giving itself over to sleep. Patients who, as children—due to the generally prevalent and regrettable custom—slept in their parents' bedroom, often relate in the course of the treatment how they lay awake, all tense, in order to listen to what their parents were doing. But apart from this, insomnia in children as well as in adults seems chiefly to be caused by sexual frustration. This is also true in the many cases where children sleep well when some stranger takes care of them but are disturbed in their sleep when their mother is present. In these cases, the disturbance is due to the much greater craving for love which the mother has aroused but which for one reason or another she fails to satisfy. Children's nurses do not hesitate to use the means of sexual gratification as the surest way to get a child to sleep.
We know that children are naturally sociable. What is not so well known is that this sociability manifests itself very early in life. At the age of a few weeks, children will cry, for example, when one suddenly looks away from them. They take cognizance of what goes on around them and are often very dissatisfied if left alone. They want attention and noticeably enjoy it until they become tired. This urge to be with others and to feel contact with them persists all through childhood and life. It is this need which is basic to all social living. Very early in life, it expresses itself towards children of the same age and development. Children should from earliest childhood have the opportunity to be together, to be comrades, and to do everything else they can to each other. This lays the foundation for the natural contact with their fellow humans which they ought to have all their lives. It is here that social life begins.

I should like, however, to point out a complication in this early social life. There is suppression by other children and by their environment. There is, first of all, the suppression of smaller children by the larger. What they receive by way of admonitions, advice or hints they usually pass on as quickly as possible. Like the adults in their environment, they are often very strict with smaller children, imitating the educational manners of their parents but applying them, in their child's way, without any restraint. This is particularly evident in children who have just entered school, but it is also true of children in the same age group: the weaker children or those with weaker traits succumb to the harder ones. This means that it is the healthy child or the still sensitive and relatively healthy child who succumbs to children who are more robust and unfeeling just because they are more effectively armored. Something like this undoubtedly happens in many kindergartens and most schools. It is inevitable whenever children with markedly different individualities come in contact with each other and where the adults in charge fail to recognize the problem or have nothing in mind but the necessary adjustment to the community without realizing that this takes place at the expense of the child's vitality. The real task is to make it possible for the individual child to grow together with the community in such a way that it can achieve in the community the maximum development of its personality and capacities. Only thus will the community be of most benefit both to the individual and to itself, and only thus will it avoid an authoritarian or more or less religious relationship which stifles the development of the individual. It will instead become the place where one enriches and unfolds one's own personality on an equal footing with others. As a problem of suppressive measures, unobserved but highly significant, we may mention the almost general custom of sending the mother away immediately after she brings the child to the kindergarten on the very first day. In that way the child is forced into the new environment; this is the aim of this procedure, but, to say the least, it makes it very difficult for the child to grow into the new environment. Certainly, then, one of the

5 This problem of a fellowship into which one fits naturally without the suppression of one's own personality, but, on the contrary, as a place where the richest personal development is possible, seems to me more than anything else to be the problem of education. It is the problem of genuinely social individuals, of society as a natural organization in general, not as an idea, but as a reality. If and when this problem can be solved, all discussions as to whether society exists for the individual or the individual for society, will become pointless, because then they form a real unity; in classical dialectic terminology one would say that they have become fused in a higher unity. But what transformations of education and of society will not be necessary before we ever attain such a goal! We know what forces will bring us nearer to the goal. It can only be the forces which are mobilized by all the pleasure possibilities here: the pleasure of being not only in harmony with one's environment, but in constant contactful interchange with it.
main tasks of a healthy upbringing is to pave the way for rich relationships between children without mutual suppressions.

But to go back to the infant: We give the child as much opportunity for motor activity as we can. Its clothes, though sufficiently warm, should not hinder its activity; and at night, we do not tuck it in or cover it with anything heavy. This has led to the necessity of keeping the bedroom at a rather high temperature, and we have gotten away from the rule, of necessity, that children should always sleep with the window open. As early as possible we also give the children some toys; at first, for example, some colored silk ribbons are hung in front of it. We feel that the child should lie comfortably and—unless there is danger of rickets—we do not feel that the customary hard mattress is necessary. We see to it from the beginning that the child has an unobstructed view not only above but also to the sides. The child is put on a bed with open sides or upon a couch when awake.

It is necessary, from the outset, to satisfy the child's desire to be caressed. This does not mean to use it as a doll or a toy which one handles according to one's own whim; but one should be without fear of being really affectionate with the child when it asks for it and needs it.

The question of cleanliness is of utmost importance, but it, too, is treated in the same way as far as possible. We do nothing to get the child clean at an early date. As long as it is small, we try to change it as soon as it wets or soils, because the child finds it unpleasant to lie in soiled diapers. Later on we just keep it dry, but we do not force it to become clean before it will do so by itself. And we let it sit on the chamber when and as long as it wants to. It goes without saying that if one proceeds in this way, one should not have expensive carpets on the floor, and there will be a lot of laundry. As a compensation, it is our belief that only in this way can one avoid the real difficulties and especially the spasms in the pelvic floor. The time at which children become clean varies a great deal. The reason for this seems to be that, in spite of everything, some compulsion in the direction of cleanliness is exercised after all. The structure of the parents and the opinion of others, especially that of visiting grandparents, is bound to have some effect.

Children usually enjoy their bath unless they have been frightened by rough handling or by the feeling of losing their balance in the bathtub. As little force as possible should be used upon children to be clean.

It is inherent in our way of looking at things that our concept of "hygiene" differs from the one commonly held. For us, this concept includes much more than the demands of asepsis and of other "organic" preventive measures. For us, it is not just a matter of preventing infections, rickets and similar ailments, but a matter of preventing anything which may interfere with the whole vegetative development. For this reason, we look with a good deal of distrust on all demands which have the effect of limiting the child's independence, motility, pleasure and general development.

In this connection, I may mention that we try to prevent anxiety, particularly in the small child. It is a common belief that small infants lack the ability to hear. This belief is supported by many well-known medical guide books for parents. It is amply contradicted in the literature and is essentially incorrect. On the contrary, noise is a common source of anxiety in infants; it often disturbs or prevents their sleep.

Crying, we consider, is a sign of unpleasurable sensations in the infant. As a rule, one can find and eliminate the cause. Only if we find that the child begins to misuse crying in order to get attention or
to obtain other advantages, do we let it go on crying.

On the whole, our experience has been that children almost always become so lively that it is difficult for adults—particularly if they have them singly—to keep up with their activity.

And finally, one example to show how strong a source of pleasure the pacifier can be and how early a strong personality can be developed (and under corresponding circumstances this development will always take place): A boy of 10 months, who had been brought up entirely according to our concepts, had to be hospitalized. The nurses told the parents immediately that it was out of the question to let him keep his pacifier. At the same time, they "promised" to get him clean. But he got the upperhand. He howled so mightily and persistently that they had to give in, and he became the first child in the history of the ward who was allowed to have his pacifier. Both parties were relieved when, after 36 hours, he was discharged.

This example also shows how great the difference is between our concepts and the commonly accepted and official ones: from the point of view of the hospital he was only an extraordinarily restive, stubborn, and ill-behaved boy. In contrast, I may mention the case of another boy who, at 8 months of age, still lay in his carriage apathetically and without any initiative most of the day. He never cried, but he was stiff with fear when strangers only looked at him. At the age of 12 to 14 months, this child, otherwise healthy, still showed not the slightest interest in other children. His somewhat elderly mother had, in a kind but determined way, "accustomed" him to lie quietly at regular intervals, i.e., most of the day, packed down in the bottom of a closed carriage, all wrapped up and fastened with straps so that he was absolutely unable to stir.

Now, a few words about the later upbringing. The principles remain the same: besides being always kind and affectionate with the child and giving it all the physical and psychic love it needs, the most important thing is to treat it with real respect for its individual personality. Often the child is, as the afore-mentioned example shows, more of an independent personality at the age of 1 or 2 than a great many adults.

The main problem of this later upbringing is, perhaps, the children's play and other activity. Here also, we let the children regulate their own affairs as much as possible; we do not impose our motives or concepts upon them nor our ideas of the way their playthings are to be used. We help them only when they ask for it. When there are several children, we permit them to regulate their mutual relationships, and we take a hand only if it is necessary to protect one or more of them. That does not mean that we do not play with them, quite the contrary; but our participation in their games is on an equal footing with theirs. All play possibilities are welcome, inside and outside. Constructive toys are always good. The best toys are those the child is most interested in and can do the most with. I may mention that my own boy for more than a year played intensively with bottlecaps. He collected them by the hundreds, arranged them according to colors, laid them out in figures, used them as goods in his wagon, etc. etc. This example shows that children need a lot of toys but that they need not be costly. It seems to me that one of the sorriest sights is a small child without any opportunities for play and activity. Such a thing should not exist. It is not surprising that children who are limited to a few playthings and play possibilities, because of their upbringing or economic need, develop a much more intense feeling of possession for the few things which to them represent all that is desirable in this world. The social and sexual consequences of
this exaggerated sense of possession are not difficult to see. I want to stress especially that we let the children draw and paint, play with mud, sand, earth, etc., and—under the proper supervision—with fire.

In this article, I cannot, unfortunately, discuss the difficult problem of how it is possible, socially and in the individual case, to arrange the children's environment so as to make all this possible.

Part of children's play is to tell stories and to play jokes on adults. Towards their questions we have the same attitude as towards their play: we take them seriously, answer them as best we can, and, for the rest, talk with them about things, including themselves, as we would with anyone else.

We are not afraid of showing children our own feelings, provided that we ourselves have somewhat natural feelings, and that includes justified anger. On the contrary; if the children are to grow up to be alive, they must grow up among individuals who are themselves alive. We shudder at the thought of people who are always "pedagogical" and "correct" or forever mild and understanding. Such behavior has a stifling effect on children. Therefore, we quietly let them know when they really bother us. It is part of a natural association with children to talk about them in their presence, just as one talks about adults who are present. One talks about their good points as well as their bad ones, but with full respect for them and in such a way as not to offend them. Similarly, we talk about their environment, their behavior towards other children, etc. We do not want any artificial respect or authority. We do not share the common, almost panicky fear of talking about the children within their hearing; nor do we countenance the irresponsible chatter about anything and everything as if the children were not present or as if they did not understand what it is all about. Anxiety and fright should be kept away from them, including all moralizing, both in the undiluted and story form.

But this does not preclude the necessary admonitions and teaching. They are taught to watch traffic and not to fall out of windows. However, if possible, it is preferable to permit them to make their own experiences; e.g., by letting them get slightly burned at the radiator, or by letting them fall down from harmless heights.

We try to be as natural as possible with regard to our own bodies as well as theirs. We never prevent the children from playing with their own or each other's bodies. And we rejoice to see them in love. Incidentally, the earliest real being in love, in the fullest meaning of the word, which I have ever seen was between a boy of 15 months and a girl of 10 months. They beamed in each other's presence, embraced each other, and cried when they had to separate.

As far as eating is concerned, we are also for complete freedom, and we think it natural that children should have a "sweet tooth." As early as possible, often around the age of 1, we let the child begin to feed itself: to choose what to eat, to serve itself, and to determine how much to eat. (There is no vitamin problem; we have yet to see a child who did not gladly take its cod liver oil.) Nothing need be added with regard to cleanliness and dressing. Children soon develop tendencies in these directions, and we let them determine for themselves what to put on—and, as soon as they are able, wash and dress themselves.

In conclusion may I mention a few things which really go without saying. We strictly avoid the use of such opposites as boy—girl, large—small, and other suggestive expressions. We never say, for example, "You are too old for that," or "Only little girls cry about a thing like that," or "What a stubborn child you are!"
etc. On the other hand, we do not hesitate to give little boys so-called girls' toys, like dolls, household things, etc., or to give the girls boys' toys of any kind. Neither would it occur to us to demand—in Montessori fashion—that toys be used in the special manner for which they were designed.

We do not force the children to be polite, modest, well-behaved, or grateful. It is perhaps just for this reason that they are, as a rule, both trusting and appreciative. They are also very affectionate and sensible, and have a remarkable ability to size up a situation and act accordingly.

We have succeeded to a far-reaching extent in putting all this into practice, and to that extent the result has been a free development in activity and imagination, and a joie de vivre. The children are in contact with their surroundings, happy and full of initiative; they show little aggression and apprehensiveness; they give and demand much love, so much that most of the adults find it difficult to keep the pace. There are extremely few adults who can freely caress and kiss their children or give themselves over to play and the constant repetition the way children can. The latter keep going until they are "all tired out."

But, living as we do, the children's independence will necessarily make the inevitable conflicts more acute. In my case, there is a daily struggle to be allowed to listen to the radio news, because to the children it is nothing but an annoying noise; and so I become a source of annoyance, too. Others have trouble having their books or other possessions left in peace.

Why is that so? The difficulty will usually be found to be due to one or more of the following three causes: Frequently, it is because one has not made the child understand sufficiently what one wants to have respected. This is undoubtedly true in my case. Often, it is nothing but the children's urge to widen the field of their activities, to acquire things, to conquer everything. Finally, it may be due to our inability to practise what we have intellectually recognized to be true; all such reservations which we may have—in spite of our better knowledge—will of necessity have an influence on the children. It is easy to see where self-regulation, harmony and pleasure have had a chance for free development and, also, where it has not been possible to avoid suppression.

I should like, at this point, to say a word about two main objections to our concepts. The first is, "Why, shouldn't there be any discipline and authority at all?" and the other, "Don't the children get spoiled that way?"

There is a general belief—on the part of physicians and pediatricians as well as others—that the child must learn to obey and to subordinate himself, because otherwise he will become spoiled and "will never amount to anything." This concept pervades all our dealings with children right down to the sorry instance where the mother is forbidden to give the child any affection at all. From a certain point of view this concept is quite logical: If one wants well-behaved, neat and completely dependent children, the thing to do is, indeed, to hold them down from the very beginning. But, if one wants children who are independent, alive personalities who insist on their own rights, one has to help and respect them, to treat them with love.

Needless to say, in our way of upbringing there also develops a relationship of authority; but it is certainly of an entirely different kind than the customary one. Our children will never obey because they shall obey, but only out of a feeling that it is to their advantage to obey. If they do not have this feeling, they simply will not obey. It may be necessary to force them to obey, but this is done only when it is absolutely inevitable. And that is not very often. In fact, it is found that when children are brought up as freely as we at-
tempt to do, they are much more open to reason than other children; thus it is always possible to show them what is really to their advantage.

To the other objection, we can answer: the gratification of natural needs and the satisfaction of the natural urge for love will never make spoiled children; it will only make independent, contented personalities.

Does this mean that there is not any risk of spoiling them? Oh, yes! There is something which we, too, call spoiling. There are parents who simply do not let the children voice their desires, who never allow them to be confronted by any task; who—psychically and physically—spoon-feed them and smother them in soft cushions and featherbeds to such an extent that the children never have a chance to develop their own skills and abilities. This is really going to the other extreme. These children are not given a chance to fight for what they want. They have no opportunity to develop themselves, their skills, needs and wishes because these are, as it were, divined and fulfilled before the child is really conscious of them. Such children first become dependent, often to an extent that they are literally unable to do anything by themselves. After that—partly because of their lack of independence—they begin to make impossible demands upon their environment and, when these demands are not satisfied, they lose their temper and complain. This may go so far as to inhibit completely the child’s development so that the child gives the impression of being retarded, dull, and lacking in initiative.

But there may be a third and perhaps weightier objection to the concepts here described: their practicability now or in the future. Upon this, I cannot enter here. Our whole educational work will have to show the ways in which it will gradually become possible to put these concepts into practice on a wide social scale.

With this, we come to the problem, Healthy or sick children. Here things are completely turned upside down: a child without conflicts is generally considered healthy, but in the majority of cases—except with infants—it will be found to be sick according to our concepts. As a rule, it is the child who has established a superficial but quite stable equilibrium which covers up the fact that it has had to renounce an essential part of its vital demands; in other words, it is a sick child. In particular, this is true of the nice, well-behaved child who, usually, has had to give up all real independence. On the contrary, it is the child with conflicts who is usually relatively or entirely healthy: he still suffers under the frustration of his vital demands. One sees, quite often, children of 2 or 3 years of age who suffer and are alive, while those of 4, 5 and 6 are without conflicts, superficially happy, but emotionally dull, “healthy” children. The fact that a child cries or gets angry when it is crossed is a sign of health; it is a poor sign if it is quietly resigned. That does not mean that healthy children do not accept events or conditions; but with them, as mentioned before, it is a question of understanding and insight, not simply of submission. Healthy children—like healthy adults under certain circumstances—will be called “nervous” on account of the intensity with which they react emotionally to their experiences. This is particularly true of the category of children whom we have come to call “the almost healthy.”

The almost healthy children will feel and react very intensely. Often, they are somewhat too aggressive and wild in their motility and general behavior, or they react exaggeratedly to frustrations, or they are somehow restless. Often, they are “cry-babies” or “mother-babies.” They may show other symptoms. What they all have in common is that they were brought up with very much regard for their in-
divinduality, the parents’ being “on the child’s side” in the sense of Neill; but that in one respect or another, they were exposed to something they were not quite able to master. Most often it is a deficiency in the ability of the parents to gratify the child’s craving for love. I have already mentioned the great importance we have come to attribute to nursing. I personally believe—and I hope to substantiate this belief on a later occasion—that as long as it remains the custom to stop nursing at the age of 6 months or earlier, we have to expect a period during which the child’s needs are particularly intense and difficult to gratify. The normal and best time to conclude the nursing period would be at the age of 3 or 4 years, i.e., when the child reaches the stage of satisfying masturbation. For it appears that in the period between weaning and masturbation, the child has no adequate means of pleasure satisfaction. In addition, there is the circumstance that when the child is beyond the nursing period, the mother is likely to be so busy that she does not have the time and energy left over which the child requires. And on top of that, there are all kinds of personal difficulties: conflicts between the parents, the lack of help and the lack of means for toys. A most important factor is, I believe, the fact that the child’s personality develops so strongly during the first few years that it becomes stronger than its parents, with the result that the parents are inclined to give in to everything simply in order to have their peace. When parents of such “almost healthy” children acquire a more positive attitude toward them, become more affectionate, and more sure of themselves, the children become almost completely harmonious. My experience, small as it is in this particular respect, indicates also that if the little boy and the little girl “find each other” or simply become good friends, this may make an enormous difference.

We can accomplish much, therefore, with these “almost healthy” children, but we must recognize that they have a difficult time; and for this reason, they are usually considered “nervous,” “neurotic,” “ill-behaved” children, or “failures.” If they become apprehensive of other people, especially of aggressive adults or somewhat tough children, and try to avoid them, they are regarded as scared children; although they are, as a rule, very trusting if one knows how to approach them gently without obtruding oneself.

**CONCLUSION**

The sex-economic upbringing, it goes without saying, is exceedingly arduous. It requires both love and respect for the child, and it requires that one never make a demand on the child which the child cannot fulfill without doing violence to itself. The care of a child in the first few years is extremely exacting because the adults have to take the full consequences of their adjustment to the child who, on the other hand, can realize himself only through the adult’s help and understanding. Nor should one make decisions for the child; it must be allowed to make its own, decisions. In that way, one reaches an equal footing with the child, and the child will recognize one’s superior knowledge and insight, such as it is. The tendency of the very small child to consider the adult an omniscient and omnipotent figure is replaced by a more natural attitude which permits the child to develop its natural independence.

The other kind of upbringing is no less arduous. Often, one cannot but marvel at all the energy that is invested in commands and prohibitions. The child is forever supposed to say this or do that, to stop this or stop that, etc. etc. The energy is used for the suppression of the child; or to train it to be “the way a child, after all, has to be in order to become a decent human being and amount to something in this world”—whatever that is.
How much, then, can the child be helped? Very much, indeed. But we must admit that even though our experiences are highly promising, they are still based on rather small material. The essential points they show are: the possibilities for development and activity, the amount of love one can and should give the child, and the extent to which it is possible to eliminate specific harmful factors.

Sex-economic pedagogy is only in the beginning of its development, but it reveals a wealth of problems and can already point to a great many definitely positive results. Its present position can be defined as follows: To the extent to which it has been employed (and this has been with infants and children in the first few years of life) we have been able to demonstrate that the principles of sex-economy fit children; and we have learned the ways in which these principles can best be put into practice. Thus, sex-economic pedagogy now stands ready to tackle, with the pleasure principle as its point of departure, the many tasks which confront it on all sides. We feel justified, therefore, in the hope that it will go on making headway toward its goal which is to help children develop the maximum of independence, harmony and love from birth through life. We believe this will lead to the happiness of the child and to the welfare of society.
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