In this article we will be dealing with a new cultural ideal, normal man, *homo normalis*. *Homo normalis* is the archetype of the “social,” “adapted,” “civilized,” “cultured,” upholder of human society. *Homo normalis* is the heir of *homo sapiens* who was the heir of *homo divinus*. In common with his predecessors, he does not see himself as “an animal” but as “a human.”

The first step towards understanding this quality of being different requires the acknowledgement that *homo normalis* really does live, feel, and think differently from an animal. What actually distinguishes him from an animal is his biological rigidity, his armor. If our method of comprehending the present position of the human animal in nature is correct, then the most important characteristics of human existence should be derivable from the armor. The latter should contain the functions that form the basis of this peculiarly human existence.

It is quite apparent that the persistent idea of “being different” has its root in the armor. Man is indeed different, whether as *homo divinus*, *homo sapiens*, or *homo normalis*. He stands out from the rest of nature because he is different. There is, however, a real core to the idea of being different, an idea which gives rise to the gravest instances of erroneous thinking. Let us quickly examine the main features of this “state of being different.”

*Homo normalis* regards all directness, all direct contact with things and events, as improper or peculiar. One of his strict rules is to be “tactful” and to resort to “tactics.” Basically he is contactless, as observed in character analysis. Lack of direct contact is replaced by the semblance of contact or substitute contact. These characteristics form an essential feature of “civilized” man. That is why we encounter mask-like, false grinning in so many people. Clinical experience proves beyond doubt that a grinning smile is a rigid, automatic action which masks cruel hatred. Substitute contacts include stereotyped politeness, the avoidance of any deep emotion.

*Homo normalis* does not feel the streaming of energy within his organism, his organ sensations, because he has developed and permanently maintains a rigid armor which inhibits these plasmatic streamings. Therefore in his textbooks on physiology and biology, psychology and psychiatry, one finds no hint of this major biological fact with which every healthy child and unarmored adult is completely familiar.

The blocking of organ sensation springs from a dichotomy in the existence of *homo normalis* which affects all his thoughts, creations, and judgments. Organ excitation naturally continues to be produced, but the sensation of it is blocked. This has created a deep split in the biology of the human animal. Out of this blocking of organ sensation has developed the hard, cold intellect; the idea that a researcher has no emotions or should have none. One of the functions of intellect, as I have described clinically in *Character Analysis*, is to ward off all organ sensations. This appears in ideational form as a sharp contrast between mind and body, intellect and emotions. A mechanical view of the world springs from “pure” intellect. This view is logical, mathematical, ordered, “empty.” The blocked organ sensations are revealed in ideology as “other-worldly” or “supernatural,” in short, as mysticism.

Since the organ sensations are inaccessible, the “biological core” of the organism always remains outside the frame of thought and sensation. The inaccessibility of the biological core casts a shadow over an infinitely broad realm of human existence. The human animal drafts one social program after another without being able to put a single one into effect. The failure of all intentions leads to even more frenzied creation of new programs, new laws, and new rules.

The split in the biological and, with it, in the social existence

*Translated from the German by Derek and Inge Jordan.*
of *homo normalis* results in a tragic and insoluble contradiction which continues to develop and grow progressively more complex. The blocking of self-regulatory biological functions creates criminal and perverse tendencies and actions. This requires more and more new laws and moral precepts to tame the antisocial drives. This, in turn, increases the intensity of the criminal drives by blocking the natural functions; and these intensified criminal drives necessitate further and more complicated compulsory regulations. So it has come about that *homo normalis* has developed into a creature “that keeps the vicious animal in himself under control and strictly obeys the laws of civilisation.” I do not say this ironically. *Within the framework* of his world of ideas this behavior is entirely rational, that is to say, appropriate. It is playing *advocatus diaboli* to admit that there is sense in nonsense and that the irrational is rational. Nevertheless, as long as we know exactly from which standpoint we consider *homo normalis*, there is no risk of gross error.

*Homo normalis* finds himself in a vicious circle. The blocking of the natural life functions has stripped him of responsibility, and this lack of responsibility requires authoritarian control over his existence. Even authoritarian social organization has a rationale. Unless the rationality of dictatorships is understood one can never expect them to be replaced by self-regulatory systems. You cannot really help the Little Man if you close your eyes to his pettiness and maliciousness. The head-in-the-sand policy of the Socialists is a deterrent example of this. They set out to establish human freedom, yet they ended up with even more stringent regulations than those they were opposing.

Thus functionalism does not only direct itself to *external* factors, it requires an understanding of the *interior* of a certain area of thought. I would never have succeeded in elucidating the mass plague of fascism* if I had not tried to study the fascist way of thinking from the inside. It was only by asking myself how logic works within the fascist frame of thought that I was able to comprehend that there is more to fascism than a banner or a clique or a particular moral persuasion. Only in

---

*From *Homo Normalis* to the Child of the Future

this way was I able to make the important discovery that “fascism” corresponds simply to the irrational thinking and actions of the Little Man.

To understand the life of the Little Man, it is necessary to have experienced it. However, one must also have overcome it in order to be able to understand it from the outside. What is this “outside?” Is it the “cosmic principle?” No. One can hardly judge a question of education from the standpoint of the orgone waves in the atmosphere. However, it can be judged from the standpoint of the vital interests of the child and not from that of the interests of the state.

*Homo normalis* is a product of the adjustment of vital needs to the notion of state, culture, etc. *Homo normalis* can only be overcome by adapting society and culture to the vital needs of the child. Why do I refer to “the child?” Because the position of the child is the broadest and deepest one from which to attack and overcome social problems. Is there anyone who can name something else that determines all social events? The development of children in a society determines the development of that society’s morals, its inner conflicts, its human productivity, and its technology. The child is a reliable “external” factor from which to judge the social system which judges children. At this point I would like to quote some rules for schoolchildren. The reader is invited to guess what type of social system they represent.

“**It is the duty of every school child:**

1. to strive with tenacity and perserverance to master knowledge in order to become an educated and cultured citizen and to serve most fully the Motherland.

2. to be diligent in study and punctual in attendance, never being late to classes.

3. to obey without question the orders of school director and teachers.

4. to bring to school all necessary books and writing materials; to have everything ready before the arrival of the teacher.

5. to appear at school washed, combed, and neatly dressed.

---

6. to keep his desk in the classroom clean and orderly.
7. to enter the classroom and take his seat immediately after the ringing of the bell; to enter or leave the classroom during the lesson period only with the permission of the teacher.
8. to sit erect during the lesson period, not leaning on the elbows or slouching in the seat; to attend closely to the explanations of the teacher and the responses of the pupils, not talking or engaging in mischief.
9. to rise and stand erect while reciting; to sit down only on permission of the teacher; to raise the hand when desiring to answer or ask a question.
10. to rise as the teacher or the director enters or leaves the classroom.
11. to make accurate notes of the teacher’s assignment for the next lesson; to show these notes to the parents, and to do all the homework without assistance.
12. to be respectful to the school director and the teachers; to greet them on the street with a polite bow, boys removing their hats.
13. to be polite to his elders; to conduct himself modestly and properly in school, on the street, and in public places.
14. to abstain from using bad language, from smoking and gambling.
15. to take good care of school property; to guard well his own possessions and those of his comrades.
16. to be courteous and considerate toward little children, toward the aged, the weak, and the sick, to give them the seat on the trolley or the right of way on the street, to help them in every way.
17. to obey his parents and assist in the care of little brothers and sisters.
18. to maintain cleanliness in the house by keeping his own clothes, shoes, and bed in order.
19. to carry always his pupil’s card, guarding it carefully, not passing it to other children, but presenting it on request of the director or the teacher of the school.
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20. to prize the honor of his school and his class as his own.

For violation of these rules the pupil is subject to punishment, even to expulsion from school.”

You almost certainly answered “fascist” and not “communist.” The text is a summary of the educational principles from the pedagogical textbook *I want to be like Stalin*, written by B.P. Yessipov and N.K. Goncharov.* These rules were adopted by the “Soviet of People’s Commissars” of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic on August 2, 1943. And this, Little Man, is the result of your Great Revolution of 1917.

The assessment “fascist” is correct. If the reader had known the origin of these educational principles, he would have hesitated to say fascist because, to his mind, “communism” is linked with the rational revolutionizing of social conditions. He falls victim to the magic of a name or a designation. Imagine a girl called Anna X; imagine that we have known her for many years as a pure and chaste young girl who later married. Then the war breaks out and her husband is killed in action. Anna X turns into a depraved psychopath who sells her body to all comers. She is still called Anna X.

Politics in Russia still goes under the name of communism. But the progression from the intellectual world of an Engels to that of a psychopathic, power-lusting, and scheming dictator remains hidden from the ordinary person. The Russian *homo normalis* judges children from the standpoint of this dictator. We judge the dictator from the standpoint of the child, and the healthy child at that. The healthy child is the vantage point from which we criticize and judge all social functions. When we say “healthy child” we do not mean the future citizen, the future member of an association, or of the church, the army, or industry; instead, we mean the *child as a living being*.

The position of the healthy child is broader, much broader, than that of the citizen of this or that country, or of the proletarian of the 19th and 20th century, or of the Catholic or

the Jew, or even of the nation or civilization. It is identical with that of the living. This is generally understood. Only the leaders of nations and of the proletariat deny it.

A future historian who will view and record human history from the standpoint of the child will ask the same sort of naive and simple questions that I am asking here. For example: How is it that in the “century of the child” precise measurements have been taken of the infant cranium but no description of the healthy child appeared in any pediatric textbook? The answer is that the child was regarded as the future citizen of this or that state, as a member of this or that race, as the inheritor of this or that ideology, and not simply as a living being. A thousand years from now this will sound unbelievable. The ignoring of the child as a living being went to such extremes that people regarded the wailing of infants as natural, and preferred pale, obese, and quiet children to rosy-colored, sturdy, and lively ones. Quiet children caused less work than lively ones. No one thought that he would later have to spend all his life struggling with the biopathies of these children, because such thoughts were beyond the range of the citizen, the church member, the party member, the representative of this or that civilization. They could only think from “Calais to Strasbourg.” Everything the other side of Strasbourg and Calais was “foreign” or “hostile,” or “German” or “French” or “Jewish.” I could go on ad infinitum.

A special type of human fallacy, namely that of the “psychoanalytic educator” deserves special mention here. He had swallowed the “culture idea” hook, line, and sinker and he was aglow with enthusiasm for it. Children were “small wild animals” who had to be tamed, and their wicked, unconscious drives had to be adapted to “culture.” Starting in the 1920s, sex-economic criticism had done away with “cultural adaptation,” as well as with “wicked infantile drives.” It had made people aware that the much-vaunted “culture,” in which the sexually frustrated daughters of Viennese businessmen wallowed, was disintegrating; that a distinction had to be made between secondary asocial drives produced by this culture and primary, natural infantile drives; that the “sublimation of genital drives” was advocated by elderly spinsters; that children who do not gratify their genitality are sick, etc. etc. However in this area, too, homo normalis had seized the reins and was drumming the declining, decaying culture of a degenerate intellectual stratum in Vienna into the minds of millions of infants whom he had to prepare for the future. The child was supposed to adapt to a declining culture which had already gone bankrupt many years before.

In the communist camp, homo normalis discovered psychoanalytic cultural adaptation after homo normalis in the psychoanalytic camp had killed the sexual theory and committed it to oblivion. Now that the idea of human emancipation was just as dead as the teaching of the sexual biology of the small child, the homines normales of both camps joined forces in the common fight against sex economy, which had threatened their activities. Biopathic old spinsters of the Left joined forces with old spinsters of the cultural front. Psychoanalytic wheelers and dealers in Topeka, Kansas raised a dirty penpusher to the position of judge over the existence or nonexistence of the cosmic orgone. All this to save culture.

Nevertheless, the battle for the rights of the healthy infant continued. Once orgone biophysics had gained more and more ground and trust within the United States, truly alive and courageous Americans began, from about 1945 on, to come out in the daily press in favor of natural infantile genitality. This was a great step forward. While the leftist saviors of mankind were calling for a red or pink revolution, the true social revolution, the revolution affecting the education of children, was taking place here in front of everyone’s eyes. This revolution was opposed vigorously by Marxists and psychoanalysts alike. It took place without any marching songs and gun salutes. Fortunately, nobody calling himself the father of all proletarian peoples participated. Instead the participants were determined, lively men and women from the fields of education and medicine who were doing their duty.
INERTIA AND INACTION IN HOMO NORMALIS

In newborn children of all races and classes we have found the specific qualities of life from which we judge our existence. We know that one of the essential characteristics of this critical standpoint is movement or constant change. I am talking about something more than just physical growth and the stages of emotional development of the child. What I mean is movement in the literal sense, the alternating of emotions, the rapid transitions from love to anger and vice versa, the lively, always vibrant interest of the healthy child. Its life functions never stand still, but are always in flux and undergoing change. Nevertheless they are sustained by a uniform basic principle with its individual variations in each child.

In our civilization this natural principle is counteracted by a force of inertia, inaction, and rigidity. Sooner or later, depending on the character of the environment, a state of quiet and immobility sets in which, in the growing child, is still eclipsed by the original biological activity, but, with age, becomes more apparent. Let us leave out the years of puberty and middle age of the typical homo normalis and consider him on the threshold of old age, i.e. after his fiftieth or sixtieth year of life. By consistently remaining outside conventional systems of thought, we are able to discern states which are otherwise hidden by established concepts such as “solid citizen” or “well-off statesman” or “heir to religious or proletarian ideology.” I am referring to a character trait of homo normalis which should be a source of serious reflection and great concern to anyone who, ahead of his time, would like to perceive the outlines of a better future.

It is a characteristic of normal people that they adopt certain habits and attitudes very early on, usually soon after the start of puberty, and become “stuck in them.” For example, let us assume that as a young man one knew a girl who chose her male friends according to certain artistic interests, e.g., in Cézanne. Thirty years later one meets her again when she is a middle-aged matron. She still has the same interest in certain aspects of Cézanne’s paintings. Nothing has changed in this respect, nothing has been added, and nothing has been lost. One searches for some trace of change and development, but in vain. She is still interested in this or that arrangement of color in Cézanne’s paintings. This example is of no particular importance socially but it does show clearly what is meant here. This mechanical propensity of the human character to sit, to remain stuck, is found in situations which are very decisive socially.

The world of technology, of knowledge, of work has in the meantime moved on. The forms of love life have changed greatly. However, the character-related and thus also the cultural reference points of the inert human structure are the same as they were thirty or fifty years ago. Lisa X. has long lost her chaste virginity; she has embraced hundreds of men free of charge or for payment; there is not one single cell in her body that was there ten years ago; she has a ruined face and a ruined body; however, she still dreams and talks of the ideals of chastity.

This is harmless when all that is involved is chastity. But it is dangerous to life when this inertia expresses itself in the politics of old revolutionaries. Illegal conspiracies, spying, and snooping were necessary ways of life for the Russian revolutionaries at and before the turn of the century. In the meantime they have seized power; they control the whole apparatus of government; they have access to all the wealth of present-day and historical knowledge of the world. The world has moved on. “Social ideas” have spread throughout society. Conservatives advocate social insurance. The 8-hour day and the ban on child labor have become generally valid institutions. And what do the “revolutionaries” of 1900 do in the year 1950? They are still conspiring and spying; they have remained sitting.

The entire state apparatus of these “leaders of freedom” consists of nothing but spying. It is the core, the essence, the goal, and the vital element of their existence. And since they have remained stuck, they maintain the interest of the whole world in old, outmoded forms.

I would now like to summarize briefly the insights that have been gained in the new revolutionary education of children. Interest in the child as the carrier of this or that culture is being replaced by interest in the individuality of the living child. The
adaptation of the child to ideals that are foreign to it is dying a slow but certain death. People have started building a special world and environment for the child. They have begun to see that neurotic mothers and fathers are totally unsuited as educators. What I tried in vain to make clear in the late 1930s now proves to be generally true, namely, that parents and teachers have been contaminated by erroneous views stemming mostly from their own emotional problems or from dependency on irrational social attitudes. While the "education of the educators" was ushered in by Marx, the representatives of Marxism have continued to support Stalinism, which stood for the methods of education quoted previously. However, the flood of rational insights has grown and the "emotional plague" has lost ground in the battle for the healthy child. The positive attitude toward infantile sexuality has begun to replace the negative attitude which dominated education for thousands of years. Progressive educators still do not dare to broach the question of puberty. However, the change in the attitude toward infants sooner or later has to bring about a change in the attitude to puberty. The way to this change was prepared by the sex-economic criticism of psychoanalysis and continues in the efforts of the pioneers of self-regulation in education, such as Neill in England, Aldrich and Stopes in America.

From the beginning, sex economy had indissolubly linked the self-regulation of the child with the self-regulation of its natural sexual functions. Later, orgone biophysics confirmed experimentally that sexuality is the most important expression of the living in childhood and puberty.

Other authors advocated self-regulation, but they disregarded the sexuality of the child or they assigned secondary importance to it. This is where the sex-economic approach to the education of children has differed from all others which deviated from the patriarchal-authoritarian path.

The inhibiting influence of homo normalis cannot be studied better in any other area of human existence than that of sexuality. His tendency to deny that something exists and to find excuses is nowhere else so obvious and so grotesquely senseless. Since regulation of the child's sexual energy is the only useful key to its self-regulation and since homo normalis fears nothing so much as sexual excitation, it is understandable that he was unable to arrive at any concept of the "healthy" child. It is not correct, as many believe, that educators avoid the question of sexuality solely for reasons of social anxiety. I know from my own experience that the average working man has developed a correct perception of these questions and that it is only the leading strata of intellectuals and educators who impress upon public consciousness the need to avoid the main issue.

Why, we must ask, do the high school teacher, the university teacher, or the school principal lag so far behind in their understanding of these matters? The answer is deeply rooted in social and biological factors. The strata of the population which are responsible for governing society must operate within the given framework of thought, i.e., within the great errors of mankind; otherwise they would not be the leaders of society. They would not be allowed to assume this role. Those people who are already at the top would block their way. Why? The question is not easy to answer. Logically it should be the other way round. Those people who have the answer to the contradictions of human existence should be the intellectual leaders of society. The teacher who comprehends sexual maturing during puberty and is able to help the young person should be the director of the educational institution and not the person who exacerbates the misery. Why then, we ask naively, are simplicity, logic, and fruitfulness the exception rather than the rule and so often even the object of persecution?

The existence of so many powerful institutions which are based on human ignorance and irrationality is not the entire answer, and it is probably not an answer at all. For, we must ask once more, if the simple and the rational both act in the general consciousness of man (if it were otherwise, the human race would have disappeared long ago), then a majority of votes in the representative body that selects teachers would be sufficient to set the situation right and to replace the reactionary teacher by the progressive one.

I am afraid that what is logical and consistent in the illogicality of the human animal's social behavior hides a very deep and
not what we want but what we are doing, not what we believe but from what standpoint we judge belief, not what our goal in life is but whether our daily thoughts and actions are in harmony with the autonomous biological and social development that occurs independent of us. I believe that these guarantees against error, even if not perfect, are useful enough and capable of being developed. One of the results of this attitude to the questions of human existence is that we avoid the risk of thinking we are something better or superior simply because we have a “beautiful” or “lofty” ideology or have found out our opponent’s error.

In order to do productive work on vital questions of human existence it is essential to understand why man, though in error, acts logically, i.e., to understand what constitutes the logic in his errors. Armed with this question we are able to expose secrets which previously seemed inpenetrable. Thus why do people, despite the fact that they know better, always entrust the reactionary and never the progressive teacher, doctor, politician, etc. with the task of managing their lives? The answer is as follows: The one who revolutionizes human values always stands outside the thought framework within which human error occurs. The reason why people can act logically and consistently, though in error, is that human structure has adapted itself to erroneous thinking and made it a measure of its existence. There are a few biological constraints, such as armor against unpleasure and biological excitation. However, the human animals who have learned to go through life armored, constricted, and incapable of pleasure can no longer exist without armor. All institutions have been established with the armor in mind. All social views and laws allow for the asocial drives developed by the armor. Tactics, diplomacy, and politics are the results and at the same time the regulators of the lives of armored human animals. Thus, no matter how irrational their function and existence may be from the standpoint of the living, they have a function and “sense in the non-sense” within the sphere of life from which they come and which they serve to maintain. The strength of their existence lies in their rationality, despite its limitation. They cannot simply be replaced by the logical and rational thought
processes of unarmored life, because the functions of armored human animals are adjusted to the rules of the armor and not to the rules of unarmored life. In addition, armored human animals would certainly err if they tried to exist in accordance with the natural laws of self-regulation. They would certainly turn their children into inwardly-torn psychopaths if they tried to let them grow up regulating themselves.

The only hope we have of fully implementing self-regulation is to comprehend why people cling to their rigid, authoritarian rules and defend them so zealously. It is not the idea of self-regulation but its practical application, not a policy of self-regulation but its growth from the ultimate biological source of human animals. In the same way that a woodcutter is unable to take out a person's appendix, so an armored human animal is unable to lead a self-regulating life or to bring up children who are capable of self-regulation. His inner being, expressed in his thoughts, behavior, reactions, laughter, talking, etc., corresponds to the sphere of life of the armored individual, and it is logical and meaningful there. However, it loses its function and reliability outside this sphere. An armored person has no feel for the language, the life expression, the needs and, above all, the simple ways of unarmored life. It is crucial to be completely clear about this contradiction.

For several decades we have been in a gigantic upheaval of all human values, institutions, and ideals. Equally unbeknown to the average man and his political leaders, the political revolutions of the first half of the 20th century changed suddenly into the biological revolution of human existence in the second half of the century. The politician, as the leader of the masses, thought only in terms of the short period of just a few hundred years. Whenever he advocated the reduction of working hours or an increase in wages, he had his sights on the "traditional enemy of the working class," the "capitalist." The idea that the capitalist was responsible for all misery became such an absolute concept that the politicians of the Left developed into the most reactionary and life inimical representatives of social ideology. The political revolt could not appeal to the masses without at the same time arousing yearnings in millions of people. While

the time frame of political ideas was conceived in centuries, the human masses responded with life-oriented questions ranging over hundreds of thousands of years. These questions, which touched on such matters as consciousness, the unconscious, religion, God, sexuality, fulfillment in life, were now forced by ignorant politicians into a framework of thought which not only froze them but also clothed them in such absolute and narrow terms as "proletariat," "nation," "national honor," etc. The socialist politicians replied to the charge of "industrial exploitation" with their "class interests." Whereupon fascism answered with its "national interests." As a reaction to this, a new idea of "internationalism and humanity" developed, which is no longer proclaimed by the class-obsessed socialists but by various strata of all nations. The following are all part of this revolution: the notion of world citizenship, the drastic changes in the approach to infantile sexuality in the U.S.A., the spread of psychology, which very quickly overshadowed the economic philosophy of life and downgraded the economic Marxists to conservative, if not to say, reactionary ideologists, the decline of the mechanistic world view of physics, and the discovery of cosmic orgone energy with its functional basic laws.

Russian Marxism, which absolutized everything it had adopted from Karl Marx, had degenerated into a brutal system of reaction which knew nothing at all of life. In contrast, in the United States the conservatives developed a new concept of the evolution of the individual and his potential. While in Russia the idea of guilt had attained new, unsurpassed peaks and new, unsurpassed levels of brutality, the conservatives in America developed an attitude which is displayed in the exemplary Report of the Committee on Civil Rights (1947). In other words, all the boundaries which had separated national and class interests collapsed. Completely unnoticed by human consciousness, an orientation developed toward what was alive, variable, and functional in human life. The "frozen" sectors of society reacted to this here and there with sharp attacks. But it was no longer possible to question the right of the child to its own life.

Few people comprehend the extent and depth of this revolution. Within the political sphere it is argued that interest in the
One could say that this dichotomy has existed for a long time. Nevertheless, the narrow viewpoints of politics, power, collective agreements have had the upper hand. The difference now lies in the fact that the authoritarian, life-denying education of small children has entered a cul-de-sac and can go no further. The unsuitability of parents as educators when they put their faith solely in their parental rights has been recognized. The sexuality of the child has penetrated people's consciousness, and the sexuality of the child, whether one likes it or not, is accompanied by the principle of self-regulation. In this way self-regulation in social life has, for the first time, a solid biological foundation in the self-regulation of the child's sexual functions.

The revolution in our existence which these events ushered in can no longer be ignored and can certainly not be underestimated. What educators and physicians now have to do will be determined by the extent of the irrational reactions of sick parents and educators to the development of biological self-regulation in the child. However, to accomplish their task, they must stand outside the prevailing systems of thought. The biological self-regulation of the small child functions in a way that corresponds to nothing, absolutely nothing, within the political or industrial thought framework. This is evident from the helplessness and lack of understanding with which an old-style politician or banker meets natural childlike behavior. It is not voters or percentage points that matter here. Nor are bookkeeping or diplomacy important. Any restriction of life, any influence that does not emanate from the child and return to the child leads inevitably to neurosis or biopathy. Judging youthful lifestyles as criminal is not getting anywhere. The police chief no longer has a role to play in education. And wherever he understands young people or loves children, he puts off his specific character as a policeman, even if he still wears a uniform. I maintain that the brutality toward children is due to the embarrassment of the armored adult toward living reactions. The politician, the diplomat, whose skill lies in keeping quiet about the truth, the stiff authoritarian, and the card-carrying socialist who is bogged down in aimless class hatred, have become a laughing stock in the face of natural childlike behavior. The characteristics of
healthy children overshadow all human attitudes which arise within the political and national framework of thought. The living quality in the child automatically eliminates race hatred. An American who hates a Japanese or black baby is abhorrent, as is a chauvinistic Jew who curses a child of Catholic parents. The child contains within itself, in a practical, living way, all the functions that the human animal has been trying for thousands of years to translate into ideals or political reality.

We want to assume that we are not introducing a "new idea of the healthy child," i.e., that we are not answering ideas with ideas but ideas with realities. The healthy child is a rarity, but wherever we observe it, we are astonished at the thousands of years of human ignorance and arrogance. We become humble and find ourselves outside all customary ways of looking at things. We begin to understand why the idea of the Christ-child was able to inspire veneration in millions of people over the millennia. While we try to assert our dignity and prejudices, we feel ridiculous. While we try to be educators, we are educated by the child. Wherever we had absolute values, the ground is cut from under our feet. The ideas of state, nation, fatherland, citizen, civilization, and whatever one may call the many absolute concepts to which the sick human animal clings, melt away. They are replaced by life functions which are new to us, which we could not foresee. All the convictions that we had acquired about the character of children collapse. And we are astonished that this world of natural functions was for so long and so consistently overlooked and so cruelly suppressed that educators and physicians were able to divert attention from it for centuries, that one could take on the burdens arising from the suppression of these characteristics of the child. We grow quiet and would ideally like to stop talking for a long time, because we are afraid that we will only cause more unhappiness.

We ask ourselves again how it was possible over the millennia to overlook, subvert, and even destroy the child's simple life functions. It would be quite impossible for us to get at the core of the biological standpoint if we do not first try to understand how this gigantic avoidance, this gigantic evasion, was possible; how it was possible that the human animal, for thousands of years, preferred sickness, infirmity, cruelty, slavery, and killing in wars, to the simple functions and phenomena of life in the child. There must be some sense in this nonsense. Trying to explain this chronic catastrophe by invoking a biological death instinct, as socially timid psychoanalysis attempted to do, is tantamount to avoiding the main issue in the worst possible way.

In this respect our criticism cannot be too sharp. We have to show consideration for our children who are the victims of such erroneous thinking by homo normalis. Our loyalty is to the child and not to a decaying cultural idea which, in its basic form, is an incitement to mass murder. We cannot and should not overlook the fact that the "culture idea" grew on the mure of crippled biological perceptions and forced itself upon an unsuspecting society. I believe that Beethoven, more than Goethe, represents and reproduces the mood of life. It is another sign of avoiding the main issue when the same human animals who are guilty of the worst kind of intellectual unscrupulousness damn our standpoint as "radical." No consideration for others can prevent us from making this judgment. And we are not interested in being praised in the daily newspapers.

It is not our task at this point to give a clinical description of the biologically healthy child. This has been done in detail in other places and the idea of the biologically healthy child is already being supported by a number of excellent pedagogues. What we are primarily concerned with here is the mechanism of human errors, errors that are not due to lack of knowledge.

Avoiding the main issue is one of the significant characteristics of homo normalis. This goes so far that he describes as uncultured or tactless any attitudes which lead toward the main issue in as straight a line as possible. Let us quickly remind ourselves of the fact that avoiding the main issue permeates many important areas of life as a basic attitude. Along the path pursued by orgone research, I repeatedly encountered completely incomprehensible refusals to consider simple facts. It is also no mere chance that it was precisely organon which encountered the astonishing avoidance of the main issue so regularly when researching biological energy. After all, it was concerned with investigating exactly those matters that up until then had been...
so assiduously and thoroughly avoided. I have repeatedly expressed astonishment that such simple and obvious functions of cosmic energy as the blue color of protoplasm or the energy functions in the atmosphere could be ignored or explained away. This astonishment has tortured me over the years because I could not admit that I personally must be so very different to perceive and comprehend what thousands of excellent researchers had so thoroughly overlooked. Here are a few examples of the avoidance of the main issue:

*In biology*
the origin of protozoa from bions, a simple microscopic observation.

*In bacteriology*
the process of putrefaction and endogenous infection.

*In medicine*
the sexual function in general and the orgasm in particular.

*In modern psychoanalysis*
the sexual etiology of mental illness, although Sigmund Freud fought all his life to have it accepted.

*In education*
the pleasure function and the self-regulation of the infant.

*In sociology and economics*
the natural bio-social (“work-democratic”) relationships between people of all ages and regions.

*In physics and general natural science*
the physical properties of the real, moving ether, the reason for the spontaneous discharge of electrosopes, the magnificent phenomenon of wave motion in the atmosphere which, when magnified one hundred times, leaves no doubt that we are living at the bottom of an ocean of moving energy. (In astronomy that phenomenon was dismissed as “bad seeing,” in meteorology as “heat waves,” in electrical theory as “static electricity,” and in nuclear physics as “cosmic rays” and “background counts”),

the thorough and dogmatic elimination of the natural scientist’s sensory apparatus from his judgment of nature.

It is not possible to claim that these oversights have nothing in common, and that they are “just” gaps in people’s knowl-

edge or understandable errors. On the other hand, it must be stated that it cannot be fortuitous that research into biological energy collided with each and every one of these different errors; that it had to explain each and every one of these omissions or avoidances before it could proceed; that the functions of all these avoided areas are characterized by one common denominator: They are all, without exception, functions of primordial cosmic energy.

I really cannot accept the compliment paid me so often by friends, namely, that I am a great natural scientist who has “happened” to elucidate so many obscure matters. Such statements may be flattering but they cannot be accepted because far more is involved than the elucidations that have been achieved. We are concerned with the question whether all these oversights were necessary; whether perhaps an important characteristic of the human animal is responsible. Standing “outside” as we do and paying no heed to the opinion of some scribbler in this or that daily newspaper, we can afford to replace a flattering compliment with a vital question.

Avoidance of the main issue seems to be the common denominator to which all the above-mentioned omissions and misinterpretations can be traced. And the main issue is the biological functioning of the human organism. Access to it can be gained in one way only, via the organ sensations which appear in their strongest form in the orgastic discharge of bioenergy. By avoiding this one function, the armored human animal has lost access to the central principle of nature, the cosmic orgone.

One cannot again avoid and circumvent such levers of human understanding by following the rule “don’t hurt anybody’s feelings” or “steer the middle course” or “be tolerant towards errors.” If one is drowning (and the public agrees that humanity is drowning) such rules and laws of etiquette appear to be merely the tools of the pathological compulsion to avoid the main issue. As a physician who for three decades has experienced and treated immeasurable misery, unnecessary misery, in children and adolescents, in young people, and the aged alike, I have to vigorously reject such cultured claptrap. The same characters who cannot find it in themselves to “hurt” a colleague at the
same university have no conscience when children die of poliomyelitis all around them. They die because this disease is closely linked to the physical and atmospheric orgone. Thus the effects of avoiding the main issue are felt in the medical approach to poliomyelitis, cancer, heart diseases, etc. I don’t think much of the cultured abundance of consideration shown by our esteemed academics in the face of such facts. By placing ourselves outside such avoidance, we find ourselves at the beginning of a new epoch of social development and not at the end of an old one, whose principal characteristics were mechanics, mysticism, and avoidance of the main issue.

We display a great deal of humor and we become childlike when we play with children. We become serious, very serious and determined, when as physicians or educators we have vital functions to fulfill. Our humorous opponents would like to have it the other way round. They want us, like themselves, to be deadly serious and strict in our dealings with children and to avoid being childlike and playful; they want us to “remain humorous” in tragic life situations, not to “take everything so seriously” and to show consideration in all respects. In short, they think and judge wrongly, because, true to the age in which they live, they want to avoid having deadly serious facts destroy their pathological equanimity.

The pathological equanimity can be viewed from inside or from outside the system of thought. Within the thought system the sangfroid preserved during a bombardment in wartime is the desired heroic attitude. It is the best possible adaptation to the given situation. However, standing outside this thought system we regard this sangfroid on the battlefield as completely crazy. It contradicts the primitive reactions of living matter which display fear in the face of danger. Within the system of thought the soldier who develops shell shock is regarded as pathological, cowardly, and useless, which is what he actually is within this thought system. However, seen from the standpoint of the living, his reaction is rational and completely understandable. Psychiatry remains within the given framework of thought and opposes anything that dares to transcend its bounds. It invents healing methods to combat the “illness” of “traumatic neuro-

sis.” Seen from outside, such psychiatry is not a science but a tool of war. Outside the thought framework everything that tends towards the destruction of life appears crazy. Within the framework it is the other way round. The two standpoints never coincide. Discussions on such questions are senseless and get nowhere unless the standpoint is first clarified. People talk at cross purposes.

We are not establishing any scientific rules here. We are still wandering as naïve observers through the regions of our existence. We are just asking questions—naïve, often stupid questions. No responsible modern government agency would know what to do with our questions or answers. Nevertheless, such questioning and probing of our existence is necessary and indispensable. Human society has lost its orientation, and we are not obliged, at least not yet, to parrot all the claptrap which the daily newspapers serve up to us.

To the observer within the given thought framework of major errors, a child is not healthy if it becomes afraid in a dangerous situation. “Boys don’t cry,” so the saying goes, because they are future defenders of the homeland, fearless, unaffected by shock when shells burst around them. To the observer outside this thought framework, a child that does not experience fear in the face of danger is sick; it reacts counter to biological laws.

To the representative of “cultural values” a child’s rage is “pathological.” The child does not seem to be “adapted” when it rages. For those of us who stand outside these cultural values, such a child is a problem. We ask whether its rage is rational or irrational. If a child reacts with rage to being continuously tormented by its mother, we find nothing pathological in that, but see it as the natural reaction to the irrationality of the mother. The living in the child fights back against such nonsense. If, as is the rule, such a rebellion is suppressed as “pathological,” the child develops an external calm. In the background the previously rational rage is changed into irrational defiance reactions which are liable to break out at the slightest instigation. This pathological defiance requires new disciplinary measures to suppress it, and these in turn provoke fresh defiance, and so on, until the young person is completely criminalized
and ends up in jail. Anyone who remains within this thought framework is helpless; there is no solution to the conflict within this contradiction. In order to solve it, one has to stand outside. In individual cases, it is often necessary to act within the framework of the conflict. For example, one cannot avoid taking stern measures if such a child shows signs of becoming a murderer. In principle, however, one has obtained a broad standpoint from which the overall question can be dealt with prophylactically. This is not understood by the educator who remains within the customary frame of thought.

Outside that framework, a child is regarded as healthy if it does not conform to this or that direction. To an orthodox Jew, however, a child who sings Christian songs appears to be sick or corrupt, and a Catholic feels the same way when a child sings Jewish songs. A psychoanalyst regards a child as sick if it does not adapt its genitality to the "agenital culture." A red fascist\(^*\) finds that a child is pathological if it does not emulate the dictator or if it develops its own thoughts on life. In our opinion, it is the children who yield to such demands who are sick. Judged from the biological standpoint, a child strikes us as sick if it does not engage in love play, if it does not resist suppression, if it does not try to assert its own rational will, if it does not ask questions about how children are conceived and born. (Children were and still are severely punished for asking such questions.) We have already carefully observed a number of children and have come to the responsible conclusion that those who develop in ways that are against the usual rules do not become constipated; they eat without compulsion and with pleasure; they are not afraid of the dark, and they are not sadistic; they willingly share things with other children; they are open and sociable; they entertain themselves; they do not develop any mystical fantasies; they become enraged when their self-regulating activities are frustrated; they want to do everything themselves, get their own plates and wash them, dress themselves, etc. They want to understand everything going on around them. Healthy children are rational. In this respect all psychoanalytic education is wrong and in an impasse. Children who develop their natural functions in a self-regulating way are not irrational. They react irrationally only if they encounter an educator who acts irrationally and for whom they are no match. They are defiant where defiance is appropriate. Try to tell such a child what it should eat, and you will be rebuffed in no uncertain manner. Try to stop such a child from playing what it chooses, and you will run up against a brick wall. These are important signs pointing to a great future. Fascists, cultural windbags, religious chauvinists, and neurotics of all kinds feel that such children are sick, useless, "maladjusted," future criminals. Let us play the devil's advocate here. Let us place ourselves within the same framework of thought from which these judgments stem. Seen from "inside," they are again correct. Such children do not tolerate authoritarian discipline. If they are rigorously subjected to it, they turn into criminals if they are tough on the outside, or into schizophrenics if they are very sensitive on the inside. Such children rarely succeed in overcoming "the rules" in life; if they do, they become great men, creators of new ideas and arts, etc. They do not develop any ideal of war. They do not want to become soldiers.

If they grow up in an environment in which pistols are admired, they also want to have pistols. The parents of such a child once found themselves in a dilemma. Their child, who was four years old, had gotten the idea from kindergarten that it wanted to be a cowboy with a pistol. At first the parents tried to convince the child that pistols are bad things and that only bad people shoot other people and animals without a reason. The absolute pacifist would have stuck to this point of view. The child would have had to yield to the "standpoint of pacifism." The child would have been understood from the narrow viewpoint of an ideology and not from the standpoint of its own development. Therefore the parents gave in, despite their convictions. Once their attempt to limit the child's interest to the cowboy uniform had failed, they bought him a pistol. They told the child that it now had to be careful to prevent any other child from using its pistol against a human being or an animal. The child was enthusiastic. For a few days it played the game "police protection for children" with the pistol, then the interest

\(^*\)Reich considered that communism, as practiced in the Soviet Union, is red fascism. [Eds.]
waned until it completely disappeared. Thereafter the child showed no interest in shooting.

Let us consider this example, taken from real life, from different points of view. If the parents had adhered absolutely to the pacifist standpoint the child would have been refused the pistol. As a result, an unfulfilled yearning would have taken root in him. If our biopsychiatric knowledge is correct, this unrequited wish would have become linked with other experiences of a similar kind and been intensified. Over a period of time this wish would have formed the core of a fantasy, namely, that of being a robber or a bad person. In short, the child’s self-regulation would have come to an end.

From the military-martial standpoint one would have given the child the pistol without any second thoughts; indeed, many fathers who had just been through the horrors of war would have taught the child to shoot Japanese and Germans. Such an attitude is possible only within the framework of an error of thought which requires the armoring of the organism in the father as well as in the son. The pistol would very soon have concentrated all destructive and sadistic impulses on itself. The path to “juvenile delinquent” or to mass murderer would have been opened if other conditions favorable to it had existed.

This is what it comes down to: Armored children do not hesitate to pick up and hold on to instruments of death. If the environment forces them to do so, unarmored children also reach out for such instruments, but they have no elements in their structure which can become anchored in murderous weapons. The murderous toy finds no response in the child. Therefore the child soon loses interest in the pistol.

It is thus not correct that the healthy child is not afraid or that it has no destructive impulses, or that it never becomes defiant or that it never deliberately annoys adults. Like all other children, it has all the potential for “good” or “bad” attitudes. The difference between it and other children who grow up within these erroneous systems of thought is that it does not remain fixed in these reactions or attitudes. It may happen that a healthy child is afraid of wolves during the night. However, a simple discussion is enough to eliminate this fear. It does not develop a phobia lasting all its life. It sometimes happens that a healthy child accidentally or intentionally breaks a glass, but the destruction of things does not develop into a chronic character trait. The child’s structure does not contain any character-related destructive rage, of which the child cannot rid itself. A healthy child knows fear, cries, hates, is defiant, “misbehaves,” but none of these things are anchored structurally.

The child that develops without any biological impediment is characterized by great seriousness, which is clearly distinguishable from melancholia or depression. The seriousness is evident in particular in the eyes. One of my younger students referred to this visual expression very aptly as “being transparent.” The expression of the healthy child is undisguised. There is nothing shy or cunning about it. It simply expresses emotions without masking or deflecting them, as we observe in armored children.

The healthy child is “living”; it experiences every mood directly and to the full. If it feels like shouting, it lets its voice ring out loud. If it wants to play by itself, it becomes quiet and shuns company. Seen from this standpoint, pedagogical ideals stemming from “within” nonbiological views seem absurd, for example, the view that a child should always be “sociable.” The rigidity and absolute quality of such demands merely reflects the armor of educators who always need pseudo-contact in order to drown out their inner emptiness. A healthy child often wishes to be alone. Healthy children think; they think intensely about many things. They ask rational questions, and this thinking and questioning is fundamentally different from the compulsive brooding and questioning that we encounter in armored, neurotic, “adapted” children.

Healthy children like to give; they share their things with others if they feel so inclined. Sometimes they want to hold on to things so they can play with them themselves. When we say “living,” we mean a way of life which does not conform to any rigid rules or ideals. The healthy child lives functionally and not mechanically; it “lives” a basic theme of its existence, but the variation of this theme is never-ending. This is what “living” is. The healthy child reacts deeply and fully to everything that it experiences; it has no pseudo-contacts. It rejects armored,
stiff people. It immediately perceives the warmth of healthy adults. A child that rejects certain adults is not "sick" but reacts from "outside" the civilized standpoint of the state, church, and culture; it reacts as a living organism. *Hominis normalis* do not understand this. They make no distinction, and indeed cannot distinguish, between rational and irrational reactions which have the same name. To the *homo normalis* defiance is defiance, regardless of whether it is justified or not. Hatred is not permitted; it is uncultured, or in some other way unacceptable, regardless of whether the child is defending itself against unwarranted ill-treatment or whether it has a morbidly destructive hatred of everything. The rigid, absolute, eternal elements in the judgments of *homo normalis* permeate our entire system of education. Nowhere have these flourished so much as in the land of the proletarian generals. Nowhere else is the variable, functional, "living" so intensely hated and disapproved of; nowhere else are "withinness," the narrow viewpoint, the absolute, and the adaptation to the state more dominant than in the land of these Marxist Jesuits.

We said that a healthy child likes to give. We must quickly add that it also likes to absorb, that it is trusting. If it is shy, this is not out of mistrust but because it requires time to get to know and make contact with others. The healthy child is open and trustful, and it embraces people with a warm hug. It loves its accustomed environment but is ready to rebel if it encounters senseless demands. To some mothers the cleanliness of the floor is more important than the enjoyment found by the child in playing. Other mothers find it difficult to permit the child to do things by itself. They feel that they must always help the child, that they must exhort it to eat this or that or something else. A healthy child reacts strongly to such interventions in its self-determination. This self-determination of the small child is the root of all later self-regulatory functions in man and society and should be protected by all available means.

As a rule, the healthy child sleeps fast through the night. It does not develop fears or experience nightmares. Occasionally, when the inner drive tensions become too unmanageable, the child has an anxiety dream. But it reports it as something out of the ordinary. And it is grateful when someone helps it to find the reason for its anxiety.

The healthy child takes all natural forms of sexuality seriously and equates them with other natural functions. I have never seen the lasciviousness and slyness which characterize armored children. Healthy children talk openly with the adults whom they trust. They keep away from authoritarian, ascetics, demanding, and constantly grumbling neurotics.

In kindergarten or elsewhere they naturally pick up all kinds of morbid tendencies from the world of the armored human animal, namely, cursing, "kill" language, nasty grimacing, etc., but they feel the alien quality of such things. Characterologically, they remain unaffected if they succeed in living their lives in a natural way for the first three to four years. Often healthy children complain about the sadistic behavior and perversions of sick children. If the pesterer by sick children goes too far, they are capable of defending themselves with their fists. The following experience bears this out: The child, like all healthy children, possessed the characteristics of natural goodness and tolerance, dangerous characteristics to display in modern social life; armored children view them as weaknesses and abuse them. One day this boy was playing in the street. A couple of louts called him over to play with them. When he got close enough they splashed a glass of water into his face. The boy ran away, shocked and crying, because he did not understand why they had done such a thing. Subsequently, one of the group of louts displayed a particular stubbornness in harassing the boy. Then something wonderful happened. The boy had obviously decided that he could not put up with this any longer. One morning, although he was younger and smaller, he threw himself with all his force at his tormentor, brought him crashing to the ground, and gave him a good thrashing, until he ran away humiliated. I observed the incident and experienced great relief. What I saw was clear evidence of the fact that the living spirit in the healthy child does not always have to be subjugated to the pestilent reactions of armored life. This is how in the course of time, millenia or centuries, healthy life will ward off unhealthy life. The child will learn to use its fists without losing its goodness, without
becoming exactly like the armored pestilent neurotic. I saw that life is able to hit out firmly and boldly if it is abused. This was a great experience for me. It has far-reaching consequences for judging the chances that the human race has of ever freeing itself of the emotional plague in all its forms.

In order to learn as much as possible from this incident, it is necessary to project the characteristics of the living in small children into present-day society and into its future. It is not important whether we see everything correctly or whether we make mistakes. We still wander through the landscape of our existence as if it were foreign territory. And we still ask our naive, simple questions, without any intention of answering them. Since regimentation by the state is still held very much in check here, we will give free rein to the existing freedom of thought and not restrict ourselves in any way.

Why did these louts torment this boy? Why did they not torment each other? This is a very simple and important question. Our medical experience with pestilent individuals tells us that she sees a pair of lovers tenderly embracing in the park. It is the same insecurity that seizes an elderly spinster when the group of louts. He had naively approached them when they had called him. Then, without reason, they threw water in his face. We encounter such anomalies everywhere in adult life. A certain type of person is singled out and persecuted for no reason at all, senselessly, and with brutal consistency. Let us pursue this grotesque situation further because it leads to even more remarkable things.

Around 1922, when I first defended the genital rights of small children, rumors began to circulate that I was seducing these children and allowing them to witness the sexual act. At scientific meetings, small groups formed which spitefully accused me of being aggressive and riding my "hobbyhorse." Later, rumors sprang up that I was insane and amoral. When I was no longer a voice in the wilderness, when more and more physicians and scientists came to share my views, the same or similar accusations and innuendoes were directed at colleagues who lived and worked far from me. In essence, these attacks did not differ from the attack by the gang of children on the healthy boy. Both types of attack were senseless, unprovoked, malicious, and carried out by a group or a gang.

Such things occur so frequently and have become such a familiar part of our social existence that they are no longer noticed. They are accepted as a matter of course. In certain political circles and systems such attacks are even carried out with the support of the law and firing squads. What does all this mean?

Earlier, we distinguished rational and irrational defiance, rational and irrational hatred. We must now make the same distinction in order to understand such gangs. The group of brutal boys would have struck the naive observer as a "normal" group of children, for example, a group of dancing children. In both cases a social grouping has been made. However, these two groups are fundamentally different. The group of dancing children has only one purpose, pleasure. A group of working bricklayers or architects or physicians functions in a similar way. Their functioning contains no hatred. Their activity is rational and has an understandable goal. The emotional composition of the group of louts is different. The group has no other purpose than to foment trouble. Obviously the object of their persecution must possess certain characteristics that set it in motion the mechanism of brutality. We are on the wrong track when we try to determine what provoked the louts. We cannot give an answer. Our medical, pedagogical, or psychiatric experience is of no use to us. We know nothing about the function of such actions. If we follow the specific nature of these actions through other
situations, in other circles or strata of society, we discover merely that nobody talks about them. Everybody accepts this as an immutable, given fact. No one likes it, but nobody understands it. Could it be that this quality of being unnoticed or "given" is part of the answer to our question? Let us follow this clue.

Let us consider everything we encounter in life with just this one characteristic in mind: the quality of a given. We soon notice that we are dealing with an evil which is attributed to fate. We have even coined a term for it: "human nature." This "is the way it is." Could it be that this expression did not come about by chance but instead represents resignation of the victim, deliberately brought about by someone? We start to pay attention to situations in which it is claimed that something is determined by fate. Such a situation is the dependence of human activity on politics. It is accepted as "given" that one does not mention certain truths, although they might save human lives. One "just does not mention" such matters, is the excuse. We prick up our ears. In whose interest is it that "such matters" are not mentioned?

We are not surprised when we are dealing with reactionary politicians. But we become suspicious when we encounter this attitude in socialists and liberals who pity the masses, promise them heaven on earth, defend political murderers' right of free speech, yet become furious when one calls a spade a spade, although failure to do so costs millions of lives.

Orgonomy has itself suffered greatly from this grotesque fact. Millions of people are dying of cancer. No one understands this disease. Any nonsense said about it is celebrated and spread all over the daily newspapers. Finally, someone discovers the origin of the cancer cell and discovers the cosmic energy which causes the tumors to disappear. Although instantaneous acceptance is not expected, one would at least presume that this event would receive the same attention that is given to the daily output of nonsense. However, this expectation was false. The hopeful news becomes the target of mud-slinging. Why? It is the same question that we had to ask when the group of louts threw water into the face of the naive boy. Within the given system of thought this is nothing special. This is the way things are, or this is the way they have always been. Anything new is automatically attacked. But outside this system of thought such behavior seems completely senseless, even insane. What is it all about, what is the intention?

Not even the rationality within the irrational is involved here. The senselessness is complete and access to understanding it is also completely blocked. It is the same kind of senselessness that characterizes the action of binding the hands of a child to prevent it from masturbating. The moral or religious explanation is merely a facade. Seen from outside, the explanation is just as senseless as what is being explained. What harm have the hands of an innocent child done? What social or moral danger do they pose?

How far does this senselessness extend in social life? Is it merely an odious appendage of life, or does it dominate our lives? Let us make use of the view from outside and carry it through to its logical conclusion. Modern philosophers attempt to combine the Eastern and Western philosophies of life and to balance out their differences. In the process they remain within the framework of precisely those modes of thinking which tore East and West apart and which have completely split the modern world. We do not even want to try such a thing because it traps us within the given error of thought. We must remain outside and seek the common denominator which has led to the nonsense in both camps. What we have here again surely is the avoidance of the essence of things, which, in the East as well as in the West, is responsible for the development of internally consistent but, viewed from outside, irrational philosophies of life. We have no answer to this. But we do have the right to ask questions. Nobody is required or forced to follow us.

Why then do young rowdies throw water into the face of a harmless child? Why was orgone research, which saved human lives, persecuted, besmirched, defamed? Why were widows burned in India and negroes beaten to death in the U.S.A.? Why does the nonworking politician have so much and the working bricklayer so little status in society? Why could God and ether not be investigated? Why may adolescents in their prime not enjoy love? Why has the 20th century physicist so many excuses
when it comes to observing orgone energy in the dark? Why do people count for absolutely nothing in Russia? Why is it that millions of human animals who work and care cannot ward off a handful of tyrants?

We are still looking around. We blame nobody; we are trying to comprehend the universal nonsense. We ask our naïve questions from the standpoint of the living, not from the standpoint of a political ideology or a state or national interest. We emphasize that our position is not just internationally humane. We transcend the bounds of humankind and try to understand the society in which man lives—not the political state, not his bowling club, but his dependence on the laws of nature. In this way we place ourselves outside again, and we are diametrically opposed to the politician, statesman, nationalist, and representative of the church as they are today. We have no bombs, no secret arsenals, no power, no exclusive organization, and we do not intend to bring down this or that government. It does not matter to us what government is governing as long as it does not prevent us from working with children and the sick, and provided it does not prescribe what we should write and think. But as soon as a government does try to do this, we defend our work. It is up to representatives of the state and also to politicians to decide whether they wish to take the risk of opposing this work. I think this example is enough to present our point of view. We defend the right to ask questions and to seek answers, consistently and with determination. We take the talk about freedom of expression and freedom of research seriously, very seriously. We are not willing to leave the field to those who claim this freedom for themselves but are not willing to grant it to others.

We acknowledge any sensible inspection by a government agency, such as the registration of radiotelegraph equipment and the inspection of garbage removal. However, when a government agency has the effrontery to set itself up as judge on orgone research, when it displays its ignorance and therefore resorts to defamation, we refuse it this right and, as workers concerned with new, concrete natural facts, we bar this agency from gaining access to our books and laboratories. This is a good practi-
structure of the human animal which has smouldered for thousands of years in the dark—untouched, uninvestigated, and not understood. We are in the early stages of comprehending. We see that the economic questions are now dependent on the solutions of the biological questions of the human animal and its society. We have only just recently started to ask questions, and the answers are still obscure. Should we then allow some insignificant but fanatical member of this or that political party to silence our tongues and thoughts, a fanatic who believes he is achieving something by professing his convictions. Comprehending and making practical changes is what matters, and not convictions.

We are against the red fascists in Russia, not because they have a particular way of thinking but because they prevent men from thinking. They punish thinking with death. This is not specifically directed against red fascists but against anyone who acts in this way. We unmask the emotional plague of the red fascist, not because he hangs medals all over his generals’ chests but because he militarizes children. We allow ourselves the privilege of calling the dictator a scoundrel or a fool, not because he acts the dictator, but because he believes that bread alone is enough for the masses; not because he is criminally stupid, but because he pretends that his criminal regression to the old tyrannical ways represents progress, and he therefore deceives the people. The problem is why the people do not see this.

We are not against ideologies or convictions but we are for the development of all capabilities in the human animal. We are looking for means to give practical expression to the wealth of human thought and feeling and, therefore, we fight against the arrogant ignoramus who has no conception of such tasks. Even more, we seriously believe that we understand better than the ignoramus himself why he exists and has power. There can be no doubt that the fool himself does not understand how all the power which he abuses accrues to him. Hitler admitted this in as many words. And we do not want to have fools and sadists telling us how we should educate our children or how we should solve life’s problems.

Therefore I believe that only in America, and nowhere else, does the opportunity exist to review the situation, even though many grotesque and cruel things exist here, too. We can think and talk and we ordinary citizens can keep arrogant organs of the state in check.

If we wish to retain our integrity, we must protect our right to be responsible for our work, in the same way that we protect our eyes, because we are working on vitally important matters. We must therefore be against anybody who merely has opinions about the work of other people and who does not permit life-related work to manage its own affairs. If socialist and communist politicians fall into this category, like other politicians, then this is their fault, not ours. They have acquired a gigantic inheritance of human thought, and they have gambled it away. Their existence is fading. Let us raise a monument to them. They once fulfilled an important function, but they did not know when it was time to leave life's stage.

I am more than willing to admit that I would also have become a dictator if power had fallen into my hands in the same way as it has to these dictators. I would not have been able to do any better without solving the fundamental biosocial question. It is not just the way they act but the way they severely hinder the process of questioning and finding answers which we actively oppose in politicians and tyrants. It therefore became a firm principle of my work to reject the usual kind of political leadership and to concentrate on independent scientific questions and answers. I had no choice but to turn down the offers to play a leading role in politics which were made to me several times over the years. This attitude is something new and unusual and consequently not understood by government agencies stuck in the rut of traditional thinking.

Whatever influence my work now has was not acquired by political maneuvers on my part. I do not have at my disposal any political organization, newspaper, or membership contributions. I have no party, no weapons, no power of any kind. The influence stems from the understanding of those people who read my writings. It is due to a special element in the structure of people and not to me. It is the feeling for the rules to which life is subject. An idea can link up with the irrational as well as the rational. In my case, what I have had to say has found a response in the love of facts. This, too, is outside the usual
run of things and is therefore not understood. There was no social intention behind the discovery of the orgasm function or the discovery of the orgone. And there was certainly no political intent. But social confusion has contributed a great deal, and decisively, to the development of my functional way of thinking. It would please me if my opponents were also stimulated by this confusion to develop new ways of thinking. It is not my fault that because of the inertia in their way of thinking they became opponents, although, emotionally, they are just as affected as all other human animals.

In our thinking we have rid ourselves of the question of guilt. We blame nobody, but we remove barriers to our rational freedom of movement. If a rock on the road blocks my car, I do not declare that the rock is guilty but I get it out of the way; I do not destroy or condemn or imprison it, but simply move it aside. If the rock is too heavy, I drive around it. If there is no road by which I can drive around it, I take the trouble to build a piece of road. This takes time and effort but it is unavoidable. Under no circumstances do we accuse the rock.

We do not blame the backward educator; we go around him. We do not try to convince him; we do not quarrel with him. If he does not understand us, we explain our standpoint to him. If he becomes vicious, we avoid him.

Let us conclude our stroll through the various regions of our existence. We have asked naive questions. We have not asked anybody to follow us or to believe us. We have no intention of forcing anyone to believe or trust us. In posing the questions and trying to orient ourselves, it is not a matter of being "mystical" or "conservative" or "backward" or even "fascist." We are convinced that only cardinal functions of life can decide about life; therefore we are in favor of governing human life through its three major functions—love, knowledge, and work. They are biological functions which go beyond human boundaries, linking man with his origins and his future. Is this conservative, because "conservatives" also have such beliefs? Right, then let us be "conservative." It does not mean anything, because the word is political in nature and nowadays all politics has sunk to the level of intellectual prostitution. As physicians and educators we are convinced that all social activity, be it in the fields of economics, education, or art, is produced and sustained by human character structure. To be sure, all this takes place under certain social conditions and limitations, but the energy needed for thinking and acting comes from the human animal's reservoir of biological energy. An exact knowledge of the nature of biological energy is the fundamental prerequisite for a new orientation in life. It is important to stress that, in our time, it is precisely the knowledge of bioenergetic processes that is weakest and most unreliable.

As working people we bear a great responsibility for everything that we do and think each day. We must refuse to allow nonworking politicians to tell us what we should think or do. Instead, it is our opinion that only those people who are actively involved in productive human work should be allowed to decide what should be produced and how. Does that make us "reactionary" compared with some scheming fool from the political "left" or "right?"

We find the world in the throes of a gigantic social and political upheaval which is not yet fully understood. This upheaval is taking place independently of and often counter to our intentions. Nobody, apart from a few politicians and pestilent characters, wants war. Nevertheless, war and everything that exists around it has dominated and shattered our lives for decades. This is very significant if we are right that there must be, and indeed is, some good sense even in the greatest nonsense.

Since all social and cultural life has been anchored from time immemorial in children and is perpetuated by the character structure formed in them, it is clear that there is no more important task than that of the educator. The fact that militarists and politicians have the best paid jobs while the educators of children have the worst paid ones shows how far we have come in understanding the upheaval. The revolution in pedagogical thought has nevertheless begun. This is a genuine, gigantic, hitherto unknown form of revolution, a social revolution operating out in the open, without weapons, police, or informants. It can no longer be stopped and will totally change our society. In contrast, all politically oriented circles have sunk to the level
of useless parasites of society. For us, the child—its health, freedom of development, and future—has become the central point of our practical biological position. We measure all social and cultural phenomena by whether they are useful or harmful to the child. We therefore urgently require a law to protect the child and its development. We need laws to protect and advance the existence of teachers and educators. We need such laws urgently and quickly if we are to prevent confused youth from creating a new form of totalitarianism.

The living does not dare to speak openly, not just because it does not yet command the correct words, but because it is persecuted and systematically defamed by those ill with the emotional plague. We therefore require strict laws to protect the natural life expressions of children and adults against sex-starved and malicious old spinsters.

We must never cease stressing the responsibility of the “Little Man.” He must develop responsibility for his personal and social existence without running the risk of losing his livelihood. On the contrary, it can only be in the interest of large industries to promote this responsibility and to guarantee and expand the worker’s participation in the fruits of production. Production can only be increased, and the present difficulties will decrease, to the extent that industrial and farm workers learn to accept their part of the responsibility for production and distribution. They will then learn from experience that it is easier to criticize the management of a company than to help bear the great responsibility. These are important elements in the continuing social revolution, and no manager who works himself will be against it. On the contrary, he knows that his responsibility will be smaller if the worker’s shoulder their share of it. The few people who are greedy and power-hungry will soon be silent, without the need to take any drastic measures against them.

The idea of a sudden bloody revolution is illusionary for several reasons. The social upheaval has been taking place for several decades now, and it is therefore unnecessary to incite it. Anyone who does so merely proves that he has no sense of what is going on around and within us. For such a person the term social revolution has become a catchword. He does not give any thought to its meaning or significance. He does not ask why all social revolutions have failed so pitifully. He does not see and will not admit that the lower strata of society repeatedly produce their own oppressors, as in fascist Russia. He does not see that his political parties are beating to death precisely those things that form the core and essence of social progress. He asks no questions whatever but remains stuck fast in absolute nonsense. His hatred springs from personal resentment and not from the burning desire finally to bring about self-regulation in the human masses. If problems in fascist Russia become too glaring, he turns overnight from a “state socialist” into a “freedom socialist,” without tackling and answering in a practical way one concrete question of human existence.

This social revolution is a process which will extend over centuries. Its object is not the state, or the nation, or a marshal, or a leader, or the nationalization of production, or espionage, or execution of capitalists. It is:

the assessment of all events from the standpoint of the happiness of the human masses.
self-regulation and self-administration of all branches of human existence.
responsibility of all workers for production and distribution.
research into and safeguarding by law of biological self-regulation in each newborn generation.
strict protection of life in the child from authoritarian, ascetic, or any other anti-life ideology and practice.
opposition to the emotional plague, as it is revealed in politics, espionage, defamation of the living, chauvinism and nationalism, mental illness, usury, and exploitation of work.
international links between all working classes and direct representation of all interests relating to work and life.
pedagogical and social elimination of all kinds of racial practices.
clear distinction between rational and irrational life interests.
protection and safeguarding of personal earnings for the person who earns them. Free initiative in all production but also responsibility of the producer for its distribution.

strict separation of all churches from pedagogical institutions. Freedom of religious creeds but also protection of science and education from religious chauvinism.

protection of the love life of children and adolescents.

safeguarding and respecting of old age through adequate social security.

establishment of world citizenship and elimination of passports in international traffic.

If the foregoing remarks are correct, physicians, educators, and social administrators of the future will come from social circles which stood outside the thought world of the twentieth century. In order to function in the world of the future, a hundred, a thousand, or five thousand years hence, these physicians, educators, and social administrators will have to guarantee the self-regulation of the human animal. In fulfilling this task they will come up against powerful vestiges of twentieth century *homo normalis*, in the same way that we experienced the "un-evolved" thought world of the Platonic state and of Aristotelian thinking of two thousand years ago as a formidable hindrance when we made our first groping attempts to correct our ways of thinking and existing. Physicians and educators of the future will certainly not be descendants of present-day socialists, communists, liberals, or conservatives. On the contrary, they will have to understand why socialists, communists, and liberals had become conservatives and reactionaries in the twentieth century and why the conservatives of this period were so often liberal. Looking back on the terrible degeneration of the great Russian Revolution, they will most probably have to understand, if they are to fulfill their task, how it was possible that it used such cruel and murderous means against its own population. And their judgment, untouched by the partisanship of our age, will probably be as follows: The Russian Revolution was carried out by politicians who based their actions on an economic theory and on the doctrine of the "inevitability" of socialism. In this doctrine there was no room for the knowledge of man as the driving force behind all social development. Man was seen exclusively as the result of the circumstances of his life. There was no mention that social and ideological processes or their reproduction are anchored in the human character structure. For this anchoring is bound to the natural sexual process in man which was treated with contempt in the twentieth century and viewed with fear by all officialism, including that of genetic biology.

The Russian politicians and economists had assumed from their lofty vantage point that the masses would take their newly-won freedom, consolidate it in their lives, and develop it further. In reality, however, the leaders came up against the inertia of the people, their characterological laziness. Bogged down in mechanical "historical inevitabilities," these politicians were forced to conclude that the inhibiting effect of the inertia of the masses was deliberate sabotage. This gigantic error on the part of the leaders could not be corrected, because they themselves were stuck in scientific views of the last century which had long been superceded by scientific developments, particularly in psychology. So it came about that the inertia of the masses and the inertia of the leaders condensed into a grotesque social phenomenon, namely, persecution of their own citizens for deliberate sabotage, although in reality only the old characterological helplessness, the immobility, the armoring, the "inertia" were involved. Millions of people were shot, subjected to the agonies of the "purges," and exposed to the suspicion of "guilt" on a scale never before witnessed in social history, not even that of the church. They were thrown into concentration camps by "people's tribunes" as "enemies of the people" and exposed to hunger and decay.

Educators and physicians of the future will understand perfectly this conformity of historical errors of thought, stagnation of the leadership and the masses, absolute guilt, immobility of society as a whole, and political mass murder, when they come across the "torpid," immobile, inert characteristics of people. It is a matter of total indifference what a contemporary scribbler in some socialist or otherwise oriented local rag may think under the pressure of his own immobility or his party leanings.
Because we stand outside, we do not need to worry about these things. We need only protect ourselves from such people's vindictiveness and malice, if their bad conscience runs off with their high ideals and they resort to defamation, lies, or murder.

Those who have sought God all their lives will go berserk if their God is discovered. Those who have abolished the Ether will continue to sit in "empty space." Those who have demanded the Ether will talk their way out of it, if its reality is demonstrated to them. This will and must be the necessary result of the characteristic of avoidance. The others, however, the outlawed and the excluded, will become the roots of new generations who will correct these errors and most likely create new ones. However, the new errors will be errors about the universe and no longer errors about the position of man in the universe. Researchers of the future will deal with and master "God" and "Ether" in a practical way through the common functioning principle of a cosmic energy.
Projeto Arte Org
Redescobrindo e reinterprelando W. Reich

Caro Leitor
Infelizmente, no que se refere a 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 orgânizá-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.

Em nome da comunidade Arte Org.
Textos da área do funcionalismo orgonômico

Texts from the area of Orgonomic Functionalism.

----------------------
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research
----------------------

Orgonomic Functionalism

01 Theodore P. Wofe. The Sex-Economic Concept of Psychosomatic Indentity and Antithesis 1942
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 1 Number 1 1942
Interval 38-59 Pag. 33-54

02 Wilhelm Reich. Biophysical Functionalismo and Mechanistic Natural Science 1941
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 1 Number 2 1942
Interval 1-11 Pag. 97-107

03 Wilhelm Reich. Orgonotic Pulsation I 1944
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 3 Numbers 2 3 1944
Interval 1-54 Pag. 97-150

04 Wilhelm Reich. The Living Productive Power, Working Power of Karl Marx (1936) 1944
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 3 Numbers 2 3 1944
Interval 55-68 Pag. 151-164

05 R. H. Attkin. Mechanistic Thinking as the Original Sin 1947
McF 207 Annals of the Orgone Institute, Number 1. 1947
Interval 51-54 Pag. 95-101--------------------------

--------------------------------
09 R. H. Atkin. Mathematical Questions Without Answers 1951
Interval 25-27 Pag. 106-110

10 Wilhelm Reich Orgonomic Functionalism Parte II D 1947
Interval 2-8 Pag. 1-12

Interval 20-23 Pag. 37-43

12 Wilhelm Reich Orgonomic Functionalism Parte II E 1947
Interval 11-16 Pag. 186-196

-------------------
Wilhelm Reich Orgonomic Functionalism
-------------------
01 Wilhelm Reich The Developmental History of Orgonomic Functionalism A 1946
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol I. I
Interval 6-20 Pag. 1-29

02 Wilhelm Reich The Biological Revolution from Homo Normalis to the Child of the Future 1950
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol I. I
Interval 21-43 Pag. 30-74

03 Wilhelm Reich A Note on Sympathetic Understanding.
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol I. I
Interval 43-47 Pag. 75-82

04 Wilhelm Reich The Silente Observer A 1952
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol I. I
Interval 47-55 Pag. 83-99
05 Wilhelm Reich Functional Thinking 1950
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol I. I
Interval 56-62 Pag. 100-112

06 Wilhelm Reich The Developmental History of Orgonomic Functionalism B 1946
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol II. II
Interval 4-15 Pag. 1-23

07 Wilhelm Reich The Silente Observer B 1952
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol II. II
Interval 16-20 Pag. 24-33

08 Wilhelm Reich Wrong Thinking Kills 1936
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol II. II
Interval 21-25 Pag. 34-43

09 Wilhelm Reich On Using The Atomic Bomb 1945
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol II. II
Interval 26-28 Pag. 44-49

10 Wilhelm Reich Mans Roots In Nature 1950
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol II. II
Interval 29-41 Pag. 50-74

11 Wilhelm Reich The Developmental History of Orgonomic Functionalism C 1947
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol III. III
Interval 4-13 Pag. 1-19

12 Wilhelm Reich Orgonomic Pulsation 1944 A
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol III. III
Interval 14-35 Pag. 20-63

13 Wilhelm Reich The Evvasiveness of Homo Normalis 1947
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol III. III
Interval 36-49 Pag. 64-91

14 Wilhelm Reich The Developmental History of Orgonomic Functionalism D 1947
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol IV. IV
Interval 4-13 Pag. 1-18
15 Wilhelm Reich Orgonotic Pulsation 1944 B
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol IV. IV
Interval 13-24 Pag. 19-40

16 Wilhelm Reich Orgone Functions in Weather Formation 1946
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol IV. IV
Interval 24-29 Pag. 41-51

17 Wilhelm Reich The Attitude of Mechanistic Natural Science to the Life Problem 1941
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol IV. IV
Interval 30-35 Pag. 52-63

18 Wilhelm Reich Orgonomic Functionalism in Non-Living Nature A 1947
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol V. V
Interval 4-13 Pag. 1-19

19 Wilhelm Reich Orgonotic Pulsation 1944 C
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol V. V
Interval 14-26 Pag. 20-44

20 Wilhelm Reich Parents as Educators 1926
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol V. V
Interval 26-37 Pag. 45-66

21 Wilhelm Reich Open Season on Truth 1942
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol V. V
Interval 37-48 Pag. 67-88

22 Wilhelm Reich The Fundamental Problem of Form 1935
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol V. V
Interval 48-48 Pag. 89-89

23 Wilhelm Reich Orgonomic Functionalism in Non-Living Nature B 1947
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol VI. VI
Interval 4-14 Pag. 1-21
24 Wilhelm Reich Orgonotic Pulsation D 1944
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol VI. VI
Interval 15-21 Pag. 22-35

25 Wilhelm Reich Desert Development and Emotional Dedness 1953
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol VI. VI
Interval 22-29 Pag. 36-50

26 Wilhelm Reich Process Of Integration in the Newborn and the Schizophrenic 1950
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol VI. VI
Interval 29-39 Pag. 51-71

27 Wilhelm Reich The Meaning of Disposition to Disease 1944
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol VI. VI
Interval 40-41 Pag. 72-75

28 Wilhelm Reich The Difficulty 1948
Wilhelm Reich-Orgonomic Functionalism - Vol VI. VI
Interval 42-42 Pag. 76-76

--------------

CORE.
--------------

Orgonomic Functionalism
--------------

01 Robert A. McCullough. Rocky Road Toward Functionalism 1955
Interval 26-31 Pag. 144-154