Q. 14. Is it not true that if children are encouraged to indulge in sex play that they will actually have intercourse at the ages of 9, 10, etc.? Isn't this harmful?

A. This question, to begin with, betrays misunderstanding and sexual anxiety. The misunderstanding is, that, according to sex-economic principles, children should be “encouraged to indulge in sex play.” Children don't need any encouragement to do so. They engage in sex play anyway. What should not be done—and what is constantly being done—is punishing children or making them feel guilty about it. That is, infantile sexuality should not be interfered with. On the other hand, they also should not be “encouraged.” The statement that children should be “encouraged to indulge in sex play” in sex play or masturbation, a statement which is constantly being imputed to sex-economy, has an irrational background, inasmuch as any mother, nurse or teacher who says so has not overcome her guilt about her own infantile sexual activities. She knows, intellectually, that the child should be free in his sexual activities, but her own—largely unconscious—guilt feelings make it impossible for her to assume a free, rational, that is, un-guilty and un-compulsive attitude toward them. She then tries to overcome her own guilt feelings by an overcompensation: the child should not only be allowed to masturbate, but even “encouraged” or “taught” to do so. Such encouragement or teaching would be not only senseless, but dangerous and harmful. A healthy child will masturbate with satisfaction. A sexually inhibited child, with a disturbed pleasure mechanism, will only be brought into still more conflict by such teaching or encouragement.

Q. 15. Why is it that some children do not walk until two years of age, whereas other children commence to take steps at the age of 8 months?

A. This will largely depend on the degree of freedom of motility which the children are allowed from the very first days of their lives. If babies are packed tightly in their cribs or carriages, or forced to lie in unnatural positions (cf. “Disas-
trous fads in infant upbringing," This Journal 1, 1942, 276 ff.), they will take much longer to develop the ability for locomotion than others who were free to develop their natural motility.

It is, however, not a matter merely of such mechanical restrictions. At least equally important is the development of the child's vegetative mobility, that is, the untrammeled development of the pleasure in his own body. This presupposes non-interference on the part of the parents with everything that has to do with the pleasure mechanism: full gratification of oral needs (nursing, sucking), the child's playing with his own body, the genitals included, and full satisfaction of the child's need for affection. It goes without saying that a child who has maintained and developed the pleasure in his own body will also develop the pleasure in using it for locomotion at an earlier date than a child who has lost this pleasure in his body and therefore feels less of an impulse to explore the pleasure possibilities furnished by locomotion.

Q. 16. At what age should “sex” be explained to children?

A. If you are not afraid of your own sexuality and the child's questions, the child will answer this question for you. That is, the child will ask questions whenever it is ready to ask them, and will go on asking them as long as you are ready to answer them honestly. There is no such thing as “sex” that could be “explained” at any given time. The very question, as it is put, portrays the attitude of the average individual who dreads the subject and wants to “get it over with.” It is not a matter of “sex” as a subject, but a matter of all kinds of sensations, fears, doubts, activities, and questions of the most diverse type. One child may ask a certain question at the age of 3, another may ask the same question at the age of 5, one adolescent at the age of 11, another at the age of 14.

It must be remembered that children often put their sexual questions not directly, but in a symbolical or otherwise disguised form. Thus, a child will ask about the content of a hollow space (box, closet, etc.) when he really means to ask about pregnancy. The adult must be able to recognize the significance of such questions and to answer them accordingly. Most children soon give up asking these questions because they soon find out that the questions are being evaded or answered untruthfully. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that the British Government recently recommended giving up telling children the stork story. This is an official recognition of a fact which has been obvious to many for a long time: the result of such sexual “enlightenment” is only confusion on the part of the child, a deep distrust of the adults, and often, as the result of the repression of a strong sexual curiosity, a severe intellectual impairment.

Q. 17. My little boy, age 5, is a continual source of embarrassment to me. Very often when I have guests he will stare at them and say, “I don’t like you.” If they try to pet him, he will hit them. How can this be overcome?

A. Here we have to distinguish two entirely different situations. Either the child’s dislike of your guests is normal. In that case all that is wrong in the situation is that it is embarrassing to you; but there is nothing wrong with the child. On the contrary, his behavior may merely indicate that he is free and uninhibited in the expression of his feelings. This makes him, of course, a “behavior problem” from the point of view of conventional behavior. A “well-behaved” child would not express himself like this; his behavior would be more like that of the conventional adult who is nice to people’s faces and then, after their departure, tells the other guests what he “really thinks of them.” With the acquisition of this “good behavior,” the
child also loses its natural way of reacting toward people.

It must be remembered that children are extremely sensitive to the armoring and to false behavior in adults. Babies will refuse to be picked up by certain individuals, no matter how "nice" they seem to be. It will always be found that such people are strongly armored individuals who are incapable of an immediate contact with the child and who, instead, try to establish a pseudocontact along the "baby-talk," "da-da-da," "aren't-you-a-cute-cute-little-baby" line. Because such people have lost the natural contact with the child, they cannot take the child seriously and are apt to treat babies as toys. Children do not want to be "petted" in this fashion but want to be loved. If a child hits an adult who "tries to pet him" in this fashion, this may be a perfectly normal reaction, comparable to that of a dog who will snap at a mean person who tries to pet him while he will enjoy being petted by a loving person. On the other hand, children will react immediately in a positive way to a warm, radiating person who is not neurotically armored but capable of an immediate contact with the child. Later on, as a result of neurotic armoring, the child loses much of this immediate contact and of the ability to size up people. It is very interesting to compare different adults' reactions to a new person. An armored individual will say, for example, "What a nice person!" while a healthy individual will immediately feel that this "niceness" is not genuine but a front which covers up a great deal of meanness. In addition, he will see direct evidence of the meanness, such as a hard expression in the eyes, a clenched jaw, a rude remark couched in nice terms, etc. All these manifestations remain hidden to the armored individual because he has the same mechanisms of insincerity in himself; if he could see behind the other person's mask, he could no longer maintain his own. That is, the lack of sensitivity for the other person's character is in direct proportion to the rigidity of one's own armor.

As we have said, your boy's dislike of your guests may be normal. Or we may be dealing with an entirely different situation: the child is neurotic, and his behavior toward your guests is not a rational reaction to their personalities but the expression of a neurotic hatred, perhaps with the intent to embarrass. In this case the child will need treatment.

Q. 18. My little girl refuses to share her toys with the other children, yet tries to grab as many of the other children's toys as she can. She always wants to have more than she can possibly use. How can I make her stop this?
A. There is no way of making her stop this except by giving her a basic satisfaction she is lacking and for which she tries to make up by this behavior. What that lack is could only be determined by a thorough study of the child and her environment.

Q. 19. My little boy is 2 years old, and still refuses to move his bowels in the toilet. I certainly started to train him early enough. When he was 4 months old I started to put him on his pottie regularly. For a short time thereafter, he moved his bowels in the potty. But suddenly he refused to do this and insists on moving his bowels in his pants. I cajoled him to no avail. Then I began to punish him. I thought that this was going to work because he kept his pants clean, but also he did nothing in the pottie. This led to constipation and the necessity of cathartics. Now I am at a loss as to what to do. What can you suggest?
A. This unfortunate story is one of the common outcomes of premature bowel training. There can be no doubt that you did not start to train him "early enough," as you say, but much too early. After a
temporary compliance, he began to rebel against this compulsion and showed his rebellion in the form of anal spite, by defecating in his pants. Later he stopped this for fear of punishment, which led to a spasm of the anal musculature and constipation. That is, a refusal to defecate turned into the inability to do so.

The further outcome depends on how the boy will weather the vicissitudes of the next phase of development, the genital one. If his masturbation is not interfered with by the environment, he may be able to overcome his anal spasm, and his constipation will disappear. On the other hand, it must be remembered that an anal spasm is never an isolated phenomenon; that is, it always involves the whole pelvic floor and the genital also to a lesser or higher degree. This may make genital gratification impossible in which case the anal spasm, and with that, the constipation, is more than likely to persist. In this case, vegetotherapeutic treatment would be indicated.

Q. 20. Children have sweet, pure and simple minds. If the sexes are mixed, and they are allowed to take their clothes off and play together, don't they begin to get "dirty" ideas?

A. What do you mean by "dirty" ideas? If the children have "sweet, pure and simple minds," where will they get the "dirty ideas"? Certainly not from taking off their clothes and playing with each other. If they get such ideas, you can be sure that there were adults around to whom the naked body and sexuality is something "dirty." That, unfortunately, will be so as long as children are brought up antisexually so that they grow up into orgastically impotent individuals who will inevitably implant "dirty ideas" in their own children.

Q. 21. Won't there be danger in attempting to apply didactically to children principles which Dr. Reich has formulated through vegetotherapy with adults only? (Question from an individual who has been aware of the difficulties encountered by psychoanalytically oriented teachers in nursery school work.)

A. This question seems to be based on the argument that what one finds in the vegetotherapeutic treatment of adults does not apply to children. This argument is erroneous. For vegetotherapy deals with basic biological functions which are the same in the adult and the child. Furthermore, one deals with vegetative and psychic reactions which were acquired in childhood and which, in the course of the treatment, are traced back to childhood. One often sees an adult react, psychically and somatically, in exactly the same manner in which he acted at that time in his childhood when he acquired a particular attitude or a particular spasm. This infantile behavior is not "deduced" or "guessed at" as in psychoanalysis, but one actually sees it before one's own eyes in an unmistakable manner, and the patient does not have the slightest doubt about the infantile nature of the experience. Thus, one constantly learns about infantile behavior and reactions from the vegetotherapeutic behavior of adults. In addition, the vegetotherapeutic experiences in adults are amply confirmed in nursery school observations of children.

Nevertheless, something like the danger suggested in the above query exists. Only, it is not the danger of applying principles which are not valid for children. The danger lies in the "didactic" application of sex-economic principles. If, for example, the average teacher, after having read The Function of the Orgasm or a few articles in the Journal, should begin to "apply" sex-economic principles to children, this would indeed be dangerous. For to work with children on sex-economic principles requires more than a theoretical knowledge. It requires the capacity on the part of the adult for self-regulation and pre-
supposes sexual health. Any genitally healthy teacher or parent will work on sex-economic principles even though he may never have heard of sex-economy. He will live these principles and need not “apply” them. Nobody who cannot live them should try to “apply” them. One does not walk “according to the principles of gravitation”; one simply walks. If one is paralyzed, one is not helped in walking by “the principles of gravitation.”

Q. 22. Is it possible that the orgone accumulator does one good by mental suggestion?

A. If this question is meant seriously, why don’t you try an experiment? Build yourself a cabinet, say, of wood, of the same size as an accumulator, sit in it, suggest to yourself that it will do exactly the same thing as the orgone accumulator, and see what happens.

Q. 23. If you follow Dr. Reich’s theories, what are you going to do with your child practically speaking when he is adolescent? Give him contraceptive information?

A. Here we have again the fear of adolescent sexuality. It is as if people said: “Well, these theories of Reich are quite all right, as long as they don’t have any practical consequences. But suppose we took them seriously? Suppose my adolescent boy wants to have sexual intercourse?”

Well, suppose he does? Adolescent boys have always wanted sexual intercourse and always will. They have reached sexual maturity. But now, all of a sudden, when adolescents want sexual intercourse, “Reich’s theories” are being made responsible for it. This is like making Galileo responsible for the earth’s moving around the sun, or making Newton responsible for gravitation. Reich’s “theories” are not an ideology or a program but merely the formulation of clinical and sociological findings. Such a finding is the fact that the adolescent, as a result of sexual sup-

pression, develops the typical “puberty neurosis” and a sexual inhibition which may make it impossible for him later to establish a happy sexual relationship. Reich never said that adolescents “should” have sexual intercourse. He stated that the antithesis is not, as commonly stated, that between abstinence and sexual activity, but between a healthy sex life and an unhealthy sex life, and investigated the conditions and results of sexual health and unhealth. As a result of the prevailing sex-negative teachings of morally prejudiced people, you may believe that sexual abstinence is harmless. In that case, you will most likely tell your son that he should “wait until marriage.” If, on the other hand, you are convinced of the correctness of sex-economic findings and of the harmfulness of sexual abstinence, you will help your son to establish a normal genital life. This presupposes, of course, that you are free from genital anxiety, have maintained a natural contact with your son, and that he is structurally ready for it. Then, why would you not give him contraceptive information?

Q. 24. I consider myself pretty normal and happy but I don’t masturbate nor have I ever had a desire to. What does Dr. Reich say about that? (Question from an unmarried nursery school teacher.)

A. Your statement that you never had a desire to masturbate points to sexual repression. Every child masturbates or has the desire to masturbate; any normal individual has the desire to masturbate in the absence of genital gratification in the sexual act. Your statement, then, means that you repressed the memory of your infantile masturbation and are repressing your genital desires now.

Your question sounds like an argument: “See, Dr. Reich, I don’t masturbate, never even had a desire to. I don’t have sexual intercourse, and never had a desire to. That shows that sexual gratification is not
necessary in order to be healthy and happy." Well, you don't say that you are happy and satisfied; only that you consider yourself "pretty normal and happy." A great many people in our society solve their sexual conflicts by repression, become unaware of their sexual needs, cultivate substitute gratifications and consider themselves "pretty normal and happy." Behind such neurotic fronts of apparent happiness one often finds a deep unhappiness, depression and resignation which, in the treatment, first have to be uncovered before the way is open to genuine happiness.

Furthermore, this apparent "happiness" is deceptive in another way. You may be able to deceive yourself and your environment, but you cannot deceive your biological organism. You can assume a psychic attitude of happiness and may sincerely believe that you are happy in spite of your sexual abstinence. This belief can be sincere because you have repressed your biological needs and have made them unconscious. But though they are removed from consciousness, they are not removed from existence. It is not a matter of ideas, but of energies, energies of which the organism, if they are denied a normal outlet, has to take care in some abnormal way. The result will inevitably be some sort of physical symptom or disease, like colds, fatigue, rheumatism, back pains, or cancer. These, when they occur, you will consider "organic" diseases which have nothing to do with your sexual abstinence, because you do not see the connection between the two. And yet, this is the form in which your unhappiness, which exists regardless of your psychic front of happiness, expresses itself.

Of course, everybody is entitled to his own way of solving his sexual conflicts as far as he is concerned as an individual only. If, however, as a nursery school teacher, one has a good deal of responsibility for the children's future health, the story is different. Nursery school children will quite naively display their sexual curiosity and will engage in sexual plays. The healthy teacher will take these things as normal manifestations of the child's vitality and will not treat them differently from any other manifestations. The sexually repressed teacher will be horrified and will try to ignore these sexual manifestations for they remind her of her own infantile sexual activities the memory of which she tries to suppress. In this way, she is excluded from contact with the child in one of the child's most important sectors of his life. The child will inevitably sense this fear in the adult and the lack of contact, and will more or less withdraw his confidence and affection. Or the teacher does take cognizance of the child's sexual manifestations, considers them "bad" and tries to prevent them, either by "diverting" the child to "harmless" activities or by punishing it. In either case a full emotional contact with the child is lost; in the latter case, the child loses its naturalness, becomes vegetatively rigid and develops the basis for a neurotic character.

In his book, *Die Sexualität im Kulturkampf*, Wilhelm Reich relates the following little episode from a Russian kindergarten which illustrates the blind spot of sexually repressed adults for the sexual manifestations of children: "Talking with the head teacher, I looked out of the window and watched the children playing in the garden. A little boy was taking out his penis and a little girl was watching it. This happened at the very moment when the head teacher was assuring me that in her kindergarten 'such things' as infantile masturbation and infantile sexuality did not happen."

Q. 25. What does Paul Martin mean in "The Dangers of 'Freedom" by the term "official morality"? (Question asked by Prof. of Philosophy interested in Semantics.)

A. By "official morality" is meant that
morality which postulates an antithesis between nature and culture, nature and morals, sexuality and work; which suppresses the sexuality of children and adolescents and thus leads to neuroses, perversions, promiscuity and sexual crimes, the very things which it purposes to do away with; which condones "marital duty" and condemns sexual happiness outside of legalized marriage; which penalizes abortion but prohibits contraception; which, finally, among many other things, by robbing people of their vegetative motility and, with that, of their native intelligence, produces people who no longer have any contact with real life and therefore retreat into the world of words. (Cf. General Semantics: The Mysticism of Words, *This Journal* 1, 1942, 186 ff.)

Q. 25. Would it be possible for me to observe Dr. Reich's work with muscular tensions? (Question asked by a therapist in children's speech disorders who is aware of muscular tensions and that they move around.)

A. This is a misconception of vegetotherapy which we have already pointed out repeatedly. Our therapeutic technique does not consist in "work with muscular tensions" in the sense of a "relaxation therapy" or massage. It is character-analytic vegetotherapy. That is, the vegetative energies are released from their anchoring in the musculature not by work on the muscular tensions, in any mechanical way, but by the systematic analysis of the character attitudes which express themselves in—or, rather, are identical with—muscular attitudes which, in their totality, form the muscular armor.

Q. 27. Our culture doesn't tolerate sex relations in adolescence. Aren't you going to make it very hard for your child if you bring him up this way (that is, without sexual repression)?

A. There are two fundamentally opposite principles of education: the one is that of adjusting the child to society as it is; this is the patriarchal, authoritarian way; it is based on sexual suppression which makes the child capable of submission to irrational demands and incapable of rational rebellion against intolerable external circumstances; it does not take into account primarily the happiness and the health of the child.

The other principle is that of self-regulation, where education is guided by the natural needs of the child and where the primary goal is the child's happiness and health. The objections to this principle are based on the fear that a child so brought up will be antisocial and that if such an education were general we would have sexual chaos.

Now, what is the fate of a child brought up under one or the other of these systems, when he reaches puberty? Do we, if we bring up the child according to the principle of self-regulation, "make it very hard for him"? In order to answer this question, we have to get away from generalities, first of all. Let us put the question this way: Is it harder for the adolescent than had he been brought up in an antisexual, authoritarian manner? What does puberty look like in the latter case? Certainly, it is far from easy. The repression of his infantile sexuality, the punishment of infantile masturbation, etc., have led to intense sexual anxiety and guilt feelings. However, the maturing of the sexual apparatus brings with it a new surge of sexual feelings. The inhibitions make both satisfying masturbation and the establishing of an adult genital relationship impossible. As a result, the adolescent is constantly tormented by his sexual excitation, by sexual phantasies which interfere with his work, and by feelings of inferiority resulting from his constant sexual preoccupation and his unsuccessful attempts either to obtain gratification from masturbation or to overcome what he considers this evil habit.
Now, is puberty “harder” for the adolescent who was not brought up antisexually? If it is harder, then why? Is it harder because—in contradistinction to the sexually suppressed individual—he is fully aware of his sexual needs and of the difficulty of gratifying them? Undoubtedly. But for that very reason is it also infinitely easier. That is, the healthy adolescent finds himself in a conflict with sex-negating society, a conflict which the suppressed adolescent escapes by himself negating his sexuality. But here is the important and constantly overlooked point: This conflict with society is a rational conflict. The healthy adolescent knows that he, in his demand for natural sexual gratification, is right, and that society, in denying it to him, is wrong. He does not, like the suppressed adolescent, escape this conflict; this is what makes adolescence indeed harder for him. But at the same time he escapes the irrational, neurotic conflicts of the sex-suppressed adolescent. It is a common misbelief that healthy people have no conflicts, that they are always happy, that nothing really hurts them, that they live in some sort of Utopia. Far from it. They do have conflicts; they are capable not only of happiness, but also of profound unhappiness; they are made to suffer by many things which rebound from the armor in which the neurotic individual is encased. But rational conflicts usually can be solved in a rational manner, while irrational conflicts, based, as they are, on unconscious factors, are usually impossible of solution without therapeutic help or exceptionally favorable circumstances.

Thus, if you bring up your child according to the principle of self-regulation, he will be exposed to certain conflicts with authoritarian society which the sex-suppressed individual escapes by adjusting to the demands of this society, albeit at the expense of his capacity for happiness. On the other hand, having retained his vegetative motility and a great deal of free energy, he will also be better able to deal with these conflicts. Therefore, it cannot be said that because the adolescent, by being brought up in the sex-affirmative manner, is exposed to certain conflicts with society, he should, for this reason, not be so brought up.

Q. 28. Isn’t it dangerous to teach a child aggression by meeting his aggression with return aggression? How can we hope to have a peaceful world if we encourage children to take such liberties? Won’t encouraged aggression produce anarchy?

A. Who ever said one should “teach” children aggression? This misinterpretation belongs in the same category as that with regard to “teaching” or “encouraging” children to indulge in sex play (cf. Question 14, supra, p. 62). In addition, there is the typical confusion here between aggression and destructiveness (cf. Wilhelm Reich, The Function of the Orgasm, p. 130 ff.). Aggression is normal; it means, literally, “approaching things and people”; it is the necessary prerequisite for the gratification of any vital need. Because it is so often erroneously equated with “badness” and “sexuality,” this normal aggressiveness is usually suppressed in children with the result that they become unable to approach people, tasks and life in general with a healthy decisiveness and courage. Instead, they become submissive, scared, lame and undecided.

What you are referring to is not aggression but destructiveness. This, in contradistinction to aggression, is not a primary but a secondary drive, resulting from the frustration of normal needs, particularly the sexual ones. The methods of education prevalent in our society will inevitably create destructive impulses. The children are frustrated at every turn in the gratification of their natural needs and prohibited from expressing their natural feelings. The result is destructive impulses. While the principle of self-regulation applies to the
normal, primary drives, it does not apply to the secondary impulses. For if these secondary, pathological drives were allowed freedom, we would indeed have anarchy. In fact, the existing world chaos is due precisely to a breakthrough of poorly suppressed destructiveness. If a child is allowed to develop normally, if it is allowed to gratify its healthy drives, it will not develop secondary drives such as destructiveness. If, on the other hand, the healthy drives are suppressed by moral regulation, it will develop destructiveness. This has to be suppressed by moral regulation and authoritarian measures. We find ourselves in a vicious circle: moral regulation creates pathological drives, and these call again for moral regulation. The only way out of this vicious circle is, of course, the liberation and gratification of the healthy primary drives; because it does away with the secondary drives, it makes moral regulation unnecessary. Certainly, in an older child this liberation of the primary drives will not be possible without treatment because the suppression of the healthy drives has become part of the neurotic character, of the character armor.

The question illustrates another thing: the fear of the adult of his own aggression and destructiveness. That is, "should one get angry with a child?" Yes, if the anger is rational. In that case, a healthy child will sense the justification of the anger and take it as the normal reaction on the part of the parent which it is. But the average adult, as a result of sexual stasis, has a good deal of destructiveness in him which he has to suppress and which, in spite of the control exercised, will often break through at the slightest provocation. In such a case, the child will feel that the outburst of anger on the part of the parent is out of all proportion to the provocation, which, of course, it is. This will make the child insecure as it never will know what little thing may lead to such an outburst. The adult, on his part, is equally insecure because he never knows which of his anger reactions are rational and permissible, and which are irrational and need to be suppressed. The constant presence of destructiveness creates the inability to express normal anger reactions.
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