STUDYING "THE CHILDREN’S PLACE"*

By Elena Calas, M.S.

This paper is a study of a small, progressive nursery school in which the attempt is made to allow a child to develop freely in all his functioning, including the sexual. The school follows Wilhelm Reich’s pedagogical concepts based on his biological findings and his sex-economic theory. It was founded in October 1944 by its director, Mrs. Lucille Denison, who was trained by Reich. At the time this study was made the school was in its fourth month of existence.

The diary form in which this paper is written was chosen because the writer knew nothing beforehand of her subject and wished to emphasize the study aspect. Thus the project is a record of day-by-day observations at the school, questions raised by the writer and her discussions of these with the director of the school.

January 4, 1945. Mrs. Denison asked me to come down to see her at her home this evening to discuss the possibility of my doing a project based on the study of “The Children’s Place,” a nursery school which she heads. I knew little about this nursery except that it was very small, had been started only about three months ago and followed Wilhelm Reich’s pedagogical concepts based on his theory of sex-economy and his vegetotherapy. In preparation for my interview with Mrs. Denison, I had read Reich’s book The Function of the Orgasm and some articles in The International Journal of Sex-economy and Orgone Research published by the Institute of which Reich is director. An article by Dr. Paul Martin, entitled Sex-economic “Up-bringing,” explained directly and concisely the application of the principles of sex-economy to pedagogy. Martin states as sex-economic pedagogy’s one goal “the development of individuals who are healthy, vital and as capable of love as possible” and “the upbringing should not really be a bringing-up, but a matter of safeguarding to the utmost the child’s natural ability to give itself fully in all its functions, particularly to pleasure and activity and to protect the natural self-regulation of all vital actions.” This involves treating the child from birth as an individual personality with a way of being all its own, elimination of inhibitions without creating new suppressions (in counter-distinction to orthodox psychoanalytic thought which accepts necessity of sublimation for social adjustment), gratification of the child’s need for love, the free expression of infantile sexuality developing into healthy adult sexual functioning throughout life. “What is to us of utmost importance is that the child’s pleasure in its own body and its capacity for sexual gratification be not destroyed.”

Reich states that the plague of the neuroses is bred during three principal phases of life: in early infancy through the atmosphere of the neurotic parental home; in puberty; and finally in compulsive marriage based on strictly moralistic standards. “Parents—unconsciously at the behest of authoritarian, mechanized society—repress the sexuality of infants and adolescents. . . . In the first phase, much harm is done by strict and premature training for excremental cleanliness and the demand to be ‘good,’ to show absolute self-restraint and quiet good behavior. These measures prepare the ground for the most important prohibition of the follow-
ing period, the prohibition of masturbation. Other restrictions of infantile development may vary, but these are typical. The inhibition of infantile sexuality is the basis for the fixation to the parental home and its atmosphere, the 'family.' This is the origin of the typical lack of independence in thought and action. Psychic mobility and strength go with sexual mobility and cannot exist without it... sex-repression is a fact characteristic of education as a whole... children thus brought up become character-neurotic adults, and re-create their illness in their own children. In this way, conservative tradition, a tradition which is afraid of life, is perpetuated.” An important conclusion of Reich's is that mental hygiene on an individual basis is obviously insufficient, and that if society is to be helped out of its neurotic misery, extensive social measures for the prevention of neuroses must be undertaken.

I must mention two other concepts of Reich's as they are indispensable to the understanding of his pedagogical approach: youth's need to “fight” and man's “natural goodness.”

"Self-regulation follows the natural laws of pleasure; it is not only compatible with natural instincts, but, rather, functionally identical with them. Moral regulation creates a sharp, insoluble conflict, that of nature versus morals. Thus it increases instinctual pressure, which in turn necessitates increased moral defense... The individual with a moral structure appears to follow the rigid laws of the moral world; in fact, he only adjusts outwardly and rebels inwardly. Thus he is exposed in the highest degree to an unconscious compulsive and impulsive anti-sociality. The healthy self-regulating individual does not adjust himself to the irrational part of the world and insists on his natural rights.” And “The function of youth at any time is that of representing the next step of civilization... Youth has to fight for its capability for progress... the inhibiting factor is always the older generation's fear of youth's sexuality and fighting spirit.”

“I have been accused of harboring the utopian idea of a world in which I would eliminate unpleasure and have nothing but pleasure. This is contradicted by my repeated statements that education, as it is, makes the human incapable of pleasure, by arming him against unpleasure. Pleasure and joie de vivre are inconceivable without fight, without painful experiences and without unpleasurable struggling with oneself... What characterizes psychic health, [is] the alternation of painful struggle and happiness, of error and truth, of mistake and reflection upon it, of rational hatred and rational love, in brief, full vitality in all possible situations of life. The capacity of tolerating unpleasure and pain without fleeing disillusioned into a state of rigidity, goes hand in hand with the capacity to take happiness and give love.”

First of all, I wanted to know if the nursery was set up primarily as a demonstration center or primarily as a therapeutic and pedagogic institution for the particular children in its care. Mrs. Denison explained that both purposes were served but that work with the particular children was of primary importance. Visitors in their professional capacity came to the school and were welcome as it was hoped that interest in sex-economic theory and methodology would spread. At present the main problem was the locating of adequate staff and the training of teachers. Teachers with a traditional professional background are generally unable to function in “The Children’s Place” and leave after a short period. Persons who have been psychoanalyzed in the orthodox Freudian manner, do not fit in either, as suppression and sublimation of instinctual desires has been accepted by them for the sake of social adjustment. In the course of the nursery's existence—since October 1944—three teachers and two other staff mem-
bers were given a trial appointment and released after two to three months, which is upsetting and difficult for everyone concerned. The permanent staff at present consists of Mrs. Denison herself, Miss Smith, who is being trained as a pre-school teacher by Mrs. Denison and who works with the 2- to 4-year group, and a nurse in charge of the "babies." There are also visiting teachers of art and music. As there are about 20 children in the two age-groups, Mrs. Denison feels she is seriously understaffed. Furthermore, her wish to expand is frustrated by the unavailability of personnel. She is hoping to move to larger and more adequate quarters next year and to extend her work.

My next questions were around the children: On what basis were they selected? Was each child's program individualized as to hours spent daily and length of attendance at the nursery? How were they prepared to fit into a more rigid traditional school after "graduation" from the nursery? How much insight and cooperation was asked of parents? Mrs. Denison told me that there was no selection of children but that due to shortage of teachers a child who needed individual therapy and overtly disrupted the functioning of the group, could not be kept as the present time as there was no possibility of giving it the individual attention it needed. Mrs. Denison feels that all children benefit by sex-economic upbringing and, whatever the length of the experience at the nursery, the child acquires a greater self-confidence which helps in his adjustment to any situation—i.e., he can accept or reject whatever is imposed with regard to his needs. The emphasis is not on facilitating future adjustments but on helping the child's adjustment from a too-authoritarian background. The only children who must be excluded from the school are those whose parents are too authoritative and rigid and cannot at any point accept the methods of the nursery school.

I was still unsatisfied in my understanding of the basis of selection of children, as apparently there had been little difficulty around the parents' acceptance of the concepts underlying the nursery school program, while there had been an outstanding problem in finding an un-rigid staff. In her discussion of this, Mrs. Denison brought out that she had "selected" the neighborhood—Greenwich Village—and that the majority of the parents were artists; this made for a more open-minded group of parents. Mrs. Denison felt that, on the whole, parents dealing with their own child and having his best interests at heart, were more ready to try out new methods of handling than were schoolteachers who, trained to handle children en masse according to some pedagogical theory not based on biological findings, were less apt to have direct contact with the individual child. Mrs. Denison does not require active cooperation from parents and does not face them with any problems until those naturally arise or unless they cannot be handled at the school in the absence of home cooperation.

The last subject under discussion was my project as such. Mrs. Denison told me that her school was too small to allow for observation by a nonparticipating adult. I agreed enthusiastically that I preferred to "work" with the children. Mrs. Denison suggested that I spend from 11 until 2 daily in the nursery, which is the time the largest number of children are in attendance, as it includes the overlapping of the morning and afternoon sessions. My study would be focused on the 2- to 4-age-group.

January 5th. "The Children's Place" is a charming, white-washed, blue-windowed, 2-floor and 2-room house to which one gains entrance through a gate and a yard. The yard has swings, a sand-box and just enough room for tots to run in. On the second floor, which can be reached both by an outside staircase and by one within, are situated the "babies" quarters and the
kitchen facilities; on the ground floor is the children's playroom and an infinitesimal office carved out of one corner of it. Behind another partition is the children's closet space for wearing apparel. The bathroom has standard-sized fixtures but a kitchen step-ladder stands by the wash-basin. The children's towels and wash-cloths hang on individual hooks under name-labels.

Shelves for toys and nursery books run along two walls; above the shelves the wall-space is decorated with almost life-size paintings of running children with armfuls of flowers. Drawings by the children hang on the opposite wall next to the “bulletin board.” There is an upright piano in a corner, and a drum and gourds. There are gaily decorated tiny chairs, a low, long table covered with red oilcloth, and a couple of smaller tables.

The toys appeared to me to be of the usual variety for 2- to 4-year-olds, sturdy and unbreakable: some of cloth but mostly of wood: blocks, trains, hammering-boards, dolls, animals, buckets and balls.

The children appeared to accept my presence easily after I had been introduced to them by Mrs. Denison, though one little girl expressed objection to my name, saying I should be called “Rose”—possibly because of the color of the sweater I was wearing. The children were willing to play with me very soon after I came in. I was impressed by their spontaneity and self-confidence: They asked for assistance from me in their climbing, carrying of water and unbuttoning to go to the toilet.

During this first day, I paid careful attention to Mrs. Denison’s and Miss Smith’s handling of the children and their way of dealing with situations as they arose, not only because this was what I had come to observe, but also because I was anxious to pick up what not to do with the children. At the end of my period of “observation,” I jotted down the following situations and their treatment:

Billy and Errol had splashed water at each other, Billy getting the worst of the deal and complaining that his collar was wet. Miss Smith said to Errol: “Billy is wet; can you help me dry him?” and the two little boys followed her peacefully into the bathroom.

The children were seated, spoons in hand, but lunch was detained. A couple of children began banging their spoons against the table, the rest joined in with vigor and the noise was head-splitting. Mrs. Denison came over to them and said she had a good idea how to bring Virginia (the maid) and lunch. She started chanting in a rather low voice: “Virginia, where is our dinner?” and the children followed her joyfully and in the same pitch. After a while, as lunch still did not appear, Mrs. Denison changed her chant to: “Virginia, do we have palm-leaves for dinner?” etc. (which came from a book concerning what animals eat), the children chanting back the appropriate “no” or “yes.” At the sight of the contents of their dinner plates, most of the children began to exclaim that they did not like stewed tomatoes or cauliflower or liver, etc. Mrs. Denison interrupted with: “I don’t want to be told what you don’t like, just don’t eat it!” Actually she did use encouragement to call in the cases of a couple of children who were coming out of eating neuroses—those she spoon-fed. The children who had emotional problems around feeding were not persuaded, Mrs. Denison simply stating: “You’ll be hungry later on.”

The children are not asked to take naps, with the exception of two little girls who get over-tired and need it. Mrs. Denison was unable to get 3-year-old Martha to go upstairs (to the “babies’ quarters) for her nap, so she arranged a folding cot in the corner of the playroom and placed screens around it. The child had promised to sleep if left downstairs, and did so.

Two-year-old Marietta, who has a compulsive wish to wash her hands endlessly,
was finally carried off bodily from the wash-basin with the explanation: “Your hands are clean, you don’t need to wash, but the others must have a chance.”

Destructive aggression against herself was thus dealt with by Mrs. Denison: Billy: “I’ll knock you over!” Mrs. Denison: “Well, go ahead and try. I’m ready for you, go ahead.” Billy: “No!” “Shall I knock you over then?” “Yes.” Mrs. Denison does so in fun.

Destructive aggression towards another child was treated thus: “Suppose I did it to you, you would not like it, would you, and Suzy does not like it when you do it to her.”

In answer to my question, Mrs. Denison told me that certain things were forbidden the children—for example, going upstairs, opening staff’s closet, playing with wearing apparel, throwing sand out of sand-box, but that in each case specific reasonable explanations were given.

January 6th. Mrs. Denison had a few moments to give me, so I asked how a specific child—in this case little Marietta, whom I was particularly interested in because of her compulsive hand-washing and screaming—happened to come to the nursery and what did the nursery experience give her? Mrs. Denison told me that Marietta’s mother was looking around for a nursery school, not even necessarily a “progressive” one but that the ones she applied to had no openings. Someone told her of a new nursery, “The Children’s Place.” Mrs. Denison had an opening and accepted Marietta. In answer to further questions, Mrs. Denison said that the mother did not see any problems in the child and that it was not in Mrs. Denison’s practice to confront parents with problems unless necessary. I wondered about the mother’s apparent rigidity, basing this on the symptom of the child’s compulsive hand-washing, and a sentence written on Marietta’s application that recent environmental changes “have resulted in a much less-disciplined and reasonable attitude than that I was accustomed to expect from her.” Mrs. Denison said that actually Marietta’s mother was not too rigid. Marietta herself has gained quite a bit from being at the nursery; at present she gets along much better in the group of children and she is easier to handle at home. Her mother had originally placed her for the morning period only but has recently extended her attendance until 3 P.M. as “it is doing her so much good.” Mrs. Denison has had no regular conference with the mother, but speaks to her often when she is calling for the child and then gives her hints on how to relax her handling.

The handling of one situation particularly interested me today. Four-year-old Billy was brought in from the yard where he had dropped a rock on his foot. Mrs. Denison took off his shoe and sock. Billy said: “I was very brave, it hurt a lot, but I did not cry.” Mrs. Denison said gently: “Sometimes it helps to cry.” Then she said: “Shall I kiss it to make it feel better?” and did so. Billy was then ready to return to the yard. I asked Mrs. Denison about her using a technique which seemed to me “too childish” for the kind of little boy Billy is. Mrs. Denison said that this approach would hold true of a child of any age as it combined reassurance that nothing was seriously wrong with an emotional response to the “hurt.” I was aware that if I had been faced with comforting the child, along with expression of emotional response, I would have given him recognition on the level he asked for it—that of the ego-ideal. Later, Mrs. Denison pointed out to me that in response to her “Shall I kiss it to make it feel better?” Billy said “Yes” and so she did it; if he had said “No,” he would not have required it and Mrs. D. would not have kissed him.

January 7th. I asked Miss Smith if I were right in assuming that encouragement by reward was dispensed with. Miss Smith told me that the usual use of rewards was
eliminated because a child needed to gain pleasure from the activity itself, rather than to desire a reward for what it was doing. As far as humanly possible, a child should never be forced. Miss Smith emphasized that the one commandment to be obeyed by every teacher and parent was Neill’s: “Thou shalt be on the side of the child.” This concept was illustrated a few minutes after my arrival by a situation involving two-year-old Amy. Amy had wet herself earlier in the morning, had been changed into another child’s extra clothes, and now that her own underwear was dry, Miss Smith was changing her back into her own things. Watching Amy’s undressing, four-year-old Irma said scornfully: “Oh, Amy wetted herself. I never, never do that.” Miss Smith’s answer was: “Oh, but we all do sometimes.” “I don’t ever,” insisted Irma. “Well, that’s nice; but Amy can’t help it and it’s all right to wet.”

Martha was difficult in her aggressiveness today—something must have taken place over the weekend, Miss Smith thought. She was particularly hostile towards little Amy, thrusting her fingers into the younger child’s eyes, biting and pushing her. Miss Smith carefully watched any arising situation so as to deal with it in the proper time. At lunch Martha’s aggressiveness led to a last warning: “If you hit her again, you must leave the table and eat alone.” Martha did hit out once again, at which point Mrs. Denison carried her off forcibly to another table, Martha loudly crying the while. As soon as she was put down on a chair on the opposite side of the room, Martha ran to a book-shelf and said she wanted to be read to from a book she had snatched. Mrs. Denison joined her, saying: “Aren’t you just escaping from something you don’t like?” She then held the child, asking: “Why did you hit Amy?” After a while Martha said: “She pushed me before.” Mrs. Denison brought the two children together, helped them agree they “were quits” and that they would no more attack one another. Later, in the yard, when I was alone with Martha and Amy, I saw Martha push Amy hard off a “sliding-board.” I asked Martha why she did it. Martha said: “But Amy pushed me off before.” As I had not taken my eyes off the two children, I knew it was not true, but I did nothing but comfort Amy as I did not know how to deal with the situation.

In a later discussion, Mrs. Denison pointed out to me that the second episode gave the impression that Martha was also lying the first time, which might be true and Mrs. Denison was aware of it at the time. However, in her talk with Amy and Martha, she gave no reproach to either child, merely talking about not hitting each other and since those two children fight frequently, the remarks could have applied to the specific or the general situation.

January 8th. I asked Miss Smith if Martha needed and was given more protection than the other children. I referred to yesterday afternoon when some new toys arrived, among them two ironing-boards; while Martha had an ironing-board and iron all to herself for the remainder of the afternoon, the other children took turns with the other. Miss Smith said it was not a case of special protection, but that as the child was disturbed and destructive, she was given special attention to comfort her. I wondered if Neill’s concept of giving approval and reward following “misdeeds,” based on the fact that “adult approval means love to every child, whereas disapproval means hate,” was put into practice at “The Children’s Place.” Miss Smith said that it was.

Five-year-old Lita was a new child to me as she had been absent the last week. I was alone in the nursery with the children, when Lita began climbing the forbidden steps to the second floor, other children starting in to follow her example. I reminded Lita that this was forbidden
and asked her to come down, to which she paid no attention. I went to Miss Smith. She said that Lita was sometimes difficult as she liked being naughty. Miss Smith spoke to Lita, explaining why the stairs were forbidden; then as Lita did not descend, Miss Smith went after her and carried her down. Miss S. immediately followed this up by suggesting a piggy-back ride to Lita, who accepted this enthusiastically.

Mrs. Denison was busy looking for a speaker for the next parent-teacher meeting. She told me she has a meeting each month and two have already taken place. The first one was devoted to readings from Neill's *That Dreadful School*, with a follow-up of valuable discussion, the second to talks by the music and art teachers on children's expression through music and art, respectively. (I have failed to mention those "lessons," each twice weekly.) The parents on the whole showed interest.

I took the opportunity to ask Mrs. Denison if, theoretically, more work with the parents was desirable in order to give them insight into their child's problems, modify handling and secure full co-operation. Mrs. Denison said decidedly so. The only reason individualized work with both parents and children was curtailed or omitted, was that at present Mrs. Denison had absolutely no time left for it.

*January 10th.* I was able to handle Lita! We were in the yard where she unearthed somewhere a flower pot. She threw it against the sliding-board, chipping it, and, unheeding me, was preparing to throw it again. I took hold of her and the pot, showed the sharp chipped edge, explained that if flower pot broke, sharp pieces would litter the yard and might cut any child who fell. Lita accepted this and my subsequent suggestion to "throw real hard" a ball at me, thus starting a vigorous ball game.

Irma's refusal to eat is treated by allowing her not to eat. This four-year-old has scarcely eaten since her parents' divorce five months ago, which resulted in a serious emotional disturbance for her, and she is white and wan looking. Since her coming to the school a month ago, her mother has co-operated in refraining from making an issue of eating. Irma as a rule sits down to table with the other children, drinking maybe some milk or taking a spoonful of dessert, but today she refused to sit down to table at all. Moving about the room and from one activity to another, she kept trying to attract attention to herself by asking questions. Mrs. Denison gave as answers: "We can't talk to you now, we're all busy eating." I wondered why the situation was treated thus, rather than giving Irma "approval and reward." In this connection I referred to other incidents when children's kicking, biting, etc., was not approved of. Mrs. Denison said that in general antisocial acts were followed by the giving of love which the child needed. The concept underlying the "giving of reward" for misdeeds is that a child attempts to compensate for emotional deprivation through antisocial acts and thus treatment is a response to the child's need for love; Biting, kicking, etc., were direct expressions of destructiveness and, depending on cause and intensity, did or did not call for extra love and approval for the child. The important point was that each case needed to be understood and treated, according to the needs of the particular child—i.e., individually.

At this time, as yet, no definite rules have been formulated for treatment of different symptomatic behavior; much experimental work still needed to be done before one could answer with assurance how each situation should be treated.

During lunch, another treatment of a situation attracted my attention. Mrs. Denison said to a child who was throwing bread on the floor: "It hurts me to see it because bread is good food; don't do it again." I wondered what difference there
was between this, presumably an emotional appeal and the forbidden “Do it to please Mother” approach. Mrs. Denison pointed out that the difference lay in that her words and manner did not threaten loss of love.

**January 11th.** I was invited to attend the weekly staff meeting. Present were: Mrs. Denison, Miss Smith, the art teacher and the babies’ nurse. Part of the discussion was around kitchen and play equipment needs and part around the problems of specific children, involving both theoretical understanding and practical handling of them. There was a free give-and-take of thinking on each problem between Mrs. Denison and her staff. Everyone knew and was interested in every child regardless of his age-group.

The first problem to receive attention was Irma’s not eating. Mrs. Denison asked if anyone had a suggestion how to get the child to eat in the meantime before Mrs. Denison has had time to work out her feelings therapeutically. Suggestions crystallized into a plan to have Irma sit down to lunch at a separate table with Mrs. Denison, of whom she is very fond. This special attention would be a satisfaction to the child and might bring about a relaxation of the tension which was preventing her from eating. The possibility of talking to her mother and persuading her to let the child stay at school all day was considered and agreed to in view of Irma’s invariable tears at the time of departure. Mrs. Denison will plan for a conference with the mother.

Biting was next discussed, both theoretically and in relation to specific children, including one of the babies. Mrs. Denison pointed out that, as in any other expression of destructiveness, the important thing is to find out why, fundamentally, has the child got the need? The best way to relax the child’s tension is to take the child on one’s knee and give him gentle loving. The biting need can be released safely by making of it a game and substituting a washcloth to bite on, much on the idea of letting a puppy tug harmlessly at some bit of cord. Biting of another child, if it cannot be averted in time, should be handled by saying in the proper tone of voice—i.e., with feeling: “Don’t do it, it hurts,” which would connect with his natural understanding of hurt and not his secondary sadistic desire.

In the case of hitting, the other child should be encouraged to retaliate in kind, rather than to harbor hurt feelings, but in the case of biting this is undesirable from the point of view of the practical handling of the group of children.

The difficulty of handling Lita was brought up. Mrs. Denison spoke of the rigidity of Lita’s parents. She does not plan to work with this child individually as it would be impossible to help her to any great extent while her care is shared with narrow-minded, unco-operative and punishing parents. I wondered why Mrs. Denison kept Lita on in view of the home versus school conflict. Mrs. Denison felt there was no real conflict as long as she refrained from working with the child therapeutically and that Lita was happy in school.

**January 12th.** Today was a perfect day from Mrs. Denison’s point of view, less so from mine as there was little call for handling of situations due to the fact that the children played peacefully with hardly any tears or destructive gestures. In part, this may have been due to the small number of children in attendance and the absence of Lita, Irma and some of the other more difficult children. Also, several new trains had been purchased so that there were enough for all; trains had been the biggest bone of contention up to the present.

Typically one budding conflict was handled and resolved smoothly: Martha had been on the rocker for quite a long while. Terry, temporarily losing interest.
in his train, wanted a turn on the rocker. He pushed and pulled Martha, who hit out at him determinedly until Terry started in wailing. Mrs. Denison explained to Martha that she had occupied the rocker for a long time and now Terry wanted his turn. To Martha's repeated "No," Mrs. Denison asked Terry to wait a while as Martha would soon be through, then suggested that Martha rock while she counted to 10, after which Martha would have had enough and Terry's turn would come. After the count was completed, Martha rocked a bit longer, then was willing to climb down. When Terry, from the rocker, saw that Martha now took possession of his train, he objected vigorously. Mrs. Denison pointed out that Terry could not use both toys at once and that he and Martha were taking turns at both. Terry forsook the rocker and, as a result, Martha put down the train, both children returning to their original occupations contentedly.

January 13th. The use of discipline was illustrated today. Lita behaved badly at lunch; she was noisy, demanding, jumped up with her plate and finally threatened to throw the plate. Miss Smith said: "Lita, you know, here we sit at table while we eat. Do you want to go home?" Miss Smith said this emphatically and Lita quickly answered she did not want to go home. "Well, then you'll have to behave the way we all do here," Miss Smith added. I had noticed the use of this technique "Do you want to go home?" on previous occasions when a child was deliberately naughty and later I asked Miss Smith about it. Putting it in question form did away with a too authoritarian approach as it gave the child a choice of action: to behave or go home. It worked because no child wanted to go home.

Amy deliberately knocked down onto the floor a row of trains which Mrs. Denison had just finished stacking onto a shelf to clear the room a bit before lunch. Hold-
from Mrs. Denison’s plate and drank three glasses of milk. Purpose of food rejection became evident during the meal as Irma talked spontaneously and freely. Eating, in her mind, is associated with some strong emotions on the part of the adults with whom she sits at table. Since she had no comprehension of those emotions, she became overwrought at feeding time and was unable to eat. Irma told Mrs. Denison: “They all sit and eat together and B. goes to bed with P., M. goes to bed with J. and L. sleeps with A.” This represented a complete confusion of partners, which might have been a correct insight on the part of Irma. Mrs. Denison pointed out that this was merely a hypothesis based on the knowledge of love-conflict in the family.

Having released her anxiety, Irma was a different child after lunch; she was rosy, played happily, and was remarkably generous to the other children. Later in the afternoon, Irma masturbated lying on the floor. She did not use her hands, but tried to obtain satisfaction through mechanical pelvic movements. Mrs. Denison said she was following position and motion observed in parents’ intercourse, Irma having revealed that she had seen her father “doing it this way.” Mrs. Denison has spoken to her about fuller gratification obtained by use of hand, but the child is evidently still inhibited.1

January 18th. I could not help wondering whether opportunity for conflict in a child’s mind was not created by differential handling at the school at the hands of Mrs. Denison and the three young women who have been coming in to help with the children for a couple of hours daily in response to a recent advertisement in a newspaper. I had heard one of them admonishing a child: “You’re a big boy, you should not hit little girls,” etc.

Another time, the door of the bathroom was closed firmly behind a child, the helper staying outside, saying: “We go to the bathroom with the door closed; you call me when you’re through.” In the case of Irma, a helper tried by irrelevant questions to distract her from masturbation. Today a helper said to Marietta in the course of playing “tea party”: “Say please when you ask for the sugar, and thank you when I’ve handed it to you.” I am aware that both in the case of parents and workers with the children (including myself), Mrs. Denison prefers to give explanation and interpretation as situations arise and call for them; nevertheless, I will be interested to discuss this with her specifically in relation to the workers.

January 22nd. In answer to my questioning, Mrs. Denison told me that the three young workers had been selected by her from about 40 girls who had responded to her newspaper ad. She wishes to experiment with another group than the traditionally-trained nursery school teachers; apart from this, she judged applicants purely individually on the basis of the likelihood of their fitting into the framework of “The Children’s Place” and being genuinely warm persons interested in children. Of the three helpers selected, one is an art student, another has done some theatrical work, the third helps her husband run an art gallery. Mrs. Denison told me she had two preliminary talks with each, during which she gave some orientation as to point of view and method of handling, covering such questions as the amount of freedom given to children, handling of destructive aggression towards other children and the attitude towards bathroom, thumb-sucking and masturbation. After this, situations or noticed mishandling are discussed as they take place—always privately. Mrs. Denison particularly stressed one point: many persons can accept theoretical concepts which they find hard or impossible to abide by in practice due to

1 Editor’s Note: This child, under the name of Jenny, is more fully discussed in Mrs. Denison’s article (infra, p. 173 ff.).
own conditioning and inhibitions. This is why she has had a turnover of workers.

Mrs. Denison added that in the case of training of permanent teachers, such as Miss Smith, for example, she gives them limited responsibility to begin with, maybe a couple of children for a certain time period, then gradually increases the responsibility. The best results are obtained by observation of Mrs. Denison, by asking her questions as situations arise. Mrs. Denison sometimes spends evenings discussing theory and methodology with Miss Smith.

In answer to my wondering as to the possibility of conflict being set up in a child’s mind as the result of the same type of situation being handled differently by the new workers and the trained staff, Mrs. D. said that mishandling of a situation can occur only once or twice before it comes to her attention. She then discusses the matter with the worker and gives her the privilege of amending her error in a similar situation with the same child. This involves specific rectification as, for example, in the situation observed by me when the teacher said: “We go to the bathroom with the door closed,” the teacher would say at the next opportunity, “You know, I made a mistake last time, we don’t have to close the door when we go to the bathroom. It just does not matter.” A child knows it is perfectly permissible to make a mistake and, when it is admitted and not repeated, no harm is done. In Mrs. D.’s experience, in general, the fallacious method is not used again by the worker. Mrs. D. prefers to instruct teachers on the basis of practical experience rather than fill them with “classroom theory.” This too is, of course, necessary but Mrs. D. believes that theoretical instruction should arise from direct contact with the children and their functioning.

I had been wanting to discuss with Mrs. Denison the practical application of the principle of self-regulation. Both from my reading and observation, I knew that all activities called for self-regulation rather than being regulated from outside by an adult. The range of activities included: eating, sleeping, toileting, thumb-sucking, masturbation, play, etc. In other words, a child had as much freedom as possible in his activities, in terms both of selection and content. In relation to eating, Miss Smith had previously told me that though therapeutically any eating behavior was acceptable, in practice this was impossible to allow in a group, as it involved spilled food, breakage of dishes, messiness of playroom, drawn-out meal periods, annoyance and distraction to those children who wanted to eat. To a lesser extent than in the area of eating, other activities were sometimes adult-regulated: toileting of some of the children who wet, playing with water, getting properly clothed before going to play in the yard, washing of faces and hands before going home.

Mrs. Denison pointed out to me that if the children had been brought up from infancy in the self-regulatory manner, much regulation by adults at this stage of their development would be unnecessary. Meal-time behavior is particularly difficult due to home associations. On the other hand, the rights of adults must also receive consideration.

I have had ample opportunity to observe that the children do have great freedom in their activities. When a child comes in from the yard because he feels cold or for some other reason, he is asked whether he wants to warm up and go out again later or whether he wants to be undressed and stay indoors. A child can refuse to nap or to eat or to take part in any group activity. Actually the children eat exceedingly well, habitually asking for a second or third portion of the main course or of any part of it which they particularly like.

Having in mind two-year-old Marietta who gets tired out in a group of older children, and at the opposite extreme,
four-year-old Billy, whose vigorous activity brings him into conflict with the younger children and who could use more physical outlets for his vitality and physical energy than the common playroom provides, I asked Mrs. Denison if, theoretically, division by age-groups was desirable. Mrs. Denison likes the idea of no division, but if the group is large enough, separation for certain periods during the day may be desirable; the grouping would not follow chronological age but rather the level of the child’s physical and emotional development. I wondered if an adult would be assigned to a specific group of children (as practiced by Anna Freud). Of necessity there would be some division of responsibility among the adults, but theoretically there is no call for this. If a child needs to form a special relationship with an adult, it will come out in relation to one of the teachers—this is covered by the concept of self-regulation. Unless a child is neurotic, he is satisfied by the freely given love of the several adults around him and does not need to focus on one.

January 26th. Fascinating to observe is Mrs. D.’s use of the device of “making a game of it.” She is able to change into joyful activity any conflict-burdened situation and aggressive needs. Today, Terry, a very difficult little boy with a strong need to possess (Terry is the one who constantly creates conflict by wanting to have all the trains), objected with vigorous hysterical wailing to Mrs. D.’s lending his rubbers to Stewart. As Terry never wanted to play in the yard and as Stewart wanted to go outdoors at this time but had refused to do so earlier when the rest of the group was being dressed and whose own rubbers had been put on a child who had come without any, Mrs. D. was now confronted with Terry’s stubborn selfishness and Stewart’s equally vigorous insistence on having back his own rubbers. Mrs. D. said, “You are very selfish, Terry; both of you make so much fuss over such nonsense.” Her tone of voice arrested the children’s attention and immediately following this, she continued in a playful sing-song fashion to repeat over and over again with changing intonations: “You make so much fuss over such nonsense” until both children joyfully joined in, forgetting all conflict.

I have been able to use this device successfully on quite a few occasions. While waiting for lunch and already seated at table, Lita kept hitting out at her neighbor and encouraging, by her example, hitting all around the table. Unable to stop her in any other way, I picked up Lita and her chair, lifted her high a couple of times, then put her back in her place, saying “It’s fun to go high in the air on your chair”; the other children immediately joined in the refrain and hitting was forgotten. Another time, while waiting for lunch, Amy kept pulling Jill’s hand until Jill was in tears; to me Amy said: “I love Jill, I want to hold her.” Catching Amy’s hand, I said: “Don’t pull her hand, it hurts, hold it gently, like this.” Amy and I held hands gently, then I said: “Now pull mine and it will hurt.” Then Amy wanted her hand pulled, following which all the children asked to have their hands held gently and for comparison pulled, which I did to an appropriate refrain.

As discussed at staff meeting, children’s biting has been handled by making a game of it: “Let’s all bite like puppy-dogs” on a towel or doll’s blanket or anything handy. Mrs. D. feels that this method of release of muscular jaw tension can be resorted to occasionally without the need for it being precipitated by biting. Apart from biting, if children are noisy and destructive, it is helpful to introduce a violent game which will release their tension. If muscular tension appears to be in the child’s arms, one should engage him in a “fight”: “Come on, let’s fight, try harder”; if muscular tension is primarily in the legs, as expressed by kicking, one can introduce a play involving pulling at the child’s legs strongly.
Observing techniques as I have been doing, I have failed to emphasize that quite apart from her skills, Mrs. D. gains the desired response by her ability to enter the child's world, to be spontaneously always on the side of the child. It is easy enough to describe or learn the how, what and when of handling children, but it is impossible to repeat intonations of voice or quality of touch which only warm love and sensitive understanding can give. I was particularly aware of this today. In the latter part of the afternoon, the children became restless and quarrelsome, possibly due to tiredness. I was alone with them and quite at the end of my ingenuity for no sooner had I handled one situation than crying or fighting would start in another corner. Mrs. D., who had been busy in the office, came to take charge. A few minutes later, she was acting out on a table the part of a rebellious child whose mother was forcing him to go to bed: she wailed, jumped up, asked for drinks of water, thumb-sucked, etc., to the children's vast glee and hilarity.

Then Mrs. D. stopped her play in order to get Irma dressed for leaving. Irma's father was calling for her (Irma is the child of separated parents who lives with her mother but adores her father whom she seldom sees). Irma became tense, over-wrought, near-hysterical. There is no way to describe the quality of voice and touch with which Mrs. D. prepared Irma for her father, combing her hair to "be specially pretty" and whispering, "I know how you feel, Irma."

January 29th. I asked Mrs. D. if I was right in assuming that no special emphasis was placed on the "mental" development of the child and that no so-called educational toys were provided with this in view. Mrs. D. does have some educational games but those remain mostly in the drawers as the children have no interest in them. Mrs. D. feels that children do not need imposed activities; all that is needful is to allow each child to develop in his own way. In this connection, Mrs. D. pointed out the importance of a child being free from fear: a child gains naturally in dexterity through handling of objects if he is not inhibited by fear and thus rendered stiff. If free of fear he does not need to learn dexterity through adult-imposed activities. I had observed an example of this "stiffness" just yesterday: Melissa, a new and very attractive little girl, joined in dancing in the circle of children but her legs moved woodenly, her gestures were tentative and she was unable to fall on the floor when the song called for this, with the gay abandon of the other children.

In view of the fact that Mrs. D. was not interested in artificially stimulating the growth of the children, in "teaching" them and having them "learn," I wondered why she selected to call "The Children's Place" a nursery school rather than just plain nursery or any other appropriate term. Mrs. D. said the children were learning the most important thing—they were learning to live. Each child was being helped to work out his own individual problems in a group setting.

I am aware that this learning to live is a process that receives continued attention at "The Children's Place" and is the basis for the handling of children in every situation. It would seem to me that the concept of equal rights—i.e., respect for others' rights and feelings in combination with the ability to stand up for oneself—is one of the most emphatically and consistently stressed. Into this area would fall many approaches to handling situations which I have already mentioned piecemeal: one cannot hit with impunity as the other child is then helped to hit back; one cannot take away toys from another child as the question is immediately put, "Who had it first? Well then, you must wait till he gets through and then you can have your turn"; or if there is a good deal of tension about this, consideration is given to "who needs it
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most"; one child cannot annoy another child as an intervening adult will say, "She does not like that, how would you like me to do it to you?" and playfully follow this out. Wherever possible, use of authority is excluded and the child is given a choice: "You can have the stick back, if you do not hit Stewart again, which do you want? I can’t give you the stick if you are going to hit Stewart but if you think you won’t, you can have it." Yet on few occasions authority is used as when a child wilfully throws all the blocks about the playroom, in which case he is made to gather them up again; on the couple of occasions when I saw this happen, the child became resistive and tense. But this involves protection of the rights of the adults who otherwise must need gather up the blocks. To a child who persistently annoys her by wilful misbehavior or who hits her, Mrs. D. reacts spontaneously by expressing her displeasure.

The learning to live becomes apparent when you hear children use among themselves the approach of the adult: "You hurt him, kiss it and make it feel better," "He had it first, you wait till he's through" and "Now I'm through, do you want it?" and the charming "I did not mean to, may I kiss you?" Of course not all the children respond equally, but according to their needs and depending on their emotional adjustment at any given time. When Martha happened to kick me today and I said "You hurt me," she answered shyly but looking me straight in the face, "I did not mean to, I like you." Whereas Billy, who had previously kicked me much harder after I had warned him many times to desist from throwing blocks around, only giggled and ran in circles after my exclamation of pain.

February 3rd. I actually observed a complete art period for the first time today as I had missed (because of my hours of attendance) the first half of the earlier regular art periods with the art teacher and also I had not wanted to be a disturbing factor by close observation. Due to bad weather, the children were unable to play in the yard and at a certain point in the early afternoon, sensing a general restlessness and aimlessness, Miss S. introduced the suggestion: "Who would like to paint?" to which the children responded enthusiastically. Newspapers were laid on the floor, then the children were paired off according to their own choice of painting partner, and each pair of children received a set of bottles of paint between them. Paper distributed, the children started off painting vigorously. No suggestions whatsoever were made by the adults, but Miss S. followed the work in progress, asking the individual children what they were drawing. If the answer gave any clue to what was on the child’s mind or was in any way revealing and interesting, Miss S. wrote it unobtrusively on the corner of the painting. But most of the time the children repeated the answer given by another child, playing with the words without giving them any significance. For example, after one of the children exclaimed "I'm painting a green crocodile," all the others took this up as a kind of refrain with no regard to the color or form of own compositions.

Adult interference was limited to dealing with quarrels and splashing paint on one another. Miss S. had begun by prohibiting smearing paint on hands and face and using fingers in place of brushes, but Mrs. D. relaxed this prohibition. Later, when washing off paint from hands and faces, Mrs. D. repeated to each protesting child: "I would not have to rub so hard if you had not got so much paint on you. If you don’t want me to rub hard, remember not to get so much paint on next time." Theoretically, Mrs. D. believes that children should be allowed to be as messy as they want to with paint, smearing it on themselves and each other, but realistically the question of clothes must be taken into
consideration because of parents’ attitudes. As in the case of other activities, there is no intention to “teach” the children, in the sense of encouraging them to greater effort or better accomplishment, the emphasis at all times being solely on the pleasure derived from the activity. Mrs. D.’s common rejoinder is “What fun!” or “Isn’t that fun!” (which I very quickly took over).

Enjoyment of natural bodily functions is safeguarded by giving approval, as for example, Mrs. D.’s exclamation “That will be fun” when two little boys expressed their intention of urinating at the same time. This was taken up the following day by all three little boys present who crowded gleefully around the one toilet, to the great interest of some of the little girls. But when the children saw feces in the toilet bowl, they dashed back with exclamations “Oh, that stank, it’s nasty,” which Mrs. D. combatted with “No, it’s good.”

Enjoyment of natural bodily functions is safeguarded by giving approval, as for example, Mrs. D.’s exclamation “That will be fun” when two little boys expressed their intention of urinating at the same time. This was taken up the following day by all three little boys present who crowded gleefully around the one toilet, to the great interest of some of the little girls. But when the children saw feces in the toilet bowl, they dashed back with exclamations “Oh, that stank, it’s nasty,” which Mrs. D. combatted with “No, it’s good.” This was discussed for some minutes, Mrs. D. helping the children to overcome their disgust and take a more natural attitude.

I did not happen to hear any verbal expression of curiosity about sex differences, though some of the children showed their interest in the intent way they watched others urinate. An incident occurred a few days ago which I handled with woeful inadequacy, I am sure, and with the unhappy feeling that due to ignorance I failed the child. Little Marietta, pants already down and impatient, ran into the bathroom where Terry was urinating. But while waiting for her turn, she became absorbed in Terry’s performance, edging around to see better. When, after having buttoned up Terry, I looked around, I saw Marietta attempting to assume the little boy’s position. Being a very small child, she was of course unable to straddle the toilet and was pressing herself to the bowl in various positions and with a look of frustration. I watched her for a few moments and as she was holding back her urine, I picked her up, put the toilet-seat down and sat her down, saying as gently as I could, “You don’t go to the toilet that way, Marietta, you go this way.” Marietta made no sign of protest, nor did she say anything.

I went with this incident to Mrs. D. who told me that I would have been more helpful to Marietta if I had explained that Terry did weewee with his penis which he held over the toilet, while girls did not have a penis, they had a vagina instead and it was more comfortable for them to weewee by sitting on the toilet. I could have illustrated this on Marietta’s body. I wondered about the use of the word penis, difficult for a small child. Mrs. D. feels words are not important but she would rather use the right ones as children grasp the meaning anyway. I told Mrs. D. that I had noticed her use of difficult words, in particular the word “escape.”

February 5th. I broached the subject which is of particular interest to social workers: case-work in a nursery-school setting. I had been observing work with the children and how individual children were helped to work out their problems. I was not in a position to observe work with the parents apart from occasionally overheard words which Mrs. D. spoke to parents when they were calling for the children. Those words and primarily Mrs. D.’s tone of voice conveyed her approval of and her enjoyment in the child—in other words, she invited the parent to share her attitude to the child. Apart from any verbal encouragement or interpretation given, I believe that no parent could remain uninfluenced by observation of Mrs. D.’s handling of the children.

In answer to my question, Mrs. D. said that case-work with parents is especially difficult as it meant facing them with a point of view which might prove too frightening. Mrs. D. deals with certain things in children which cannot be gen-
eraly accepted. To avoid this immediate frightening off, Mrs. D. postpones discussions with parents until they are ready for this and then proceeds slowly, a step at a time. Thus when a mother sees improvement in her child, she is ready to approve of the manner in which he is handled in the school; in answer to her "You've done wonders for my child," Mrs. D. can begin to discuss what has been done and why.

Besides individual talks with the mothers, there are the parents-teachers meetings with general discussions of problems. At the January meeting, Dr. Theodore P. Wolfe, vegetotherapist, sat in on the discussion and answered questions. Mrs. D. remarked on the manner "all parents tried to escape themselves." One could not stress too much the need to proceed a little bit at a time, so that any interpretation given gradually became part of their knowledge.

When the subject of masturbation was introduced, Dr. Wolfe asked a very elementary question: Does every child masturbate? To this some mothers answered in the positive and others in the negative, the latter being under the impression that masturbation is limited to use of the hand and not realizing that children attempt to gain satisfaction through rubbing the genital against furniture, sitting astride, etc. Dr. Wolfe then pointed out that all healthy children masturbate and need to gain satisfaction through this activity which is normal, being the natural sexual expression of children who have not yet attained genital maturity.

Subjects introduced by the mothers were directly concerned with problems they saw in connection with their child. Stewart's mother brought up the question of biting and scratching: she was no longer willing to tolerate Stewart's coming home all scratched up as a result of the assaults of some of the children. Mrs. D. explained to me that the problem did not lie solely in the oral frustration of the children who did the biting, but in the fact that Stewart was the victim—i.e., why did Stewart allow himself to be bit and scratched? Why did he self-righteously allow himself to be victimized? At "The Children's Place" the children were encouraged to fight back in self-protection; thus it was a case of dealing with Stewart's inhibitions aside from the destructiveness of other children.

The two children who contributed most to Stewart's victimizing were Terry and Martha, whom Mrs. D. was particularly interested in as she had achieved good results in her work with them. Mrs. D. suggested to Stewart's mother that it might be best to take Stewart out of the school if the parents felt so strongly about the situation; she followed this up with an attempt to lead the mother to face the question: "Why was it Stewart who always got hurt?" but the mother escaped from facing the problem from this angle.

Marietta's mother was perturbed by Marietta's too frequent request to be taken to the bathroom. The mother was able to accept that it was an attention-getting device. Mrs. D. then posed the question: Why did the child select to get attention in this particular area, when there were so many other ways to get attention? By implication this meant: the mother gave more attention to this area than to any other. Mrs. D. pointed out to me that Marietta's frequent desire to void was significant also from another angle: that pressure of the bladder is often experienced as a genital sensation.

February 12th. I could, in concluding my observation period, list and possibly group under various headings, techniques used at the school in the treatment of different situations as, for example, those involving destructiveness, possessiveness, attention-seeking, etc., but I feel this would be contrary to the whole dynamic approach of "The Children's Place." When the accepted aim is to help a child by allowing him the freedom to grow naturally, the
emphasis can not be on how and what an adult should do, but on the needs of each child and how best to meet them. Some of those needs and thus the situations to which they give rise would, in the first place, not have been present if the children had, from birth, a self-regulatory upbringing, but in fact, the school receives the children when certain neurotic manifestations are already present.

An elucidation which needs to be added belongs in the area of conflict for the child because of differential handling in the home and school environments. This is the area which admittedly disturbed me and to which I referred frequently. Mrs. D. stressed: if, due to a semi-rigid home-environment, the conflict in the child between authoritarian and self-regulatory upbringing should be too strong, Mrs. D. will work slowly until she believes that the child is prepared to handle himself more freely in day-to-day situations, and then give him the opportunity for further self-regulation.

If one accepts as final the norms of society as it stands today one must necessarily reject some of the concepts of the school as contrary to present-day mores—i.e., if the emphasis is on the necessary moulding of the child to present-day adult reality, one must reject the revolutionary implications of such a point of view in child development. No one who believes in the status quo can avoid resisting the consequences of a sex-economic upbringing of children. Necessarily the accepted thinking on the authoritative role of family, religion and culture are challenged. However, many people are in conflict in their attitudes to the world today and thus there may be an increasing support for new ideas with a genuine acceptance of their implications.

Whereas the psychoanalytic groups, the English School and the Viennese School are interested in the adjustment of the individual to his society and thus do not specifically imply the need for social reform as such, the sex-economic point of view calls for wide social changes. Children who have been allowed to develop freely in all their functioning, who are free of inhibitions and fear and thus have strong constructive impulses, will want to create a world in which they will be happy and one where constructive impulses can find expression. Whereas psychoanalysis, stressing the importance of the parent-child relationship as basic to normal growth in all societies, aims toward adjustment within the family group, sex-economy minimizes the role of the family as essential to the healthy development of the child and would prevent the child from neurotic family ties. There can be little doubt that a happy experience in “The Children’s Place,” if prolonged, can create conflict between the usual home and school. The problem here is whether conscious conflict between child and parents may not be preferable to a subsequent internalized conflict due to neurotic inhibitions.
Projeto Arte Org
Redescobrindo e reinterpretando 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.
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Em nome da comunidade Arte Org.

Textos da área do desenvolvimento infantil

Texts from the area of child development

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

--------
Children
--------

01 Ernst Walter. A Talk With a Sensible Mother 1936
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 1 Number 1 1942
Interval 16-22 Pag. 11-17

02 Paul Martin. Sex-Economimc Upbringing 1942
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 1 Number 1 1942
Interval 23-37 Pag. 18-32

03 Editorial. Physiological Anchoring of Psychic Conflicts 1942
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 1 Number 2 1942
Interval 83-85 Pag. 177-179

04 A.S.Neills. The Problem Teacher I 1939
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 1 Number 2 1942
Interval 86-90 Pag. 180-184

05 A.S.Neills. The Problem Teacher II 1939
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 1 Number 3 1942
Interval 90-96 Pag. 282-288

06 A High School Student. The Sexual Behavior of Adolescents in a New York Borough 1943
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 2 Numbers 2 3 1943
Interval 61-65 Pag. 153-157

07 Theodore P. Wolfe. A Sex.economist Answers I 1943
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 2 Numbers 2 3 1943
Interval 66-73 Pag. 158-165
08 Paul Martin. Reviews Which Kind Progressive Education 1943
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 2 Numbers 2 3 1943
Interval 83-96 Pag. 175-188

09 A.S. Neill. The Problem Teacher III 1939
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 2 Numbers 2 3 1943
Interval 106-112 Pag. 198-204

10 Theodore P. Wolfe. A Sex Economist Answers II 1943
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 3 Number 1 1944
Interval 67-75 Pag. 62-70

11 Theodore P. Wolfe. Reviews The Boy Sex Offender 1943
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 3 Number 1 1944
Interval 87-91 Pag. 82-86

12 A.S. Neill. The Problem Teacher IV 1939
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 3 Number 1 1944
Interval 92-101 Pag. 87-96

13 Paul Martin. Sex Education in the Schools
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 3 Numbers 2 3 1944
Interval 92-94 Pag. 188-190

14 Notes. Some Observations of Children 1944
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 3 Numbers 2 3 1944
Interval 101-107 Pag. 197-203

15 A.S. Neill. That Dreadful School I 1944
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 3 Numbers 2 3 1944
Interval 124-136 Pag. 220-232

16 A.S. Neill. Coeducation and Sex 1945
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 4 Number 1 1945
Interval 56-60 Pag. 54-58

17 Felicia Saxe. A case History 1945
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 4 Number 1 1945
Interval 61-73 Pag. 59-71

18 Alexander Lowen. Adolescence A Problem in Sex-Economy 1945
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 4 Number 1 1945
Interval 74-97 Pag. 72-95

19 Notes Editorial. Sexuality Before the Law 1945
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 4 Number 1 1945
Interval 102-105 Pag. 100-103

20 A.S. Neills. That Dreadful School II 1945
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 4 Number 1 1945
Interval 117-130 Pag. 115-128

21 Elena Calas. Studying the Childrens Place 1945
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 4 Numbers 2 3 1945
Interval 34-50 Pag. 156-172

22 Lucille Bellamy Denison. The child and his Struggle 1945
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 4 Numbers 2 3 1945
Interval 51-68 Pag. 173-190

23 A.S. Neills. That Dreadful School III 1945
International Journal of Sex Economy and Orgone Research Volume 4 Numbers 2 3 1945
Interval 107-130 Pag. 228-251

24 Felicia Saxe. Armored Human Beings Versus the Healthy Child 1947
McF 207 Annals of the Orgone Institute, Number 1. 1947
Interval 21-40 Pag. 35-72

25 Ilse Ollandorff. About Self-Regulation in a Healthy Child 1847
McF 207 Annals of the Orgone Institute, Number 1. 1947
Interval 44-49 Pag. 81-90

26 Elizabeth Tyson. The Armored Teacher 1947
McF 207 Annals of the Orgone Institute, Number 1. 1947
Interval 49-51 Pag. 91-94

--------------------------------
--------------------------------
Orgone Energy Bulletin
-------------------------------
--------------------------
Children
----------

01 Elsworth F. Baker. The Concept of Self-Regulation 1949
Interval 12-14 Pag. 160-164
02 Richard Singer. Play Problema of a Healthy Child 1949
Interval 14-16 Pag. 165-168

03 A. E. Hamilton. Reviews The Problem Family by A. S. Neill 1949
Interval 26-28 Pag. 189-193

04 Wilhelm Reich About Genital Self-satisfaction in Children 1927
Interval 10-12 Pag. 63-67

05 A.S.Neill. Self-Regulation and the Outside World. 1950
Interval 13-14 Pag. 68-70

06 Meyer Silvert Editorial Note. Critique of an Attitude Expressed by Anna Freud 1950
Interval 21-22 Pag. 84-87

07 Wilhelm Reich Children of the Future I 1950
Interval 22-28 Pag. 194-206

08 Wilhelm Reich Armoring in a Newborn Infant 1950
Interval 3-13 Pag. 121-138

09 Editorial. Protection of Life 1953
Interval 3-4 Pag. 2-4
-----------------------------
-----------------------------
雏潼婴 Outononic Functionalism
-----------------------------

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