
ANNALS OF THE ORGONE INSTITUTE

NUMBER 1

PRICE \$2.00

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
ARTICLES	
Work democracy in action	<i>Wilhelm Reich, M.D.</i> 4
Armored human beings versus the healthy child	<i>Felicia Saxe</i> 35
Sex-economy and orgone research in Palestine	<i>Walter Hoppe, M.D.</i> 73
About self-regulation in a healthy child	<i>Ilse Ollendorff</i> 81
The armored teacher	<i>Elizabeth Tyson</i> 91
Mechanistic thinking as the original sin	<i>R. H. Atkin</i> 95
Thoughts on the sex behavior of American soldiers in the ETO	<i>Anthony I. Swarowsky</i> 101
FROM THE HISTORY OF ORGONE BIOPHYSICS	
Our congratulations to Freud on his birthday (1936)	108
The expulsion of Wilhelm Reich from the International Psychoanalytical Association	114
NOTES	
A warning repeated	127
Some observations of children	128
Jerry's case	133
Again the common cold	138
A note on "specific diseases"	138
IN MEMORIAM	
Fritz Brupbacher	140
REVIEWS	
Ribble, Margaret A.: The Rights of Infants	<i>Mann</i> 142
Leonard et al.: The Child at Home and at School	<i>Tyson</i> 147
Aldrich, C. Anderson and Mary M. Aldrich: Babies Are Human Beings	<i>Tyson</i> 153

Copyright, 1947
ORGONE INSTITUTE PRESS, INC.
799 Broadway
New York 3, N. Y.

© Copyright renewed 1974 by Mary Boyd Higgins
As Trustee of Wilhelm Reich Infant Trust Fund

Second Printing, by offset, 1949

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



Congratulations to WILHELM REICH
on his fiftieth birthday, March 24, 1947

Reich and his son Peter, Maine, 1945



INTRODUCING THE ANNALS OF THE ORGONE INSTITUTE

At a time when scientific work is still in full development, changes in the work may necessitate changes in the mode of publication. The establishment of the ANNALS OF THE ORGONE INSTITUTE corresponds to such a necessity. The ANNALS continue the functions of the INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SEX-ECONOMY AND ORGONE RESEARCH published from 1942 to 1945. Among the factors which necessitated the change are the following:

In the JOURNAL, the emphasis was on *sex-economy*, with orgone research appearing as a developmental product of sex-economy. This no longer is in keeping with the facts. Today, *orgone biophysics* is leading; it determines thinking and working also in the field of sex-economy. The accent shifted more and more from psychiatry to natural science, to biology and physics. Our attitude toward early upbringing, also, is determined predominantly by our orgone-biophysical insights into the child as a living organism. With that, the sexological and psychological functions do not lose any of their significance; they are, however, put in a wider framework and on a deeper basis, that of biology.

The JOURNAL having been published in yearly volumes, we were held to certain deadlines; increasing paper shortage and other conditions in the printing business made it increasingly difficult to meet these. We also had to adhere to a certain number of pages. These mechanical requirements restricted our freedom of mobility. For this reason, the ANNALS will not be published in yearly volumes, but in single numbers, appearing at irregular intervals and of irregular volume. The resulting flexibility in the mode of publication corresponds better with our functional way of thinking and working than the rigid form of a Journal.

The ANNALS represent the organ of the Orgone Institute. However, as before, each individual author is alone responsible for the contents of his publication.

For the Orgone Institute
WILHELM REICH

WORK DEMOCRACY IN ACTION*

By WILHELM REICH, M.D.

The work groups in various countries differ greatly in experience, specialization, capacity of achievement and social influence. The difference in maturity is part of the *pioneer* character of the work as a whole. There are, as a result, a great many problems which represent problems of *growth*. The Institute does not form a homogeneous group of specialists with the same degree of training and achievement. There are, e.g., teachers who do as yet not know what to do with orgone physics. There are, on the other hand, sociologists with a socialist orientation who are still deeply rooted in pre-war ideologies or even in party ideologies and who find it difficult to keep pace with our *work-democratic* social orientation. Again, there are good therapists and teachers who never have had any practical contact with social problems, or students of biology who have no contact with the sociological matrix from which orgone biophysics grew more than a decade ago.

Orgone biophysics, the new theory of living functioning, forms, as does its object of study, an indivisible *functional unity*. It is to be feared that to this functional unity a *functional antithesis* and *antagonistic splitting up* will soon be added, unless we take into account the disparity in maturity.

One cannot expect a teacher to keep pace with the biophysicist who works on the identity of static electricity and atmospheric orgone. Nevertheless, the teacher will have to understand what the "biological energy" with which he works actually represents.

One cannot expect of the average vegetotherapist who treats patients many hours a day that he master the classical fundament of sociology which has so many connections with our mass psychology. Nevertheless, he must be conversant with the social processes which produce the emotional diseases.

Finally, one cannot expect a man who daily experiences sociology in his work as social worker or journalist to be able to follow the principles of orgone-biophysical research. Nevertheless, he must have a certain knowledge of living functioning.

The more closely one's work is connected with everyday social living,

* Translated by the Editor.

the more one will be inclined to emphasize the social element in our work, at the expense of the natural-scientific. It is precisely this type of practical worker who most drastically experiences the deep chasm between long-view natural science and short-view practical work. Unless he has a broad view of things, he may even be inclined to regard orgonometry as a flight from hard reality, as an "unwarranted academic luxury." Orgone biophysics, however, is experimental natural science and thus must have a sound foundation in mathematical (orgonometric) laws. I may say here that orgonometry has already found its confirmation in well-established classical calculations of astronomy. It will be a long time, however, before these results are ripe for publication.

The chasm, then, exists practically. It is bridged only theoretically by the basic orgone-biophysical concepts of the unitary character of all life manifestations. We are still very far from a practical mastery of this deep chasm between natural science and practical social endeavor. This is the reason for many dangerous situations with which the Institute has been confronted in the past and will be confronted in the future.

Although, in reality, *science* and *society* form an indivisible unity, the *practical* aspect of the problem is exceedingly complex, namely, the combination of "science and politics," or, better, the development of a "socially conscious science," of "social endeavor based on natural science." The chasm between natural science and practical social endeavor occasionally manifests itself in the form of irrational behavior on the part of the representatives of science as well as those of politics. It is precisely at the point where the natural scientist meets the gigantic demands of the social chaos and where the practical worker meets the demands of strict natural science that political irrationalism enters the arena and confuses thinking, disrupts human relationships, and leads with logical inevitability to murder, when defamation, gossip and other, milder, manifestations of the emotional plague no longer suffice. Formation of cliques, intrigues, personal irrational enmity, irrational ambition, envy and hatred are sure indications that the conflict between slow-working, penetrating natural science and politics with its everyday demands has led to a crisis. Careful investigation of such "political differences" again and again discloses the conflict between scientific principle and the demands of everyday social life. Let us go a step further in order to better understand this conflict and, if possible, to solve it for our organization. *How does the irrational mechanism of the emotional plague set in?*

Every human individual, without exception, has the tendencies to emotional plague reactions in himself. The difference in practical behavior is not determined by the existence or non-existence of such mechanisms. It is determined by the ability to sense, understand and control these plague mechanisms in time. I do not hesitate to admit that I am not always capable of recognizing these tendencies *in time*. No human being is excepted from this fate. The best way is to wait quietly until the situation becomes cleared, and never to act as long as one is under the influence of plague reactions. It goes without saying that our work has to be protected by an alteration of structure through character-analysis and orgone therapy. He who is already healthy in our sense is less apt to become dangerous than he who is rigidly armored; nevertheless, this applies to him also.

The following is based first, on clinical experience with individuals suffering from the emotional plague, second, on numerous experiences with co-workers in the course of about 20 years of teaching, and, third, on self-observation. I might add a study of the behavior of political leaders in times of social crises. The contentions to follow, then, are not accidental personal opinions, but a scientifically founded *explanation*. This explanation shifts the emphasis from the individual to where it belongs, namely, the realm of our *biosocial functioning*.

It is only in the course of the past few years that the problem has become as clear as it is now. Before that time, I felt completely helpless in the face of the ever-recurring catastrophes in my work which appeared like an inevitable fate. I could not understand the thing, did not know what to do about it and suffered from the justified self-reproach that a gap in my understanding was in part responsible.

The teaching and research structure of *orgone biophysics* of today is composed of analytic depth psychology, biology of the instincts, physics of the instincts, sociology of the instincts and mass psychology, organ pathology, clinical medicine, pedagogics and, last not least, social politics. So many specialties, and, correspondingly, so many specialists?, the reader will ask.

It was my task to master these manifold and co-existing things. This would be impossible if this co-existence had not derived from a logical sequence of things, which was somewhat as follows:

1918-1924 essentially natural science (physics, chemistry, biology, medicine) and natural philosophy; developed up to date.

- 1920-1930 classical sexology, psychoanalysis and psychiatry; developed up to date.
- 1923-1944 clinical *orgasm theory* and *sex-economy*, as a new, autonomous field.
- 1927-1936 classical sociology, and foundation of social sex-economy.
- 1932-1937 vegetotherapy, breakthrough into the biophysical foundation of the emotional plague.
- 1934- bio-energetic research.
- 1939- orgone physics, orgone biophysics and orgone therapy.

When, about 1922, I gave myself over completely to psychoanalysis, this shift in main interest led to the loss of a number of valuable friends who remained with classical natural science and since became mechanistic biologists, chemists or physicists. There is no longer any contact with them, but the separation created no enmities.

When, between 1923 and 1926, I began to develop my orgasm theory, I lost a number of good co-workers among the psychoanalysts; some became bitter enemies who later resorted to defamation; the conflict with Freud also developed at that time. On the other hand, the young theory won new and enthusiastic co-workers among the psychoanalysts in the technical seminar in Vienna and Berlin, and later in Copenhagen and Oslo.

When, after 1927, I established practical contact with sociology and developed my social sex-economy, many Marxists became my friends and co-workers, at the expense of another number of friendly psychoanalysts.

When, at the time of the German catastrophe, I began the criticism of party-political thinking (*MASS PSYCHOLOGY OF FASCISM*, etc.), many party politicians became enemies: social sex-economy and structural psychology made too high demands. I found myself alone, outside the psychoanalytic as well as the political organizations of Europe.

At this time, a new campaign of defamation began against me and my co-workers; this was waged by the politicians under the slogans of "Freudianism, sexualism" and by some psychoanalysts, successfully at first, with the slogan "schizophrenia."

I lost my students from the psychoanalytic seminars. Not one of them remained; not one of them took the step into character-analysis and later biophysics. This was the hardest blow of my scientific career.

When, in 1937, I had to take the difficult step from the purely psychological method of character-analysis to the biophysical technique of vegeto-

therapy, I lost again several important and capable co-workers, among them the influential director of the Psychological Institute of a university. However, most of the physicians, psychologists and teachers trained by me after 1933 withstood the pressures and came along, often with great difficulties, but more often with enthusiasm. Today, most of them are independent leaders of work groups. Since they were not hampered by other organizational bonds, they were able to follow the bion research after 1934 with interest and understanding. But very often it was difficult to keep together the already widely scattered activities. Social sex-economy, clinical sex-economy, mass psychology and vegetotherapy went well together where the scientific contact was close. Where it was not, the usual irrationalism took the place of cooperation.

A new rupture threatened when, in 1939, I had to concentrate my attention on the newly discovered orgone. However, the development of cancer research from bion research and from clinical sex-economy brought new friends with much understanding, for now the close connection between the disrupted human sex-economy and the cancer scourge was clear.

The political chaos in Europe hampered the development of mass-psychological work; on the other hand, the interest in the natural-scientific work grew. It was clear that *orgone biophysics was not a development away from sociology; rather, it promised a better foundation for our sociological work*. The problem, however, as to whether, in these catastrophic times, the socio-political or the natural-scientific work deserved preference in effort, remained acute.

I must point out here a significant change in our social orientation which still creates a certain amount of confusion. Many of our co-workers had either come from socialist circles or had personal or ideological connection with them. I myself had for years worked as a physician in socialist organizations, and my mass-psychological publications were not only basically sex-economic but were also strongly colored by socialist views.

Then, a sharp conflict developed in our socio-political position. On the one hand, it was clear that Marx's sociology and economics could provide theoretical and practical connections with our sexual sociology. We, however, were in the first place natural scientists, physicians and teachers, while the Marxists were primarily politicians. We came from psychoanalysis or other branches of natural science; the representatives of politics, however, came from party circles. There followed the *backward* move-

ment of politics and the *forward* movement of our natural science, rapidly widening the chasm between science and politics:

1. The "peace parties" of central and northern Europe did not understand the irrational biopsychological content of fascism; there are no indications that such an understanding has come about since that time. We, on the other hand, began, after 1933, to understand fascism better and better. The understanding of fascist irrationalism today (outside of party politics) is the result of our pioneer work. For we were *the first to comprehend the problem of fascism mass-psychologically and sex-economically and to make it widely known*.

2. In the Soviet Union there was a regression, step by step, from a revolutionary to the authoritarian, nationalist principle, in economics and social sex-economy, a regression which today has reached the stage of propaganda for families with many children, to the reintroduction of reactionary sexual legislation, bemedaled generals, church hierarchy, abolition of coeducation, etc. We, on the other hand, had gone beyond the confines of psychology, had given our previously only psychological and sociological theory of character a foundation in biophysics and had established the following facts: *The sexual energy is the life energy per se*, and, *Human character structure anchors the social process by means of sexual energies*.

In their retrogressive development, the politicians developed an increasingly bad conscience and correspondingly increasingly sharp measures against us who continued to adhere to the idea of internationalism and worked on the *BIOLOGICAL basis of the productive power, working power*. The bad conscience of the political Left wing explains the fact that most of the attacks and defamations of any weight came from the camp of the socialist politicians. In Germany they came from the Communists as early as 1932, when the concepts of social sex-economy became widespread among masses of people; later, in Scandinavia, they came from members of socialist organizations.

The break with the old political organizations became complete, while the connection with Marx's sociology became firmer. We understood why the political organizations became the victims of fascism; it was because their lack of understanding of race mysticism, of social sex-economy and of biopsychiatry. We also knew where economics required complementation with depth psychology, where we were able to correct concepts and to fill gaps in the understanding of the biosocial process. Gradually, we arrived at the insight that social development proceeds from the *many-*

party-system over the *one*-party-system (dictatorship) to the *no*-party-system, to natural *work democracy*. A new social conflict appears on the horizon: that between the *world of work* and the *world of politics*.

More and more clearly, we saw that *the pathological character of politics has its foundation in the biopathic character*, in the rigid armoring and fear of life of the mechanized, armored animal, man, which is unable to live without political leaders. The more deeply our research progressed into biophysics, the clearer these facts became, but the greater also our impotence. For now we knew better than before *how deeply* in the biological foundation of man his social misery is anchored, and how gigantic is the biosocial catastrophe of the animal, man.

To the same degree we removed ourselves from everyday politics in which even the best and most honest socialists and liberals had become entangled. We understood the resistance on the part of the responsible politicians against taking cognisance of the magnitude of the problem represented by the "society of the irrationally reacting animal, man." For the more one learned about it the more hopeless it appeared, the more dreadful seemed the social illusion of the possibility of progress *without eliminating that human structure which craves a Führer*.

The more urgently everyday politics called for practical measures, the more sharply stood out the finding of natural science: The social misery has its roots far, far deeper down than we dare acknowledge. It is anchored in the armored character structure of the masses of people. Dictators are not important. Important are only the masses of people. They alone bear the responsibility. They alone can become victorious over themselves. Man is the only animal which has lost contact with life, which became rigid and out of its biological rigidity created the present chaos. The prerequisite for any genuine movement for freedom is the elimination of the conditions and institutions which create character armoring.

This was a shattering realization. How senseless is it to fight dictators and political machines alone! This would change nothing, for the helpless, authority-craving masses would immediately create new dictators of one kind or another, and submit to them. Fascism owes its power to the social helplessness of the masses and the unconscious sympathy of many democratic politicians for fascism (Munich, 1938; Stalin-Hitler pact, 1939).

I do not believe that anyone can envisage the extent and depth of human biopathy who does not continually deal with it professionally. By referring to our findings, somewhat contemptuously, as "simple formulae," he be-

trays complete ignorance of the tremendous complexity of the “simple” facts of sex-economy. This ignorance of the complex nature of our simple contentions is of no lesser danger for the real mastery of the emotional plague than human biopathy itself. He who has such a concept of sex-economy will soon get into insuperable difficulties and will fail in practical reality. He will attempt *ideological* instead of practical solutions. “Affirmation of adolescent sex life” sounds simple, matter-of-course and “revolutionary”—ideologically. But let one try *practically* to remove, say, the obstacles which a youth group meets in the path to a healthy sexual life. Then, one will inevitably fail unless one knows where to look for the enemy: in the party secretary who is worried about the “purity” of the party ideology, the school director who fears for his job, and—in the adolescent himself who suffers from orgasm anxiety, not even to mention ministers and district attorneys of whatever party ideology.

Fascism grew, weedlike, not only in the circles of capitalists but also in the circles of “the little man.” That the capitalists used fascism for their purpose, *once it was there*, and that again the little man got the dirty end of the stick, is another story. If fascism is to be beaten definitively, we must keep clearly in mind that all the nationalist dictatorships which kindled the world war derived their strength from the suppressed masses. This has nothing to do with economics directly; it is the expression of the mass structure, a biopsychological problem which calls for mental hygiene measures on a gigantic scale. No sociologist or politician of the past century could have predicted *that the suppressed masses themselves would one day support the irrational political St. Vitus’s dance*.

This was clear in 1939, and the war confirmed these insights. But I did not dare write it down until 1942 and it was not published until 1943 (“The biological miscalculation in the human struggle for freedom,” *Internat. J. of Sex-economy and Orgone Research*, 2, 1943, 97-121).

Our biosocial insights did not derive from any political interest; on the contrary, they contradicted it. They paralyzed any practical social initiative, for how would one practically master the rigidity of the masses? Nevertheless, we knew that we had seen things correctly and had drawn the correct conclusions. The hatred, the defamations and persecutions which came our way are due, in the last analysis, to the deadly fear of the armored individual of our recognition, that is, *of recognizing himself*. The more we disassociated ourselves from politics and took a long-range view on a natural-scientific basis, the closer we came in reality to social achievement,

the more did we become genuine democrats, work democrats. The demand for an answer to the gigantic problem became more and more urgent. But correct answers cannot be forced in a hurry, particularly to historical social questions. They gradually come about by themselves, according to the law of organic growth of scientific insights. Rash solutions have always proven erroneous, as is clearly shown, for example, by the outcome of the French as well as the Russian revolution. Since none of us made any claim to political leadership, we could wait. We could not have helped anyhow, and there are enough political noisemakers. The relinquishment of political leadership was indispensable if one was to adhere to the *basic problem* of the social tragedy. But it was clear to us that a great social responsibility had become ours; the form of its practical realization will result spontaneously from the further process, if we remain honest.

We know some of the basic reasons for the tragedies of the social revolution, the most important of which is the disrupted biological functioning of the animal, man. Biologically rigid masses of people who are incapable of freedom, cannot suddenly create a genuine democracy. We know theoretically what social measures would be necessary to do the spade work. But practically we have against us not only the powerful apparatus of the organized emotional plague, ready at all times to destroy our existence; more than that, *the masses of people themselves, infested as they are by this same emotional plague, would not let us act.* This is inherent in the facts. It is the most cruel of all facts that the social misery stems from the biological rigidity and fear of life of the masses of people themselves. We have proven this fact. The proofs are everywhere: on the street, at a boxing match where 50,000 people cheer, in the mental hospitals and the wealth of biopathic diseases. Whoever has eyes to see, can see it. To those who cannot see it it cannot be shown. Limiting one's efforts to small circles will lead nowhere. Such a limited attempt would easily be nipped in the bud by the overwhelming majority of life-inimical cultural circles. The political achievement in a small sector of society would be no more than a drop in an ocean of misery. The natural-scientific approach promised no immediate practical action, but it led into the general social problem.

This contradiction between present-day political demand and slow natural-scientific maturing of long-range actions often leads to irrational reactions in our co-workers when they are not able to adapt to the situation. If one feels helpless practically, one cannot retreat to patient scientific

viewing and waiting unless one is engaged in productive scientific research. If, on the other hand, one is engaged in scientific work only, one is apt to lose the social perspective necessary to do what is possible at the right moment. One may then be inclined to become an irrational rebel, or to look down on those with primarily social interests as “non-professionals.” In either case, helplessness in the face of the gigantic problem is at work; it will inevitably lead to irrational actions unless one has learned to master one’s plague reactions. I might be able to save others some errors by relating my own development in the conflict between science and politics.

Until the end of the first world war I was a naive member of the big human herd, that is, “unpolitical,” full of views none of which survived for five years, oppressed by material struggle, etc. Thus I know the little, unpolitical man very well from my own experience. I also was unscientific, for in the college teaching of the old Germany and Austria there was no scientific stimulation. Then, between 1917 and 1927, I became conscious of the nature of science. When political unrest began in Austria in 1927, social interest was added to the scientific. Suddenly, I saw the gigantic contradiction of scientific life and everyday political life. There seemed to be no connection between the two realms; more than that, they seemed to contradict each other. Marx offered sociological science and social direction at one and the same time. Marxism was the only sociological orientation in Europe which pointed *forward*.¹ Then began the sociological criticism—which is still correct—of my scientific psychiatric work. The ensuing 10 years showed this criticism to be highly fruitful for both research and social activity. But the conflict of “science *or* politics” remained insoluble. One could not be researcher and party politician at one and the same time.

So I remained medical researcher, but every scientific fact now came to be scrutinized according to two basic questions:

1. What is the attitude of the ruling public opinion toward this fact?
2. What are the practical social consequences of this fact?

Thus social sex-economy grew out of clinical sex-economy. The practical consequences usually were immediately obvious, such as the social affirmation of natural infantile and adolescent sexuality, or the responsibility of the worker for the social process of production, things which now, 18 years

¹ Until 1939, I knew the nature of the American revolution only from a distance. I cannot enter here upon the vast difference between the American and the European concept of freedom.

later, are the focal points of active struggle. But the question in 1930 was, who should advocate these practical consequences? The obvious answer was: the political parties who, among other things, had included rational sex-political aims in their programs. These were the communist, socialist and liberal organizations. Thus I began to work in the framework of these three organizations.

Later, I found out a tremendous miscalculation. That it took me so long to correct it was due to the erroneous orientation of the freedom organizations in questions of mass psychology.

The miscalculation was the following: *Here* is political reaction which suppresses and exploits the masses. *There* are the masses who are oppressed and yearn for freedom. All one has to do, therefore, is to stimulate, organize and lead these masses, so that they throw off the social shackles of political reaction and create freedom in the world. Accordingly, I organized the Austrian and later the German Sexpol. The task of sex-politics was to provide the masses with rational biosexual knowledge as the economic parties provided them, or tried to provide them, with economic knowledge.

It must be remembered that at that time, fascism was not yet in power; there was as yet no biophysical theory of human depth structure beyond the distinction between "primary" and "secondary" impulses; there was no inkling yet of the characterological anchoring of social suppression in the people themselves. It was believed that social sex-affirmation would be sufficient to master the sexual neuroses. One was convinced that the masses of people had a burning desire for a free life. Their structural fear of freedom and incapacity for freedom was as yet unknown.

Then came the social teachings of the world events: fascism, which is extreme despotism, won over millions of people. This event raised, for the first time in the history of sociology and mass psychology, the question as to *how it is possible that suppressed masses follow political reaction and carry it to power.* I must emphasize the fact here that I was the first to formulate this question in 1930. Today it is widely discussed, usually without mention of its source. I emphasize my priority because I alone had to carry the *responsibility* for the *sex-economic* aspect of the problem while other mass psychologists attempted to comprehend the behavior of the masses in a socially harmless and dangerless manner. With this question, the social accents became shifted: *What was important was no longer the reactionary Führer or capitalist, but exclusively "human nature," that is,*

the human character structure which not only accepted suppression but actually affirmed and furthered it.

It was, then, no longer a matter of suppression on the Right and of being suppressed on the Left. Rather, *social suppression was at work in the people themselves*; not, however, as the manifestation of an allegedly biological “death instinct” or “need for suffering,” as a degenerated psycho-analytic theory put it, but, as sex-economy was first to find, *as the result of socially conditioned rigidity of the human plasma functions which in turn make society mechanistically rigid*. If one does not understand this, one cannot follow a single step of our work. It was essentially this social problem which forced my clinical work into a direction which, a few years later, produced a scientific insight of the first order in the “muscular armor” and “characterological helplessness.” Study of a social problem had fructified medical research.

With the shifting of the social accent from small groups, political parties, individual great men, etc., to the character structure of the masses of people, the Sexpol collapsed, for it had been based on the erroneous concept that “Right is black” and “Left is white.” The dissemination of the natural-scientific findings of sex-economy among the masses met such great difficulties, and finally failed, because it could only penetrate the armoring of the mass individual but not dissolve it. Experience showed again and again that people who were attracted by sex-economy not only had genuine interest, but, on the other hand, *also secondary impulses and a pornographic sexual structure* which made a *responsible* way of living in the sex-economic sense impossible. The pornographic view of sexual life was too deeply rooted and too much socially supported; natural genitility was too disturbed and socially ostracized to allow—as had been my earlier belief—sexual self-regulation and natural functioning. The *longing* for happiness did not have a foundation in the *capacity* for happiness. More than that, political reaction of a Mussolini or Hitler came from the masses; the masses themselves showed themselves to be primarily reactionary. As amazing and painful as this fact was at first, it was matter-of-course when one became used to it: when the masses of people have been kept ignorant for centuries and filled with erroneous, superficial slogans, and kept from regulating their lives themselves, society only reaps the fruits of its crime against these masses. The realization of these facts made the economic point of view of the “Left” parties untenable, for this point of view counted on unequivocally progressive human structures. Clinical experi-

ence shows the masses to be as reactionary as progressive. This makes clear the necessity of still more radical social measures but also removed us more and more from *practical* everyday possibilities. The biological rigidity of the masses made a mass organization *against* the parties impossible. Thus, everyday politics receded more and more into the background, whether we wanted to or not.

More and more, events showed our views to be correct. In Germany, after loosening of the compulsive moralistic fetters, the *secondary, sadistic and perverse* impulses broke through the armor. In the Soviet Union, there was a rapid regression to an authoritarian regime in economy and sex-politics. Unlike the Russians, we knew *why* this regression was "necessary," that is, inevitable. We keep adhering to *the original goal of social and individual self-regulation*, while they do not; *we continue to search for the path to social self-regulation*, while they have given themselves over to illusions. This is because we follow conscientiously the sex-economic process in the individual and in society, while they discard the whole problem of mass psychology as "unproletarian." From a long-range point of view, it makes no difference whether our point of view will be generally recognized as correct and useful in 10 or in 100 years. The responsibility for the millions of human lives lost through the prevailing social shortsightedness is not only ours, but that of the masses.

If, then, one were to avoid catastrophes and at the same time to adhere to the original goal, sex-politics in the framework of party-political organization was out of the question. But there was absolutely nothing that could have taken the place of the old, party-oriented sex-politics. One cannot treat vegetotherapeutically millions of people in order to replace the secondary, perverse impulses by natural genitality. True, it is possible, by way of penetrating clarifications, to smash armorings *en masse*; but what then comes to the surface is brutal irrationalism and not what we strive for: rational self-determination of life.

The alteration of human structure, its de-armorings and the elimination of the secondary, pornographic and sadistic impulses, requires not only a knowledge of the deep biological processes even in the newborn, but also a social environment in which these processes can function in a natural manner. Any kind of authoritarian or mystical form of living makes this impossible. The formal-democratic organizations were, as they still are, permeated to such an extent by authoritarian concepts and practices that they also could not provide a framework. Since political parties have an

authoritarian structure and live on human helplessness, nothing could be expected of them. Thus one was confronted by a big void when one asked oneself what social organization would help the insights of sex-economy and its clear-cut social consequences to come through. This void paralyzed every practical step for a number of years.

However, during these years, an answer gradually and spontaneously formulated itself: *natural work democracy*. Gradually, I came to recognize its existence and mode of functioning. It was easy to see how, again and again, it ran into conflicts with formal-democratic and authoritarian principles. It is now five years since I began to understand its functioning; I still do not know where these observations will lead. To return to the organization of the Orgone Institute:

My attention was called to the work-democratic functioning of society when the reproach was made, in 1938, that I did not give sufficient directions to the members of the organization. In 1939, I was able to answer to this that *every worker must find and secure his own place within the framework of our work methods*. I did not feel like being a "President." I cannot tell the director of a school how to bring up his children, or a director of a birth control clinic how to run it, or the chief of a psychiatric clinic how to treat his patients. In addition, everyone has his own peculiarities in carrying out his work functions, peculiarities which may be at variance with my own or those of others. Nevertheless, our Institute kept together and grew steadily, even though slowly.

On what principle, then, was our organization based, if there were no votes, no directives and commands, no secretaries, presidents, vice presidents, etc.?

What kept us together was our work, our mutual interdependencies in this work, our factual interest in one gigantic problem with its many specialistic ramifications. I had not solicited co-workers. They had come of themselves. They remained, or they left when the work no longer held them. We had not formed a political group or worked out a program of action. It was the demands of the many-sided work and the necessity of solving social, professional and personal problems which, in January 1936, made us form the *Institut für sexualökonomische Lebensforschung*. We had no other than professional meetings. Each one made his contribution according to his interest in the work. One physician raised money because he wanted to see my laboratory grow and wanted to work in it himself. Others translated sex-economic writings and published a Journal in their

own language, without my having suggested it, simply because the work required it. Roger du Teil organized bion research in France because he felt it was his duty as a natural scientist, not because I persuaded him. Neill came because he needed vegetotherapy in the work with his pupils; I, on the other hand, needed his school because it confirmed my concepts of self-regulation by its splendid functioning.

My dependence on the microscope and the thermometer, or the dependence of orgone research on research in electricity and light done by other scientific workers is a *historical work dependence*. In this dependence there is no room for political ideologies. It is the *workers* of all professions and not the Machiavellis who, during the past centuries, have established the historical soil for my work. Just as political ideology cannot do work, so it cannot grasp the work-democratic functioning in social life. Workers criticize results and methods, they learn, and help to *do things better*; they do not call each other "traitor," "spy," "renegade," etc.; they do not shoot each other as the political gangsters do. They do not force anybody to do *their* work, as the politicians force others, at the point of the knife or machine gun, to die for *their* ideas.

My assistants in the bion laboratory came to me because they were interested in *the work*. The one remained for years, because he applied his interest *practically*. The other only wished to be an employee without a responsible interest in the work, or he wanted to become "famous" without practical achievement, and soon dropped out, *automatically*.

One physician returned to his country and spontaneously began to build up a sex-economic nursery. Subsequently, I learned as much from his experiences as he had previously learned from mine. I had not directed him to start this undertaking, I had not even suggested it. He had children himself. Their development, together with his professional interest, gave him the idea of a sex-economic study of infants.

There are, then, objective biological work interests and work functions capable of regulating human cooperation. Exemplary work organizes its forms of functioning organically and spontaneously, even though only gradually, gropingly and often making mistakes. In contradistinction, the political organizations, with their "campaigns" and "platforms," proceed without any connection with the tasks and problems of daily life.

A group of socialists in Holland, whom I did not know personally, published works on political psychology and soon had many followers in various cities. But since they operated partly on the basis of party-political

principles there soon were quarrels, ideology formations and empty, formal organization politics, and the movement disintegrated. So much about the international circle.

There were also the connections with more remote branches of work. For example, the bion research required special kinds of apparatus. An instrument firm in Vienna built these according to my specifications. Without the work of this firm, I could not have proceeded. On the other hand, the firm also gained from the contact with my laboratorium. For example, I demonstrated to the representative of the firm the technique of microphotography at magnifications of over 2000x, something which at that time was a great novelty. If the war had not interrupted this connection, this work connection would have become very fruitful. What right, one must ask, has a political good-for-nothing *to destroy* such achievements? Why are there no laws against such social crimes? Why can a whole world of industrious people be hindered in their work, their lives, and their international intercourse by a handful of parasites?

The following illustration may show how political procedure is at variance with factual work. In the old Sexpol, it was customary to "discuss" scientific questions in the manner of formal-democratic party organizations. I remember a meeting early in 1936, after the discovery of the bions, in which I stimulated a discussion among politically oriented people. I showed a bion film and explained the principle. In the discussion, all kinds of opinions, objections and doubts were expressed, all without any factual basis. From this I learned the following fact: *Factual processes cannot be discussed unless the participants themselves do practical work and have practical experience.* In Germany and Austria, party politicians customarily voted on birth control, social medicine, methods of bringing up children, etc. What nonsense! How can a general or trade union official determine what measures in social medicine are good or bad? How can a party secretary know the requirements of a mental hygiene organization? But in Germany and Austria this kind of work depended on the mentality of a party secretary, and of a neurotic one to boot. The practical result was left to chance: whether this or that official was a humanly open or an ascetic character. This fact alone has wreaked untold damage in many social realms.

Only my trained and practically active assistants can, together with me, determine the tasks of orgone research. Only Neill's pupils and teachers can, together with him, determine the fate of Summerhill School, not I,

or the Secretary of the Orgone Institute, or the manager of the Orgone Institute Press. As long as Neill's educational methods work factually in the direction of self-regulation, and as long as I, in the Orgone Institute, have factual contact with it, the *work-democratic* relationship functions. If Neill, tomorrow, should introduce authoritarian methods of punishment while I should continue to advocate self-regulation and the danger of corporeal punishment; or if I were to advocate the suppression of infantile sexuality while Neill should continue to adhere to self-regulation and sex-affirmation, cooperation would automatically cease. In order to separate from me, Neill would not need to agitate against me or to shoot me. The relationship would dissolve of itself, for there would no longer be a common interest and mutual furthering of functioning.

This is an incontrovertible fact: *If personal enmities, intrigues and political manoeuvres make their appearance in an organization, one can be sure that its members no longer have a factual meeting-ground in common, that they are no longer held together by a common work interest. And where there is no work interest, there is also no work-democratic principle. This is work-democratic self-regulation.* Just as organizational ties result from common work interests, so they dissolve when the work interests dissolve or begin to conflict with each other.

To take another example: Wolfe takes care of our Journal. Our interest in the Journal we have in common with other workers of the Institute. As long as Wolfe functions in his work, as long as I or others write articles in keeping with the demands of the work, the work-democratic relationship continues. True, there may be this or that difference of opinion, but *the function of the Journal takes precedence*, it alone determines the course of the work. There may be differences of opinion as to the size or the character of the publications, but all this remains in the framework of rational work interest. But if Wolfe were to do a poor editing or publishing job, if he used the Journal for personal instead of factual purposes; or if I were to do my scientific work not in the interest of research and of the development of the total work, if, say, I were to modify it in the interest of obtaining a Nobel prize, that is, would let irrational motives interfere with the work, then the work-democratic relationship would collapse, and the Journal with it. In brief, not votes, *not organization politics determine the function of an individual in the total work, but only and alone good or poor work function. Should one of my co-workers better master bion research, orgone therapy and sex-economic theory than I, I would relin-*