

Strick July 2020 OIRC talk, first tape excerpts

I. In this talk, I will outline some of Reich's observations from the printed reports of the Organomic Infant Research Center (OIRC), as well as from audio recordings of OIRC meetings from the Reich archives. Some of these are about the design of the project: Reich felt if improperly designed it would go astray from the outset. Some of these remarks are about obstacles encountered, including character structure obstacles in the workers themselves, physicians, social workers, and educators. Professor Bennett alluded to the structural hate that emerged at the 12 February 1950 meeting. But there was a lot more. So much so that Reich essentially gave up the project after August 1951. These things are extremely cautionary for anyone hoping to simply "launch a self-regulating child enterprise"—be it a nursery, a daycare center, a school, etc. It is important that we learn from these mistakes, as well as from the positive accomplishments and findings of the Organomic Infant Research Center.

Though Reich began the OIRC in December 1949, he was clearly thinking about this as early as the summer and fall of 1944. In a paper that became part of *Cancer Biopathy*, Reich describes the process by which the organs of the infant begin to coordinate with one another, so that the infant coheres as its own independent unit and learns the boundary between itself and the outside world. The infant's organs move and function spontaneously before there is any *purpose*, says Reich.

The eye, for instance, follows a moving hand [its own.] The closing motion of the hand develops long before the infant actually takes hold of any object and has nothing to do with mechanical "grasping reflexes." *Purposeful grasping develops gradually through the merger of many functions, i.e., through the contactful coordination of movements of previously uncoordinated organs.* Purposeful seeing, for instance, is established when the eye comes into contact with a pleasure-inducing movement in the surroundings. Once the act of seeing is accomplished, then the function, already complicated, seeks *new* pleasurable subjects on which to fix the gaze. Unpleasurable stimuli produce contractions and do not develop an act of seeing. The excessive amount of anxiety and displeasure experienced by our infants later leads to "dull eyes," "myopia," restriction of movement of the lids and, with it, to the "dead" expression in the eyes.

In the face of these facts, what can be done with the mechanistic conception that "seeing is the response of the retina to a light ray"? *Certainly*, it is, but the reaction of the retina is only a vehicle, a means of seeing. *Is a child's dancing "only" the contact of*

feet and floor or “only” such and such a sequence of muscle contractions? The emptiness of all the mechanistic interpretations of life is revealed here very clearly.¹

In this passage from Oct. 1944 and the AOI article from July 1944, it’s fascinating to see how Reich, with a new baby in the house, interweaves his thinking about work democracy, his research on preventing cancer, and his thoughts about child development and childrearing.² Here in the summer and fall of 1944 at the latest are the seeds of what would germinate over five years later into the Orgonomic Infant Research Center.

II. As Professor Bennett told us last week, by December 1949 Reich was excited by such observations and had become ready to organize a research effort to better understand the development of infants and children, particularly how to prevent or minimize the armoring process. He emphasized that we know nothing about healthy unarmored expressions in the newborn, or in the early weeks and months of development. Yet he cautioned that “we should not strive to bring up children who have no trouble at all”—that is, an over-idealized fantasy produced by our armored structure—but rather “children who are free of pathogenic armoring, so that no symptom can take root and persist.” As he put it in the initial organizing meeting in Dec. 1949:

Please don’t think now of children brought up in a separate atmosphere. They have to take their damages. We want to see how a child brought up more or less naturally according to its own laws will take such damages. We cannot separate ourselves from the whole social process. We are always in it—ahead of it a stretch, hopefully, but in it.³

In our armored world, Reich said, “Children will get badly entangled emotionally for a long time to come. The main thing is to keep them fit enough for speedy disentanglement.”⁴ Thus, Reich pointed out:

The task of preventative education becomes much simpler. We do not have to watch every one of the child’s millions of thoughts. What we have to do is to keep the child’s biosystem free of any tendency toward stasis of its biological energy. The rest will take care of itself...It is the energy charge accompanying the ideas that counts. Pathological

¹ Cancer Biopathy, *op cit.*, pp. 392-393. Also *Children of the Future* pp. 126-127; “Anorgonia in the Carcinomatous Shrinking Biopathy,” *IJSO* 4: 29.

² Wilhelm Reich, “Work Democracy in Action,” *Annals of the Orgone Institute* 1: 1-32 (1947), completed July 1944.

³ Tape of 16 Dec. 1949 OIRC meeting, Reich archives, Countway Library of Medicine, Boston.

⁴ Wilhelm Reich, *Children of the Future: On the Prevention of Emotional Pathology* (NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1983), p. 63.

ideas collapse like a house of cards if there is no stasis of bioenergy for them to feed on.⁵

Thus, parents need not worry about a child wanting to play with guns, even quite a lot, as long as there isn't chronic armoring. Because that assures there will be no pent up rage or hatred to turn the play pathological. The optimism Reich felt, to which Prof. Bennett referred, also comes through strongly in the Dec. 1949 audio recording:

By exchanging all other principles for the principle of the living protoplasm, we shall find that it affects everything we do, especially in our contact with other doctors on the outside. Even the scene in hospitals changes very fast and for the better, so I want to make clear that we shall not be alone in this, not outside the general stream. We are not isolated, just ahead of most of the stream, but definitely moving in the same direction. We will have contact with the main stream.⁶

Regarding "sexual education" for children and adolescents, Reich insisted it was "by no means enough to give sex information. The child must be protected against the evil ideas and practices of" our sex-negative culture all around them—TV, jokes, clothing, nasty individuals political irrationalism. "And finally," he said, "no mere talking about sex can ever solve the problem. *The child must live its nature practically and fully.*"⁷ The difficulties of creating and defending the necessary circumstances for our children will not soon be solved. But with a bit of courage, it may not be as difficult as we sometimes think.

III. After the first few meetings, when attendance had become spotty, Reich stated a requirement for regular and punctual attendance, saying: "This is not a course where people can come or not come, as they please. That's not because of my preference, but because we would not accomplish our task."⁸ He then outlined a crucial problem: how to popularize organomic knowledge without distorting it. **PLAY TAPE PASSAGE 20 January 1950-- 3:00 to 11:00.**

"In the course of history of natural science, it always happens that profound, true thoughts or true facts, when they are popularized or spread among the people, are always

⁵ Ibid, p. 35.

⁶ Tape of 16 Dec. 1949 OIRC meeting, Reich archives (RA), Countway Library of Medicine, Boston.

⁷ *Children of the Future*, p. 37. Reich-Neill "dulden vs bejahren" sexual lives of kids. Also found on this p. 7-8 of Reich, *The Invasion of Compulsory Sex Morality* (NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1971).

⁸ Tape 1 of 20 Jan. 1950 OIRC meeting, RA, "tape 12."

either distorted or flattened out. Now we understand in part this kind of happening. Certain scientific methods or thought procedures or methods of fact-finding cannot simply be popularized. There is a certain language to science, a certain scientific method, which the average human being does not necessarily understand. Now one of the major problems as we go along in our project is how to popularize ergonomic knowledge: that is, how to enable the average social worker, the theoretically inclined physician, the educator to use our theory—that means to use our concepts, which unite the facts...-- how to popularize without having it flattened out or distorted. And I would like to say right away that the danger, especially of distortion, is particularly great in the case of ergonomics....We know how much emotions are bound up with our work, that we cannot be 'objective,' as the term goes. It gets us in our guts, and in our personal lives we are influenced by it. That means we cannot separate the worker, the observer, from what we observe, from what we see.

"I don't know whether you all agree with me or not, but this scientific principle of cool objectivity and of aloofness, as they call it, is not quite possible in our field. Now we are apt to run into difficulties in other respects, and I think we shall have to surmount this difficulty here. We have to watch out for distortion in the process of popularization.

"Now the first thing that happened already, is that the scientific term 'self-regulation' has been distorted; insofar as nobody really, practically knows what self-regulation is, what it means, and how it can be defined or handled. I already experienced in several cases that self-regulation became a kind of ideology or a kind of slogan: 'From now on we shall be self-regulatory.' Or 'We shall try to apply self-regulation to our children.' Oh, of course they thought 'self-regulation is quite simple. Everybody knows more or less clearly what it means.' But, as you go along in self-regulation, and as a child that has been brought up in a self-regulatory manner meets the world which is not functioning according to self-regulatory principles, things become very complicated. And in due time, you learn to see that it is very difficult to keep going in a self-regulatory manner, if you do not know exactly the laws, the natural laws, on which self-regulation is based. This is quite essential. We cannot do self-regulation by means of 'Thou shalt.' That is out of the question. Either we are capable of

reaching the natural functions in the children, and in the mothers and in the fathers; the natural functions which are in themselves self-regulatory. Or we shall fail.

“If we do not succeed in this, then we shall have a new religion. And this religion will be called the religion of self-regulation or of orgasmic potency. And that would be the worst thing that could happen to a piece of work which was done really by sweating it out, and by very, very serious sacrifice. And I personally declare that I will be the first to fight with all my strength, with whatever I’ve got, against such a distortion of our principles. We must be scientific, we cannot be political, in these matters. And scientific work means to do things, and in order to observe and to know what self-regulation actually is, and to protect then what you have found, we have to go back to the child, and not to impose an idea of self-regulation on something which has nothing to do with it.”

Unfortunately, according to Reich, “self-regulation which is contained in every living substance in every living organism, is not capable of regulating itself in the case of human beings.” Animals regulate themselves. There is no law from above; whatever laws there are, they are natural laws derived from the natural functions. Nobody tells a bird how to build a nest. Nobody tells a dog how to nourish its puppies. “And nobody tells a deer to do that and that in order to survive. It is one of the most dramatic and tragic examples of human misery that the human animal has lost the ability to do and to learn out of its own inner nature. We shall have to understand that, and we shall meet it at every single step of our project. And one of the major requirements here will be that you learn to distinguish a self-regulatory function from a function which is imposed from above....”⁹

Reich asked the participants what would have to be true, in order for parents to be able to receive the new knowledge about allowing self-regulation in children. After a few suggestions, one person said: “When the parents get desperate enough.” Reich agreed. Another asked “but how does such a desperate situation come about?” Reich replied:

That’s a good question. First, people feel that they don’t function well. Now a man or woman of 20 or 30 in 1890 would not have felt anything was wrong with them. But after 30-40 years of struggle to understand the human structure, now such a person realizes and feels that they do not function well....

⁹ Tape 1 of 20 Jan. 1950 OIRC meeting, RA, “tape 12,” from 3:00 to 11:00.

It is true that there is a fear of doing things on a great scope....You should do your small thing [e.g., figure out how to help an individual child]. But you must keep in view the larger social situation. You must see in each child the social situation, thousands of others like that child. You must see this need for salvation that is ravaging the planet today as an expression of possibilities that actually exist, deep down, in people. [i.e., they have the capacity to get out there and do practical work]...[We must] derive social judgments not from political things, but from what do people need. We need to derive our whole view from the needs of the Living in the child. And nothing else....Because the culture, the state, that passes in just a few years. But the needs of the Living in the child have been the same for millions of years...¹⁰

Reich stressed that he did not want to start a movement—“Save the Babies”—he wanted only to observe children and see what the Living is like.¹¹ He warned them to distinguish between natural, primary drives in children and the all-too-common secondary drives—often destructive, “the wild animal”—that result from the frustration of the primary drives. A good example of this distinction was children’s loud vocalizing. Said Reich, “Small children go through a phase of development characterized by vigorous activity of the voice musculature. The joy the infant derives from loud noises (crying, shrieking, and forming a variety of sounds) is regarded by many parents as pathological aggressiveness.” As a result these very young children

are admonished not to scream, to be “still,” etc. The impulses of the voice apparatus are inhibited, its musculature becomes chronically contracted, and the child becomes quiet, “well brought up,” and withdrawn. The effect of such mistreatment is soon manifested in eating disturbances, general apathy, pallor of the face, etc. Speech disturbances and retardation of speech development are presumably caused in this manner. In the adult we see the effects of such mistreatment in the form of spasms of the throat....Clinical experience has taught us that small children must be allowed to “shout themselves out” **when the shouting is inspired by pleasure**. This might be disagreeable to some parents, but questions of education must be decided *exclusively in the interests of the child*, not in those of the adults.¹²

¹⁰ Tape 1 of 20 Jan. 1950, begin at 39:20.

¹¹ Tape 2 of 20 Ja. 1950, 1:00-3:00, “tape 13.” When writing in German, Reich often used the expression “das Lebendige,” which has holistic resonances dating back to at least the 18th century, and which he here renders in English as “the Living.” As used by C.F. Wolff in the 18th c. as an adjective it meant “living” or “lively” and implied “possessing its own forces.” See Sarah Eldridge, *Novel Affinities: Composing the Family in the German Novel 1795-1830*, chapter 3, pp. 35-36, NED - New edition ed., Boydell & Brewer, 2016. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.7722/j.ctt19x3hf5. Accessed 11 June 2020.

¹² *Children of the Future*, pp. 127-128. Originally written Oct. 1944, published in *IJSO* 4 (1945): 29-30, boldfacing mine, italics in original.

Self-regulation could not, however, apply to the armored world of secondary drives.¹³ Nor should they be naïve about the attacks that would come their way. If they could learn to distinguish, then, he said:

I shall have co-workers and not admirers. I don't want admirers. I had enough of that already. You must be clear in every single child, what's nature in it and what's against natural functioning. You must be very skilled to do that....You must be able to protect them.

And I must be able to protect you. From the great dangers that are around....There is a disease in human beings, and we must understand it. [10:16] I don't want you to go out and convince mothers that a child can smash a window. If you do that, you will be smashed down....

You must not only understand what circumcision does to the child. But you must also understand why people do it. And what are the emotions that are bound up with it.

Otherwise the local Orthodox synagogue, for example, will very soon use connections to crush what you are doing, trying to teach parents that circumcision is harmful.¹⁴ And parents—distracted over destructive secondary drives—will know instinctively that you can't confuse "license" with "freedom." Because he was asking a high level of responsibility, more than one of the workers said that after the OIRC was disbanded, they felt relieved.¹⁵

This is not to say that in an armored world nothing in the way of self-regulation can ever work or be helpful to a child. A talk by educator Wilbur Rippey highlighted the many ways in which children's play normally contains significant features of self-regulation, if adults don't intervene too much.¹⁶ And as a teacher for 35 years, I've found that some degree of free choice in a classroom, tied to responsibility, can be felt by students as an invigorating breath of fresh air. It's relative. Furthermore, much recent research on typical children (and adults) has shown that creating a learning environment around "slow learning," with lots of mistakes and no rush to test, actually facilitates more long-term growth and retention of learning. A "slow learning" environment—as described by David Epstein, for example—certainly lends itself far better to

¹³ For more on this, see *Children of the Future*, pp. 47-48.

¹⁴ Tape 2 of 20 Jan. 1950, "tape 13," 10:00-11:00.

¹⁵ Martha Stodt Oxenfeldt, lecture at New School for Social Research, Oct. 1984.

¹⁶ Wilbur Rippey, "Self-regulation Revisited," talk at Orgonon, July 1985, available on dvd from Wilhelm Reich Museum.

relatively more self-regulation—even if few schools can operate in an armored world as Summerhill did under A.S. Neill’s leadership.¹⁷

IV. One of those who expressed relief when the OIRC ended, a social worker Martha McGinty [later, Martha Stodt Oxenfeldt] gave a talk in 1984, in which she elaborated on Reich’s leadership, but also on her own shortcomings as a worker in the project. Ms. Oxenfeldt (nee McGinty) was a social worker in 1945-46 and read *The Function of the Orgasm*, sought out a therapist, and got involved in the “Committee for Self-Regulation.” She reported that, as a therapist Reich was warm and empathetic, and as a scientist had total concentration on whatever was happening, which gave, indirectly, a sense of his urgency. She pointed out that a liability of Reich’s charisma was that when he left for Maine, the workers left behind in New York were without the guidance of his personal presence. I quote from her talk at length here: “I was chosen as a social worker for the OIRC, but this meant that in Reich’s assessment I was likely not to be harmful to children. At no point was I told that I was ‘healthy’ or unarmored or orgasmically potent. I say this because those of you too young to have been there cannot imagine how wild the atmosphere of those times was: how many people were talking about who was orgasmically potent, who had the orgasm reflex and who didn’t.”

....Reich’s criteria for a teacher, among other things, was that s/he must have a satisfactory love life and must be capable of living with children and enjoying it...

In preparing her 1984 lecture, Oxenfeldt had read a report from the OIRC, of a conversation between Reich and herself in August 1951: “His kindness touched me then in person, and I felt it just as clearly from a printed page, over 30 years later.” She had suggested to him that workers meet more regularly in larger groups, instead of in twos and threes as it had been occurring for most of the past year.

Reich replied: “You feel lonely. Before discussing the proposal that workers meet more regularly, let’s discuss the background from which you make this request. Tell me about the school where you have been studying.”

¹⁷ David Epstein, *Range: Why Generalists Triumph in a Specialized World* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2019), esp. chapter 4.

On Reich's recommendation of Bank Street College as one of the best teacher training schools around, she was studying there. She reports on the mocking, slightly pornographic tone with which orgonomy was referred to by many at Bank Street. They have a few good things to say, but only about *Mass Psychology* and *Character Analysis*.

WR: "It's quite logical that they should go through *Mass Psychology* first. They're going the same way I went. First the human interrelationships, and then down into the emotional depths, and from there to the cosmic orgone energy functions. It's even rational that they avoid the core issues. And rational to deny their own orgasm anxiety when confronted with it.¹⁸ Rational in the sense that they wouldn't know what to do with the depths if they were brought out. It would even be dangerous for them to do so.

So your difficulty is, you know something crucial and you can't do anything with it. Now with that predicament, what is your function there?"

MSO: "Well, I'm open about what I believe."

WR: "About what you know. Not what you believe."

MSO: "Well, I was frank about orgonomy in the term papers I wrote, though some professors were quite upset about it. But when people say 'Tell me about the orgone,' I feel horribly inadequate in explaining what I know. I feel terribly inadequate."

WR: "You are learning to be a teacher and you find that you can't teach, is that it? But before you can do anything or teach anything, you have to know not only where they are but where you are. Now the pornographic reaction that you mentioned, that isn't malicious. They don't mean to debunk you. Oh, of course there are some emotional plague characters who are malicious, and you just have to exclude them right away. Have nothing to do with them. But they are comparatively few. In the majority, it's due to the social situation. They don't know any other language. It's the only way of going about life functions that they know. And as we said, their interest in *Mass Psychology* and *Character Analysis* primarily is perfectly natural and quite logical. It's the terror of the middle layer. Always remember the middle layer [i.e., the secondary drives].

¹⁸ For more on orgasm anxiety, see Wilhelm Reich, *The Function of the Orgasm* (NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1973), chap. 5 and especially chap. 8.

We're of course feeling lonely out there in the world, working away. We have a lot more to learn, but we're on our way. We're much further ahead with it here [i.e. Orgonon]. ...So go the lonely way. If you handle such a school properly, you have done a very important thing. Accept your loneliness; it's part of your training. Learn to accept the loneliness without pain. Drink from that well. It will help you. Learn not to yield to people, to 'socialitis.' Of course you need people, you have to have friends. But it's in a different way. Learn how to cope with people, with the plague, and then if you really find somebody, you have something genuine and not all this nuisance friendship. It sounds more frightening than it is. It is most interesting. Be glad that you are in it."

Oxenfeldt (back in the present, in her 1984 talk): "These words of Reich to me become more poignant when you recall that at that very time he was finishing the manuscript to *The Murder of Christ*."¹⁹

V. Another fascinating case, described in *Children of the Future* in the chapter "Armoring in a Newborn Infant," was also documented in an audio recording from October 1950. The recording involved a talk with the parents of one of the children studied (the case reported in *Children of the Future*, pp. 89-113), an examination of the child, and a discussion of the case by Reich.²⁰ The mother had entertained over-idealized notions of being the "healthy mother" of a "healthy baby," and was therefore surprised and overwhelmed to find that caring for a young infant is emotionally and physically pretty demanding. She didn't at first understand, when the child cried, what it needed. But her previous fantasy made that a surprise, which made her doubt herself, rather than anticipating and recognizing that a new baby means a big period of adjustment and a challenge to stamina. The more anxious (and eventually depressed) she became, the more anxious and hard to satisfy the baby became, resulting in a vicious cycle.

Reich comments in *Children of the Future* that parents' pride in their children's self-regulatory behavior (as he learned from his own experience) can quickly become mixed up with their own neurotic needs. The disappointment and hurt pride they feel, the first time real

¹⁹ Martha Stodt Oxenfeldt, lecture at New School for Social Research, Oct. 1984; given again at Orgonon, July 1993.

²⁰ This case was originally published in *Orgone Energy Bulletin*, (1951). On this case see also Jean Harris, "'Dear Child': Letters to an Unborn Child," *Offshoots of Orgonomy* 5 (Autumn 1982): 58-59.

world difficulties mess up their over-idealized picture of themselves as “self-regulatory parents” can become a major obstacle that makes the situation worse—to the extent they are unaware of this and unable to quickly drop their false pride when they see it in themselves. Reich cautions: “How harmful the consequences of false pride are should be a subject of deep reflection.”²¹

In addition to the material later published on this case, a number of important points were made.²² For instance, referring to the mother’s depression over feeling less than ideal, Reich noted:

When she felt tense, the child nursed poorly and was not satisfied at the breast. The sucking process is not only a mechanical physical intake of fluid. We have always assumed that the quality of the milk must change when a woman is depressed... whether the nipple is sweet or sour. Now we don't know what that means, “sour.” But I’m going to try to relate it to hyperacidity in the stomach in depression....When we say that somebody “turns sour” emotionally, it refers to an actual physical reality in the body of the person.

Recall Reich’s “basic antithesis of vegetative life,” in which a preponderance of hydrogen ion, acidity, is related to sympathetic effects of the autonomic nervous system.²³

This child eventually developed a bronchitis. Reich noted that most doctors would see this as nothing abnormal:

“Why shouldn't the child get a cold?” and so on. But we try to keep an open mind on these matters....If we assume orgone biophysical unity of child and mother, then how can we separate the cold from the mother's depression?....I am inclined to understand a cold as a disturbance of the bioenergetic equilibrium of the child. Perhaps the lining of the tubula react to the emotional changes one way or another....It’s important to ask such questions.

Perhaps the most important point in this meeting was Reich’s emphasis that no mechanical prescription for handling these problems is possible; i.e., that the essential element was the quality of the contact on the part of the physician, social worker, parent, or whoever the intervening person might be. While being examined, the child was crying and in considerable distress. Its chest was held rigidly high. Reich felt a need to help it. He just put his

²¹ *Children of the Future*, p. 54-55, quote on p. 55.

²² Tape 1 of 21-22 Oct. 1950 OIRC meeting, RA, “tape 23.”

²³ See, for example, Reich, *The Function of the Orgasm*, chapter 7.

hands on the sides of the child's thorax, and it felt the warmth. He very gently stroked the intercostal muscles, but did not 'massage' the chest.²⁴ Reich described the results:

Then the child caved in. It peed. Felt relieved. I was surprised. I had never seen anything like that before. [28:00] My daughter, Dr. Eva Reich, after 6 years in medical school and 2 years working in a hospital...asked "What did you do there?! How did you do that?" And I said to her: "What does a painter do when painting a landscape? Does he paint a blue spot 2 cm. by 2 cm., and then outside of it a green spot 1/2 cm. in diameter, and then a streak of white 10 cm. long by 1 cm. wide? No. He just paints it."...Of course I could see that the chest was high, but I wasn't going on a formula. I just came there, and out of my knowledge came what I did. I didn't massage or even tickle....If we could just teach this much to doctors and nurses, we'd be accomplishing a great deal.

The child soon began crying again, however, and it became clear that its chest was held rigidly high. Reich tried again to get it down. After awhile of no success, he said:

"I can't deal with the armor. You can't [turning to his students] do anything about it. The mother needs to work on this. [Then, to the child, as it cries] **"Yes, be angry! Be angry!!"**

The child responded by crying more vigorously and deeply, then after awhile it calmed a bit.

Reich: "Now what did I do?...It has nothing to do with quantity....It has only to do with having contact with this baby and how it feels....Now I'm sorry to have to repeat this again, but what I don't want is for social workers, psychologists, etc. to go out and press down babies' chests [mechanically]..."

Yet he felt anxious about the danger that the professions would turn it into this, to make money. He said it could be important for parents to be able to do this kind of first aid. One of Reich's students, Dr. Richard Singer, said that in the community he worked in, however, out of 100 mothers he had interviewed, only two had the contactfulness to be able to do this. Reich: "This cannot be ignored. It must be taken into account. It's clearly a major obstacle."²⁵ About this kind of first aid for parents and babies, we will hear much more from Dr. Thomas Harms in his upcoming talk.

²⁴ *Children of the Future*, p. 107.

²⁵ Tape 1 of 21-22 Oct. 1950 OIRC meeting, RA, "tape 23".

VI. At this point in that same (Oct. 1950) meeting, Dr. Chester Raphael, one of Reich's students, had presented his report on orgone treatment during labor, later published in *Orgone Energy Bulletin*²⁶ (available as a reprint from the Wilhelm Reich Museum bookstore). Raphael had used orgone therapeutic procedures to intervene in two cases of women in labor, in which their severe anxiety reactions were causing the process to be more painful and protracted than necessary. Helping them stay in contact during the process had greatly eased things, to an extent that surprised even him. Thereby it also prevented a cascade of further medical interventions, highly disempowering to the woman, of the kind that so often end up in emergency C-section. Discussion followed his presentation.²⁷ On another occasion, at a 1993 conference, Dr. Raphael described these cases in person. He emphasized that in modern medicine

The tendency is to direct attention only to where the pain is, rather than to the total organism. I hadn't the slightest idea what to do in this situation (having been called to help out a woman having difficulty in labor with some kind of orgonomic 'first aid'), but in observing her, I felt what I could try....You have the feeling that you can do something about it. It seemed so clear and effective....²⁸

Many nurse-midwives, including upcoming speaker Renata Reich Moise, are indeed working along these lines—I'm sure we will hear much more on this from her.

²⁶ Chester Raphael, "Orgone Treatment During Labor," *OEB* vol. 3 (1951), pp. 90-98.

²⁷ Tape 2 of 21-22 Oct. OIRC meeting, RA, "tape 24."

²⁸ Chester Raphael, talk at Orgonon, 16 July 1993.