

# **WILHELM REICH: The Dean of Sex Revolution**

©2005 By Marvin H. Clark, Jr., esq

Wilhelm Reich. A name which shall live in infamy. He ought to have been thankful to America for giving him refuge from Hitler's satanic holocaust. But instead, he turned his sexual perversion loose on an unsuspecting Christian nation and began seeking her demise from the moment he arrived. Reich was well-known as a sexually fanatic communist in Europe. But his generous American hosts never suspected the immense hatred for Christians that lurked beneath his breast.

Reich was born to wealthy, non-observant Jewish parents on March 24, 1897, in Galicia, which now is known as "Eastern Europe." His parents excluded him from all children outside the family, both Jewish and Gentile, and gave him a corrupted personal tutor during his early years.<sup>1</sup> His writings and associations later in life clearly were Sabbatian in nature.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Fury on Earth, by Myron Sharaf, St. Martin's/Marek, New York, 1983, pp. 36-52.

<sup>2</sup>"**Sabbatians**" were renegade followers of Sabbatai Zevi, who, in 1666A.D. was proclaimed "messiah" by Nathan of Gaza in Palestine. His arrival was celebrated worldwide by many who were deceived. This false messiah was a "son of perdition" because he married a prostitute and preached that Israel could be redeemed through the commission of evil deeds and abominable, blasphemous sacrilege. Later leaders of this sect, all claiming to be reincarnated from this man, included the need to weaken non-Jewish government and gentile societies. The idea was that Israel "must amend itself and become its own messiah." The entire history of this movement to the present era is available from strictly Jewish sources. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, by the late Gershom Scholem (professor of Jewish Mysticism at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem), Schocken Books, New York (1971); *Sabbatai Zevi: The Mystical Messiah*, by Gershom Scholem, Princeton University Press (1973) (1000 pages long); *To Eliminate the Opiate*, by Rabbi Marvin S. Antelman, Zahavia LTD., New York-Tel Aviv, 1974; *Politics of Bad Faith*, by David Horowitz, Simon and Schuster, New York (1998); *America's Real War*, by Rabbi Daniel Lapin, Multnomah Press, 1999.

At the age of eleven, young Reich found himself seduced by one of the household maids. Shortly after experiencing sexual intercourse, he in turn discovered his mother having sex with his tutor. Reich later admitted that his thought was to demand sex from his mother, too, in exchange for his silence. However, he declined and eventually informed his father. The resulting disaster caused his mother's suicide,<sup>3</sup> for which he blamed himself. His later writings certainly reflect deep seated hatred for his father, no doubt in connection with the same event.

After losing his mother, Reich was sent to attend school in Czernowitz, where his experience with the household maid held him in good stead with prostitutes at local brothels. He apparently also bumped into a number of his school teachers in those brothels, too.<sup>4</sup>

When Russian troops invaded the country in 1915, Reich joined the Austrian army, saw combat, and wound up a defeated veteran three years later. He decided to study medicine in Vienna, and there he fell under the spell of his great mentor, Sigmund Freud. Thereafter Reich wrote, "...I have become convinced that sexuality is the center around which revolves the whole of social life, as well as the inner-life of the individual."<sup>5</sup>

While in Vienna, Reich also joined Schoenberg's music society and so was linked with origins of the vaunted 12-tone system that later contributed Rock and Roll to the American culture war. But psychoanalysis proved to be his first love. Accordingly, he became one of Freud's most promising proteges.

Like his famous mentor, Reich also began seeing patients to his sexual advantage and

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 56

wound up having sex with one of these, a Jewish girl named Annie Pink. When the girl's parents caught on to the relationship, her father solved Reich's ethical problem by simply demanding that Reich marry her.<sup>6</sup> Reich apparently did so with some reluctance. Eventually the bride also became a practicing psychoanalyst.

Marriage proved unfulfilling for this young man who later would rage vehemently against the requirement of lifelong commitment. Not long after the wedding, Reich was again enjoying himself freely. In fact, one of the patients Reich used as a lover died of an abortion he obtained for her. His guilt carried over into his home, and soon he was wildly accusing his wife of engaging in the same illicit activities that he was into. Reich was the ultimate narcissist. He never admitted fault. Instead he sought to rid himself of guilt by rationalizing. Quite possibly, Reich built his entire career upon the projection of personal guilt through his writings and activities to further political causes.

To Wilhelm Reich, the entire world could be reduced to one word: sex. As a psychoanalyst, he was convinced that sex motivated all personal instincts. As a socialist, he came to believe that all social problems also were rooted in Christian repression of sex. Therefore, it is not surprising that after joining the Communist Party he immediately began attempting to marry the theories of Sigmund Freud to those of Karl Marx.

Please recall from our discussion of Karl Marx that most of the "socialist" philosophies had their genesis with the theories of Rousseau and Hegel. Those elder philosophers aimed at the creation of a "Super-State:" a totalitarian structure under which common people could be controlled by the elites.

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 108-109.

Christianity brought individuality and education, which in turn spawned freedom and democracy. Consequently, the elites lost control over little people and they wanted it back.

After Hegel, an army of political philosophers came into being, who sought to advance Hegel's theories. But divisions in that army soon appeared: the Hegel Left and the Hegel Right. The Hegel Left believed in "International Socialism" built upon total state ownership and one-world government. The Hegel Right believed in "National Socialism" built upon huge corporate cartels with individual national governments. Those of the Hegel Left were the Communists. Those of the Hegel Right were Nazis. Both systems denied individuality and freedom. Now, Reich would try to introduce into this theoretical matrix the Freudian free sex movement. It only remained for the grasping elites to recognize strength in Reich's arguments, and to give them the "nod."

To this day, Wilhelm Reich is well remembered for his "Sex-Pol" movement during the waning days of the German Weimar Republic that existed between the two World Wars before Hitler came to power. Reich made a name for himself by holding town rallies in Austria and Germany to promote the political virtues of infantile masturbation and pubertal sex. In 1929 he organized the "Socialist Society for Sexual Advice and Sexual Research." That organization then set up half a dozen clinics in poor sections of Vienna, where people were urged to recognize the sexual basis for socio-political problems. After 1930, Reich even succeeded in having his "Sex-Pol" movement brought under the umbrella of the German Communist Party. This Sex-Pol organization grew to 40,000 members.

It wasn't long, however, before Reich's loud nature became an annoyance to Communists and psychoanalysts alike. By the end of 1932, the Communist Party decided that Reich's efforts

to link sexual and political revolution was a political liability. Reich was expelled from the German Communist Party the next year. After Reich published his book, Mass Psychology of Fascism (1933), the International Psychoanalytic Association became equally concerned for its good relations with German Nazi's and expelled him from that subversive movement as well.

Following these expulsions, Reich entered a "no-man's" world where he seemingly became at odds with everyone. He became the proverbial prophet rejected by his own. But the Communists and psychoanalysts both were social-political movements seeking their own identities - - each with its own idea about remaking the world after a new image. Reich saw the two ideologies as totally compatible and predicted that neither could conquer the world without the help of the other. He failed to live long enough to witness the two movements joining forces in America.

Reich saw Marxist ideology as far too brittle and felt that it should be made more adaptable to changing times. He also saw Freudian psychology as too limited in that its principles were not being applied on an mass scale. Reich saw little difference between repressed hungry coal miners and repressed sex-starved young people. The former had a hungry stomach. The latter a starved libido. Reich felt that the libido could be manipulated into revolution just as easily as the stomach. He was correct. But because those in high places didn't invent this idea themselves, there was a natural tendency to ignore the loudmouthed young upstart from Galicia.

When Hitler turned his armies against Great Britain and Jews in 1939, Wilhelm Reich left for safer parts in America, where he once again set up shop and began promoting his blend of

thought. He passed somewhat unnoticed at first, and rewrote two of his most famous works for the American market, The Sexual Revolution, and Mass Psychology of Fascism. Abandoning his loyalty to Kremlin ideologues, Reich stripped out most of the identifiable communist lingo previously contained in these books, making them more saleable to Americans. But Reich's extreme nature eventually became his ultimate undoing.

As Reich began to age, he also seemed to become psychotic. Possibly Reich was merely being a psychoanalyst when he began inventing fantasies to support his social theories - - just as Freud had done. Reich claimed to believe that, not just the earth, but the entire cosmic universe could be explained by the word "sex." Reich proclaimed that he had discovered a strange "energy" called "Orgone" that was generated naturally by organic matter coming into contact with metallic matter. He claimed that this energy provoked sexual instincts and behaviors. In fact, Reich even claimed that the "Milky-way" galaxy was shaped like a huge "69" because of the massive presence of Orgone energy that kept the whole universe in a perpetual state of orgasm! Reich's claims were similar to those of Fleiss, Freud's bisexual lover, who built weird theories around alleged male "menstrual" cycles that supposedly led to Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo.

In any event, Reich reasoned that Orgone energy could be put to good use in curing sexual dysfunction. He built what became his famous "Orgone Energy Accumulator," that allegedly collected and fed the mysterious "gas" into a large wooden box about the size of a refrigerator. His "patient" was instructed to sit in the box, breath this "gas", and then to go forth having bigger orgasms! This would be humorous enough, except that Reich soon began selling his invention as a cure for other ailments - - including cancer. This then landed him in a federal prison where he finally died in 1957. Some indications point to tertiary syphilis as a cause of his

death. Perhaps the syphilis also would account for his seeming insanity in later years.

Wilhelm Reich's awkward demise ought not be an excuse for dismissing his main writings as unimportant. The author has sound reasons to suspect that Reich's good work may have fallen into evil hands in high places, hands that were eager to use it, but wanted to avoid being exposed to the more embarrassing aspects of Reich's teachings. Reich was a megalomaniac, and if his theories would be implemented on a grand scale, he never would have been silent and allowed others to take credit. Reich would have insisted upon center stage, along with his Orgone energy theories, which would have discredited the entire program. Reich had to be eliminated - - to be silenced permanently - - so that his social theories could be effectively put to use by street level revolutionaries. This is perhaps circumstantial reasoning, but Reich's books, The Sexual Revolution and Mass Psychology of Fascism, as well as his essays contained in a posthumous work entitled Sex-Pol, contain theories which have since been fully implemented by the Radical Left. What Reich proposed in full detail, now has become the essence of American pop-culture. The editor of Sex-Pol, Lee Baxandall, wrote,

“The integration of Reich's work with that of his peers and successors, and into the structures of our own lives and organizations and thought, is a process that can be said to have begun but has no ending in prospect.”<sup>7</sup>

Approximately 160,000 copies of the Sexual Revolution reportedly were marketed in America during the 1960's. One would assume that most of these were sold to activists and

---

<sup>7</sup>Sex-Pol, by Wilhelm Reich, Random House, New York, 1928-1934, Foreword by Lee Baxandall, p. vi.

academicians of the Radical Left. Christians never even sensed that this man existed, even though Radical students in Europe were pelting riot police with copies of Mass Psychology of Fascism during this same era. Everyone knows that the phrase, “the sexual revolution” became popular in America during the 1960's, and Wilhelm Reich deserves the credit that he never received for that crime.

More than any other philosopher involved, Wilhelm Reich had the greatest influence in causing an acute cultural civil war in America that has been raging since 1964. He built his ideas on the writings of his predecessors. Others have picked up and carried his drum, and have beaten it loudly in their own names ever since. Nevertheless, Wilhelm Reich is one of the most culpable individuals we shall ever confront.

When the Communist Bolsheviks hijacked the Russian Revolution and seized power there, international socialism already was attempting to mutate into a more survivable form. There were elements of the movement that recognized changing conditions. Unfortunately, the Germans who financed Lenin's Bolsheviks did so in order to take Russia out of World War I. They chose Lenin for that purpose *only*, not to create any kind of worker's paradise. The Bolsheviks were labeled as “vulgar Marxists” because of their fundamental adherence to the Marxist dogma of “dialectical materialism.” This was the kind of mind set that says, “We don't care if our idea doesn't fit reality, we'll simply change reality to fit our idea.”

By the time Reich became a Communist a decade later, the failure of Lenin's “Russian” Revolution was evident. Lenin's successor, Stalin, had ditched “internationalism,” and was in truth a “national socialist.” Stalin acted to save Russia -- or what was left of it. Stalin asserted that “international” socialism would be directed only from Russia, and demanded allegiance from



Communist parties world wide. True internationalists, like Leon Trotsky, who were merely nihilistic destructionists were driven out of the party. Stalin, who had his own mental problems, then lapsed into a paranoiac rut, from which he ruled by means of revolving murderous purges. And so, intellectual life within Communist ranks became ossified and frozen, never to thaw again until the whole system crumbled and collapsed 74 years after the Revolution.

Reich noticed that in the Soviet Union the Communists repeatedly had problems which, he figured rightly, were rooted in human nature. It seemed as if the Bolsheviks always were trying to force a square peg into a round hole. For instance, party members lost their desire to sacrifice as soon as family interests became affected. Women lost interest in work if they were required to turn their children over to communal nurseries (daycare). Party officials had trouble enforcing rules that impacted their own families. There also was the problem of male workers disappearing from remote places where men were required to work long stints in isolation from family and women. All of these manifestations affected productivity and progress of the revolution. Reich concluded that the Communists were orchestrating their revolution in a backwards manner. This, of course, put him on a collision course with “vulgar” Marxism.

Vulgar Marxists expected a collectivist culture to result from a collectivist economic system. They ignored Max Weber’s observation that things happen the other way around: economic systems result from particular cultures. Needless to say, Reich didn’t have much of an audience at Party headquarters. But Reich spoke up anyway, and declared that the Party program never would get out of the ditch until the Party first changed the people’s psychic nature, or in other words, the culture. So long as the people possessed a psychic nature based upon individualism and family norms that survived the old regime, they never would develop a truly

collectivist attitude toward the revolution. Without the collectivist culture to support it, the Communist revolution would be doomed to failure. Communal life requires people with “collectivist” instincts, rather than those of rugged individualists and family orientation.

Putting things differently, rugged “individualists” usually demand independence and are apt to rebel against the control of any aristocratic elites. “Collectivists” are sheep – herd animals – who will respond positively to control if mere pressure is applied to the herd.

Reich reasoned that “individualism” came from infantile development within the nuclear family. “Collectivist” instincts would result when children would be raised “by the village” within communal nurseries. In that situation, the child bonds with the “collective” of its peers, not with its parents. The patriarchal father is easily replaced by the State. Only people raised from infancy in such surroundings would be capable of establishing true collectivist communism.

To accomplish the collectivist instincts in society, Reich suggested abolition of the family, communal rearing of children, and total destruction of all moral inhibitions concerning sex. Reich said that sexual restraints imposed by religion were intended to support not only the church, but the nuclear family, which in turn became the foundation upon which power of the old regime was laid. By eliminating all sexual restraints, Christianity and the family would be destroyed. And by erasing all memory of “family” ties, all of the problems in production that resulted from family considerations would cease. Free sex would, Reich reasoned, also pacify workers and make them happier about their conditions in the work place.

Wilhelm Reich possessed an active mind and a loud mouth. He knew what was wrong with Communist Party methods in the Soviet Union, and said so. He tried mightily to change those methods. But in the end, he too failed to win approval and was thrown out of the

Communist Party.

Reich also was one of the first Communists to notice that Party dogma often violated the vital interests of common people. Reich took the Communist theory of “Class Struggle,” and asked a very simple question from a psychological point of view: “What is class consciousness?” Reich concluded that there is no single way to define class consciousness and that it might vary greatly, depending on conditions and circumstances. Reich’s proposal was to put a “human face” on theory and to put the Party apparatus at the disposal of issues that supposedly concerned common people.

When one stops to think about it, one can easily think of dozens of ways to divide a people over various issues. Reich’s idea was to look for those controversial issues and to figure out how to manipulate the outcome to Communist advantage. This very strategy is at the heart of what now is called, “Critical Theory.” Some refer to it as “dialectical imagination.” The “movement” is limited only by the “imagination” of those who apply dialectical logic to contrived issues. It is the strategy that has been applied in America for decades already.

Reich put forth his proposal as follows:

*Let us try to formulate the question in another way. Everything that contradicts the bourgeois order, everything that contains a germ of rebellion, can be regarded as an element of class consciousness; everything that creates or maintains a bond with the bourgeois order, that supports and reinforces it, is an impediment to class consciousness.<sup>8</sup>*

Instead of simply dividing society according to “the haves and the have-nots,” Reich was one of the first to realize that classes of people might be made hostile to Christian culture through other

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 295.

issues: those relating to gender, age, marital status, desire for abortion, sexual preference, occupation, race and on and on.<sup>9</sup> But when Reich made these proclamations, Communist Party officials were in such a rut that no one would listen to him. So far as the vulgar Marxists controlling the Kremlin were concerned, the only “proletariat class” that they needed was that of “workers and peasants.” They simply couldn’t accept a proletariat class comprised of disparate groups ranging all the way from environmentalists, feminists, elders, children and gun haters, to drug addicts, handicapped, consumers, “sex workers”, racial multi-culturalists, homosexuals, and yes, even pedophiles.

As a psychoanalyst, Reich already had targeted sexual desire, with its immediate link to the Christian family structure, as a lucrative target to exploit. Having once been young in the heart of Christendom, he knew that millions of Christian youth could be caused to rebel on the question of pre-marital sex. Reich reasoned correctly that an entire movement could be based upon that one topic alone. This was what his “Sex-Pol” movement was about. Reich was a man ahead of his time. His other weird ideas about Orgone energy eventually made him an outcast almost everywhere.

There were other currents also flowing against Reich. As described early in this text, the Bolsheviks did attempt a sexual revolution at one time. The family and marital laws put into effect by Russian Communists in 1918 were virtually identical to those now on the books in most American states today; the results were identical too: social chaos, parents abandoning their responsibilities in droves, leaving children victimized by broken homes. Juvenile delinquency and crime went out of control. Children slept unattended and unfed on Moscow streets because

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 277-358

their parents abandoned them for “new” families or just plain “free sex.” The Russians tried it all, long before America did. But, to the credit of the godless Communists, they wisely recognized the dangers of total collapse inherent in such a sexual revolution and tried hard to brake it. Measures were reversed, and the government attempted to reinstall the family, but the damage already was done. Even after 74 years, the Communists never were able to correct all of the damage done to Russian society in only 10 years of folly. Ultimately, that damage contributed greatly to their total collapse.

Reich was incensed that the Russians had rejected sexual revolution because of social “chaos.” Reich indicated that “chaos” was the main object of sexual revolution, because a whole population of people with chaotic lives won’t care what their government does to them!<sup>10</sup> One can only imagine the ego of any megalomaniac who would clearly indicate such a bold statement for all the world to read. Reich wasn’t just a sex pervert. He was the ultimate sadistic monster who should have been sent to prison for promoting crimes against humanity instead of the relatively petty crimes for which he eventually was prosecuted. Unfortunately, Reich was stopped much too late, after his ideas already had fallen into very dangerous hands - - exceedingly powerful hands - - that have used them as weapons to destroy the finest Christian society our world has ever known

### Reichian View of Christian Homes

To better perceive how this has been done to us, and to recognize just where we might need to go in changing the situation, it will help to look more closely at Reich’s ideas. Some

---

<sup>10</sup>The Sexual Revolution, by Wilhelm Reich, Orgone Institute Press, New York, 1945, p. 195

basic definitions are in order at this point.

#### Authoritarian Society

Reich classified Christian society as an “authoritarian” society. The term “authoritarian” connotes *illegitimate authority*. A socialist society would not be “authoritarian” according to Reich, even though personal freedoms might be fewer, because the socialist society would possess “legitimate” authority to repress those freedoms.

#### Patriarchal Society

Any social structure that is built around the authority of a father in the home.

#### Authoritarian Home

Reich classified the patriarchal home as an “authoritarian” home because he defined the father’s authority as “illegitimate,” and supportive of Authoritarian (Christian) society and State. He said that the father would represent the authority of God and government in the home, and would repress illicit sexuality.

#### Matriarchal Society

Any social structure that is built around the authority of a mother in the home.

#### Non-Authoritarian Home

Reich classified the matriarchal home as “non-authoritarian” because, 1) he defined the mother’s authority as legitimate, and 2) because the matriarchal home lacks sexual norms (anything goes).

#### Communist Household

Reich accepted the concept of a “Communitistic household,” as defined by Frederick Engels and Karl Marx, because in such a household the authority of the matriarch is supreme. In this kind of household the children are raised by their mothers without the influence of their fathers, and males are viewed as merely transitory personalities who come and go in the life of the mother. The idea of lasting commitment to marriage is absent from this model.

#### Mysticism

Reich used this word to refer to monotheism, particularly Christianity, in the *spiritual* context.


### Fascism

Reich defined Fascism as the basic emotional attitude of people in Christian Society and its “mystical” conception of life. “Fascist Mysticism” is the orgasmic yearning within people in Christian society, which is restricted by mystic distortions and the inhibition of natural sexuality. Fascism is whatever Reich and his kind don’t like.

### Bourgeois Order

The Christian middle-class.

In his book, *The Sexual Revolution*, Reich leans upon Freud’s categorization of the traditional Christian patriarchal home as “authoritarian” in nature. Reich correctly analyzes this home as consisting of a triangle:



In a home of this constellation, the child is wedged in between two figures, the father and mother. These two figures are, in Freudian terms, the child’s “super-ego,” which asserts coercive pressure to cause the child to control his “primal instincts.” In other words, they act together to help the child build good character. When the child becomes unruly, the mom says, “If you don’t

mind me, when your pappa gets home from work, he's gonna spank you!" The child's mind is thus imbued with a healthy level of fearful respect, and he does as he is told. Thus, the father serves as the age-old enforcer of moral and cultural values.

Reich declared that this traditional family model no longer serves any legitimate function. Reich declared its authority to be "illegitimate," because, he said, this kind of family only serves as "the factory for authoritarian ideologies," and "conservative structures." Reich declared that the father is nothing less than the exponent and representative of the anti-Communist government authority within the family. Hence, the father and his coercive "paddle," must be eliminated from the family structure.<sup>11</sup>

Furthermore, Reich declared that education within the traditional Christian patriarchal family lays the basis for a "marriage and family" mentality. This is because the parents emphasize "eating and excretion" while "strictly prohibiting genital activity."<sup>12</sup>

"The ideological and educational inhibitions of sexuality, with the simultaneous witnessing of the most intimate acts among the adults, already lay in the child the basis for sexual hypocrisy."<sup>13</sup>

Hence, Reich seems to be reacting to his own sad childhood experience in making this argument.

Reich declared that parental repression of sexuality should be ended. Children ought to be encouraged to masturbate and to play genitally with children of the opposite sex.<sup>14</sup> If children from three years onward were brought up outside the influence of parents, they would develop an

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 71-79.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 75



entirely different sexuality. Even a few hours daily in the traditional family is an impediment to this process. Reich declared that the “parental fixation” (within the family triangle) makes the step into sexual and social rebellion at puberty difficult if not impossible to achieve.<sup>15</sup> To destroy this parental fixation, the children ought to be taken away.

“The psychoanalysis of men and women of all ages, all countries, and every social class shows that *the interlacing of the socio-economic structure with the sexual structure of society and the structural reproduction of society take place in the first four or five years in the authoritarian family*. The church only continues this function later. Thus [the family] becomes the factory in which the state’s structure and ideology are molded.”<sup>16</sup>

Reich pointed out that the greatest difficulties encountered by the Soviet government in its Communist revolution were the result of family ties. When it came to stripping private owners of their property, the greatest resistance came from the small and medium property owners. This was because of the family atmosphere that exists in such small enterprises. He added that it is this same atmosphere within the middle class family that is known to produce “the best nationalistic fighters and to imbue the women with nationalistic fervor.”<sup>17</sup>

“This economic and family situation would break down if it were not secured by a specific relationship between man and woman, a relationship we designate as patriarchal, and a mode of sexuality derived from this specific relationship.”<sup>18</sup>

Reich said that the moralistic attitudes concerning sex (which, interestingly, he and all the rest of his ilk call “philistine”) ultimately result in feelings of *honor* and *duty*, and that these

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 76-77

<sup>16</sup>Mass Psychology of Fascism, by Wilhelm Reich, Farrar, Straus & Giroux, New York, 1933, pp. 29-30.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 51

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 51

feelings of honor and duty in turn support the family, the church, and the state. Therefore, if the wife and children within the home become sexualized, they will lose their feelings of duty and honor, and this underpinning of Christian society will be lost.<sup>19</sup>

Reich said that it is the authoritarian family that ties the child to sexual inhibitions. It is the biological tie of the child to the mother and vice versa that prevents the child from entering into sexual relations outside of the marital relationship. The tie to the mother is the basis of all family ties, and in their subjective emotional core the notions of homeland and nation are notions of mother and family. The family constitutes the “nation in miniature.”<sup>20</sup>

“Sexual desires naturally urge a person to enter into all kinds of relations . . . in a variety of forms. If they are suppressed, they have but one possibility: to vent themselves within the narrow framework of the family.”<sup>21</sup>

This then lays out the family as the basis for state, culture and civilization, all in one. This is why Reich said that the family is “political reaction’s germ cell.” The family is the basic unit that generates all cultural values. Reich declared that this “germ cell” would break down and fall apart if the patriarchal relationship between man and woman, and its peculiar mode of sexuality, would be destroyed.

Reich said that children naturally develop enormous hatred toward family during puberty and that if this hatred is allowed to become conscious through rebellion against parental control, then the child might develop into a powerful revolutionary force to be manipulated by Party

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid, pp. 52-54

<sup>20</sup>Ibid, pp. 56-57

<sup>21</sup>Ibid, p. 56

cadre.<sup>22</sup> Reich added that those rebellious youth who would fail to connect with Communist social movements might wind up mislabeled as “morally insane delinquents” - - psychopaths and impulsive characters.<sup>23</sup> No doubt these are the “outcast” kids who have been going into our schools and killing everyone.

On the other hand, Reich said that young people who could not be made to rebel during puberty would wind up with “repressed hatred.” These, he said, would wind up “blindly loyal” to the patriarchal family structure, conservative society, and the “authoritarian” (Christian-based) state. These conservative young people, he said, would then be lost to the cause and would not become revolutionary fighters for “freedom.”<sup>24</sup> Reich’s bottom line is that the family must be destroyed because it is a fortress of the conservative social order, the *Christian* social order, and it guarantees the maintenance of the “authoritarian” state and of conservative society.<sup>25</sup> In short, the home must be gutted because it supports *Christian* institutions.

The question I ask of deChristianized members of the National Rifle Association is this: do you really enjoy your sexual freedoms so much that a pagan lifestyle is more important than your right to bear arms? Do you really think that you can have your cake and eat it too? The hedonistic personality creates the anarchy which *justifies and requires* the very tyranny that the possession of guns was intended to prevent. Having it both ways is impossible. So, how can you enjoy the life of a pagan when, by living it, you are undermining the same Christian institutions

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 78

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 83-84

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 78

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 79

that gave you both personal restraint and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment to start with? Wouldn't a humble return to God be in order, *or*, would you rather have them actually “pry that gun out of your cold dead fingers” some day soon?

## REICHIAN SEX REVOLUTION

Reich said that all youth are interested in sex, but whenever Party leaders tried to organize the youth to discuss sex, they invariably met “the greatest obstacle: the parents.”<sup>26</sup> However, Reich added, “Experience shows that even the strictest parents cannot maintain their attitude in the presence of a united mass of adolescents.”<sup>27</sup>

It is interesting to note here that, according to Professor Sarkis Atamian, the term “teenager” never was heard being used until after World War II. Since then, the use of that term appears to have been manipulated to create a united mass of young people who have escaped the control of their parents, by claiming that “everyone else is doing it.” “This is a ‘teenage’ thing!” The media has further been able to intimidate good parents by targeting that age category in a way that creates an illusion - - to make parents feel that they are somehow “not with it” if they object to the new waywardness of youth.

Prior to creating this new class of young people called “teenagers,” this group consisted of mere individual youths under the strict control of parents in the home. The parents’ independent judgment formerly was affirmed by social institutions that were beyond the control of media influence. Government had no need and never dreamed of intruding into the home.

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 85-88

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 88

Reich discovered during the 1920's with his Sex-Pol organization, as did Adolf Hitler a few years later with his “Hitler Youth” movement, that young people in puberty will immediately form up their own distinct sub-culture the moment they become free to associate as a group. This phenomenon had never before been officially observed. Hitler capitalized on this and channeled the young into the Nazi mold, thereby making them a subculture that ran counter to that of their Christian parents.<sup>28</sup> By the time the German parents caught on, it was too late. The Nazis already had captured their kids.

Reich pointed out that as early as 1928 in America, young people were in the process of changing their moral code. There was an “inner struggle” going on in youth. The external economic restraints against bad behavior had been destroyed, enabling sexual release without too much consequence. “The sole question now,” he said, “is how soon and how effectively will the internal restraints of a voluntarily accepted code, which alone can keep people going straight, take their place.”<sup>29</sup> Reich correctly implied that America was ripe for intervention by sexual revolutionaries.

### **Destruction of the Patriarchial Family Unit**

So, the question arises, how to destroy the American family and all of the institutions of conservative society that it supports. Reich merely declared that the family would be destroyed by ending sexual repression. Sexual suppression serves the purpose of making youth capable of monogamous marriage; by allowing sexual freedom for youth, they become incapable of lasting

---

<sup>28</sup>Sex and Society In Nazi Germany, by Hans Peter Bleuel (Dorsett Press 1973), pp. 102-144

<sup>29</sup>The Sexual Revolution., by Wilhelm Reich, Orgone Institute Press, New York, 1945, pp. 97-98

marriage.<sup>30</sup> Reich presented statistics to demonstrate that the earlier a young person becomes sexually active, the less likely it is that *that* youth will achieve a lasting marriage.<sup>31</sup>

“The earlier these people, on the average, established a sexual relationship, the less faithful were they in marriage, the more did they tend to occasional extramarital relationships....Those who established a sex life at an early age had an irregular sex life later on....Early sexual intercourse makes people incapable of marriage...in the sense of one partner for life.”<sup>32</sup>

On the other hand, Reich said, abstinence creates a structure that makes people incapable of any sex life except that of monogamy.<sup>33</sup> In order to insure abstinence, there is a corresponding need to repress sexual excitation. Repression of sexual ideas, particularly that of sexual intercourse, is a prerequisite of abstinence.<sup>34</sup>

The way to destroy families, it turns out, is to end sexual repression by stimulating sexual ideation. No rocket scientist is necessary to figure out how to accomplish this. The Radical Left only needed musical sex on every radio station, and nudity regularly displayed, to provoke the active hormones of every young person. The Radical Left only needed to end media censorship so that sexual images could be fed to our children without restraint. To end media censorship, the Left merely needed fraudulent Supreme Court decisions to give first amendment “protection” to filth. Like I say, Reich’s theories apparently found their way into evil hands in high places.

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., pp. 100-101

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 101

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., pp. 101-102

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 102

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 103

Given the social institutions that existed when Reich did most of his work, normal people in America would have recoiled and exclaimed, “Well, with everyone fornicating freely, how could such behavior continue for any length of time?” Of course, we don’t ask such questions today - - we know the answer from our own experience with Reichian revolution. But Reich did have answers for such objections.

Obviously there are economic consequences to sexual activities. Reich would build economic socialism, and the entire social order, around the obvious need to eliminate those consequences. Reich proposed ending the economic dependence of women and children upon the family. Women would be made not only sexually free, but financially independent of men. Not only would they be encouraged to divorce and abandon being “just a housewife,” but the government would establish full social care and education for the children of single moms. Children born out of wedlock no longer would be viewed as “bastards” by the legal system. The taxpayer would pay the full bill to support these kids in style.

On the other hand, abortion would be made available upon demand to suit the fancy of anyone not wanting to give birth. There would be an end to public condemnation as well. Women with multiple sex partners would be given the illusion of normalcy, while the resulting “jealous” males would be castigated as social mongrels. No one would be made to feel guilty about illicit sex, even with multiple partners of either or both sexes.<sup>35</sup> Girls would be taught from infancy that the father’s authority in the home is somehow illegitimate and that being sexy can unlock the doors to “happiness.” Reich suggested all of this.

It only remained for a rather disgusting German sex doll, a little miniature slut with big

---

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 118-129

bare breasts, to be clothed in high fashion, renamed, and introduced as a suitable role model for young American girls to emulate. She was named “Barbie.”

The effects of Barbie are hard to over state. A Jewish businesswoman, Ruth Handler, who co-founded Mattel, Inc., spotted in Switzerland a naked little sex doll named “Bild Lilli.” The sex doll was being marketed as an amusement for men. “Bild Lilli” also was a cartoon character, known for her sleazy sexuality. Men would buy the little sex doll and present it to their “dates” when they wanted to suggest “something.” Like Reich, when he noticed children’s great interest in any sex subject, Ruth Handler noticed that children immediately went for the little doll with big breasts. She returned to America determined to sell it to our kids.

The little sex doll met with opposition at Mattell. It also was rejected by the toy industry. Worst of all, American parents objected. But this was the new age of television, and Ruth Handler knew that the product needed to be marketed to the real customers, children, not parents. Television was a powerful new medium that enabled her to usurp parental control and to present the product directly to children-- whether the parents objected or not. So that was what Ruth Handler did. And she relied upon the kids to nag their weary parents into submission.

To help the kids along with the job of selling their parents, Ruth Handler hired a Viennese “psychologist” at the Institute of Motivational Research to help her overcome parental objections. Earnest Dichter was a specialist in planning how to get people to buy things that they really don’t want, and Ruth Handler paid him \$12,000.00 in 1958 to help her sell this little sex doll to our kids. Dichter noticed that American moms wanted their daughters to catch good husbands, so he suggested the marketing line, “This doll will help your little girl get a guy; the doll is a learning tool to teach her how to catch a man.”



Then Ruth Handler went to Jack Ryan, who was married to Zsa Zsa Gabor. He was known for wild beach parties that featured lots of scantily clad pretty girls. Jack Ryan dressed up “Barbie” for her new job. The results were devastating.

One woman of “40-something” age, stated on a 20/20 documentary, “When I got Barbie it was like getting heroin.” Another said, “You want to be in that world (where Barbie lives) and do what she’s doing.” Yet another stated, “Barbie was my way of figuring out how I wanted my family to live.” Imagine selling our kids a sex doll that has *that* kind of affect on them.

Barbie’s mate, “Ken,” on the other hand, “was a palpable idiot,” who even got a big “bump” to represent his genitals. Ken became known for playing “giggly, naughty games” with Barbie. When Ken would move on to someone else, as new dolls came on line. there always seemed to be a new “idiot” friend to take his place with Barbie. Barbie became a “queen” with men merely transitory in her life. During the 1960's, kids as young as three or four already were learning how to live in the Reichian nightmare of the 1980's and 90's. Every little girl was in effect being told, “You want to have legs like hers, so you can have all of her men friends.”

Barbie became the Reichian culture’s aspiration for the “perfect woman.” But as two generations of American girls were influenced by Barbie, many became “loose” adults without ever realizing that the doll had subliminally programed the minds of naive young girls whose parents did not comprehend the implications. Their parents were blindsided. This is because the naughty little German sex doll got a name change and fancy clothes. Everything else about “Bild Lilli” remained essentially unchanged in “Barbie.” And “Barbie” became the paradigm representing a “fusion of high glamour Hollywood with the onrushing age of the liberated woman.” Barbie was the perfect Reichian goddess. She represented the “sexually awakened

woman, affirmed as such,” to put it in Reich’s own words.

Furthermore, Barbie became known as the “versatile” doll, in that she could become whatever the little girl fantasized her to be. She could be an airline stewardess, a doctor, a mechanic, as well as a beach beauty. Barbie had all of the different lifestyles that a little girl could imagine, with all of the most luxurious surroundings possible. Little girls soon came to fantasize themselves being everything that Barbie could be, and the very thought of not being like Barbie became unthinkable to many.

Sadly, Barbie never became known as a mother or faithful wife, who raised children and earned the right to be loved as a grandmother, during her entire half-century of life. Many of her early admirers also have shared in this fate. They aborted babies, divorced multiple husbands and they are growing old alone.

Interestingly, the very year after Reich died in a federal penitentiary, “Barbie” was born in a toy factory. Today, the average little girl in America has access to 10 “Barbie” dolls, while Mattell garners world-wide annual sales of \$2 billion from her.<sup>36</sup>

According to Reich,

“Sexually awakened women, affirmed and recognized as such, would mean the complete collapse of the authoritarian (Christian) ideology.”<sup>37</sup>

Reich felt that the strict moral attitude of monogamy would loosen up when women would achieve economic independence. Once moralism would be overcome in an atmosphere where free sexuality is publicly affirmed by media and education, there no longer would be any inner

---

<sup>36</sup>The Secret Life of Barbie, ABC News, 06/11/98

<sup>37</sup>Mass Psychology of Fascism, by Wilhelm Reich, Farrar Straus & Giroux, New York, 1933, p. 105

argument against intercourse with extra partners. “The ideology of marriage collapses and with it the marriage.”<sup>38</sup>

In order to help women achieve economic independence, and thus to achieve this “sexual awakening,” Reich proposed that divorce courts should force the jilted ex-husbands to pay “temporary” spousal support in addition to child support. Where this would not be forthcoming, there should be welfare to pay the way.<sup>39</sup>

Obviously such a system completely negates the financial security of society’s male population. When divorce is granted on the whim of any woman asking for it, and the man is expected to bear the financial burden of it, the man can never be financially secure. No matter how hard a husband works to build financial security, he never knows when some black robed tyrant setting on a court bench will strip him naked and throw him penniless out onto the street. He becomes a piece of meat to be sliced and diced, and usually is left financially impotent. According to Reich, this is *necessary*.

“It was a matter of course that the revolutionary law intended the abolition of patriarchal power. Depriving the ruling class of power meant at the same time the elimination of the power of the father over members of the family, and the representative of the state *within* the family as the structure forming cell of the class society.”<sup>40</sup>

American men obviously have been stripped of all patriarchal power, they’ve been labeled as mindless idiots, and have been left financially impotent - - unable to secure the future for their children. Child support, spousal support, attorney fees, they all operate to destroy men

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 144

<sup>39</sup>The Sexual Revolution, by Wilhelm Reich, Orgone Institute Press, 1945, pp. 146-149, 166-167

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 166

more than to provide well-being for families. As fathers become financially disabled, they become driven further and further from their children.

By the same token, all of the sexual images have also lured many men away from families. This has deprived good women of good men, and has stripped their children of whole homes.

According to Reich, divorce would feed the process of changing the psyche of the population, by the effect it would have on children produced in broken homes. Reich said that the child's attachment to the parent of the opposite sex is important for maintaining monogamy. If that attachment is destroyed, as through divorce, a great deal of the monogamous ideology collapses with it. Because divorce courts routinely send little girls packing with their mothers, these girls naturally grow up alienated toward the concept of being the wife of a husband. It is no wonder that young women from broken homes wind up having higher divorce rates than did their mothers. The problem feeds on itself.

On the other hand, Reich pointed out that in monogamous lifelong marriages, where girls are taught that they ought to have sex with only one man, they become incapable of divorcing their husbands even if he is unloved. Because the girl's mom lasted in her marriage, so will the daughter determine to do the same. Reich called this attitude "a most inhibiting factor to enforcement of monogamy."<sup>41</sup>

Little boys also suffer from divorce. Boys without dads in the home often grow up resentful of female authority, since by nature they aspire to be manly leaders. But without dad, the boy never has an example of how a husband should relate to his wife. As soon as the

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p.127-128

feminized young man faces his first marital crises, he is likely to behave like an emotional woman - - and wind up labeled a “violent male” just because he yells, or screams, or slams a door.

I recently attended a “continuing legal education” seminar that was offered to attorneys. It ostensibly concerned “domestic violence.” But as the program unfolded, feminine lecturers repeatedly drummed into our ears that the “process” really was “about divestiture of power.” When I inquired as to “whose power?” I was told, with an upraised brow, “It is usually the husband’s power, of course.”

One lecturer even declared that the “advocate” who is assigned to each “victim” woman, should locate her children’s “allies” (play friends) and encourage them to “advocate” (speak critically) against the child’s father. If these “allies” would be unwilling to do this, then the “advocate” should seek to cause the mother to find “new allies” for her children. The new “allies” could then be made to “advocate” against the father. Again, we were constantly reminded that the whole “domestic violence” process is about “divestiture of power.” The Reichian feminist movement seeks to destroy Christian patriarchal family structure. The family courts are being used to this end by those who believe in Reichian communism.

### **Destruction of Parental Authority**

As soon as the marriage is ended, Reich calculated that the link between mothers and their children ought also to be destroyed. This would terminate all connection between the child and anything resembling a “family.” He said that in the Russian experience, one of the main difficulties was the inability of “liberated” women to give up caring for their children.

“The woman, because her whole life was sexually empty and economically dependent, had made the upbringing of her children the content of her life. Any restriction of this relationship, though it might have been for the good of the children, she experienced as a serious deprivation and fought against it.”<sup>42</sup>

Notice the words, “because her whole life was sexually empty and economically dependent. . .”

To encourage mothers to turn over the care of their children to strangers in daycare centers, their lives must not be sexually empty or economically dependent on husbands. Many sexually free women in divorces would gladly dump their children on fathers except for their economic need for child support, or need to avoid paying child support themselves. If Dad doesn't have a job, or is bitterly refusing to cooperate with the “child support” system, then welfare picks up and nowhere is the woman any longer dependent on the financial support of a husband. This not only frees her from the marriage but gives her the opportunity for a “new life.” In order to cash in on sexual liberties and this new life, the majority of divorced women today find it no problem at all to dump off their offspring to be cared for by complete strangers in state subsidized daycare centers.

So, what purpose is served by public daycare centers? The answer to this question is basic. Socialists everywhere are interested in some level of “collective” activity in society, whether it is the “merged” corporate cartels of the Nazi economic model, or agricultural communes of the Communists. The idea is the same. But in the Soviet Union, where the family survived the revolution, a collective commune could only be achieved by armed force. The “individualistic psyche that is naturally produced in a family environment, resisted collectivization.

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 160

Social collectivism of the Reichian sort means communal groups living without families. This collectivization is possible to achieve without the use of armed force. The same children who are programmed to rebel against the discipline of parents, also are programmed to accept discipline from the State. This is why government schools and child welfare agencies now act as if they own your kids -- and you as well. This is why they get away with it, instead of being swept out of town by hostile citizens. The family psyche had to be destroyed to achieve this tyranny.

A client of mine, who works in a daycare, remarked to me how the children under her care never seem able to “bond” to their parents because the parents see so little of them, and yet the moms are happy handing these kids over to her - - a complete stranger. With 20 competing children in my client’s daycare, none of them bond with her either. Instead, the kids actually bond to each other, as a collective. By putting children in the daycare environment and preventing them from bonding closely to their parents, the children are being instilled with the collectivist psychic already. Their “family” becomes the group they spend the most of their time with, and parental influence later on during puberty is diminished accordingly.

Reich saw collectivized daycare for children as indispensable for achieving ultimate change in people’s psychic structure.

“Human structure must be adapted to collective living. This adaptation, no doubt, will require a decrease in jealousy and the fear of losing a partner. In general, people are incapable of sexual independence; they are bound to their partners by loveless, sticky ties and therefore incapable of separating from them; they are afraid that in losing a partner they might not find another. This fear is always based on infantile attachments to mother, father or older siblings. If the family were replaced by the collective, the

formation of such pathological attachments would not occur.”<sup>43</sup>

This is beginning to sound like a “cure” for so-called “codependency,” a philosophical theory now being advanced by Freudian quacks to convince women that loving a husband is some kind of mental illness. But Reich has more to say,

“If the compulsive family is upheld ideologically or structurally, the development of the collective is inhibited. If the collective is incapable of overcoming this inhibition, it is destroyed by the familial structure of its members.”<sup>44</sup>

Thus we see that Reich viewed this whole process of sexual revolution as a fight to the death between the collective mentality and the traditional family unit. And to create that collective mentality, the *patriarchal* family needs to go.

The history of the formation of ideologies shows that every social system, consciously or unconsciously, makes use of the influencing of children in order to anchor itself in the human structure. If we follow this anchoring process of the social order from matriarchal to patriarchal society, we find that the sexual education of the child is the core of this influencing process. In matriarchal society, based on the social order of primitive communism, the children enjoy complete sexual freedom. To the same extent to which patriarchy develops, economically and socially, we also find the development of an ascetic ideology as applied to the children. This change is in the service of creating structures with an authoritarian attitude instead of the previous non-authoritarian structure. In matriarchy, there is a collective sexuality of the children, corresponding to collective living in general; that is, the child is not forced into any preconceived forms of sexual life by any fixed norms. The free sexuality of the child provides a firm structural foundation for its voluntary adaptation to the collective and for voluntary work discipline.

---

<sup>43</sup>Ibid, p. 233

<sup>44</sup>Ibid, p. 162-163



With the development of the patriarchal family, the sexual suppression of the child developed to an increasing extent: Sexual playing with playmates came to be forbidden, masturbation to be punished. Roheim's report on the Pitchentara children shows clearly in what tragic manner the whole character of the child changes once its natural sexuality is suppressed. It becomes shy, apprehensive, afraid of authority and develops unnatural sexual impulses, such as sadistic tendencies. The free, unafraid behavior is replaced by obedience and dependence. The fighting down of the sexual impulses requires much energy, attention and "self-control." . . . One can easily observe in all patriarchal circles how children, at the age of about 4, 5 or 6, become rigid, quiet, cold and begin to armor themselves against the outer world. In this process they lose their natural charm and often become awkward, unintelligent and "difficult to manage"; this in turn provokes an accentuation of the patriarchal methods of upbringing. This is also the structural basis of religious tendencies, the infantile attachment to the parents and the dependence on them.<sup>45</sup>

Reich says that the patriarchal system needs to be destroyed so that children can "*blossom*" and express their "*natural charm*." But Reich never says exactly *what* "natural charm" consists of. We have all seen these kids with no daddies and "natural charm." They're usually called "hellions" and delinquents. They grow up with "*natural charm*" and give birth to more little bastards, who then tend to take after their own parents.

But Reich goes even further in his diatribe. In Sex-Pol he wrote,

*"...Ideological struggle against what is known as 'being good' should be one of the important tasks of the proletarian front...It isn't enough to refrain from beating one's own children; what is needed is propaganda on the broadest international scale. Any mother seen beating her child in the street should be publicly challenged; such a measure, if carried out in an organized fashion, would soon engage everybody in a struggle for the child as a member of society, against the treatment of children as family chattels....[Ordinary people], the overwhelming majority of whom know nothing whatsoever about communism, would be against the*

---

<sup>45</sup>Ibid, p. 236-237

*notion, and this would draw them into the class struggle, i.e., it would engage and activate them a thousand times more effectively and usefully than leaflets pushed under the door which would only be thrown unread into the waste paper basket.”<sup>46</sup>*

Once more, we can see what the American “child welfare” movement really is all about. It is about Communism. It is about stripping good parents of control over their children, and assuming that same control in the name of a totalitarian State. It is about making children the legal equals of parents and giving them complete standing to challenge parental authority. Our kids have been programmed to rebel against us, and to look to the State to “discipline” their parents. What American parent is not now fearful of being “*publically challenged*” if seen spanking a child at the supermarket?

We are all terrorized by the massive army of self-appointed busybodies who “*know nothing whatsoever of communism,*” but who have been convinced that ordinary spanking is “child abuse.” One anonymous phone call to the “family cops” in most communities is enough to get children grabbed out of any Christian home by our new communist *masters*. Numerous Christian mothers have been wrongfully criminalized by these tyrants and thrown into jails here in America merely because of slapping out-of-control teenage daughters.

In this regard, let me say that I was informed by a custody investigator that many school principals have a favorite weapon that they use against challenging parents. They pull their children out of class and send them to see the Freudian “counselor,” who quickly inquires about possible gripes that the kids might have against parents and step-parents. Then they use these staged interviews as springboards for making bogus reports of “potential abuse” against the good

---

<sup>46</sup>Sex-Pol, by Wilhelm Reich, Random House, New York, 1928-1954, pp. 316-317.

parents.

“School principals are frightened of lawsuits, and if they think the parents might sue, they sometimes try to strike first through child welfare to get the parents off of their backs,” she said.

I have counseled numerous others who have tearfully complained that their 13 and 14 year old daughters were refusing to come home, and were on the streets, but that the police were refusing to even encourage the girls to go home because “no laws were being broken.” Sometimes Christian parents have been forced to watch while 13 year old daughters have been allowed by *our* government to move about from one pagan family to another, being used in each pagan home as sex toys for their pagan punk sons. Again, the police refuse to help so long as the pagan “stud” is about the same age as the Christian’s daughter. And yet, the Christian parents always remained chained by *our* government, denied the right to discipline their own children. These same parents are subject to complete financial destruction by *our* government, the moment their children wind up confined in a juvenile center. Such parents are routinely forced to pay large fortunes in exorbitant “*child support*” to the government.

I ask Christian parents, “What is the measure of *your* freedom in America?” If you are denied the right to discipline and to raise children according to Christian principles, how can you claim to be living in a “free country?” Isn’t it time that we remember those fearful words from America’s Declaration of Independence, “*When in the course of human events...?*” There are at least 60 million adults in this country who claim to be Christians and to believe the Bible. If this is true, then *why* do we accept the status quo?

Tens of thousands of us have died fighting “tyranny” all around the world. Why are we such cowards here at home? If our grandfathers had believed the Bible the way our “preachers”

do today, there never would have been a United States of America. Could it be that our pastors have become intimidated by hoaky, but extremely oppressive IRS audits? Is *this* why they are afraid to *rock the boat?*” Shame! It’s all about *money*.

Thus we see that Reich’s whole social scheme seems a bit circular in nature. The process feeds on itself and grows bigger as it rolls, like a ball of dung being pushed along by the Beatles, who sang such explicit musical sex. Reich desired to destroy Christian style government, so he sought to destroy Christian society and its institutions. To do that he proposed destruction of the family, by enabling women and children to become sexually promiscuous. To accomplish that, he needed to end patriarchal control in the home, which in turn enables more promiscuity among the young and further destroys attachment to family; which in turn creates more promiscuity; which in turn further diminishes the family, and on and on. Eventually we create chains of females, each giving birth successively at younger and younger ages. Mothers and their daughters, all babies giving birth to yet more babies, none of whom have much chance for normal lives outside of poverty. None of whom are even capable of taking care of their own children by the time they first get pregnant. This is the perfect constituency for any socialist welfare state. This represents the end of Christian civilization. This represents usurpation of power and tyrannical control by *our own government*.

In my practice of family law, I have personally observed clear distinctions emerging based upon the generational position of the parties. Baby Boomers, the first generation sexualized by the Reichian socialist revolution, have been lousy marriage mates, unable to be faithful in monogamous marriages. Their marriages typically end after five to eight years when someone gets involved in an extramarital affair. They know from childhood what a normal

family is supposed to be. But because of early sexualization, they simply can't hold it together.

Generation X'ers, on the other hand, don't seem to be able to hold any family together for long, even if interested in doing so. This generation also seems to be losing its knowledge of just what a family is. I now see young couples in their 20's engaging in the most bizarre marital infidelity. Instead of the Baby Boomer who had an affair with a co-worker, the X'er just as often catches a mate involved in group sex or with members of the same sex; husbands and wives acting together having sex with underage minors, sometimes members of their own families. These people seem to have totally lost touch with even the concept of family.

The children of the X'ers literally lack all feelings of "right" and "wrong." I believe that as a result of being raised in homes without family bonding, especially where the concept of family already has been lost on the parents, we are now witnessing young children who are totally alienated to our society. I believe that these are many of the ones who now are committing horrible acts of inexplicable violence in schools and elsewhere. I believe that this young generation is the "harvest" of young revolutionaries sought by Reich and his cohorts. This is the kind of youth that makes a perfect "Brownshirt" or "RedGuard." Great soldiers and brutal killers. They only need to be politicized by the media in order to be fully utilized by some tyrant. Time alone will tell what is intended to be done with these pitiful victims of the sexual revolution. I fear that Christians some day will be fully repaid for their sorry "piety."

### Ultimate Goal: Destruction of Christianity

Hand in hand with his attack on the home, Reich also aimed his sex revolution directly at

the Church. He argued that religious excitation is *nothing but another form of sexual orgasm*. He claimed that psychoanalysis had shown that our idea of God is identical with that of a father, and likewise the Mother of God is identical with the mother of every religious individual. He said that the family triangle of father, mother, and child is merely represented in the trinity of the Christian religion.<sup>47</sup>

Reich claimed that the basic idea of all patriarchal religions is the negation of sexual needs, and that over time the religious “cult” merely supplanted the sexual cult. The religious man has the same sexual desires as does the pagan, but he “has completely lost his ability to experience natural sexual tension and release.”<sup>48</sup> As a result, the Christian suffers constant torture which he endures in exchange for a promise of joy in the hereafter. This causes the Christian to seek the “*forepleasure*” of religious tensions. The Christian arranges entertainments at church through which he vents these sexual urges in disguised forms.<sup>49</sup> Quoting Reich:

His biologic organism prompts him to construct a musical instrument, an organ, the sound of which is capable of evoking such currents in the body. The mystical darkness of the church intensifies the effect of a super-personal sensibility to one’s own inner life and to the sounds of a sermon, a chorale, etc., intended to achieve this effect.<sup>50</sup>

Reich could have preached a nice sermon for many Christian churches today. Surrounded in society by sexual images from every angle, many Christians seemingly are unconsciously moving their Sunday services towards sex. Music suitable for any strip club already is standard fare in

---

<sup>47</sup>Mass Psychology of Fascism, by Wilhelm Reich, Farrar Straus & Giroux, New York, 1933, pp. 149-151

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 147

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 147

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 147

some churches. Women in these services put on pretty good shows for preachers who stand on the podiums gawking at their jiggling boobs. It isn't any wonder that the preaching "Jimmy's" get caught up in sex scandals when their services are laced with so much symbolic sex.

Reich went on to claim that while treating mentally ill priests, doctors discovered that involuntary ejaculation often occurs at the height of religious ecstasy, and that such mental states are nothing other than conditions of sexual excitation that never can be acknowledged consciously. But he never seemed to document this wild claim. Reich said that the strong desire for redemption from sin merely enables the Christian to dam up natural desires.

Because Reich was a Sabbatian, and hated Christianity, he could only slander that which he could not understand. He never noticed that Christians regularly find sexual pleasure within marriage. This is because Christianity only outlaws sex outside of marriage. Within marriage, everything is legal.

Reich claimed that children do not naturally believe in God. He claimed that *the belief in God takes place when the child discovers that he needs to refrain from masturbation*. This fear of pleasure thus becomes transposed as the fear of God.

However, the idea of God would not be able to bind the child's sexual energy if it were not also associated with the actual figures of father and mother. He who does not honor the father is sinful. In other words, he who does not fear the father and indulges in sexual pleasure is punished. The strict father, who denies the fulfillment of the child's desires, is God's representative on earth and, in the fantasy of the child, is the executioner of God's will. . . . In a patriarchal social organization an appeal to God really is an appeal to the actual authority of the father. When the child invokes "God," he really is invoking his actual father. In the structure of the child, sexual excitation, idea of *father*, and of *God* constitute a

unity. *In treatment we meet this unity as a palpable condition of genital muscular spasm. With the elimination of the spastic condition in the genital musculature, the idea of God and the fear of the father always lose ground. Hence, the genital spasm not only represents the physiological anchoring of religious fear in the human structure, but at the same time it also produces the pleasure anxiety that becomes the core of every religious morality.*<sup>51</sup> (emphasis added)

Hence, Reich viewed effective Christian resistance to sexual vice as a form of “*spastic paralysis*.” He said that once this paralysis is overcome, once the child is taught to masturbate, then the child’s belief in the Christian God and respect for the human father always loses ground.<sup>52</sup> Reich never explained how primitive societies without any sexual restraints still believe in animism, gods, and the supernatural. Reich only hated Christianity and people who claim to be Christians, so he merely adjusted his arguments to suit his needs.

Reich tied this discussion to a situation involving an actual seven year old girl. Some have opined that this may have possibly even been his own daughter. This girl was brought up without any idea of God, yet she suddenly developed a compulsion to pray. This prayer then interfered with her ability to masturbate freely each night before going to sleep. Suddenly she was afraid to masturbate, and instead had the desire to kneel down beside her bed and pray. When her father got involved in this “problem,” the little girl told him, “If I pray, I won’t be afraid.” Her father attributed this fear to the fact that his seven-year old daughter had been caught playing “at having sexual intercourse” with her little boyfriend. The older boy who caught the two had shouted “shame” at them.

---

<sup>51</sup>Ibid, pp. 150-151

<sup>52</sup>Sarkis Atamian adds that Reich never explained why primitive societies without sexual restraints still believe in animism, God, and the supernatural. However, Reich isn’t concerned with the religious beliefs of primitive societies, since these pose no threat to the kind of tyranny Reich wanted to establish, as does Christianity.



“Though she had been told by her parents that there was nothing wrong with such games, she felt ashamed and, in place of the game, masturbated before going to sleep.”<sup>53</sup>

Reich also blamed an incident wherein this girl and her friends had been walking home, “singing revolutionary songs,” when an old woman shouted at them, “May the Devil take you - - you band of atheists!” Reich said that the girl’s fear of masturbation developed that very evening and said, “*Prayer had taken the place of sexual gratification.*”<sup>54</sup>

From that time on she was afraid of a supernatural being who could punish her for her sexual offenses. Hence, she recommended herself to His care. This constituted a reinforcement of her struggle against the temptation to masturbate.<sup>55</sup>

Reich said that this fear of masturbation dissolved as soon as the little girl was told that there was no God and that the fear was ill-founded.

Reich said that the average youth is faced with an acute conflict between sexual pleasure and fear. He claimed that the “mystical experience” of Christianity causes youth to repress sexuality into “a state of vegetative excitation.” Then, the young person’s sexuality develops in “a passive homosexual direction,” and this passive homosexuality in turn leads to passivity and masochistic attitudes. It is these final attitudes of passivity and masochism, he said, that form the “basis of patriarchal authoritarian mysticism in the human structure.”<sup>56</sup>

This explains why the man who has been inculcated with mystical or nationalistic “ethics” is so accessible to political reactionary catchwords, such as *honor, purity*, etc. He is continually forced to

---

<sup>53</sup>Ibid, pp. 153-155

<sup>54</sup>Ibid

<sup>55</sup>Ibid

<sup>56</sup>Ibid, p. 163

remind himself to be honorable and pure.<sup>57</sup>

Reich pointed out that the Soviet Union fought Christianity in three ways: 1) confiscation of property; 2) anti-religious propaganda; and 3) changing the cultural level of the masses.

Nevertheless, Reich was told in Moscow in 1929 that the only organized resistance to Communism remained the church! Reich blamed this on the Soviet refusal to follow through with the sexual revolution.

“Clinical experience shows incontestably that religious sentiments result from inhibited sexuality, that the source of mystical excitation is to be sought in inhibited sexual excitation. The inescapable conclusion of all this is that a *clear sexual consciousness* and a *natural regulation of sexual life must foredoom every form of mysticism*; that, in other words, *natural sexuality is the arch enemy of mystical religion*.”<sup>58</sup>



“I say that *sexual consciousness is the end of mysticism*.”<sup>59</sup>



“*Sexual consciousness and [Christian] mystical sentiments cannot coexist*.”<sup>60</sup>

Reich adapted a Nazi concept by suggesting that Christianity could be destroyed through “*social mental cleansing*.”<sup>61</sup> (emphasis added) This “mental cleansing” of course would consist

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid, p. 169

<sup>58</sup>Ibid, p. 178

<sup>59</sup>Ibid, p. 179

<sup>60</sup>Ibid, p. 183; Sarkis Atamian points out that the “love for mankind, altruism, and the religious sexual rites of pagan religions – even Reich’s devotion to free sex – are just as mystical as Christianity. Again, “religion” isn’t the target. Only Christianity is targeted.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid, p. 184-187

of flooding our communities with deviant sexual images and propaganda designed to transform society's attitude towards open free sex. Of course, we easily can recognize that this Nazi concept of "mental cleansing" has been fully implemented in America by the media and culture industry. Once sexual passions are provoked within a society, that society will begin to demand access to more and more illicit sex. This is now the case in America. This demand thus becomes a commodity of class consciousness. Gun confiscation isn't the only thing to fear from tyrants. The social chaos caused by all of this free sex provides plenty of justification for taking away people's guns.

### Illicit Sex: An Ultimate Weapon of Mass Destruction

According to Reich, sexual excitation can never be tolerated for long without one of two consequences: 1) society will be forced to suppress the excitation by cutting out the sexual images from public view, or, 2) there will be mass gratification.<sup>62</sup> Socialist revolutionaries masquerading as freedom-loving Supreme Court justices effectively prevented our parents from choosing the first option - - leaving only the second option for the newly enslaved American nation. Now our own kids are enslaved by these demons in high places. Unfortunately, we are the last generation of Americans with knowledge of normal society. Our children don't know the difference. Therefore it falls to us to take responsibility for ending this tyranny before we pass. We may be the last generation able to do this!

Reich was completely frustrated with the Communist Party when he wrote his major books.

---

<sup>62</sup>The Sexual Revolution, by Wilhelm Reich, Orgone Institute Press, New York, 1945, p. 104

In fact he added that, “*We* can no longer rely on any political party.”<sup>63</sup> (my italics) Reich never defined the word “we.” But almost all of his friends and associates were from the same community of Sabbatians. So who else could “we” be? Reich was searching to form a movement of his own. He clearly recognized that the future of the Communist movement rested with young people, and he had an agenda to woo them. But he didn’t live long enough to see that agenda become reality.

According to the combined writings of Jewish authors Nathan Glazer, David Horowitz and Rabbi Marvin Antelman, we have been able to determine that the “student revolt” which began in 1964, with the “Free Speech” movement in Berkeley, California, was orchestrated primarily by students whose Sabbatian parents had left the American Communist Party. Tens of thousands of Communist Party members abandoned the Party during the 1950's after Khrushchev admitted that Jews were being persecuted in the Soviet Union.<sup>64</sup> Those former Party members had thousands of college-aged kids who suddenly were without any ideological home for their Communist beliefs. When Reich’s books were handed to them by those organizing the “New Left,” these students once again had a cause.<sup>65</sup> Reich’s real promise always did reside with the youth.

Anyone over the age of 45 probably remembers news reel images of young radical protesters holding “Love-ins” wherein they would engage in public group sex. As they were carted away by police for indecent exposure and disturbing the peace, those same protestors shouted for cooperative

---

<sup>63</sup>The Mass Psychology of Fascism, by Wilhelm Reich, Farrar Straus & Giroux, New York, 1933, p. 189

<sup>64</sup> Strictly Jewish Sources: Radical Son, David Horowitz, Free Press (1997); Remembering the Answers, Nathan Glazer, Basic Books, Inc., (1970), p. 222-244; The Social Basis of American Communism, by Nathan Glazer, Greenwood Press, (1961); To Eliminate the Opiate, by Rabbi Marvin S. Antelman, Zahavia LTD., New York-Tel Aviv (1974).

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.; The Destructive Generation, by Peter Collier and David Horowitz, Simon and Schuster, 1989.

media microphones, “End the repression!”

One doesn't need to strain one's memory to remember Sabbatian student radicals, like Bernadine Ohrstein, aka Bernadine Dohrn, who yelled for eager newsmen, “We're gonna tear down the institutions!” How could any of us forget those stunning words? This was Reichian revolution in the process of destroying our nation. We watched all of this happening before our own eyes when we were young and easily exploitable. Now some of us are watching our dumbed down, sexually uninhibited children bear us cocaine babies out of wedlock.

Reich had solid grounds for his argument that the Communist movement needed to expand its horizons to include his sexual revolution. Reich believed that the best way to do combat was to watch the enemy - - to observe what interests conservative society considers to be most vital to its survival. Reich wanted to attack those interests first. Reich wrote:

When political reaction tells us again and again that the preservation of the [law against abortion] is necessary in the interest of the family and “moral order,” . . . then we must agree with them that “authoritarian family” and “moralistic” ethics are decisively important reactionary forces. . . . It is a matter of binding the women to the authoritarian family by means of suppressing their sexual needs; it is a matter of the reactionary influence exercised by these women on their husbands; it is a matter of safeguarding the effect that reactionary propaganda has on millions of women who are suppressed and who tolerate their suppression. From a revolutionary point of view it is imperative to follow political reaction wherever its effects are felt. . . . Thus the interest in the authoritarian family as an institution intended to “preserve the state” takes priority in all questions of reactionary sexual politics.<sup>66</sup>

Reich was the grand strategist from whom Stalin could have learned much. Stalin, the Georgian, didn't listen. Consequently no other significant Communists did either. It remained for

---

<sup>66</sup>The Mass Psychology of Fascism, by Wilhelm Reich, Farrar Straus & Giroux, New York, 1933, pp. 107-108

a new breed of radical totalitarians - - the “New Left” - - to make their break from the American Communist Party in the 1950's.

Reich knew from experience that society could easily be turned on to free sex.

“He who has once seen the intense eyes and faces at sex-economics assemblies; he who has heard and has had to answer the hundreds of questions relating to the most personal sphere of human existence - - that man has also arrived at the unshakable conviction that social dynamite lies buried here, . . . ”<sup>67</sup>

Reich also knew that he could seduce mothers en masse. He wrote:

“When I talk to a sexually inhibited woman in my office about sexual needs, I am confronted with her entire moralistic apparatus . . . If, however, the same woman is exposed to a *mass* atmosphere, is present, for instance, at a rally at which sexual needs are discussed clearly and openly . . . then she doesn't feel herself to be alone. After all, the others are also listening to “forbidden things.” Her individual moralistic inhibitions is offset by a *collective atmosphere of sexual affirmation*, a new sex-economic morality, which can paralyze her sexual negation . . . The sexual need is given confidence by the mass situation; it assumes a socially accepted status. When the subject is broached correctly, the sexual demand proves to have far more appeal than the demand for asceticism and renunciation;. . . ”<sup>68</sup>

Using the mass media as an illegitimate backdrop, Reichians were able to give free sex an aura of collective social affirmation. This in turn intimidated most critics. By the late 1960's, free sex in America was established as a going concern. The sex revolution was “rocking and rolling.” No sooner than the Sabbatian student radicals and their corporate mentors accomplished this, did they begin their push for abortion on demand. They quite literally created one issue out of sex, and then began mastering subsequent issues as all of the problems with free sex began to unfold. Today

---

<sup>67</sup>Ibid, p. 188

<sup>68</sup>Ibid, p. 187

this is happening with Gay rights and demands for AIDS research.

This has been Reichian “dialectics” to the core. Reichian “class consciousness” has been put into practice. As stated earlier:

*“Everything that contradicts the bourgeois order, everything that contains a germ of rebellion, can be regarded as an element of class consciousness;. . . .”*

We have all watched it unfold before our eyes for the past 40 years!

Abortion laws that fell in 1973 constituted only one such fulfillment. Reich said this about abortion:

*“Nor do the masses have the slightest interest in questions of population politics; they don’t care a hoot about them. The abortion law is of interest to them, not for political reasons, but because of the personal distress that hinges upon it.”<sup>69</sup>*

Having created a demand, the Radical Left then moved to champion the issue on behalf of millions who now felt unable to abstain from free sex and needed to avoid its consequences. The “movement” was rolling.

Reich understood that people who would become receptive to the idea of free sex probably also would become immune to the influence of the church and conservative party forces. He advocated global sexual affirmation to create such an atmosphere that masses of people would be

---

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 185

attracted to the movement. But he warned:

“*We* can no longer rely on any political party. The task lies within the framework of natural work-democratic development.”<sup>70</sup>

Again, Reich did not define the word “we.” The reader is left to observe that he associated almost entirely within the Sabbatian community. His prodigy during the 1960's assumed the task and accomplished the job.

### The Reichian Trajectory: Kiddie Sex In The Classroom

Reich never sacrificed the long term for short range goals. He always felt that the best place to start his revolution was with children. And, he said, “In the main, revolutionary work with children can only be sex-economic work.” He taught that children in the pre-pubertal stage can be directed best by sexual education. He noted that children of *all* social classes are *filled* with sexual interest, more so than during later stages of life. As a matter of “class consciousness,” sexual suppression seemed to concern *every child of every class without exception*.<sup>71</sup> Said Reich:

“While it is true that political reaction is far superior in its organizational work with children, *there is one thing that it cannot do: It cannot impart sexual knowledge to children, it cannot give them sexual clarity, nor can it dispel their sexual confusion*. Only the revolutionary movement can do this. . . because it has no interest in the sexual suppression of children. . . If we could once succeed in engaging the sexual interest of children and adolescents *on a mass scale*, then reactionary contamination would be faced with a tremendous counter force - - and political reaction would be powerless.”<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p. 189

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 195-196

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 196-197



So now, forty years later, we see *why* our “educators” were told by their national labor union to demand the right to give sex education in public schools. The nightmare really did begin in Orange County, California, when sex educational authority was first taken from parents and usurped by the government. Forty years ago, the arguments for sex education put forth by “educators” seemed persuasive. But now that their revolution has destroyed our Christian culture and left our nation debauched, “sex education” clearly always was a crime against humanity. Reich knew what he could accomplish by doing this to us. He said,

*“By affirming their sexual interests and gratifying their thirst for knowledge, children must be educated to take an interest in social matters. They have to become firmly convinced that this is something political reaction cannot give them. And they will be won over in large numbers, be immunized against reactionary influence in all countries and - - what is most important - - they will be firmly bound to the revolutionary freedom movement.”*<sup>73</sup>

Those same kids who were sucked into the sex movement of the 1960's, went on to become “cadre” for the innumerable “issue” oriented movements that now have been set in array against us by the Radical Left. Environmentalists, feminists, elders, child rights, queer rights, animal rights, abortion rights, anti-war, anti-gun, anti-prayer, anti anything and anti everything, you name it. There are few of us who aren't being assaulted regularly by these groups. It's nice to know that Reich counted on all of this when his prodigy captured the attention of millions of kids with sex education back in the 1960's. It's nice to know that our kids have been taught by so many people who secretly *hated* their students' parents.

Reich outlined the entire process for his prodigy before they were even born. Basically, he

---

<sup>73</sup>Ibid, p. 198

saw three stages in the movement to destroy Christian society. Those are set forth below.

1) “Before the revolution the task of class-conscious Communist youth is to mobilize the mass of all youth for the revolution. During this phase the sex problem of youth is part of the general front of the proletarian movement. Before the revolution we cannot do much to help the mass of young people in sexual matters, but we must politicize the issue, and transform the secret or open sexual rebellion of youth into revolutionary struggle against the capitalist social order.”<sup>74</sup>

2) “In time of revolution, when the old order is shattered and everything outdated sinks into oblivion, when we are standing knee-deep in the debris of a corrupt, predatory, cruel, rotten social system, we must not moralize if the sexual contradictions among the young are at first intensified. We must see the sexual revolution in the context of general historical change, we must place ourselves alongside youth, we must help youth so far as we are able, but more than anything else we must realize that we are living in a time of transition. To be put off by the confusions of such a transitional period, to take fright at the “*crazy youngsters*” and to fall back into bourgeois attitudes, such as asceticism and moralizing, attitudes which it is one of the tasks of the proletarian revolution to eradicate, means being left behind by historical events and standing in the way of progress.”<sup>75</sup>

3) “After the revolution, when the people liberated from their exploiters can at last begin to build socialism, to transform the economy into a socialist one and to destroy the rotten remains of capitalism in every sphere, the question is once again entirely different. The workers’ society is then faced with the important task of thinking about the future order of sexual life and preparing for it. . . . Evidence that socialism alone can bring about sexual liberation is on our side. Therefore under capitalism we must use all our energies to convince the oppressed masses of this truth, too, and mobilize them for a merciless struggle against everything that impedes such liberation. And in this mobilization, precisely because of the great material and sexual oppression, the authoritarian bondage in which they are held today and which creates a link between them

---

<sup>74</sup>Sex-Pol, by Wilhelm Reich, Random House, New York, 1929-1934, p. 272

<sup>75</sup>Ibid, p. 272-273

all, young people will march in the front rank. We shall win them over to the cause of the revolution. . . .”<sup>76</sup>

The first stage clearly existed throughout the 1960's, 70's, and 80's. The Clintons appear to have kicked off stage two when Bill defiled our White House with every kind of devil and unclean spirit, making homosexuality his administration's GREAT REFUSAL of Christianity. All that we saw during the Clinton years represented “*sexual contradictions*” and the moral “*confusion*” of the transitional period referred to by Reich.

Clinton left town pretty beaten up to be sure. But amazingly, his constituency remained solidly resolute to the bitter end - - as if under strong delusion. We saw the “*crazy youngsters*” during the Clinton term: kids armed with shotguns, machine pistols, and even propane bombs in school houses. The first Christian young people were martyred by those same foul-mouthed pagan prodigy of the Democratic Party.

We also saw our “head” of State caught with his pants off. We could almost see him calmly smoking a cigar that was freshly wetted with vaginal secretions, after “rimming” with his own tongue the anus of a young Jewish girl. To our amazement, the Democratic Party constituency merely scoffed, “It's *only sex!*” They were following Reich to the tee, refusing “*to fall back into bourgeois attitudes, such as asceticism (self discipline) and moralizing, attitudes which it is one of the tasks of the proletarian revolution to eradicate. . .*”

Indeed, part of the Clinton legacy is the fact that America's stand on human rights was correctly perceived abroad as American promotion of homosexuality. We became an object of derision world-wide and a stench in the nostrils of moral nations residing outside the culture of

---

<sup>76</sup>Ibid, p. 273

“Western Marxism.” Of course, Europe, Britain, Canada and Australia also put on the same satanic act during this period, and continue doing so to the present.

Muslim clerics who spoke to “Christian” audiences after the September 11, 2001 attack were able to *grin* when they said, “Islam doesn’t believe in killing innocent people.” Of course not; the problem was that all of those being spoken to were *guilty* by Muslim standards - - guilty of adultery, fornication, incest, homosexuality, bestiality, stealing, lying, murder, and failure to become Muslims. By silence and acquiescence, all of us have participated in the *murder* of 48 million babies to enable 15 year old children to fornicate freely without consequence. All of us are sinners, and according to Muslim law, all of us are worthy of death. Grinning at the crowds in Christian cathedrals was natural for the Muslim clerics. A great deed had been done by Islam. The 9-11 attack was Islam’s GREAT REFUSAL of what they believe to merely be sleazy “Christian” morality.

On September 11, 2001, America immediately clothed her naked body with our flag, climbed up and wrapped her legs around the pulpit like a stripper straddling her brass pole, and then began giving a sermon of her own to the Muslims. But the fact remains that we were attacked, in some part, because we have become hated by those who abhor our storm gutter morality. America now is obliged to defend herself to prevent more attacks, but she is not innocent in this affair. America has had her legs broadly spread like a huge whore, inviting all who wish to fornicate with her. We’re all *guilty* of permitting this; every one of us who have merely wrung our hands and lamented, “After all, what can *we* do about it?” Guilty!

Sadly, the Reichian sexual revolution hasn’t ended. America is defiantly denying her guilt while handing out fresh condoms to every kingdom on earth. The Democratic Party is waiting in the wings for a chance to accomplish stage three of the Reichian revolution. At the first opportunity,

that party and its Marxist/Reichian revolution will continue business as usual.

The next Democratic Party takeover will give the Radical Left absolute control of “Homeland Security,” as well as all the rest of the total police-state apparatus now being erected to control us. Sooner or later “fundamental” Christians will be explicitly targeted as objects of derision and hate. Christendom will be openly attacked with violence in this country. The Radical Left media already is equating Bible-believing Christians with Muslim “fundamentalists.” This ploy is just one more example of how the Radical Left makes ominous weapons with clever linguistics.

Consider some final words of Wilhelm Reich:

“In capitalist society there can be no sexual liberation of youth, no healthy, satisfying sex life; if you want to be rid of your sexual troubles, fight for socialism. Only through socialism can you achieve sexual *joie de vivre*. Pay no attention to the opinions of people who don’t know anything about sex. ***Socialism will put an end to the power of those who gaze up toward heaven as they speak of love while they crush and destroy the sexuality of youth.***”<sup>77</sup>

Let us make no mistake, Reichian revolutionaries are out to get us. They’re merely waiting for their next opportunity to finish off our freedoms.

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid, p. 274