Using the following index, click on the relevant addendum, section or sub-section to go straight to the latest update.

Index   Page

Return to index

ADDENDUM TO PART I, CHAPTER 1: 'From violence to harmony: childrearing and social evolution'.

More evidence that societal dysfunctions have psychological root-causes (updated: 14/11/5)
In his latest book: 'Collapse – How Societies Choose to Fail or Survive' (Allen Lane 2005) biologist and ecologist Jared Diamond chronicles the self-inflicted demise of a number of the world's societies through the centuries, from the Easter Islanders, to the Greenland Norse. In trying to answer the question: 'why did these societies collapse?', Diamond has teased out key recurring themes that distinguish self-annihilating cultures. Societies have engineered their own ruin largely through the stubborn clinging to cultural and religious values that are designed to concentrate power and prestige among an elite few, and the thoughtless and wasteful plunder of their natural environments. 'Throughout history, actions or inactions by self-absorbed kings, chiefs and politicians have been a regular cause of societal collapses…' (p 431). Diamond notes that collapses are based on: 'lust for power' (p 431), adding that: 'Religious values tend to be especially deeply held and hence frequent causes of disastrous behaviour' (p. 432). This pattern of catastrophic, culturally entrenched concentration of power and privilege among the few has recurred - through history and around the globe – often enough to serve as a stark warning to us in modern times: any failure to respect equally the dignity of all individuals from the very dawn of life, can severely compromise the long term survival of the whole.

While Diamond impugns 'psychological denial' (p435) among societies' bearers of power, I think we should also consider the perils of 'psychological denial' among the many who are credulous and submissive towards authoritarian politicians, religious leaders and captains of industry. Authoritarian and punitive styles of parenting place the whole society at risk.

Societies have repeatedly failed to solve terminal problems - even once the problem has been clearly perceived – because the powerful sought to advance their own interests at the expense of the whole - and because much of the population has been since childhood trained to be acquiescent to this kind of 'authority'. In the modern world, the profit motive is sometimes an example of this phenomenon. Whenever business decisions geared to increase shareholder profits are incompatible with the public good or with wise resource allocation, the profit imperative wins out. This fatal imperative is in fact codified in corporate law; it is the 'fiduciary responsibility' of company directors (Diamond J (2005) 'Collapse', Allen Lane, pages 446 and 483, Bakan J (2004) 'The Corporation' The Free Press).

Here is one of the most poignant current examples of the perils of this imbalance in power relationships. The cataclysmic 'Greenhouse Effect', for example, is the offspring of the fossil fuel industry's stranglehold on world energy markets, and of their vastly disproportionate influence on governments. Corporations associated with fossil fuel extraction have funnelled millions into strategic lobbying and PR campaigns to combat

climate change awareness. (Flannery T (2005) 'The Weather Makers – The History and Future Impact of Climate Change' Text Publishing Melbourne, and Rampton S and Stauber J (2001) 'Trust us! We're experts! – How Industry Manipulates Science and Gambles with your Future' Penguin/Putnam New York, NY). It is astounding that in the face of such imminent planetary danger, the Bush administration has joined with major automobile manufacturers in the USA to oppose the Californian and New York initiatives to limit vehicle emissions (New York Times, Editorial: 'Cleaner Cars for New York' November 11, 2005).

Diamond's historical tragedies contain the kernel of hope, since these cultural flaws are psychological in their origins, and are therefore entirely avoidable. Human relations lie at the very centre of our collective success or failure. The conditions that lead to societal collapse are prepared in the nervous systems of children, as a result of customary childrearing practices. The lessons of history decoded by Diamond now demand our attention more urgently than ever. As it becomes increasingly clear that childrearing reforms are the engine of enduring social change, we are put on notice that precisely those reforms must be at the very top of national and international agendas.

[Return to index](#)

Section: The current dilemma (updated: 11/11/5)
Jared Diamond's expansive cross-cultural and historical study (Collapse, 2005) confirms that over-population is a very unreliable explanation of why communities or nations explode into armed conflict. He cites for example the genocides that occurred in moderately populated nations such as Hitler's Germany and Cambodia, while social harmony reigns in countries such as Belgium and Holland, which are more densely populated than Rwanda. Anthropologist R. Brian Ferguson ('The Birth of War' in: *Natural History* July-August 2003) concurs that throughout history, scarcity has been the result of unequal resource distribution: an artefact of politics and not of overpopulation. Over-population is certainly problematic, but is a *symptom* of dysfunctional relationships more than a *cause*. Fertility rates are much lower in relatively gender egalitarian societies where women are empowered and have reproductive control. It is psychological factors, borne of culturally based childrearing norms, that produce our greatest social, political, economic and even environmental dilemmas.

Our current global warming crisis, for example, could have been addressed and rectified much earlier were it not for the interventions of lobbyists working on behalf of the fossil fuel industry, who scheme to confuse public opinion and delay government action while humanity suffers. In his new book: 'The Weather Makers' (2005), the internationally acclaimed scientist and conservationist Tim Flannnery exposes the machinations of oil industry lobbyists in the White House (USA), where a dozen major reports on climate change have been altered, suppressed or dismissed. The coal mining industry donated US$20 million to the Republican Party in 2000, and added a further US$21 million since. In Australia, according to Flannery, a technologist for a mining company deeply involved

in coal was nominated by the Howard government as chief scientist to advise on issues such as climate change.

The 'Global Climate Coalition', an industry lobby group formed in 1989 to represent the interests of 50 oil, gas, coal, car and chemical corporations, has as it's stated aim: 'to cast doubt on the theory of global warming' (page 242). According to Flannery (2005), this organization has greased the palms of government with $US60 million in political donations, and by spending further millions on sophisticated PR campaigns of denial to stall public action.

Flannery joins a growing chorus of international scientists to warn that civilization is now in the gravest danger. Radical solutions are urgently required; we need at least a global 70% reduction in the use of fossil fuels by 2050.

Governments have been painfully slow to act - this is particularly true of the USA and of Australia - while the Greenhouse crisis rapidly deepens. The recent hurricanes (Katrina and Wilma) that caused devastation in Louisiana, Texas and Florida have been linked to the unusually warm ocean currents in the area, which are now understood to be partially the result of the Greenhouse Effect. A study from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found that hurricane wind speeds have increased about 50% in the past 50 years, and scientists project this is likely to get worse. (http://www.time.com http://www.cnn.com http://www.realclimate.org). The link between increased hurricane activity and industrial activity is endorsed by Sir David King, the British Government's chief scientific adviser: (Buncombe, A (2005) 'King: Global warming may be to blame' *The Independent (UK)* 31 August 2005 http://news.independent.co.uk).

Australia has recently been experiencing some its worst droughts on record. The generally deteriorating dry conditions have also been identified as a product of the Greenhouse Effect. A new scientific report released by World Wild Fund for Nature Australia and leading meteorologists in 2003 (http://www.wwf.org.au) has shown that industrially induced global warming was a key factor in Australia's current droughts. The report entitled 'Global Warming Contributes to Australia's Worst Drought' states that in 2002 Australia recorded its highest-ever average March-Nov temperatures. This is confirmed by Australia's pre-eminent climate scientist, Ian Lowe, who asserts that the unending drought conditions and worsening water shortage is also caused by the fossil-fuel economy. (Hodge, A. The Australian, 15th September 2005).

The supremacy of fossil fuel interests over government and economics remains largely unchallenged, as global warming wreaks its devastation in our own backyard. A scenario of ecological and economical collapse, along the lines of those analyzed by Jared Diamond (2005) looms closer with each new season, unless the general public demands more democracy, transparency and accountability from those whom we have empowered to represent us. Elitism in power structures has proven to be disastrous time and again, and a collective maturation in our relationship to 'authority' is urgently called for.

ADDENDUM TO PART II, CHAPTER 2: 'Childhood through the ages' (updated: 11/11/5)

Section: Parenting 'instinct': myth or reality?
With regard to prehistoric violence, there is continuing controversy among archaeologists and anthropologists about the prevalence of warfare in hunter-gatherer societies. Some propose that warfare only emerged around 10,000 to 15,000 years ago when the first permanent settlements were established (R. Brian Ferguson (2003) 'The Birth of War' *Natural History* July-August 2003), while others argue that warfare has been prevalent from the beginning (see Keeley LH (1996) *War Before Civilization – the Myth of the Peaceful Savage* Oxford University Press, NY, and Le Blanc SA (2003) *Constant Battles – The Myth of the Peaceful, Noble Savage* St Martin's Press, NY). While it seems that organized strategic warfare may have been rare until the Neolithic era, roughly 10,000 years ago, (personal correspondence with Lloyd de Mause, November 1st 2005), other forms of violence did exist among pre-agricultural peoples (additionally, there is archaeological evidence that Neanderthals were warlike). The earliest evidence of human homicide dates back between 35,000 and 25,000 years, and violence is still observed in today's hunter-gatherer societies (Wendorf F and Schild R 'The Late Paleolithic Burials at Jebel Sahaba: The Earliest Known Warfare' *Scienze Dell'Antichita – Storia Archeologia Antropologia* 11 (2001-2003) *Estratto* Edizioni Quasar). Fred Wendorf, President of the Society for Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) in USA has stated: "all modern hunter-gatherer societies have conflict, murders and revenge killings, but not warfare" (personal correspondence, November 2nd 2005). Infanticide and the sexual molestation of children has been well documented among hunter-gatherer and early agricultural societies (de Mause, L (2002) 'The Emotional Life of Nations' Karnak, New York, Chapter 7). Findings such as these persuade psycho-historians to surmise that infanticidal-mode parenting and interpersonal violence were common among pre-historic hunter-gatherers. So, although there have been many relatively peaceful societies emerging through the various eras, it is an over-idealization of our past to think that a violence-free existence has ever been the norm. On the other hand, we cannot say with all certainty that infanticidal-mode parenting and violence was comprehensively the norm across all prehistoric nomadic societies, the picture may be more complex.

Regardless of the nature of our pre-historic origins, the hard-won – though as yet insufficient - gains in democracy, human rights and children's rights that many countries enjoy today, are entirely unprecedented in their scope. These remarkable social-evolutionary developments indicate that humanity is beginning to give more attention to the inner voice of the 'parenting instinct'.

ADDENDUM TO PART II, CHAPTER 11, 'Yugoslavian Childhood: From War to Democracy' (updated: 11/11/5)

Yugoslavia was not alone in Eastern Europe in its preponderance of punitively patriarchal family types, early in the 20th century. A popular saying among the peasantry of neighboring Romania – where my parents come from - was: *Muierea nebatuta este ca moara neferecata.* Roughly this translates as: 'a woman who is not beaten is like an un-oiled windmill'. This proverb was still in use in the early 20th century, and wealthy mothers were still farming out their babies to wet-nurses (*doica*) at this time. The patriarchal and authoritarian Romanian culture was to produce, in Nicolae Caucescu, one of the most brutal of Eastern Bloc dictators.

[Return to index](#)

ADDENDUM TO PART III, CHAPTER 14 'Religious extremism – a parenting style'

Section: Childrearing and Islamic extremism (updated: 11/11/5)
A clarion call for peaceful reform comes in Irshad Manji's: 'The Trouble with Islam' (Random House, Sydney, 2003). Manji gives testimony through her own life experience and Islamic education to the misogyny endemic to many sections of Islam, and calls for feminist reform throughout the Islamic world. Manji focusses on *cultural* reform as essential to addressing the root causes of violence and of terrorism. I noted in 'Parenting for a Peaceful World' that patriarchal authoritarianism and misogyny are the forerunners of punitive child-rearing, and therefore social violence. Reforms to gender relations and family dynamics – by implication child-rearing reforms – have historically been effective (see Part III of 'Parenting for a Peaceful World) where a 'War on Terror' cannot hope to be. It is these kinds of reforms that the relatively democratic nations should be sponsoring in authoritarian states.

In this section of the book I had cited from the SPARC (Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Child, a Pakistani advocacy group for children's rights -) report: *The State of Pakistan's Children – 1999.* This report has been updated and a 2004 edition has been released (http://www.sparcpk.org). The latest report finds that the Pakistani government has made some effort to improve children's educational opportunities, but their efforts have been rather slow and insufficient. The section on violence against children reports that it is rising, and it is carried out with impunity. This report perceives a tacit acceptance of abuse and violence in many areas of Pakistani society, and unchecked cultural practices that aid and abet violence against children. The practice of child marriage continues unchallenged, particularly in the rural areas of Pakistan. The child labor situation is 'dismal' and getting worse, owing again to the fact that it is a culturally entrenched practice. Fundamentalism, sectarian violence and terror's foot-soldiers will always be produced in any part of the world where the situation of children is so abysmal. Peace and democracy cannot flourish without a culture that respects the wellbeing of children.

International resources should be urgently diverted towards assisting Pakistan and surrounding nations to protect women and children from violence while securing non-partisan education for all. It is far more costly to continue as we do today: waiting passively for mass childhood trauma to flare up as social and international violence, then addressing this violence militarily.

Return to index

Section: Childrearing and Hindu Extremism: (updated: 11/11/5)
Similar problems persist in some rural and traditional parts of India, where it was recently reported that more than 200,000 minors are believed to be married off every year (The Australian, 26th June 2005, page 10).

Return to index

Section: Childrearing and Christian extremism: (updated   11/11/5)
Some Christian institutions are again opposing child protective reforms aimed at banning corporal punishment, this time in New Zealand, where a bill seeking the repeal of 'reasonable chastisement' is currently before parliament. Significant opposition to this bill comes from the Maxim Institute, a think-tank of the Religious Right. To counter this bill, one Christian school distributed pro-spanking leaflets to all its parents, instructing them on how to use chastening implements to punish their children (http://www.stuff.co.nz).

Never before has the impact of religion on society's health been so candidly put to the test, as was done in a recent study published in the Journal of Religion and Society, (Paul, G (2005) 'Cross-National Correlations of Quantifiable Societal Health with Popular Religiosity and Secularism in the Prosperous Democracies' *Journal of Religion and Society* Volume 7, pp 1-8 http://moses.creighton.edu/JRS/2005/2005-11.html). This study compared a number of prosperous democratic nations on several measures of religiosity and public health. The findings fly in the face of what many people have assumed to be the benefits of religion: *the more secular a democracy, the lower its rates of social dysfunction*! The USA emerged as the most religious of all developed democracies, and it has the highest rate of homicide. Portugal, with its quite religious population, also suffers a homicide rate higher than the norm. The USA was shown to have more mass student murders than all secular democracies combined, far higher rates of sexually transmitted disease (6 to 300 times higher than other democracies!), unusually high rates of adolescent abortion, and teenage pregnancy rates 2 to several dozen times higher. Generally, higher rates of religiosity correlate with higher rates of homicide, and poorer public health in prosperous democracies. This is despite the unparalleled wealth of USA, and despite the fact that spending on health care is higher per capita in USA than in any other developed democracy.

One weakness I perceive in this study is that it does not differentiate between proponents of literalist denominations and of modern, progressive churches. In Australia, the Church has repeatedly been a force for justice and human rights, in its vocal defense of refugees and of fair industrial relations laws.

Gregory Paul has identified a strong correlation between religion and social dysfunction, but has not identified the cause. As I stated in my book, studies have shown that communities that cling to literal interpretations of Scripture tend to be more punitive towards their children, owing to Biblical texts that encourage corporal punishment. If American religiosity has been a vehicle for social violence and dysfunction, this is because followers of fundamentalist Protestant denominations are still a majority, albeit a dwindling one (A study by the National Opinion Research Centre (NORC) revealed that the proportion of people free of religious affiliation climbed from 9% in 1993, to 14% in 2002. Protestants in 1993 comprised 63% of the population and by 2002 were down to 52% - a proportion that is likely to have dropped below half by now, see: www-news.uchicago.edu/releases/04/040720.protestant.shtml). Forty-two percent of Americans (Goodstein, L 'Teaching of Creationism is Endorsed in New Survey' *New York Times*, August 31, 2005) still hold strict creationist views, and 38% favor replacing evolutionism with creationism in high schools.

[Return to index](#)

Section: Child-rearing and Jewish Extremism (updated   11/11/5)
I had written that on old custom amongst ultra-religious Jewish sects was for the mohel (ritual circumciser) to suck the blood from the penis of the circumcised infant (entailing direct mouth-genital contact), but that this custom had been rejected by reformists in the 19th century. I have recently learned that this practice endures among some fundamentalists. Last year, a New York mohel who suffered from oral herpes was thought to have infected three babies during their circumcision rites. One of the babies died ten days after the procedure. The Rabbinical Council of America has since issued a statement supporting the use of a sterilized glass tube for suction (Guttman, N (2005) 'Freedom   of   circumcision   v.   health   hazard'   *Haaretz*   March   15,   2005 http://atlanta.indymedia.org/mod/otherpress/index.php?limit_start=80)

[Return to index](#)

ADDENDUM TO PART IV, CHAPTER 16: 'The carrot and the stick'.

Section: Social implications of authoritarian parenting (updated: 11/11/5)
George Lakoff, professor of linguistics at the University of Chicago, analyzed the role played by family dynamics in molding individuals' worldviews, and published his results in: 'Moral Politics' (University of Chicago Press, 2002). Lakoff concludes that people's political views show a strong tendency to reflect the kind of families they were brought up in. What we were overtly taught as children is of little consequence; far more influential is the model of authority exercised by our parents at home. People that come

from families characterized by a 'strict father' model, in which obedience is emphasized, and exacted via regimes of reward and punishment, tend to cling to a more conservative outlook. In the USA this means they tend to vote in favor of the death penalty, in favor of harsh prison terms, against gun control measures, against rights for sexual minorities, against multiculturalism, and against initiatives to protect the natural environment from exploitation. A nation's political landscape mirrors the predominant attitudes to its children.

Return to index

ADDENDUM TO PART IV, CHAPTER 17: 'Authoritarian Control Method 1: Corporal Punishment'

Section: Even ordinary spanking or smacking is harmful (updated: 21/11/5)
A new international study assessing the impact of mothers' use of corporal punishment in China, India, Italy, Kenya, the Philippines and Thailand found that in all these countries, it was associated with more aggression and anxiety in the children (Lansford, et al (2005) 'Physical Discipline and Children's Adjustment: Cultural Normativeness as a moderator' *Child Development* Vol 76(6) Nov/Dec 2005, pp. 1234-46).

Return to index

Section: Social consequences of corporal punishment (updated: 11/11/5)
As we saw earlier, Gregory Paul's comparative international study (Paul, G (2005) 'Cross-National Correlations of Quantifiable Societal Health with Popular Religiosity and Secularism in the Prosperous Democracies' *Journal of Religion and Society* Volume 7, pp 1-8 http://moses.creighton.edu/JRS/2005/2005-11.html) found that the more religious nations have poorer levels of social health and increased levels of crime and social violence. Paul does not explain this correlation between religion and social dysfunction. In Part III, chapter 14 sub-section on 'Childrearing and Christian extremism', I cited a number of studies conducted in the USA that show adherents of literalist interpretations of scripture are significantly more likely to use physical punishment on their children. Research indicates that corporal punishment is a risk factor for violent behavior, making this a plausible explanation for the correlations found by Paul.

I had mentioned in this section that the USA was one of only five nations retaining capital punishment for juveniles, but at the time of writing this policy was being challenged before the courts. The good news is that the USA has now rejected this policy (http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4308881.stm). Unfortunately, the USA remains one of only a few nations that sentence juveniles to Life Without Parole (LWOP), and one of only two countries, alongside Somalia, that has not signed the Convention of the Rights of the Child. There are at least 2,225 child offenders serving life without parole (LWOP) sentences in US prisons for crimes committed before they were aged 18   (http://www.hrw.org/english/docs/2005/10/12/usdom11835.htm).

Australia is currently experiencing a yearly increase in rates of reported child abuse, currently reaching 33,000 cases annually. In the state of NSW, where police now receive an abuse report every 35 minutes, the rate has been increasing by 5% every year (The Weekend Australian: 'Disturbing rise in child abuse', 24th October 2005). It is possible that a growing willingness to report abuse is affecting these figures, and it is difficult to discern if abuse itself in on the rise. Either way, these figures are appalling. Given that child abuse often occurs in the context of 'discipline', it is disappointing that so few voices call for a ban of corporal punishment in Australia. The same ban overseas has successfully reduced the incidence of abuse. These figures make prohibition in Australia all the more urgent.

Return to index

Section: Is corporal punishment here to stay? (updated: 11/11/5)
More countries have joined the world movement towards abolition of corporal punishment, raising the total to fifteen. Hungary passed prohibition laws in 2005, and the Dutch cabinet has agreed to proceed with full prohibition. A bill to repeal the defence of 'reasonable chastisement' is before parliament in New Zealand, where over 100 government and non-government organizations have pledged their support, and where the municipality of Ngongotaha has declared itself a 'no smacking town'. A similar resolution has been adopted in the town of Brookline, Massachusetts (USA). The President of Taiwan is also pushing for reform, saying: '"I am absolutely against corporal punishment of children, or of women" (**http://nospank.net/shuibian.htm**).

The highest courts of Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and Portugal have ruled that any kind of corporal punishment against children, whether at school or in the home, is unacceptable. We can soon expect these court rulings to be enshrined in legislation in these countries. (http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org). Commitments to proceed with full prohibition are current in the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Greece.

The UK government has fallen foul of the Council of Europe for being one of the few recalcitrants still eschewing reform. The European Court of Human Rights has found unanimously that UK law – the "reasonable chastisement" defense – failed to give children adequate protection. Among the British people however, the call for abolition is gathering momentum. This movement is spearheaded by umbrella organizations such as: 'Children are unbeatable!' - an alliance of more than 300 groups including the NSPCC, Save the Children, Barnardo's and the National Children 's Bureau.

Insofar as corporal punishment in schools goes, every industrialized country in the world now comprehensively prohibits school corporal punishment, the U.S. and Australia are the only exceptions. (http://www.stophitting.com/disatschool/worldwide.php).

ADDENDUM TO PART VI, CHAPTERS 25 and 26: 'First and Second Rites of Passage: the Right to Exist and the Right to Need'

Sections: Baby's emotional needs at this time (updated: 11/11/5)

Sub-sections: 'To be responded to promptly' and: 'To receive a timely response to her needs' (updated: 11/11/5)

In a recent study (Lewis M and Ramsay D (2005) 'Infant Emotional and Cortisol Responses to Goal Blockage' *Child Development* Volume 76(2) PP 518-530) researchers observed what happens when mothers did not respond to their babies as they reached out to them. They found that some babies tended to react with sadness, others with anger. The saddened babies had elevated residual levels of the stress hormone cortisol, whereas the babies that reacted angrily did not. The babies' brain chemistry showed that their anger at being ignored is potentially healthier. The damaging effects of excess residual cortisol arise when babies 'give up' reaching out for contact. The results imply that we should perhaps be particularly concerned for babies who cease to reach out when their cries are ignored; the ones who become sad and then give up, such as when practices like 'controlled crying' are utilized. *Practices intended to train babies to stop reaching out or crying out may be causing psychological and neurological harm.*

[Return to index](#)

ADDENDUM TO PART VI, CHAPTER 26: 'Second Rite of Passage: The Right to Need'

Section: Baby's emotional needs at this time (updated: 11/11/5)

Sub-section: *'to have her oral needs gratified'* (updated: 11/11/5)

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) has recently updated their 'Policy Statement on Breastfeeding' ('Breastfeeding and the Use of Human Milk' *Pediatrics* Vol 115 pp. 496-506). The full text of the revised 2005 version can be downloaded at: http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/115/2/496

The revised recommendations constitute the strongest endorsement of breastfeeding thus far. Updated advice includes: that babies should receive nothing but breast milk for the first six months, that we should avoid giving babies pacifiers at least until latching on and regular breastfeeding is well established, that there is no upper limit to the duration of breastfeeding and no evidence of harm from breastfeeding into the third year or even longer. The AAP now acknowledges the health and economic cost of not breastfeeding at US$3.6 billion dollars (in the USA).

For more information about the health benefits of breastfeeding go to: www.askdrsears.com

Sub-section: '*to sleep near Mum and Dad*' (updated: 11/11/5)
The latest AAP breastfeeding Policy Statement ('Breastfeeding and the Use of Human Milk' *Pediatrics* Vol 115 pp. 496-506) now agrees that babies should sleep near their mothers at night to facilitate nighttime breastfeeding.

Return to index

PART VI, CHAPTER 30: 'Who Parents the Parents?'

Section: Childcare (updated: 11/11/5)
An abundance of research continues to accumulate around the world – for instance in the UK, the USA, Norway, Australia and Italy – confirming the developmentally disruptive effects that can arise from institutionalized childcare. The more hours a baby or toddler spends in childcare, the more he or she is likely to suffer from emotional insecurity and from difficulty with peer relationships.

Long hours in daycare are increasingly recognized as a risk factor for children's lack of compliance with adults' requests, and for openly defiant behavior. Many kinds of behavior problems may have this premature and excessive separation from family as their root cause (NICHD: Early Child Care Research Network (2003) 'Does amount of time spent in childcare predict socio-emotional adjustment during the transition to kindergarten?' *Child Development* Vol 74).

The 'National Institute on Child Health and Development' (NICHD) – followed up the progress of 1,100 children in childcare, around 10 USA cities. They found that the longer the hours a child spends in daycare, the more disharmonious the mother-child relationship becomes. At 4.5 years, children in long daycare (more than 30 hours per week) were three times as likely to show aggressive behavior than children who had attended less than 10 hours per week. Similar results in Australian and British studies are cited in Anne Manne's: 'Motherhood: How should we care for our children?' (Allen & Unwin Crows Nest NSW, 2005). However, by focusing singularly on 'aggressive behavior', these studies ignore a host of other possible effects of excessive institutionalized care.

One study involving 1,200 children in the UK concluded that children in childcare perform worse in developmental tests, and they tend to be more withdrawn, compliant or sad – as well as showing higher levels of aggression. As little as 12 hours per week of daycare for infants was sufficient to be associated with significant increases in 'difficult' behavior. (The Observer: Sunday October 2nd, 2005. http://observer.guardian.co.uk).

Increasingly, the effects of childcare are being evaluated by testing for elevated levels of stress hormones in children. A Cambridge University study showed that without their mothers present, children's cortisol levels doubled during the first 9 days of childcare. Even five months later, cortisol levels remain comparatively high (http://www.guardian.co.uk/medicine/story/0,11381,1573248,00.html). Professor Michael Lamb, one of the authors, recommends shorter hours in care, and that parents should stay in the

centers with their children until they are visibly contented, as done in Swedish open schools. This is similar to what I proposed in chapter 31.

Many more studies have found elevated cortisol levels in the afternoon for full-day centre-based care (Cited in: Manne, A (2005) 'Motherhood: How should we care for our children?' Allen & Unwin Crows Nest NSW, page 196). This effect is true even in the most 'high-quality' centers. This is reason for concern for, as discussed in my book (chapter 21) *when stress is continual, so that excess cortisol fails to be reabsorbed, it can destroy brain tissue in the areas of the brain concerned with the regulation of emotion, and permanently alter the balance of brain chemistry. Therein lies the biological basis for the long-term psychological effects of long hours in childcare.*

I would not argue that childcare is damaging across the board. For toddlers who are helped to separate from their parents gradually and at their own pace, preschool can offer many stimulating and empowering social and educational experiences – provided that their attachment needs are taken care of. So, what exactly goes on in childcare institutions that would account for these worrying findings? To begin with, childcare for infants and babies introduces separation from parents much too early, too suddenly, and for periods that are too long. Furthermore, investigations have found that toddlers in these centers receive very little individualized attention, precious little intimacy, affection or physical touch, and that often their attempts to reach out for contact are simply ignored (Manne, A (2005) 'Motherhood: How should we care for our children?' Allen & Unwin Crows Nest NSW, page 199-200). Even in centers that are considered of 'high quality', babies' all-important need for bonding can go unmet. Italian researchers (Fein, G (1995) 'Infants in Group Care: Patterns of Despair and Detachment' *Early Childhood research Quarterly* Vol 10 pp. 261-75) reported that even in centers with staff-to-child ratios at 1:3, babies appeared to be disengaged, sometimes exhibiting despair-like reactions.

The inadequacy of modern childcare solutions is emerging as a public health issue of huge proportions. In the USA, 12 million (more than half) of toddlers are in daycare, many beginning at a few weeks of age, and many languish in these centers for up to 40 hours a week. In Australia, mandatory staffing ratios stand at five children per staff member. For babies in particular, this is an insufficient level of individualized attention, and disregards their attachment needs. Long daycare also makes breastfeeding impossible.

Though it cannot be denied that the emerging data is convincing, I am frustrated with the general willingness to put the wellbeing of babies and toddlers on hold, while awaiting the verdict from debates about the results of costly and lengthy studies. The squabble about the relative merits of research findings seems to be a red herring that delays corrective action. The problem with this over-reliance on research is that it rests on the assumption that the childcare issue can be looked at in a theoretical vacuum. It can't. Without even glimpsing at these alarming research results we should know that many aspects of institutionalized childcare spit in the eye of everything we have painstakingly learned over recent decades about the centrality of attachment; the critical importance of sensitive, warm and prompt responsiveness to babies as a cornerstone of their lifelong

emotional security. Most of our current models of institutionalized childcare, with their low child-to-carer ratios, and with closed-door policies towards parents, cannot possibly provide for those critical developmental needs. No matter what the quality of institutionalized childcare, there is one crucial thing they cannot purport to do. They cannot *love* our children. The conditions of institutionalized care do not allow for the depth of bonding that is crucial for emotional wellbeing to take place.

Increasingly we seem immersed in an era of free-market fundamentalism where we allow market forces to dictate our every fate. Productivity-neurosis trumps all of our needs for relationship, and in our privatization frenzy, we have finally privatized family love. We can even buy shares in the substitute. The profit motive decides who will care for our children, and so we are creating a generation deprived of healthy early attachment. Few dare to question, in this brave new world, the wisdom of a society that fails to support parents and grandparents to remain close to their children. This is both a tragic and a risky social experiment.

[Return to index](#)

ADDENDUM TO PART VII, CHAPTER 31: 'Emotionally healthy children: a communal responsibility'.

Section: Government and industry sponsored steps to a more peaceful world (updated: 11/11/5)
In this section I proposed seven key pro-family initiatives that would bring about 'incalculable' social rewards, but I believe there are further essential strategies that need to be put in place.

The eighth crucial initiative (I have not listed them in order of importance) would be to legislate against the use of corporal punishment in the home, as well as at school. The fast growing list of nations – mostly European - that have adopted this ban are enjoying remarkable reductions in social dysfunction.

The ninth initiative I propose is for financial incentives for retirees and for grandparents to care for their own grandchildren in-house - perhaps even for others' grandchildren if some training and certification is provided. We have a giant untapped resource of love: our 'ageing population'. Our governments should reward pensioners for home-based, family-centered care of their grandchildren. Co-operative, non-profit centers run by senior citizens might afford far healthier staffing ratios without the burden of having to enrich shareholders. Combined with enhanced maternity and paternity benefits, this would take pressure off the perpetually bemoaned shortage of childcare places, while providing far healthier bonding opportunities for children. It would also be a valuable solution to the global problem of the 'aging population'. Retirees could also be ideal mentors for older children and adolescents, and should receive financial rewards and some training for such an invaluable contribution to society. We should be looking at how society's grandparents can be a resource of love, care and wisdom rather than a

viewing them simplistically – and dismissively, as we seem to today - as a fiscal burden or nuisance.

Return to index

Section: Are there alternatives to war? (updated: 11/11/5)
It should come as no surprise that the experiment to enforce democratization on Iraq has so far been disastrous. After yielding some initial positives, the attempt to impose democratic change by brute force has led to a resurgence of religious authoritarianism and unrelenting violence. Precious little was done to support the democratization of the culture and of the family, without which 'democratic' government is an empty gesture; unviable and unsupported by too many of its people.

Nevertheless, the democratization of nations remains an imperative. Studies continue to find that democratic states almost never go to war against each other, and in fact democracies tend to be generally less war prone (Vasquez, JA (2000) 'What do we know about war?' Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford). But world leaders must understand that democracy does not arrive on the tip of a missile; it grows from cultural changes driven largely, at their core, by child-rearing reform.

Return to index