

When I first began to think about our topic - "what can we expect of pre-school
child" - changed. When can we expect of the efforts on child psychology in
relation to child development.

Child of tomorrow - atomer age child.
Sometimes we get the impression from women's magazines - that if only
we know enough about child psychology we will eventually be able to
bring forth a super deluxe model child, a model to surpass all others in
performance, raised up under rigid road tests - fair weather & foul, no
mechanical imperfections. We've been working on that model for a long,
long time and the engineers still haven't worked out the kinks. In 1949
Junior's brakes are effective only 30% of the time; his self-starter
is poor in the morning & too good at night; he stalls frequently,
gets overheated, wears out his door covers. Oh well - in 1960 they'll surely
put out a better model when the child psychologists get the kinks worked out.

Harsh Parents -

If the parents understand all the child's problems, causes elimination.

The reality - (1) the moment of crisis - road burning, etc.
 getting married.

- (2) parents' identification with own parents -
 a. Seder.
 b. Mrs. Green.

The idea of parental blame - how better of untrained parents, no one to learn from - a dilemma.

School Age child.

How is he different from pre-school.

- (1) conscience - now he acts towards his naughtiness the way Mrs. & Pa. did - (reason)
 (2) capacity for sublimation - fire - soccer - gymnastics.
 Seder - J. man

What has happened to the old fears - how he modifies them.

- (1) identification with father & mother.
 (2) reality principle.
 (3) sublimation.

games - pursued by someone - turning fear into pleasure again.

hop-scotch, etc. - penalty game.

capt & robber - good & bad games.

Stories - he is Superman & no danger threatens him.
 & more.

Investigation & learning
 & our world today.

But fears will still break out occasionally.

fear of punishment for bad wishes.

Discipline - as learning.

Psychology of punishment - Spanking.

Deprivation of privilege - (a) library card - (b) radio program - (c) temper tantrum.

Parents' guilt about disciplining.

Sibling rivalry.

Looking for values.

Money, toys - Gifts = love. ??? husband has no modesty about discussing money & kids.

Family cultural backgrounds.

Bigotry?

1
~~We have decided to talk about the school-age child today. I must admit we have no intention of doing justice to our topic. We know, of course, that our topic is inexhaustible.~~

We have decided to ~~talk~~ ^{add} the school-age child today. Maybe you're wondering as I am just how we'll manage to cover our new topic in one session: we won't of course. But I think we can go on to a few areas of child development of concern to all parents of the school age.

First of all. "What do we expect of the school age child? What constitutes normality?" Now our women's magazines have some notions. Dr. Spock would tell us: (1) a child should have no fears. A corollary of this thesis is that a child who has fears is "emotionally insecure" & his parents do not give him enough affection.

Every day problem. Please age child -

Now that we are here together I'm sure you all have the same question in mind that I have - How well we ever cover this vast topic in an hour.

Age range - about 6 - 18 -

On being parents today -

~~Parents~~ never was

Reminds me of story when being a parent was more difficult.

One topic understanding the scholarly child - We know we are all going to understand our children.

This is a vast topic. I'm sure we all be glad to admit - that at the end of this hour we won't have complete understanding of our scholarly child. It's the question - "If we understand everything about our children - but everything - would we have no problems - I doubt it. We can at the least understand - but not administer

It's the reality -

If there is one complaint where we

~~have talking about normal~~

The idea of "understanding" children is not very old.

Let's take the science of child psychology in perspective.

No phobias - no fears?

Infant: he is afraid when his mother is absent
of the dark -
he begins to crawl -
the furniture
of the room -
the
fears
of the
infant.

Pre-school - afraid of ^{drag} tigers & crocodiles,
also
afraid of death.

What is the job of the parent? To eliminate all fears? Then
we have to do away with the child.

The job of the parent is to keep the child under his fears -

Difference between normal fear & neurotic.

We notice how these fears gradually diminish in intensity.

Some of the recommendations to being a good parent - are
actually recommendations for being a parent.

5 1/2 year old -

Development of conscience & ego-ideal.

Sublimation -

Discipline -
when

Rel. to parents & ego-ideal -

Selfishness - & when to interfere - when not to -

Use of money -

School -

I don't know why we should expect a miracle of child psychology. After centuries of research in medicine children still get measles, mumps, & chicken pox. But it is to the credit of medicine that children rarely die of these diseases & the death rate & after-effects of more serious diseases brought to a small percent. Let us carry the analogy further. Science & the best parental care will not eliminate all the emotional problems of childhood - not now or ever. There are problems which are part of childhood development, universal & archaic problems. We shall never get rid of these mechanical imperfections in a super-duper model child. They will always exist & it will always be one of the parents' to help the child manage his problems.

Ansatz:

(1) infancy.

separation mother.

death -
weaning
falling.

(2) second year -

toilet training.

fear of inanimate - furniture.

(3) 3rd year to 6 -

hyperactive phases.

birth of baby in family.

How does child master anxiety?

1. mother-father.

2. reality principle.

Difference between anxiety & neurosis.

THE ANTISEPTIC BABY GROWS UP

Selma H. Fraiberg

It was just about a generation ago that the Antiseptic Baby was born. Those of us who followed him around through the years with gauze mask, alarm clock, measuring cup, yardstick, and I.Q. tests are relieved to find him almost of voting age and independent of our follies. For the Antiseptic Baby was born at an unfortunate stage in our psychological teachings.

If we can send the children out of the room for a while this may be as good a time as any to take stock of the last 20 years of child-rearing.

The Antiseptic Baby was born in the twenties at the height of an era devoted to the study of microbes and morals. It was, you remember, a period of moral upheaval, of revolt against the parents and breaking with tradition. For those who were less inclined to revolt, this moral housecleaning had as its counterpart a war against germs in which every housewife could participate with a sense of moral uplift. Since the methods of child-rearing are always a product of their times the two main ideas of this era were embodied in a new approach to childhood education. Henceforth babies and children were to be set free from the stranglehold of tradition and the stifling bonds to parents. The parents who had revolted against their parents were going to set their children free. The modern child, it was said, needed to be well nourished, germ-free, and healthy. Beyond that he did not need his parents. In fact the sooner the unhealthy tie to parents was severed the better for child and parents.

And so the Antiseptic Baby came into being. He was born like most babies unfortunately, a little early or a little late, but not on time. This early show of a disregard for time was dealt with sternly in the handbooks of infant care. It was certainly one of the few times the Antiseptic Baby was permitted to come

early or late. Like all babies of all times he came fully equipped with an apparatus for the registering of hunger sensations and sound equipment for the broadcasting of same. This machinery was regarded as primitive, outmoded and untrustworthy and an alarm clock and a Feeding Schedule were brought into the nursery. After 20 years of study I think we can now say conclusively that in 49% of all nurseries the babies registered hunger before the alarm clock, in another 49% the alarm clock registered hunger before the baby, and in 2% of the nurseries there were no alarm clocks. Since the Antiseptic Baby was in no event to be fed until the alarm clock got hungry the nursery was often a den of chaos while grim feats of endurance were performed by infant and parents.

Sooner or later the Antiseptic Baby met the stern demands of life with resignation. When he so forgot himself as to wail disconsolately in crib or play-pen he was left alone to bear his sufferings like a man. "Don't spoil the baby!"

Often after the Spartan rigors of his infancy, the Antiseptic Baby turned the tables on his parents. As soon as he was old enough to play this game right he found he held all the cards. He became in the jargon of his day a Feeding Problem. "Now it's their turn to wait." He found cynical revenge in a comedy where mother danced around him with a spoon and father made like a choo-choo train. He and his whole generation caused innumerable psychological tracts to be written on "Feeding Problems in Early Childhood."

But in this grey and chilly nursery it happened that every now and then the mother and father, guiltily side stepped the Handbook, ignored the warnings and promised disasters and picked up the baby. They held him and they made foolish noises. It is also reported that a grandmother, acting as sitter once a week, secretly rocked the baby and sang to him. (She asks to remain anonymous of course.) In this way, through the cooperative cheating of parents, grandma and the baby, the Antiseptic Baby survived the long winter of his infancy.

Having successfully completed these harsh initiation rites of our society the Antiseptic Baby was inducted into the second phase of his childhood and to a new psychology of child care which had nothing to do with the first. At three years of age he was ready for nursery school. Now his Social Self and his Creative Urges which had been refrigerated by the Infant Handbook were ready for a good thaw and a work-out.

So the Antiseptic Baby and his parents applied themselves conscientiously to this new regime. The small boy learned to express himself through the arts. He learned to adjust to the hazards of the pre-school social group. But hardly had the creative and expressive urges reached their finest flower when the Antiseptic Baby was dealt another hand by fate. The honeymoon period was over. It was farewell to the paint jars, the easel, the jungle-jim and the hearty fellowship of the kindergarten.

At six the small boy was ready to come to grips with one of Life's greatest challenges, the Platoon System. The architects of this educational scheme had devised a plan which combined the best features of the law of gravity, the ancient game of musical chairs and the modern factory production line. It was, in fact, the brain child of a Detroit educator. In the Platoon System the complete body of required knowledge for the child was broken down into eight parts; 8 classes, 8 teachers. Every 33 minutes a bell rang, the classroom erupted, expelled its occupants into the corridor and three minutes later yawned and swallowed fifty new children. One of the best features of this plan was its guarantee of full occupancy of each room in the building with no seat left unwarmed for more than three minutes. The teachers in their "special" classrooms remained fixed points in a constellation of whirling bodies, spinning lines and unearthly noises, all propelled by an immutable law to their destination.

The Antiseptic Baby got on the conveyor belt at 8:45 each morning. After a short grind in the Home Room section he was sent down the line for a 30 minute

spin in geography, then off for a turn in Nature Study, down for a quick press in the lunch line, back to the Home Room, over to the Gym, now to the Art Room and then, with a final buffing in the Music Room he emerged with that fine patina we so admired in the children of yesterday. At 3:30 the small boy reeled homeward.

As the years multiplied the belt moved inexorably toward its goal. Sometimes it let on an educator with a new idea but he usually came to grief after a short ride, and nothing remained of his zeal but a scrapbook on the Sioux Indians, a broken down easel, and a cage of white mice which rolled off the end of the assembly line into oblivion. Sometimes a school board member was snagged and bumped along for a while but long enough to make the front page of the newspaper with a speech on the fads and frills in the School system. And the School Board warned the principal, and the principal fired two teachers for fadding and frilling, and the teachers kept the class after school, and the kids wrote things on the side walk and everybody said it was terrible and something should be done about it. It was the fads that were to blame; it was the frills that were to blame; it was the parents, no the teachers, well the System. It was the system. Or Something.

There was a Committee to study things. And they found out that the trouble was that the parents weren't strict enough and the parents were too strict and that children needed more freedom and children needed a good wood shed. And furthermore the educational system was sound at the core but it was the parents and anyway the educational system was rotten at the core and it was the teachers. And this was because the teachers were too young and didn't have any children of their own and also because there were too many teachers who were married and had children and couldn't do two jobs at once.

And when the mothers and fathers read this report they said, "It's time we got

strict with that child and laid down the law. On the other hand maybe we've been too strict and that's the trouble."

The parents wanted to do the right thing. They wanted to be modern parents. So that on some occasions when they observed the Antiseptic Baby in the act of conking his little brother with a mallet they would say, "well that's just an Attention Getting Mechanism so we'll ignore it." After they said it they would try to be very calm about it in much the same way as you would in summoning the spirit of your great-~~annt~~ Hester at a seance. But the spirit did not appear after the magic words were spoken and the Attention Getting Device often resulted in a disaster. At other times they decided that the thing to do when such episodes occurred was to lay down the law or to spank him. But that didn't seem to work either and proved to be neither cure nor preventative for conking. More than once mother and father found themselves in a theoretical dispute and while one would advocate "laying down the law" the other would press for "ignoring it". It was usually too late for either. The parents found all of this very confusing.

As for the Antiseptic Baby he only knew that sometimes it was all right to conk his little brother and sometimes it was not. But he wasn't sure just when. He found this very confusing.

Well, as everyone knows, the Antiseptic Baby grew up. And almost at the same time as he reached maturity we began to change our notions about child care. Now mind you, nobody came right out and said that the Antiseptic Baby was not a triumph for his advocates. But his advocates seemed to have disappeared. Quietly.

Lessons from the Antiseptic Baby

In 20 years we have learned some remarkable new facts and some embarrassingly old facts about infants and children. Our revolution in child care had disinfectd the nursery, junked the grandparents, and whipped up a new pre-cooked

child psychology which someone had failed to pre-test in our own sanitary kitchen. After all these exertions a whole generation of experts and parents were left standing around awkwardly, a little winded and uncertain. We were left with the job of putting out a new model baby after firing the old production manager.

It.
Lesson #1 - On the Relationship of Alarm Clocks and Infants

As we saw, the new theories of child care were enriched by our discovery in the twenties that parenthood was a form of tyranny designed to enslave and to crush the spirit of the young. If, in our middle years, this statement seems a little strong, it would be well to pick up the magazines and novels of the twenties and remind ourselves that there was once a great and noisy emancipation of youth which shook the nation to its foundations. From our own struggle against dependency we concluded that children should be set free from their parents as soon after birth as possible.

On the face of it that looks absurd. But we tried to do it. We made infants independent of their mothers by putting them on bottles. We tried to make them self-sufficient and disciplined by feeding them by the clock instead of satisfying their hunger. When they cried out of fear or loneliness or frustration we did not comfort them, "they would learn to expect it", "don't spoil them". We toilet trained them at six months, "the sooner the better". But we didn't succeed in making an independent baby because nobody can. They're not born that way.

The instincts have a way of playing practical jokes on us when we try to get tough with them. With the Antiseptic Baby they really made us look a little foolish. For far from creating an independent child we produced one of the most dependent babies in history. How did we do it? It was very easy. To the baby food and love are equated. To be fed when hungry is an evidence of parental love to the infant. To be fed as much as he wants, when he wants it, means phy-

sical and emotional satisfaction. "I am well loved". With the Antiseptic Baby method we fed babies by ounces and by the clock. He was to be fed so much, no more and at a certain time, no less. The unsatisfied hunger, the frustration of waiting, created early doubts in the infant regarding the feelings of his parents. I feel I can understand his feelings very well when I consider my own as I wait in a restaurant for the food I ordered an hour ago. "Well," I always hiss between the teeth, "maybe these people just don't want my patronage! Well!" So it was with the Antiseptic Baby. And instead of making him brave and independent as we hoped we made him anxious and uncertain and prolonged his need for infantile attention. Because the child gains independence and self confidence through the certainty of love; he clings to his parents through uncertainty and doubt.

For trying to outwit the instinctual needs of the infant we paid a price to these formidable opponents. For frustrating the hunger needs of infants, for making the nourishment of infants a task of endurance, for making food and love and uncertainty, we have paid a price in a national child-hood disease called "Feeding Problems". The files of the Child Guidance Clinics, the indexes of professional journals, provide testimony to our failure through thousands of painstaking case citations.

We also tried to make babies self-reliant and self-controlled through early toilet training, usually at six months, often sooner. The task of enforcing control of elimination in a child who cannot make intelligible sounds and who cannot even sit up without support is one which engages the determination of the mother and the determination of the instincts in a fierce struggle for dominance.

Far from creating independence in the infant, we produced anxiety and terror, infant rages, constipation, loss of appetite and numerous related symptoms, the infant's physical protest against these unreasonable and incomprehensible demands.

Out of fear and out of a wish to secure the approval of his mother, the infant usually learned to comply with these demands, or at least to compromise with them. But clinical experience reveals later developments. A little later on in childhood a large number of these babies developed temper tantrums, soiling problems, or excessive cleanliness and fear of dirt. In other words when later they were faced with even the ordinary demands on children which the family and the world require, these children were thrown into panic and reverted to the same type of behaviour provoked by the excessive demands in their infancy. We had paid still another price.

With the Antiseptic Baby we followed the stern admonitions of the handbooks, "Don't pick up the baby", "Let him cry it out". These warnings we all remember were designed to prevent the "spoiling" of the infant. "He'll get too dependent!" "He'll want attention all the time." No one said so, but it was generally understood that properly refrigerated a baby would keep indefinitely without spoiling.

Infancy then, as in all times, was a lonely and frightening period of life, a world of blurred visions, of lightness and darkness, of frightful sounds, and of a strange periodic pain accompanied by the desire for a something that would fill the body and sooth the pain. In this world without meaning the infant feared the space and the emptiness about him. When he was hungry or in pain he wanted to feel enclosed and safe and intimate with another human being. He was too simple an organism to make sounds and cries just to annoy his parents.

Left alone, like the Antiseptic Baby, he could only learn that he could expect no comfort for his fears. And because he was not reassured against these nameless fears, the fears were magnified and they became ominous Things against which he had no protection. He cried, all the more loudly and more frequently then.

Mothers will tell you that the Antiseptic Baby was the cryingest baby that ever was.

And once again we were tricked. For the baby did not develop courage and independence in his struggle with fear. He did not learn to settle his own conflicts. He did not learn that he couldn't get attention by crying, as the handbooks assured us he would learn "soon enough". He only learned that he couldn't expect much from adults. And for that lesson let us all bow in shame.

Those babies who stood up best under such a regime later developed a kind of cynicism and distrust of their elders which is a marked trait among many children today. Those babies who did not stand up so well, later were prone to neurotic fears, to infantile, clinging attitudes, and various other disorders. And once again we paid a price.

But where do we stand now? What do the experts tell us today about infant rearing? The experts of this age are men and women who are on speaking terms with infants and parents. As you leaf through the writings of Ribble, Gesell, Spock, and Aldrich you are impressed by the absence of schedules, rules and ceremony in the handling of infants. The phrase "self-demand feeding" has come into usage. It means that the infant is fed when he is hungry, as often as he is hungry, and as much as he wants. We will permit Grandma a well earned snort at this point. We will even let her laugh up her sleeve at us, if she will only stop following us around and cackling, "Well, how else did you expect to rear a baby." We know, now, that each baby has his own hunger rhythm, a specially designed swiss movement with alarm attachment, and with certain irregularities. Any attempt by well meaning parents, or ill-informed handbooks, to improve upon this mechanism will result in mechanical difficulties.

We know now, that babies need fondling, cuddling, rocking, singing and foolish

noises. They do not need these things to mad excess, but they need them in the easy, spontaneous and tender way that good ^{love} ~~live~~ is given. We know now that a child's first experiences in love begin in infancy. It is not a forgotten period, a dark ages in the life-time of man, it is a time in which the senses are awakened and educated. We know that certain character traits are formed in infancy and are basic to the development of the child's personality. For infancy is the beginning of the civilized process whereby self-love is converted by slow degrees to love of others.

Lesson #2 - There Never Was a Never-Never Land

Had I used the word discipline in a professional journal or popular magazine a few years ago I would have been hissed and booed by an angry mob or if I were lucky I would only have been tossed aside as a harmless if zany eccentric. Even now the keys of the typewriter jam and creak when I try to get that word spelled out. It is a dishonorable old word in our vocabulary, associated with crank letters in the public letter box concerning children who run all over certain people's lawns and have no respect for certain people's property, signed "Fifty Years a Taxpayer". It's a foul word when used by people who shout for the Return of the Woodshed and the Oldfashioned Beating. It's a misleading word when it is used more today in its military sense than its original meaning. The word has so fallen to ruin that I must consult the dictionary to revive its meaning and its past. In its original form the word discipline meant "teaching, instruction". Apparently the word came from decent stock, so let us take heart and pursue its lineage to modern times. We find in Webster the definition of discipline as "training which corrects, molds, strengthens and perfects". The word may also be used to mean "punishment, chastisement" but Webster lists this among six other meanings. The synonym for discipline is "education".

Since the word discipline appears to have perfectly respectable connotations it

is certainly worthwhile to ask how come it fell into such ill-repute. In the twenties, at the time we were noisily liberating ourselves from the past and rebelling against parents, we began to hear much talk of "free expression" for children. This phrase is not to be confused with "progressive education" since to my knowledge the best thinking in progressive education circles has always recognized sensitive and sensible training of the child. But this phrase "free expression" captured the imagination of a generation of adults who were busily emancipating themselves from the past.

Now actually very few parents carried the theory of free-expression to its logical extreme. I know only a few such valiant parents and they have grown prematurely old and have retired to California. Their children have not been grateful either. What actually happened, however, is that a whole generation of parents practiced the profession of parenthood with the uneasy feeling that their children would theoretically be better off without them.

A further difficulty arose out of our conviction that our children should not be raised as we were raised. Now that was all right since there was certainly enough rubbish about children to be cleared out of the family attic. But along with the rubbish we almost threw out the family. Since children were to be "free" parents were to have no authority. (meaning authority with a small "a" not capital "A" as in the case of Papa Barrett of Wimpole Street). Something happened to the American Papa during the last generation which caused him to step aside from his traditional and honored role as a dignified authority in his home. Our American fiction has dramatized his plight and he is often portrayed as a harrassed and weary fellow, grimly holding on to his opened newspaper while bedlam breaks loose from all sides.

Parents found themselves pulled in two directions on the subject of child-rearing. They vacillated between "allowing" and "forbidding" with wide extremes between

the two. "Forbidding" meant being like one's own parents who had been "too forbidding". "Allowing" meant not interfering for fear of being a bad parent. The result was often a chaotic kind of child training in which "allowing too much" resulted in the necessity for "forbidding too much" and vice versa; a state which could only be confusing to the child and wearing for the parents.

All in all we have so undermined the position of parents during the past generation that perfectly good and well-intentioned parents have stood by and silently surrendered themselves to the idea that every mistake they made was a sign of their unworthiness as parents. In Child Guidance Clinics we are accustomed to seeing parents weighted down with a sense of sin and failure because a child is not reading well, because he wets his bed, because he is shy and for the many other reasons which bring parents and children to clinics. Who can "blame" a parent for the mistakes he has made knowingly or unknowingly? What does that accomplish beyond paralyzing a parent so that he cannot seek help? Yet we never pick up a newspaper without finding a speech condemning parents for one thing and another and for some reason we always feel that by placing blame we have solved the problem.

Where do we stand now on that word which Webster defines as "training which corrects, molds, strengthens and perfects"? (Only let's leave out that word "perfects". Too much of a strain on us and the kids.) We are growing to understand that children need limitations as well as freedom. In fact we don't think of freedom in the sense of anarchy in our modern psychology. It is a freedom with limits. We conceive of parental authority not as a table-pounding, "because I said so" authority, but a dignified, certain, and unself-conscious right and obligation of the parent to "mold and strengthen" the character of his child.

We know that the small boy grows up in the image of his father, so that a father

must be a source of strength and quiet authority for his son to enable him to grow to maturity certain of masculine values. A father represents "the good man" to his daughter and she will pattern the choice of husband on her father. We cannot have a good society with displaced fathers.

We know that a mother must represent womanliness to her daughter to enable that daughter to grow into maturity with a sense of the dignity of womanhood and the rightness of being a woman for her. For this task of educating our daughters we, as mothers, must give convincing proof that it is good and rewarding to be a woman. To the son a mother is the most important woman until he meets his first love or his wife. That difficult task of rearing a son so that he can make his adult choice of woman with freedom and healthy masculine emotions can only be done through the wise guidance of both parents.

We know that young children are naturally impulsive and pleasure seeking. It just ain't good sense to say that "if you leave em alone they'll learn by themselves." Cast adrift on a desert island they might learn by themselves or they might not. But in the history of civilization and even in the history of those primitive tribes which we choose to call "uncivilized" there has never been a child who has learned to live in the society of his time without the guidance of an adult. The more complex the society the larger the parental task. We cannot create a "Never-never Land" for children where they will be free of the expectations of society, unhampered by its rules. It is the ancient and honorable task of the parent to teach his child not only to enjoy life and experience its many pleasures, but to accept when necessary, limitations, frustration, and the occasional relinquishment or curtailment of pleasure.

Lesson #3 - On Learning on a Conveyor Belt

A prominent educator in my home town said recently, "In our mass education sys-

tem we ignore the fact that learning is a personal experience." She means, I know, that it is the relationship between educator and child which makes for good learning, bad learning, or no learning.

What can we say then, of the conveyor-belt system of education? Our class rooms in large cities contain forty to sixty pupils. There can be no relationship between pupil and teacher under such conditions. This fact has been emphasized over and over in hundreds of articles like this. I repeat it once again because I feel that the psychological damage, the stunting of intellect which results from such learning situations is incalculable. It means that hundreds of thousands of learners get their intellectual food in a kind of educational cafeteria. No exchanges on the blue-plate luncheon, no substitutions, and if you're allergic to the educational succotash, you'll eat it anyway. The diet is impersonal, prescribed for a mythical "average", and simmered down to an unpalatable mush. It is dished out by a cook who was trained to understand intellectual appetites but hired to run an intellectual soup kitchen. There are moments when the cook meets the eyes of the bored, indifferent patrons and her shame and unhappiness become too terrible to bear.

Let's chalk up another big red E for the architects of the educational system which makes learning a schedule, a formula, a graph. They were partners in crime with those other grim scientists who believed that babies should be fed by the clock. Let's not give the usual apologies that this was the best solution under the circumstances, school enrollment expanded, teacher shortages, etc., because if we had really felt strongly that learning was a personal experience we would have spent more money on schools during the twenties when we had the money and when this system was born. No, let's face it. We produced this system because of the beliefs of our time. We believed in the twenties that learning should be produced efficiently, noiselessly, systematically; that

it could be engineered like machinery. We loved machinery. And we didn't concern ourselves with the teacher-pupil relationship factor in learning because we didn't think in terms of personal relationships as we do now. It was that peculiar fusion of mind and machinery which is the most remarkable characteristic of the twenties.

We produced a nervous, taut, restless student. We produced poor readers, poor spellers and poor lots-of-other-things according to teacher complaints. But it wasn't the "new fangled methods" as the grouches would have us believe. Because it doesn't matter an awful lot which Method is used, it's what goes on between teacher and pupil in the learning process that matters.

Where are we now? In the midst of an educational revolution I'd say. The grumbles of teachers, students, parents have grown into a mighty roar from coast to coast. It is the noisiest protest against education this country has ever known. And every headline, every speech, every brick, literal and figurative, thrown against the school-house window is aimed at the destruction of production-line education.

So the Antiseptic Baby has grown up now. The great experimental baby has come of age and his parents and educators, in that relaxed and retrospective mood that comes to people who have just married off the last youngster, have started to think. They're thinking about a lot of things. They're thinking it's time we started to get that rubbish out of the attic again. It's a crime the way things accumulate in twenty years. Only this time we're not in such a hurry. We're a lot older and wiser. We've seen a lot of fundamental beliefs in family life affirmed and strengthened. And these ideas have found their place in a new psychology where basic human relationships have become dignified and have been given scientific validity.