

VOLUME 17

NUMBER 4

Child and Family

Breastfeeding	244
Motherhood	263
Puerperal Fever.....	276
Educational Reformers.....	301
Index	315



*A Quarterly Survey on
The Family*



*We are dedicated to those values which
ensure order, human dignity, health, and
happiness to the family and community.*

HERBERT RATNER, M.D., Editor
CAROLINE E. WARD, M.P.H., Managing Editor
DONALD DEMARCO, PH.D., JOHN F. HILLABRAND, M.D., ROBERT L.
JACKSON, M.D., WILLIAM A. LYNCH, M.D., ROBERT S. MENDEL-
SOHN, M.D., GROVER C. NABORS, M.D., MARIAN TOMPSON, and
GREGORY J. WHITE, M.D., Associate Editors
JOAN M. LOMASNEY, Editorial Assistant
RUTH A. UTERITZ, Editorial Assistant

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

JAMES P. BAGGOTT, Ph.D. Pennsylvania
ROBERT A. BRADLEY, M.D. Colorado
CHARLES J. CORCORAN, O.P. Illinois
EUGENE F. DIAMOND, M.D. Illinois
HUGH P. DUNN, M.D. New Zealand
MINER C. HILL, M.D. New York
CLAIR ISBISTER, M.D. Australia
CHARLES A. LANG, M.D. Illinois
JOOST A. M. MEERLOO, M.D. Holland
JAMES CLARK MOLONEY, M.D. Mexico
JOHN I. NURNBERGER, M.D. Indiana
KONALD A. PREM, M.D. Minnesota
DOROTHY SMITH RATNER, M.D., M.A. Illinois
AUDREY PALM RIKER, R.N., ED.D. Indiana
LOUIS F. RITTELMEYER, M.D. Virginia
ROBERT E. SCHNEIDER, M.S.P.H., ED.D. Maryland
PAULINE G. STITT, M.D. Hawaii
LOUIS C. VACCARO, Michigan
GEORGE M. WHEATLEY, M.D. New York

VOLUME 17
NUMBER 4
1978

Child and Family

Kinsey and Kosnik IV. <i>An Editorial</i>	242
Breast-Feeding <i>A Joint Statement: American Academy of Pediatrics and Canadian Paediatric Society</i>	244
Motherhood: A Proud Profession Samuel L. Blumenfeld	263
The Contagiousness of Puerperal Fever <i>Oliver Wendell Holmes</i>	276
Essays on Educational Reformers <i>Robert Hebert Quick</i>	301
Index.....	315

Child & Family (ISSN 0009-3882) is owned, edited, and published quarterly by the National Commission on Human Life, Reproduction and Rhythm, 244 S. Wesley, Oak Park, IL 60302. Manuscripts and editorial correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, Box 508, Oak Park, IL 60303. Subscription: United States \$8.00 a year, Foreign \$9.00. Renewal or change of address

should be received at least four weeks in advance. Checks and money orders, payable to Child and Family, may be sent to Box 508, Oak Park, IL 60303. Second class postage paid at Oak Park, IL 60301 and at additional mailing offices. Send 3579 to P.O. Box 508, Oak Park, IL 60303.

Motherhood: A Proud Profession

FIRST, I WANT to say how delighted I am to be here. I was truly honored by your invitation to address you. After all, is there a more important audience than this one? I think not, for without mothers, can there possibly be any future at all for the human race, let alone this country? Second, I have a confession to make. I really don't like the title of my speech. After all, to think of motherhood simply as a profession or to compare it to a career is, I think, to shortchange it. Motherhood is much more: it is at the very heart of life; and the mother-child relationship is the inner sanctum of life's mysteries. Also, I am very wary of the word *proud*. Of course, I can understand a woman's pride in bearing and raising her children. But too much pride can lead to unrealistic expectations. It can sometimes become a barrier to love, which requires much more humility than pride.

Also, the phrase "proud profession" smacks of our having to justify motherhood, and only a lunatic society would have to do that. And I'm sure that all of you would

agree that we don't live in a lunatic society—or do we? I don't know. Yet, it is a strange irony that this organization and this convention have had to come into existence in the first place. It's as if we had to create an organization to encourage people to remain human.

Apparently, there are a lot of people in this world who do not want to be as God created them. They want to be some product of technology, a mechanical being programmed to fit in with computers, jumbo jets, cars, frozen foods, and pills. The pills are supposed to liberate us from our emotional, instinctual, and spiritual needs so that we can conveniently mesh with all of the technological contrivances around us. It is a dehumanizing process which started in the last century when man discovered the uses, or I should say the *misuses*, of scientific technology. It is a dehumanizing process that has been accelerated greatly in the last thirty years, making it virtually impossible for our newer generations to know what being human is. It is a process which must be stopped and

reversed unless we wish to destroy ourselves.

During 1974, when I was writing *The Retreat from Motherhood*, I found myself becoming very pessimistic about the future. So much of what I found out about the women's liberation movement, the increase in premarital sex, the widespread practice of abortion, child abuse, the epidemic of divorce, the pornographic explosion, the anti-maternalism of our educational system, the increasing suicide rate among the young made me feel that the situation was quite hopeless. And then I found out about La Leche League, and I thought that perhaps here is the beginning of the way back to sanity. It was the only positive ray of light I found in that vast darkness, but it was a strong ray. Indeed, it was strong enough to lift me out of my pessimism. I was particularly encouraged by the fact that, despite all of the trends in the opposite direction, the League has grown remarkably since its founding in 1956, and that the idea of breastfeeding has become much more acceptable among young mothers. Part of this, I suppose, is due to the back-to-nature movement among the young, and part of it, I believe, is the result of a healthy rebellion against dehumanizing technology.

Let me say at the outset that I am not against technology per se.

SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD, Boston, MA, a former book and magazine editor, is the author of several books.

I have no objection to any technological advance that enhances life. But technology has always been a two-edged sword, capable of doing both good and harm. And unless we know or learn how to maximize its benefits and minimize its harms, we shall not know how to use technology. For example, amniocentesis was invented by a doctor in New Zealand as a means of tapping the fluid in the amnio sac during pregnancy to see if the prenatal infant required treatment *in utero* prior to its birth. Its purpose was to save the life of an endangered prenatal infant. But this same technique has been adapted by other doctors to perform saline abortions which kill perfectly healthy prenatal infants. Thus, the sword is indeed double-edged. Yet, some social scientists would say that the second use was just as humanitarian as the first. I'll let you be the judge of that.

Another example. Dr. Albert Einstein, the great humanitarian physicist, discovered the principles of nuclear energy. But the way man first made practical use of them was by destroying two Japanese cities. So we must always be on guard where technology is concerned, particularly where technology removes man from what is natural to him, and where technology is applied without sufficient knowledge. For example, there is the recently reported case of the maternity clinics that routinely subjected about four million newborn babes to a

high dose of radiation in the 1940's and 1950's because it was believed that such treatment would eliminate the need for future tonsillectomies. But today it has been discovered that these grown up individuals are now susceptible to cancer of the thyroid because of that supposedly benign dose of radiation.

Man's intrusions

The fields of pediatrics and obstetrics, I'm afraid, are full of that same kind of mindless application of technology with surprisingly little concern about future ramifications. Entire hospital procedures have been developed that have made of childbirth a technological nightmare, transforming a natural process into a hospital sickness in which everything is done to place as much emotional distance between mother and newborn infant as possible. The fact is that modern obstetrics and pediatrics are the children of modern technology. They are man's intrusions into God's processes.

I know it is no longer fashionable to talk about God. It's all right to believe in astrology or the occult, but mention God in educated or so-called enlightened circles, and you get back very peculiar vibrations. They either think you're a religious fanatic, a primitive fundamentalist, or a political reactionary. They simply will not take the idea of God seriously, and they consider anyone who does as someone fit for psychi-

atric treatment or commitment to a mental institution. And it is these secular humanists, as they call themselves, who today totally dominate science and technology. They consider themselves the guardians of rationality and they consider religionists as basically irrational.

They see motherhood as a productive but limited and inferior role in society, to be managed by the scientific principles of behavioral psychology and subordinated to the policies of government planning. I see motherhood quite differently. I see it as a manifestation of God's will for both mother and child. I see motherhood as the result of God's technology, not man's. The miracle of birth exceeds anything man has ever done or will ever do. All you have to do is observe what happens from the moment of conception to the birth of a unique human being nine months later to realize how really puny man's achievements are in comparison.

But man's pride is insatiable and he must denigrate God's achievements in order to elevate his own. And he does this by denying the sacredness of God's creation and treating the unborn child like so much fetal tissue. Make no mistake about it, a true respect for life is impossible without a belief in its Creator. And that is the basic issue that separates religionists from secular humanists.

There were about a million abortions in America last year, all

in the name of rational family planning. These perfectly healthy prenatal infants were killed because they were unwanted. Unwanted by whom? By their parents. Think of it, such a terrible denial of all that is sacred to the human heart and conscience, all for the sake of personal convenience, sexual enjoyment, and social advantage. And both our legal and medical systems have been perverted to accommodate this silent carnage. Ms. Gloria Steinem was terribly upset some months ago when the Congress voted against the use of federal funds to pay for the abortions of poor women. She could not understand why a very large number of American taxpayers did not want to become accomplices in what can only be described as mass murder. And Ms. Steinem is a shining example of a secular humanist in action.

It is fortunate for us that the people who first settled this country and created the United States were anything but secular humanists. They were, for the most part, Calvinists, profoundly religious, fearful of God, and ever mindful of man's depraved, sinful nature. They were so wary and distrustful of human nature that they created a Constitution and a form of government that would minimize man's capability of inflicting tyranny on his fellowman.

Now if you wish to understand secular humanism—the philosophy currently predominant among America's intellectuals, educa-

tors, natural and social scientists—you have to understand that it not only rejected the Calvinist view of man but also the entire concept of a God-centered universe. The universe of the secular humanist is man-centered, and man, they tell us, is not by nature depraved. He is not the sinful descendant of Adam and Eve. On the contrary, he is basically benevolent, rational, and perfectible. He is, some of them say without modesty, even Godlike. But if man is so wonderful, one asks, why does he commit so much evil? Why have we seen in our own lifetime such devastating warfare, such atrocities, so much violent crime, so much mayhem? The secular humanists have been studying the problem for at least the last one hundred years under the heading of "psychology" and they've theorized that men do evil because of poverty, ignorance, social injustice, racial and religious prejudice, lack of adequate education, poor housing and other environmental factors, sexual frustration, abusive treatment in childhood and, of course, faulty upbringing by their mothers. So in the minds of some social scientists, mothers have fallen under suspicion as being a prime cause of evil.

Like psychology, modern pediatrics is a child of modern science, and it emerged in the 1880's as one of the new medical specialties. Its first practitioners were male doctors who thought they could apply scientific principles

to the rearing of infants. The man who is most credited with having founded modern pediatrics is Dr. Luther Emmett Holt, who received his doctor's degree in 1880, after which he worked at the New York Infant Asylum. In 1887, the Babies Hospital of New York was founded and a year later Holt was appointed its director. Under his leadership, the hospital grew and became quite well known; its procedures became the standard for the field. In 1894 Holt published his *Care and Feeding of Children*. The success of this book was unparalleled in medical publication. It ran through more than 75 printings, was translated into three languages, and made Holt's name a household word.

The book was written in the form of questions and answers, and here is a sample of some of Dr. Holt's advice:

How can a baby be taught to be regular in habits of eating and sleeping?

By always feeding at regular intervals and putting to sleep at exactly the same time every day and evening.

When should regular training be begun?

During the first week of life.

Should a baby be wakened to be nursed or fed if sleeping quietly?

Yes, for a few days. This will not be required long, for regular feeding soon teaches an infant to awaken regularly for his meal almost upon the minute.

Should children during the 3rd and 4th years be fed between meals?

Under no circumstances should anything but water be given between the regular meals.

Should a child sleep in the same bed with its mother or nurse?

Under no circumstances if this can possibly be avoided; nor should older children sleep together.

At what age may an infant go all night without feeding?

At five months a child should not be fed or nursed between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. At one year a child will usually go from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. without feeding or nursing.

Is rocking necessary?

By no means. It is a habit easily acquired, but hard to break, and a very useless and sometimes injurious one.

When is crying useful?

In the newly born infant the cry expands the lungs, and it is necessary that it should be repeated for a few minutes every day in order to keep them well expanded.

How much crying is normal for a very young baby?

From 15 to 30 minutes a day.

What is the nature of this cry?

It is loud and strong. Infants get red in the face with it; in fact, it is a scream. This is necessary for health. It is the baby's exercise.

What is the cry of indulgence or from habit?

This is often heard even in very young infants, who cry to be rocked, to be carried about, sometimes for a light in the room, for a bottle to suck, or for the continuance of any other bad habit which has been acquired.

How can we be sure that a child is crying to be indulged?

If it stops immediately when it gets what it wants, and cries when it is withdrawn or withheld.

How is an infant to be managed that cries from temper or to be indulged?

It should simply be allowed to cry it out. A second struggle is rarely necessary.

At what age may playing with babies be begun?

Never until four months, and better not until six months. The less of it at any time the better for the infant.

What harm is done by playing with very young babies?

They are made nervous and irritable, sleep badly, and suffer in other respects.

What are the most common bad habits of children?

Sucking, nail-biting, bed-wetting, and masturbation.

What should be done when one of these habits is discovered?

The fact should be brought immediately to the notice of the mother and physician, and every means taken to break up

the habit while the child is young and before it becomes deeply seated.

In the case of sucking or nail-biting confining the hands to the sides during sleep or the wearing of mittens will often succeed if persisted in. On no account should the habit of sucking be allowed as a means of putting children to sleep or to quiet them while restless or suffering from indigestion.

Masturbation is the most injurious of all these habits, and should be broken up just as early as possible. Children should especially be watched at the time of going to sleep and on first waking. Punishments are of little avail and usually make matters worse. Medical advice should at once be sought.

I wonder what mothers did during the thousands of years before there were pediatricians? How did they know what to do before Dr. Holt came along? As you probably suspect, Dr. Holt, who dominated the field of pediatrics during his long career, was a pioneer in getting mothers to switch from breastfeeding to bottle feeding. Bottle feeding fitted in so much better with the scientific way of doing things. In a way, Holt wanted to turn mothers into pediatricians, for everything he did was calculated to create the same kind of distance between mother and child as existed between pediatrician and child. Holt also urged mothers to get rid of the cradle.

Infants enjoyed rocking too much and anything a child enjoyed that much had to be bad. And in just a few years time, the millions of cradles in American homes were discarded for the flat, stationary crib.

For thousands of years the cradle had been used because it was found that infants were soothed by a gentle rocking motion. After all, for the first nine months of life, an infant is in constant motion within its mother's body. And even when its mother is asleep, it is aware of the rhythmic heartbeat and the occasional movements that even a sleeping person makes. One pediatrician, Dr. John Zahorsky, who was critical of the wholesale abolition of the cradle, wrote an article about the cradle's benefits in 1934. He observed that the cradle's motion acted as a gentle fan. It was also soporific and soothed an excited nervous system. But an even greater benefit, he argued, was its aid to the infant's digestion. He wrote:

The intestine always contains gas, and the swinging movements of its body causes the liquid chyle to gravitate backward and forward over the intestinal mucosa. Rocking, therefore, is a physical therapy which aids digestion and probably absorption.

According to the good doctor, the motion of the cradle was able to relieve the infant of certain

annoying digestive symptoms, which the stillness of the crib could not do. Once the symptoms were relieved, the infant could fall asleep. But Dr. Zahorsky's views went against the general trend, and his words fell on deaf ears. Pediatricians preferred to follow Dr. Holt down the scientific trail.

Modern pediatrics revolutionized child care. Mother love, with its rocking and petting, billing and cooing, was identified and condemned as the indulger and spoiler of children, and therefore was to be studiously avoided. One noted pediatrician wrote in 1900, "An infant during the first year should neither be amusing nor amused." And Bessie Cutler, a pediatric nurse wrote in her textbook of 1927, "The child must never be rocked to sleep, given a pacifier or any soothing device." Is it any wonder that Americans turned to cigarette smoking by the millions to make up for the oral deprivation they suffered as children and to relieve the tensions never relieved by soothing care? And is it any wonder that many mothers began to feel guilty about their natural maternal impulses? I don't think it would be too rash to characterize Dr. Holt's pediatric philosophy as a subtle form of child abuse.

At the turn of the century, this antimaternal philosophy of child care was so prevalent in children's hospitals, that many infants who were given the best scientifically approved care died from sheer neglect. Without that important in-

redient of mother love, the infants simply wasted away. What we learned from that very tragic experience was that infants have a very definite biological need for the stimulation that comes with mother love, and that unless this need is satisfied, normal growth is thwarted.

Really, it's quite evident that a mother and child are made to indulge each other to their heart's content. That is the nature of the relationship, and satisfaction is its sweet reward. In fact, that is the lesson that La Leche League has taught us all about breastfeeding: that the mother gets as much emotional value out of it as the infant. Another thing we've learned is that there is a lot more to breastfeeding than feeding alone. The tactile experience is as important as the nourishment, if not more so. When being nursed, the infant learns to associate the feel, the warmth, the touch, and the smell of the mother with the taste and satisfaction of nourishment. It is an experience that appeals to and activates all of the senses. It encompasses a whole range of pleasant feelings. The mother, in her turn, also experiences a similar range of physical, emotional, and psychological pleasures. In the course of a year, this marvelously harmonious relationship forms the basis for a lifelong attachment.

Today the favorite word is *bond* or *bonding*. I prefer to use the word *attachment* for a number of reasons. We talk of the bonds of

friendship or the bonds of marriage almost in the sense of physical ties that can be broken. But the word *attachment* implies a more emotional and spiritual tie, something more permanent than a bond. Let's face it. Friendships and marriages break up, but the attachment between mother and child endures a lifetime. It may undergo changes over the years, but it can never end. For many, this attachment will remain a lifelong anchor of emotional stability.

Incidentally, the truth of this was dramatically demonstrated to me not so long ago when I saw a TV show in which adopted children, reunited with their real mothers, expressed the deep feelings that compelled them to seek out their real mothers. As much as they loved and were attached to their adoptive parents, they retained a special attachment to the mother who had given them up or abandoned them.

A painful period

The need for attachment is a lifelong need, and we first become acutely aware of this need in childhood. Every child between the age of eight and twenty-four months begins to experience a painful period of emotional growth and adjustment known as attachment behavior. From a psychic point of view, it is as emotionally painful as teething can be physically painful, but only more so. It is the most important ad-

justment all children must make, and so I think it would be worthwhile to dwell on it for a few moments.

The human infant is a completely dependent being for several years, and during the first year of life he is the totally passive receiver of love and nourishment. He and his mother seem to be one. Then as he grows and gains the ability to move about, he becomes aware that he and his mother are not one but two entities and that the loss of mother is a possibility. He begins to feel an acute psychic pain known as separation anxiety. How do we know he feels it? By his behavior. He clings to mother, follows her around, requires constant reassurance of being loved—all in order to quell this painful separation anxiety. In fact, he acts very much like a passionate but highly insecure lover. Eventually he discovers that the best way to eliminate separation anxiety is to create an emotional tie by maintaining a permanent state of love between him and his mother. So from being a passive receiver of mother love, he learns to become an active giver of filial love. This permits the growing youngster to tolerate greater physical separation from mother without experiencing severe separation anxiety.

But the threat of separation anxiety is always there. It can be caused not only by a fear of losing mother but also by the threat of being attracted away from mother. And so the youngster in turn

develops filial loyalty. The very same problem exists among adults in marriage. Separation anxiety can be aroused by the fear of losing one's mate or of being attracted away from one's mate. So we behave lovingly to keep our mates happy and develop monogamous loyalty to dampen our sexual response to others. We do all of this because we need the attachment. That is why so many bad and indifferent marriages endure. Because the pain of separation can be far more intolerable than the pain of a bad attachment. But obviously, a good attachment not only quells the negative pains of separation anxiety, but also provides a wide range of positive pleasures as well.

The human being first encounters the problem of separation anxiety as a small child. But it is a problem that remains with us throughout life. I am inclined to believe that separation anxiety is one of our emotional reflexes, an intrinsic part of our biological makeup, a survival instinct. For the separation from mother in primitive circumstances meant sure death. Without separation anxiety the highly dependent small child might wander too far from mother and be killed. Human beings have a weak sense of smell. We don't run fast. Our muscles are comparatively weak. Our survival depends on strong, intense emotions that link us with other protecting human beings.

So there is far more to the mother-child relationship than

Dr. Holt ever dreamed of. There is the need to be loved and the need to love. There is the need for the stability and security of attachment and the need for the freedom and encouragement to grow. A wise mother must learn in some way how to satisfy all of these needs, and in the process she no doubt finds herself relying more and more on her intuition and instincts than on her pediatrician.

Now mothers must get over the idea that their job is to produce perfect children. There is no such thing as a perfect child, for human beings are not perfectible. Besides, no two parents would agree on what a perfect child is. But apparently many of you are quite aware of this, for there was an interesting session this morning about the myth of the Super Mom entitled, "Now I'm a Leader: Why Aren't My Children Perfect?" The wise mother learns quite early that her child is a separate human being whose ultimate destiny is in God's hands, not hers, and no amount of pediatric experimentation will ever change this. The most that any mother can do is simply instill in her child a sense of trust, constancy, and harmony, and hope for the best.

So intuitive an art

It is because motherhood is so intuitive an art that I consider it a calling rather than a profession. It is a calling which God has limited to women alone, and to whom

He gave instincts suitable to cope with it. We have been told by modern scientists that there is no such thing as a maternal instinct, that mothering is a learned pattern of behavior. I don't think it is. I think that if a young mother and a small infant were left alone on a deserted island, she would know instinctively how to care for the child. I think that modern society has simply made it impossible for many women to feel their own maternal instincts. I think that modern pediatrics has made many young mothers afraid that they may be doing the wrong thing. It is part of the whole dehumanizing process.

We have been told a great deal about man's brain—his rationality—as being his primary tool of survival. I differ with this view. Man's brain is merely a tool of survival, a tool that applies more to his adult situation than his childhood one. His instincts and emotions are far more important to him, particularly during his early years, and only a mother can suitably respond to them. That's her special insight. That's what makes the qualitative difference between a man and a woman. She is made to respond to instinctual and emotional need. And that is why male pediatricians like Dr. Holt, with all their scientific know-how, were so far off base.

The tendency in these egalitarian days is to minimize the differences between men and women. In fact, we are in danger of mini-

mizing them out of existence. But the truth is that these differences are far more important than the women's libbers would permit us to believe. Moreover, it is quite significant that these differences, for the most part, involve children. First, only a woman can actually bear a new human being in her body. A man cannot do so, no matter how much he may wish to. Second, only a woman can nurse a child with her own body. True, a man can feed an infant with a bottle, but you and I know that that is not the same as breastfeeding. Third, only a woman can experience the symbiotic mother-child attachment with its great intensity in the early years and its satisfying emotional and spiritual aspects in the later years. In short, only a woman has that special capacity—both physical and emotional—to relate to her children in a way that is biologically denied men.

And don't for a moment think that men to some degree have not envied women their special capabilities. Yet, the psychologists have cleverly reversed the situation, giving the impression that it is the women who envy the men, and not vice versa. I suppose God was kind enough to permit men some compensatory pleasures and interests which made up for his limited biological function and complemented, in a paternal and husbandly way, what women were able to do in a maternal way. It is a marvelous division of labor based on biological realities. It

doesn't mean that a woman cannot become a truck driver or an architect if she wants to. But it does mean that a man cannot become a mother no matter how many Equal Rights Amendments are added to the Constitution. God is not an egalitarian, and that is why the secular humanists resent Him so, and that is why they want to remake the human race to accord with their own peculiar notions of social justice. That's what dehumanization is all about. To be human is simply to be as God made us.

Which brings me to a most important issue. There is a danger in America that with all of our emphasis on family planning, parents are losing sight of what parenting means. Because technology has now given us the power to determine whether an unborn child is to live or die, some parents have decided to usurp God's role. For example, there are some pregnant women who will ask their doctors for an amniocentesis on the pretext that they want to determine if their unborn child is afflicted with some dreaded abnormality. Actually, what they really want to know is the sex of the child so that they can decide whether or not to abort it. I'd hate to be the child of parents who made such a life-and-death decision on such a cruel and arbitrary basis. A child born to such parents under such conditions would be expected to be what his parents wanted him to be, and not what he himself might want to be.

In denying God's will, the parents also deny the child's own personal destiny. Such parents are incapable of the unselfish and unconditional love that all children need. To such parents children are wanted for what they can give the parents, and not vice versa. The child is indeed a "wanted" child, but he is wanted for all the wrong reasons.

If motherhood is a sacred calling, as I believe it to be, it is because a mother must also be prepared to accept the heartbreak of a sick child, a deformed child, a child who may one day go astray. Everyone has to have a mother, the good and the bad, the saved and the damned, the ugly and the beautiful, the idiot and the genius, the success and the failure. That is why it helps a mother to believe in God, so that she can accept with serenity God's plan and thereby, through the power of her own love and faith, transform misfortune into blessing.

The happy mother is not the woman who fights God's will but who submits to it and enjoys its pleasures and satisfactions. She responds to the calling of motherhood, aware of its inherent sanctity. She knows that she is more than a breeder. She knows that in passing life on to the next generation, she is passing the torch of humankind forward. She also knows that motherhood is an art, not a science, because human beings are not produced on an assembly line like mechanical dolls. Each child is unique, an individ-

ual, a work of divine creation. And each mother-child relationship has its own special qualities, created by the interrelationship of two unique human beings, one helpless and dependent, the other loving and caring. So motherhood is both a calling and an art and it demands of a woman everything that is good in her: affection, gentleness, understanding, patience, playfulness, as well as firmness, restraint, endurance, courage, constancy, and sacrifice. A child who drinks at the fountain of such goodness cannot help but grow up loving and revering his mother, and experiencing a great zest for life.

Life's wonderful potential

To sum it up, let me say that motherhood is a marvelous opportunity for a woman to convey to her child the idea of life's wonderful potential. Some months ago, when Bette Davis, one of Hollywood's greatest stars, was honored by a television special that reviewed her remarkable career, she stood before that great, glamorous, and sophisticated audience at the end of the show and paid tribute to the one great influence in her life, without which her entire career would have been impossible: her mother, Ruthie. There was a mother-daughter relationship that transcended all difficulties and survived all of life's uncertainties, and it was a moving experience to hear that famous woman recalling the impor-

tance of mother love in the midst of all that plastic and celluloid technology. Without mother love, none of it would have ever happened.

In this century, where we focus so much of our attention and hopes on romantic and sexual love, we tend to forget that mother love is a far greater sustainer of life in the long run. And when we do achieve happiness in adulthood with our mates and our children, we know how much we owe to our mothers for what they did for us, for what they taught us, for what they were to us. This is a theme that runs throughout our lives. And when it is time for a human being to leave this earth, how often do we hear in that final whisper, the very first word we ever learned to speak: Mama?

My own mother died in 1960,

and every day I think of her in some way. She was a simple immigrant woman who mothered five children without ever having read Dr. Holt. She accepted God's calling whenever it came. The idea of killing an unborn child was anathema to her. I derived more pure love and joy from her than from any other human being. And I didn't have to do very much to get it—just be born. How blessed I was. And that, in a nutshell, is what a mother can do for a child that nobody else can do: permit him or her to experience the full sense of God's benevolent power and blessing.

And so, I will very appropriately end by saying God bless you all, and God bless La Leche League, and—oh yes, one last thing—please bring back the cradle! □

*Presented at the Sixth Biennial Convention of La Leche League International,
Toronto, July 14-16, 1977.*

Editor's Comment:

Our admiration for B. continues unbounded. He says so many right things: motherhood is a "calling" not a "profession," "an art, not a science"; "instincts and emotions are far more important" to "survival" than "rationality"; we must not "minimize the differences between men and women." And he says so many right things so well: "The happy mother . . . knows that she is more than a breeder. She knows that in passing life on to the next generation, she is passing the torch of humankind forward"; we must be on guard against the "mind-

less application of technology with surprisingly little concern about future ramifications"; "I don't think it would be too rash to characterize Dr. Holt's pediatric philosophy (e.g., banning play with infants) as a subtle form of child abuse." Here we are reminded of a La Leche mother's definition of a fanatic: "She is a mother who is right 20 years before a male researcher finds the scientific justification for what she has been doing all along." Incidentally, B. is a great prolifer, and a great banquet speaker. Prolifers please take note. HR