

CHILD-REARING REFORMS: THE SEEDS OF DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

If abusive and authoritarian upbringing leads to war and political tyranny, what kinds of social change are brought about when a large enough proportion of any population shifts to more supportive and empathic parenting? In this chapter we will look at the growth of democracy and social justice in nations such as France, the USA and Sweden, and how these developments have closely followed child rearing reforms.

Further on, we will look at some of the remarkable social changes brought about by the advent of modern child rearing (socialising mode) in the 20th century. Even more exciting improvements in social harmony and sustainability will be possible as ‘helping mode’ or natural parenting styles begin to germinate. Whenever I look at this historical and sociological data I’m reassured that prioritising support for families and child rearing will produce inestimable social rewards. I have found this discovery extremely encouraging — a sense I wish to share through this chapter.

<A>Early French flirtations with democracy

One of the most significant turning points in history, a cataclysmic moment which marked the birth of modern nation-state democracy, was the French Revolution of 1789. Though French democracy was to falter and stumble many times, with governments often reverting to tyranny, terror and military rule, the remarkable events of 1789 and the years that followed shunted the world toward democracy beyond the point of no return. Some of the more momentous products of the French Revolution included the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, the abolition of feudal power, of church power, and aristocratic privilege. For the first time a nation upheld that its citizens (though at first only males) — rather than individuals claiming the fatuous doctrine of ‘Divine right’ — are the only legitimate source of civic power. Certainly, the ideals of liberty, fraternity, and equality remain incompletely manifest in modern democracies, but it is clear that they germinated in the collective imagination of the French middle class toward the end of the 18th century. For the first time, masses of ordinary people stood up to oppressive authority, and demanded more freedom, equality and respect for human rights than had ever been available in any nation.

Undoubtedly, there are many factors which helped to precipitate the birth of French democracy. But what was it that enabled the psychological shift in the minds of the many who came to be convinced that a freer society was possible? What made the emergence of democratic thinking, and the progressive ideas that were expounded in the French Revolution, possible in the minds of so many French citizens? It is no accident that this maturation in French society followed a transformation in parent–child relations that had begun one generation earlier.

The ideas of ‘family love’ and ‘mother love’ first appeared in French literature in the middle of the 18th century. For the first time publications dealing with parenting issues began to emphasise parents’ obligations to their children, rather than the reverse. If the

concept of ‘mother love’ as depicted in Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s highly influential *Emile* seems unremarkable now, it was a revolutionary idea in 1762, the year of publication. The French Revolution, a fulcrum in the history of democracy, came 27 years later.

During the 1760s in France, a flurry of publications urging mothers to keep their own babies at home and to breastfeed them appeared. Although still rife in 1780, the practice of wet-nursing had begun its decline in 1770. The horrendous statistics relating to its incidence in 1780 indicated that authorities had begun to take an interest in measuring, then curbing this disastrous practice. Though it took decades for wet-nursing to disappear, increasing numbers of French babies were remaining near their mothers through the 1760s. These developments in child rearing, affecting firstly the French middle class, were sufficient to sow the seeds of a more liberal society. The French middle class was the main intellectual driving force behind the Revolution.

The emergence of this new appreciation of children was sufficient to ignite a spark of democratic thinking — alas, it was not to be too much more than an ideal for some time to come. Rousseau himself proved unable to live up to his own ideals of a loving parent — he abandoned all his children in foundling homes. Soon after this initial burst of democratic reform, revolutionaries in power seemed unready to sustain democratic responsibilities, and the nation slid into mob rule and terror. Child-rearing innovations were slow to spread to a majority, and a limited French democracy and dictatorship interchanged for a century. This is not surprising since, according to Lloyd de Mause, new moves towards maternal breastfeeding were not to last, and by 1905 most French mothers had reverted back to wet-nursing. Nevertheless, the core democratic values were never to be entirely rubbed out, and France became an example for other nations to follow. Once the virus of democracy was caught, it remained entrenched in the social organism, and France continued its march toward democracy, thanks to the process begun in 1789. Further hallmarks of social justice, such as universal suffrage and fair labour laws, were to develop just as in other democracies, in step with additional improvements in child rearing.

<A>American reforms set the pace

At around the same time, in 1790, the USA was to become the most democratic nation at that time. What was it that released the fierce individualism that fashioned, through the American Revolution, the world’s first enduring nation-state democracy, producing also the most liberal society of the times? What was it that enabled democracy to gain its tentative toehold in the New World while it faltered in Europe? American achievements included: gradual abolition of slavery (in northern states to begin with), banning of hereditary titles, and the breaking down of the political powers of the church. Enshrined in the 1791 Bill of Rights were freedom of speech, press, worship and assembly. These were all quantum leaps toward a fairer and freer society at the time. These were all quantum leaps toward a fairer and freer society at the time. However, America’s fledgling democracy was deficient, as it excluded women and non-whites and even today, American democracy is quite flawed.¹ Nevertheless, despite these failings, this embryonic

‘democracy’ created in 1790 was a significant discontinuity in history, a social ‘great leap forward’ in which the USA was — at the time — the undisputed leader. American prosperity has been the reward for a culture whose support for the individual, and for freedom of self-expression, has set a benchmark for the world to aspire to. Pioneering Americans dabbling with democratic processes provided a powerful example that helped other nations follow suit. Why did these liberal forces gain such momentum in the North American colonies, in particular, and not in other resource-rich colonies or countries?

Lloyd de Mause’s research has unearthed a clear pattern of child-rearing reforms that produced individuals whom, relative to their times, were more emotionally mature.ⁱⁱ It was these individuals who blazed a trail for modern egalitarianism, respect for basic human rights and freedom of thought.

What de Mause’s research uncovered is that the bulk of the people who fought (with quite a bit of fervour and subsequent success) for the values of liberty, equality and fairness, were drawn from waves of middle class English migrant families and their descendants. These families came from a time and strata of English society that, around the 17th century, produced a turning point in the evolution of childhood. To begin with, there is evidence that the practice of infanticide — mostly of daughters — then commonplace throughout Europe, had abated and all but ended in England by this time. Census figures showed that whereas boys had previously outnumbered girls by about one third, the ratio had evened up by the 17th century. England was at the time about a century ahead of France and 200 years ahead of the rest of Europe in such key indices as the decline of infanticide, the rejection of baby swaddling, and the cessation of farming out babies to wet-nurses. Mainland Europeans were still practicing abusive ‘purification’ rites on babies and children. England was ahead of other European nations in child rearing, but it was particularly middle class parents among whom close and nurturant parent–child bonding appeared for the first time.ⁱⁱⁱ

From the start then, parents in the American colonies, particularly in the north-east, were measurably closer to and more nurturant toward their children. It was the first time in western history that mothers were beginning to spend significant time empathically caring for their infants. Colonial America had the most even boy:girl ratio and the least child abandonment and infanticide in the world. At a time when abandoned infants could still be found in European streets, ‘foundlings’ were comparatively low in numbers in American cities, as noted by European travellers. In 1685 it was remarkable, and worthy of note, for English traveller Samuel Sewall to record the “first child that ever was...exposed in Boston”.^{iv} The rates of infanticide and abandonment were much lower than anywhere in Europe, and thus the need for foundling homes was drastically reduced. Except among some of the stricter, more authoritarian religious communities, the wet-nursing, swaddling, and cold disciplinarianism that prevailed in Europe was largely absent from the American colonies. Before becoming the doyens of the world’s first democratic nation, the Americans were also the first to end wet-nursing and swaddling.^v

Children of early American colonists tended to be breastfed on demand, a significant advantage over their European counterparts.^{vi} European visitors to these colonies during

the 17th century frequently commented on the greater liberty, precociousness and self-assurance of American-born children. Europeans were often shocked by American children's tendency to be outspoken and go about unchaperoned. Many of these children did not exhibit the unquestioning obedience instilled in their European counterparts. (Notable exceptions existed among Puritans, who preached minimal affection, strict obedience, and who frequently sent their children away to work for friends or relatives.)^{vii} In addition, the USA was to become the earliest country to set up mass public schooling, and one of the earliest to campaign —with limited success — against the beating of children both at home and at school. The state of New Hampshire abolished corporal punishment in schools toward the end of the 19th century. It was this unusual concentration of comparatively advanced parenting that caused American social structures to evolve beyond the rest of the contemporary world.

In contrast to the migration of colonists into New England, which generally contained more 'advanced' parents, the demographic profile of migrants to the south was quite different. Many of those who migrated to the south did not do so as intact families: these waves of migration comprised a high proportion of indentured (abandoned) children. Migrant families who came to the southern colonies were on average less educated, and they practiced more old-fashioned forms of parenting. As a result, the south lagged significantly behind the north in their average style of child rearing.^{viii} The cultural lag of the south was most evident in their defence of slavery during the American Civil War.

In the north-east, it was those Americans who had been allowed to be closer to their parents than anyone before in history, who formed the driving force behind American liberalism and the formulation of the Bill of Rights.

<A>Sweden reaps benefits of better nurturance of children

One of the world's leading examples of peace and social justice achieved through child-rearing reform exists in Sweden. How did the Swedes manage, despite their relative scarcity of natural resources, and their Arctic climate, to prosper so much and advance so far socially? For instance, Sweden was one of the first countries to enshrine in law equal pay for men and women, in the *Act on Equality Between Men and Women at Work*. Sweden has for a long time led the world in the care of children. Swedish churches instigated a universal literacy program over 200 years ago. Universal elementary education began in Sweden in 1842. Sweden lowered its infant mortality rate before any other country in the world and continues to lead the world in this area.^{ix}

In 1979, the new Swedish 'Children's Code' stated that children "shall be treated with respect for their person and their distinctive character and may not be subjected to corporal punishment or any other humiliating treatment". Sweden was effectively the first country on earth to make hitting children, in any shape, form or intensity, explicitly illegal. Hitters are not criminalised, but counselled and educated. Since this law was passed, there has been a cultural shift, with measurable benefits for children. Firstly, there has been a sharp and near total reduction in public acceptance of corporal punishment, which demonstrates that legislation can alter public attitudes. Secondly, there has been a

marked reduction in assaults on children. The death of children caused by their parents' abuse has been almost totally eliminated: the child homicide rate was zero for 15 years running.^x In the decades since the legislation, children's own reports of being hit have plummeted dramatically, below that of other industrialised nations.

Any fears that an end to corporal punishment would lead to 'undisciplined' children are groundless, and invalidated by the results. Since 1979, there has been a steady decline in youth crime, youth alcohol and drug abuse, rape and youth suicide. There has also been an increase in the reporting of youth violence, caused by a country-wide zero-tolerance policy toward bullying in schools. Clearly, this legislation giving children the same protection as adults, has been remarkably successful for Swedish children, as well as for Swedish society as a whole.^{xi}

As at 1998, Swedish mothers were entitled to 450 days of paid maternity leave.^{xii} The rest of the world would reap immeasurable benefits from adopting similar initiatives. Far from being a costly exercise, this will save masses of money in the long term, by helping to create happier, healthier, and better-adjusted children. Consider this: it is no coincidence that, as the world leader in the care of children, Sweden has managed to stay out of war for almost 200 years, and its homicide rate is amongst the lowest in the world.^{xiii} This is an incredibly enviable state of affairs, but one that is demonstrably within the reach of any country that chooses to put its resources and political will firmly behind improved nurturance, protection and education of parents and children.

Because it has been such a successful measure, the Swedish legislation banning the corporal punishment of children both at home and at school has now been imitated in 13 other countries, and proposals for controls on hitting are under discussion in several more countries.^{xiv}

<A>Social rewards of reforms in Uruguay

Another inspiring example comes from the South American nation of Uruguay. Corporal punishment was banned from Uruguayan schools in 1876. At the same time, free, compulsory and secular education was made available to all children. Uruguay has for a long time held fast to a tradition of freedom of religion, coupled with a requirement that all public institutions, including schools, universities and hospitals, remain strictly secular. This has made it impossible for fundamentalist religion, with its rigid, authoritarian family structures, to gain a foothold in this country. Uruguay's early commitment to protecting its children from violence or indoctrination brought inestimable social rewards.

Uruguay's children benefited from perhaps the most liberal developmental environment in Latin America, from well over a hundred years ago. These liberal and progressive reforms to education, based on a fundamental respect for individual children's rights, brought about outstanding social reforms one generation later. Predictably, Uruguay was to become the first welfare state in South America in the early 20th century. Described as a 'model country', it was also the first to introduce universal suffrage in 1932,

unemployment benefits, old-age pensions, the eight-hour work day in 1916, paid holidays, and subsidised medical care. Today, the capital city municipality of Montevideo boasts one of the world's most democratic community decision-making processes. Their 'participatory budgeting' system engages members of all echelons of society in every major decision regarding development. This style of 'open-door government' is reputed to provide an enviable record of administrative accountability and transparency.^{xv} Time and again we see remarkable social dividends such as these manifest in countries that take progressive steps toward child-rearing reform. (Sadly, the abject poverty of this small and under-resourced nation may stall further progress there, at least until neighbouring powers move forward.)

<A>Social dividends of socialising mode parenting

'Socialising mode' parenting emerged toward the close of the 19th century. As these child-rearing innovations were embraced by people in growing numbers, this gave rise to what we know as our modern societies, with their increasingly egalitarian and democratic character. There is no modern democracy that cannot boast a greater degree of social justice, than what was available 100 years ago.

The advent of this new parenting mode, being more benign than the previous modes, facilitated some momentous social changes wherever it took hold. Compared to our forebears, we enjoy a marked reduction in gender-based inequities, laws that protect minorities from vilification, discrimination or attack, a liberation from rigid or repressive social mores, some social welfare safety nets for the old, the sick and the unemployed, and significantly fairer labour laws. These are advancements we take for granted today, but such ideas were considered 'pie-in-the-sky', utopian flights of fancy in our grandparents' time. Just as these realities seemed no more than idealistic dreams not long ago, how many of our present day hopes, dismissed by many as 'unrealistic', might come to fruition in the future? Is the hope for world peace, for instance, merely a fool's fantasy? Or would it be the readily attainable outcome of continued child-rearing improvements?

The more we examine historical childhood, the clearer it becomes that family relationships are the blueprint for the way public and political life unfolds in any nation. If child rearing continues to evolve and improve throughout the world; if we continue our steady trend away from authoritarian, punitive, shaming and manipulative child-rearing methods, we should expect a collateral improvement in key aspects of social, national and international affairs.

<A>Movement away from 'might-is-right'

There is reason to be excited about future probabilities. According to the Conflict Data Project of the University of Uppsala, Sweden, the number of worldwide armed conflicts dropped from 55 in 1992, to 24 in 1997. The Worldwatch Institute found that global military expenditure in 1996 was 2.6 per cent of global economic output, down considerably from 5.7 per cent in the mid-1980s.^{xvi} More and more, albeit imperfectly,

the world acts in concert through the United Nations to bring swifter ends to conflict or famine. Between 1946 and 1988, 13 international peacekeeping operations were established. This has grown to 21 such missions that were carried out between 1988 and 1995. It was a world-first when United Nations' peacekeeping troops were deployed, on human rights grounds, to put a stop to the Balkan atrocities of the 1990s. These are the early signs of a small but growing multinational movement that denies the legitimacy of warfare, and acts against it.

The World Trade Centre attacks, the subsequent American-led war on Afghanistan and Iraq, and the deterioration in the Middle East situation seem to negate recent gains toward an era of peace. On the other hand, the recent war on Iraq was protested by the largest anti-war marches the world has ever seen.^{xvii} Humanity has never before displayed so comprehensive and passionate a rejection of the call to arms, with up to ten million marchers in 60 countries.^{xviii} Nevertheless, recent escalations in war and terrorism highlight the urgency of further reforms in the child-rearing practices of the USA, Britain and Australia, throughout the Middle East and the Muslim world. In 2000, Israel passed a law that fully prohibits the use of corporal punishment against children, both at home and at school. It is more than feasible that such cultural changes — that honour children and their vulnerability — will eventually turn Israel into a major force for peace and development in her area.

The idea of inalienable universal human rights only began to gain global credibility in the 20th century. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was signed by 48 nations in 1948.^{xix} The human rights watchdog, Amnesty International, was created in 1961. It now has over a million members worldwide, and its goals and work are shared by 900 other non-government organisations (NGOs) worldwide.^{xx} The term 'crimes against humanity' was coined at the post-World War II trials of Nazi war criminals at Nuremberg. The Nuremberg trials signified the very first act of international intolerance toward war criminals, which at the time was a revolutionary concept, since war objectives were once reason enough to justify any atrocity. It was the first time in human history that butchery was formally put on trial at an international court of justice, rather than passively accepted as an unavoidable fact of politics, or a necessary evil.^{xxi} These modern developments represent a sensational forward shift in human consciousness. No act committed under the rubric of 'warfare' was ever given a second thought, let alone considered a crime, up until recently. In this new era of universal human rights, launched in Nuremberg in 1948, we have come closer than ever to rejecting once and for all the belief that 'might-is-right'.

The momentum toward a new world, where universal human rights form the basis of every society, has not been lost. New and remarkable precedents were set when Augusto Pinochet (Chilean dictator), and later Slobodan Milosevic (Yugoslavian dictator), were captured, detained and brought to trial. These were the first former national leaders who were denied diplomatic immunity, and forcibly deported to answer for crimes against humanity. For the first time, even presidents are no longer above the international rule of law. The extradition of Ricardo Cavallo to Spain to face charges for his part in Argentina's 'dirty war', also broke new ground in international prosecution, prompting a

lawyer for Human Rights Watch to say that this “sends a message to soldiers and police officers around the world that if they commit torture today, they could be prosecuted somewhere tomorrow”.^{xxii} As the world community continues to gain confidence in bringing war criminals to heel, we are edging closer toward the set-up of an International Criminal Court (ICC) with a permanent residence at The Hague.^{xxiii} The establishment of a permanent ICC has been supported by 120 nations, and only opposed by a handful of recalcitrants including Iraq, Iran, and the USA. The ICC at The Hague has already successfully prosecuted a number of Yugoslavian and Rwandan war criminals, who are now serving time for crimes against humanity. It was not unwarranted for Mary Robinson, Human Rights Commissioner to the United Nations, to dub this the Age of Prevention, or for eminent human rights lawyer Geoffrey Robertson to talk of a new “Age of Enforcement”. It is not inconceivable that we might be approaching an era when war and dictatorship will be considered illegal, and will be nipped in the bud by immediate, decisive and united international prevention. In his book *Crimes Against Humanity*, Geoffrey Robertson suggests that if this trend continues — especially if the USA finally gets behind it — all war and dictatorship will be classified as a crime against humanity, and perpetrators will be held accountable before an international court.^{xxiv}

All around there are encouraging signs that humanity is finding powerful alternatives to violence. Certainly, the most casual glimpse at any newspaper reveals that we are a long, long way from abandoning war and terror. But it cannot be denied that new, violence-free methods of conflict resolution are burgeoning, with increasing frequency, in ways that are utterly unfamiliar from our collective past. The 20th century welcomed many instances of non-violent struggle as a means of defying undemocratic authority and combating injustice. Peaceful resistance has frequently been far more successful than violence, in achieving its aims of justice or freedom. Some of the most notable examples, key transformative moments in our bloodstained history, include: Mahatma Ghandi’s success against British colonial hegemony, Nelson Mandela’s peaceful transition to post-apartheid power, the dogged non-compliance with Nazi directives by Danish citizens, the women of Berlin who stood up to the Gestapo, Otpor’s defiance of Serbian dictatorship, and Burmese democrats’ valiant face-off against the military junta — to name but a few.^{xxv}

For the first time, human rights concerns are translating into international pressure, in protest against brutal regimes. Though it does not materialise often enough, this new phenomenon has had a powerful impact in South Africa, and in East Timor.

Many times over, peaceful citizen action has brought brutal and oppressive government to a standstill, forced concessions from powerful and irresponsible multinational corporations, even deposed autocratic leaders. Naomi Klein’s *No Logo*^{xxvi} examines the growing, worldwide phenomenon of well-organised, peaceful demonstrations and boycotts, which attract tens of thousands of individuals from all walks of life and political persuasions, to protest against damaging corporate activities. Consumer boycotts forced a major food manufacturer to stop aggressively marketing baby-formula in the developing world. In 1997, there were co-ordinated protests in 85 cities across 13 countries against the exploitative use of sweat-shop labour by a leading sports-shoe maker. This popular

protest precipitated a massive drop in this company's share price. A series of student boycotts of a popular soft-drink forced the manufacturer to sever all ties with the repressive Burmese military regime, and to withdraw its business there. An oil company intent on dumping a decrepit oil platform into the North Sea was stopped by a citizens' boycott that spanned the European continent. In many places around the world, people are increasingly convinced that peaceful means resolve conflicts more effectively, that violence is inexcusable and that it never achieves its goals. Bloodless strategies — once a complete unknown — are increasingly the norm in the human striving for justice.

Wherever family dynamics become more democratic, and children cease to be regarded as property, relatively democratic governments come into being. Democracy, with its freedoms, continues its global expansion, slowly chipping away at hallmarks of tyranny such as gender inequality, child labour, military or religious power, and the curtailment of free speech. As the influence of human rights advocates like Amnesty International increases, domestic injustices are increasingly exposed to international criticism. National governments are becoming more transparent to the watchful eyes of the United Nations. These exciting social advances are the predictable result of the continuing evolution of child-rearing practices.

<A>Shortfalls of socialising mode

It would be simplistic to suggest that socialising mode parenting has created a completely fair and egalitarian society. Certainly, it can be said that this mode of parenting has furthered our psychological and emotional development, and this has enabled us to make considerable progress in areas of social justice. However, celebration of our social progress needs to be tempered. While socialising mode child rearing has moved us away from strong-arm styles of dictatorship, it has not eliminated strategies for attaining power that involve cunning. In modern societies, illicit and improper advantage is more often won through sleight-of-hand, rather than through overt intimidation. Sophisticated techniques of psychological manipulation are used to win votes, and to garner market domination irrespective of the quality or integrity of a product or service. Highly paid 'public relations' professionals are able to whitewash the most unscrupulous government or corporate activities, thanks to a blindly trusting, and largely undiscerning public. Politicians win over a credulous public thanks to charisma, and the wiles and tricks of their professional spin-doctors, rather than the merit of their policies or their personal integrity. Some of the worst and most toxic products and ideas can be widely sold thanks to our modern methods of psychological manipulation — 'image building' and advertising. Not with invading colonial armies, but under the guise of 'free trade' and 'economic reform', all-powerful western corporations are bleeding developing nations, causing an explosion of poverty and civil unrest. Crippling loan packages carrying conditions of austerity and excessive privatisation are seductively imposed on poor nations 'for their own good'.^{xxvii}

When it comes to corrupt attitudes to power, the iron fist has been superseded by the con. A cavernous inner emptiness makes us insatiable consumers, bewitched by the latest trend, easily suckered by handsome or smooth-talking politicians, and slick advertising

campaigns. It is all too easy to manipulate public opinion for personal gain, when a wounded or ill-formed self-esteem makes us so open to manipulation (we will see in Chapters 19, 26 and 27, that the conditions that render individuals more vulnerable to psychological manipulation arise from specific, painful childhood experiences). On average, our collective level of emotional maturity has yet to make us immune to psychological manipulation.

Socialising mode child rearing has not eliminated social ills such as substance addiction or depression, but once it has taken hold for at least one generation, it has the potential to end extremes of human suffering such as the brutality of war and dictatorship. If these are the social dividends brought by socialising mode child rearing, imagine what could happen as ‘helping mode’ child rearing takes hold, what additional social problems can begin to dissolve.

<A>Conclusion

Once we fully comprehend the far-reaching implications of our collective parenting choices, the idea that a mother or father in the home are of lesser status than an executive in the boardroom, will be dumped in the deepest corner of the trash-bin of history. Parenting or school teaching are no less momentous and influential career choices than joining the diplomatic corps or registering for a Masters of Business Administration. Parents and teachers can be the most powerful and effective social-change agents — as long as they are given the resources and social support they need to fulfil their potential.

Peaceful and prosperous communities, societies and nations are wholly possible when children’s wellbeing is made a top priority. If we continue to actively pursue the path of child-rearing reform and evolution throughout the world, then utopian ideals such as world peace and ecologically sustainable development are entirely within our grasp.

Many modern nations have succeeded in safeguarding the physical development and education of the majority of their children. However, this is not enough. The next task before us is to pay closer attention to children’s emotional development. We need to continue to explore how to best help our children to develop a rich and balanced emotionality, for this underscores their ability to form and maintain harmonious relationships. With the help of modern advancements in psychology, we are gaining a much deeper understanding of human emotions. We have come to realise that ‘emotional intelligence’, a faculty that is nurtured in childhood, is the most vital ingredient of psychological health, it is also the key to good relations with others, and with the world around us. A harmonious society arises when children are nurtured at all levels.

So far we have looked at how, for better or for worse, the way children are cared for can literally change the course of history. Before we look at natural parenting (de Mause’s ‘helping mode’), the newest development in the evolution of parenting, we need a clear picture of socialising mode parenting — the most common in modern societies — to help us distinguish one stage in the evolution of parenting from the next. The following section looks at the behaviour control methods that characterise the socialising mode

approach to children, followed by a discussion of non-authoritarian ways to set interpersonal boundaries with children.

ⁱ Though it can boast some enviable freedoms, today's American democracy is no longer the most advanced in the world. It has fallen behind other, relatively more progressive, dynamic, open and responsible democracies, such as Switzerland, where citizens have a direct say on most major governmental decisions. See <http://www.wikipedia.org/> and search for 'Direct democracy'. By contrast in USA, the First Amendment gives constitutional protection to corporate financing of elections, a measure that gives corporations extensive control over the electoral process. For a rather chilling account of this subsuming of democracy to corporate interests see Bakan J (2004) *The Corporation — The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power* The Free Press, New York pp 85–110. See also American Civil Liberties Union under 'National security' <http://www.aclu.org/> (last accessed 1 December 2004).

ⁱⁱ De Mause L (1982) *Foundations of Psychohistory* Creative Roots Inc, New York

ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid, pp 109–110.

^{iv} Cited in de Mause (1982) p 110.

^v Ibid, p 110.

^{vi} It is interesting to note that this exceeds what many American infants are offered today.

^{vii} Greenleaf BK (1978) *Children Through the Ages: A History of Childhood* McGraw Hill, New York

^{viii} De Mause L (2002a) 'The evolution of the psyche and society' *The Journal and Psychohistory* Vol 29(3) pp 238–285

^{ix} McFarland R (1999) 'Peace on earth, goodwill toward children' *Journal of Psychohistory* Vol 27(2) pp 200–211

^x Durrant JE (1999a) *A Generation Without Smacking: The Impact of Sweden's Ban on Physical Punishment* Save The Children, London

^{xi} Durrant JE (1999b) 'Evaluating the success of Sweden's corporal punishment ban' *Child Abuse and Neglect* Vol 23(5) pp 435–448, and: Durrant JE (2000) 'Trends in youth-crime and wellbeing since the abolition of corporal punishment in Sweden' *Youth & Society* Vol 31(4) pp 437–455

^{xii} See Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (2002).

^{xiii} Keeley LH (1996) *War Before Civilization — The Myth of the Peaceful Savage* Oxford University Press, New York p 32.

^{xiv} See The Center for Effective Discipline <http://www.stophitting.com/laws/legalReform.php> (last accessed 1 December 2004), and End All Corporal Punishment of Children <http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/> (last accessed 1 December 2004).

^{xv} Lewit D (2002) 'Participatory democracy in Porto Alegre' 27 February 2002 — search the Alliance for Democracy <http://www.thealliancefordemocracy.org/>

^{xvi} McFarland R (1999) 'Peace on earth, goodwill toward children' *Journal of Psychohistory* Vol 27(2) pp 200–211.

^{xvii} See 'Global protests against war on Iraq' Wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org> (last accessed 1 December 2004).

-
- ^{xviii} See ‘Millions join global anti-war protests’ BBC News 17 February 2003 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/> (last accessed 1 December 2004).
- ^{xix} It celebrated its 50th anniversary in 1998. See United Nations <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html> (last accessed 1 December 2004).
- ^{xx} See Amnesty International <http://www.amnesty.org/> (last accessed 1 December 2004).
- ^{xxi} The proceedings of the Nuremberg Trials have been preserved for the world to see by Yale University, see The Avalon Project at <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/imt/proc/v1menu.htm> (last accessed 1 December 2004).
- ^{xxii} ‘Argentinian extradited to Spain’ *The Sydney Morning Herald* 30 June 2003 p 7.
- ^{xxiii} See International Criminal Court <http://www.icc-cpi.int/> (last accessed 1 December 2004).
- ^{xxiv} Robertson G (2000) *Crimes Against Humanity The Struggle for Global Justice* Penguin Books, Ringwood, Vic.
- ^{xxv} Ackerman P and Du Vall J (2000) *A Force More Powerful* Palgrave, New York.
- ^{xxvi} Klein N (2000) *No Logo* Flamingo, London
- ^{xxvii} Stiglitz J (2002) *Globalisation and its Discontents* Penguin Books, London, Pilger J (2002) *The New Rulers of the World* Verso, London, and: Klein N (2002) *Fences and Windows* Flamingo, London