able to respond to the Cry which bids him 'stand up'. He is set free to integrate his total personality, to become autonomous and, at the same time, 'a man for others', spontaneous, loving and unhampered in his relationships.

EVE LEWIS

CHILDREN AND PARENTS: Their Problems and Difficulties, by Susan Isaacs. *Routledge & Kegan Paul*, London. 1968. 236 pp. 14s.
BETWEEN PARENT AND CHILD, by Haim G. Ginott. *Staples Press Ltd*, London. 163 pp. 30s.
YOUR CHILD AND YOU, by Rosemary Simon. *Sphere Books Ltd*, London. 1969. 223 pp. 7s. 6d.

Susan Isaacs (1885-1948) has been described as 'a real giant' among the thinkers who in the first half of this century brought about a revolution in our understanding of young children. From 1924 to 1927 she ran the Malting House School in Cambridge for children aged two to ten years old. It was partially residential and her published detailed observations of the children were pioneer studies throwing light on their intellectual and social development. She inaugurated the department of Child Development at the Institute of Education in London. From 1929 to 1936 under the pseudonym of Ursula Wise she answered letters from parents and nurses in *The Nursery World*. A collection of these was published in 1948 by Methuen. Paper-back editions of this and her other works are now being republished by Routledge and Kegan Paul.

In publishing these questions and answers on such problems as discipline, tantrums, shyness, jealousy, phobias, destructiveness and sex education, Susan Isaacs aimed to give nurses and parents some idea of the child's normal development and a greatly increased awareness of the intensity of the child's feelings in his various relationships—'how human he is, even as an infant, and how necessary it is to be aware of this if one is to treat him reasonably'. Parents' own childhood problems are re-lived. . . . 'My great sin has been quick temper through being spoilt, I don't want her to be the same.' The mother who has deceived her little girl is rebuked: 'Intelligent children are extraordinarily quick to sense signs of evasion of the truth in grown-ups.'

Even today, with so much more published work on child development available, many parents do not appreciate the pain—literally heartbreak—often experienced by the first child on the arrival of a brother or sister. Now he must learn to share his parents' affection—and everything else that before was his exclusively. At two his own emotional and intellectual development is at a peak; largely inarticulate, he loves and hates the baby by turns, and is afraid of his own strong feelings. Usually by three he is much more co-ordinated, less dependent, ready for nursery schools or play group and much better able to 'take' a new arrival. 'To ask adults to accommodate themselves to the emotional crises of little children is surely not difficult or unreasonable.'

'What', Mrs Isaacs asks another mother, 'is the use of *our* superior self-control and politeness and reasonableness if we cannot exercise them to help little children over a stile?'

In this small social document of the thirties, it is interesting to find that mothers who employed nannies and maids faced much the same problems as modern parents.

Dr Ginott in the recent U.S. best-seller *Between Parent and Child* tackles the basic problem of communicating with one's children in a way which he hopes will bring new solutions to old problems. Children's messages are often in a code that requires deciphering. For example, on his first visit to an infants' school, Bruce, aged five, asked loudly, 'Who made these ugly pictures?' Mother was embarrassed and answered hastily, 'It's not nice to call the pictures ugly when they are so pretty'. Teacher smiled and said: 'In here you don't have to paint pretty pictures. You can paint nasty pictures if you feel like it.' Bruce settled happily in the class, for now he had the answer to his hidden question, 'What happens to a boy who can't paint very well?'.

Ginott shows that parents can help their children come to terms with their emotions not so much by advice or contradiction as by holding up a mirror for their feelings. When a child tells us 'The teacher spanked me', we do not have to say 'What did you do to deserve it?'. We don't even have to say 'Oh, I'm so sorry'. We need to show him we understand his pain and embarrassment and feelings of revenge. One could say, Ginott suggests, 'It must have made you furious', or 'It was a bad day for you'. After all, adults find that intense feelings lose their sharp edges when the listener accepts them with sympathy and understanding.

The cornerstone of the new approach to discipline is the distinction between wishes and acts. Most discipline problems consist of two parts: angry feelings and angry acts. Each

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028428900058224 Published online by Cambridge University Press

part has to be handled differently. Feelings have to be identified and expressed; acts may have to be limited and redirected. 'The restrictions are applied without violence or excessive anger. The child's resentment of the restrictions is anticipated and understood; he is not punished additionally for not liking the prohibitions.' It all makes good sense, but, as the author concludes, a wise application of any new approach will not ignore the basic grain of a child's temperament and personality.

Rosemary Simon of *The Times*' Women's Page has compiled a factual handbook for parents giving details of publications and addresses of organizations covering such topics as: group activities for under-fives, the gifted child, the handicapped child, children's holidays, the working mother, youth service in the community, etc. A really useful addition to the family bookshelf.

ANN HALES-TOOKE

JUIFS ET ARABES 3000 ANS D'HISTOIRE, by Jean-Pierre Alem. *Grasset*, Paris, 1968.

Courage, sense of the past and—let us admit—lack of *mesure*, characterize the story in Jean-Pierre Alem's book. Whether in terms of history or the current political situation, I would regard it as a manifest impossibility for anyone to write a book about the Arab-Israel problem without being partisan. M. Alem's book is the closest I have seen anyone come to success. His title should not deceive: he has wanted to set the present conflict in perspective but of his 380-odd pages all but the first fifty deal with the events of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, from the parallel rise of Jewish and Arab nationalism. His rehearsal of the historical evidence is full and fair—exceptionally so for a French writer—and he does not get hot under the collar when Syria or the Lebanon are mentioned. But these facts, however manipulated or interpreted, are available already; more interesting perhaps is his view of future developments.

His conclusions run roughly like this. At the beginning of 1967, an Israeli-Arab peace was inconceivable. The 1967 war changed the data of the problem. Before then, the Israelis wanted peace, the Arabs rejected it. Now Israel is no longer threatened with destruction, and war can only break out if the Israelis so wish. There is no serious likelihood of either extreme solutions being adopted: Israel returning all the conquered territories, or abandoning them all. The revisionists, under the banner of the Herut, want to retain everything, including Sinai, and a half-canal at Suez. But that would mean accepting 1,400,000 Arabs facing 2,400,000 Jews in a Greater Israel, and the Arabs' more rapid demographic growth would give them a majority in several decades. Some Israelis, including Dayan, have suggested the formation of an Arab state in 'Cisjordania', demilitarized, linked economically to Israel and willing to accept the presence of the Israeli army on its eastern frontier. But this would be a vassal state, and in the twentieth century such a solution would hardly be viable. It would go against the decolonizing current of history and be morally unacceptable. A prolonged occupation of purely Arab territories would develop terrorism, whose first manifestations have already appeared. But brutal oppression has never, in modern times, strangled national resistance. The result would be a tragic escalation; and the majority of the Jewish people would never countenance the creation of a Gestapo.

But it is no less improbable that Israel should renounce all her conquests. Jerusalem is too dear to the heart of the Jewish people, 'indispensable to her soul'; and it seems unlikely that Israel would relinquish the Gaza Strip or the Golan Heights, from which the Galilee *kibbutzim* have so often been shelled. Between total abandonment and total rejection there is a vast field for negotiation. Time is not on the Arabs' side, and they should not put off negotiating. Israel must not make it difficult for them to do so. The Arabs always find it difficult to pass from the plane of dreams to that of reality, so honourable clauses must be proposed and their humiliation avoided. It is indispensable that Israel abandon her demand for direct bilateral negotiations, and give back those territories which are not vital to her survival. And the refugee problem must be solved.

In May 1967, the refugees already numbered 1,000,000. Today there are 1,300,000. The absorption of these by the Arab states is not easy. The solution is closer now, paradoxically, since Israel controls the majority of the refugees. In the framework of peace negotiations, one could envisage the Jewish Agency, with its remarkable experience, helping in the definitive settling of this population. The operation would cost over three thousand million dollars —Alem's figure being based on the Jewish Agency's evaluation of the cost of integrating

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028428900058224 Published online by Cambridge University Press