

Rodolfo Keller
Im Stutz 4
CH-9478 Azmoos
E-Mail: rodokel@bluewin.ch

Azmoos, 2024

Mr. Jon R. Moeller
The Procter & Gamble Company
1 P&G Plaza
USA- Cincinnati OH 45202

Public letter

Amazing pole position

Dear Mr. Moeller

Times are changing. Philip Morris, a tobacco company, wants to establish a smoke-free future. The oil group BP plans to stop trading with fossil fuels. Not long ago, the underdeveloped were called to follow our example. Now we know that our way of life, extended to all people in all countries, would end in collapse.

More than 2/3 of all mothers worldwide don't use disposable diapers. This reveals a large market gap. - But is it up to date, to lead the rest of mankind on our questionable track? - For thousands of generations and still for the great majority today, instead of Pampers, one got and gets along with **elimination communication (EC)**.

Pampers are not primarily responsible for the loss of **EC** in our civilization, but **Procter & Gamble** might be the only authority with the power to restore it. Why should you do so? -

1. **You eliminate a lump risk for P&G...** (to understand the reasons,
2. **... and make the world a better place.** see the annex)

"The only thing that will redeem mankind is cooperation." (Bertrand Russell)

EC rouses and develops our innate ability to cooperate. - Cheeky question: Can you imagine to collaborate with supporters of diaper freedom? It would be similarly paradoxical as the U-turn of BP. But less radical, because **EC** and diapers do not exclude each other. And you are in good company with other industry leaders like BP or Philip Morris, who consider proactively the signs of time. The word and brand Pampers becomes a burden. If pampering replaces human affection, the material substitute will never suffice. So more and more is needed...That may boost some business. But insatiable greed hinders peaceful coexistence and preserving natural resources. And the fulfillment of greed brings neither satisfaction nor happiness but makes one addicted and sick. The longer the more, the reputation of **Pampers** will suffer. And the central issue is not plastic waste from disposable diapers, but the **fateful effect of pampering** in a most formative stage at the beginning of life.

Hopefully you are able to see your historical responsibility not mainly as a strain but as a chance? You could be a model for liberation from abundance. To get rid of the lump risk is not only healing for the social basis, but also for **P&G**.

May I congratulate? You're in a triple pole position to start a due turn. As CEO of **P&G**, market leader for diapers and mediator of primary experiences for newborns.

Seize the opportunity! -Thank you in advance.

Sincerely Rodolfo Keller
(former diaper baby, lone wolf,
wannabe team player)

Annex: The end of an illusion

The end of an illusion (brings hope for reality)

Reflections on a taboo subject

Food and drink are popular topics. The opposite, what goes on below the belt, is rather taboo. The diaper issue is additionally taboo because a calming illusion seems to be vital in turbulent times. This fact forbids critics concerning the practice of diapers.

Thanks to Pampers, babies sleep like on clouds. Deep sleep promotes brain development. Well rested babies are in a good mood, which has a favorable effect on social contacts. Thus, new earthlings become clever, popular and successful...

Plop!
„fall from all clouds“



Breaking taboos and destroying illusions hardly arouses sympathy. But it is necessary so that **Procter & Gamble** is protected from unpleasant surprises and can rise from „spoiling pampers“ to a **healing game changer**.

How beneficial is pampering?

Child welfare is a very high good. So the question whether pampering is a boon or a bane becomes quite ominous. Alfred Adler found, that pampering is a form of child abuse worse than neglect. Evil tongues claim, Pampers combine both. Babies are pampered with material comfort, but neglected with regard to human affection, if the diaper replaces elimination communication. **EC*** demands and supports social bonding. The feeling of safety and belonging, the release of the bonding hormone oxytocin, restful sleep depend on human contact, not on diapers. That's why the „proof photo“ on each package can be considered as misleading advertising. - Or even worse as human rights violation! Is it compatible with human dignity, to ignore the innate instinct of a newborn? To disregard the body language, facial expressions, sounds, behavior, through which babies announce the urge to relieve? To force a forsaken child soiling himself with feces? And to abuse any baby, who testifies unmasked with his elated face on the diaper pack how great such treatment is?

„A picture is worth a thousand words.“ So it is superfluous to claim verbally, that Pampers make happy. The customers „realize“ it in the light of the „proof photo“ themselves. Are they stupid? No, it's clever marketing. The picture addresses the heart, not the brain. And the illusion is comforting...

EC* and potty training...

... have a contrasting effect. The interaction between mother and baby in **EC*** creates bonding, promotes the child's belief in self-efficacy and awakens the sense of cooperation. **EC*** responds to unconscious, instinctive signals. It demands and evokes sensitive attention.

Potty training is humiliating when the baby is required to perform in ways that he or she cannot because the neural pathways to consciously control the excretory organs have not yet been established. This weakens the child's self-confidence and his relationship with the tormentor. It is divisive.

Advertising and unrealistic expectation

„The baby just didn't stop crying.“ This is the standard excuse of parents, caregivers, who accidentally shook a baby. This happens in the USA 1000 times per year, with an unknown number of unreported cases. About 20 percent violently shaken babies die. Far more get lifelong severely disabled, e.g. with spastic cramps and debility. Fatal for the victims, but also for the perpetrators, who - perhaps overstrained and exhausted - lost control for a second. - Nonetheless how can someone be so angry with an innocent baby? -

A main reason is **unrealistic expectation**. Screaming is the adequate, life saving, gene controlled reaction of a newborn, who feels lost, when he misses the physical contact to a familiar person. From adult point of view the baby cries without reason, because there is no danger. And unconsciously in the back of the mind haunts the frustrating mismatch between the marketing mirage and the real „noisy brat“. A baby, fed and freshly pampered with five-star comfort, including air channel luxury, should sleep thankful and satisfied as if on cloud nine - and not scream like crazy! How impertinent! -

Are the advertising promises jointly responsible for unrealistic expectations and hence for SBS (shaken baby syndrome)? -

Such a question is unthinkable as long as Pampers enjoy a perfect image and nobody dares to scrutinize the tempting, pervasive „proof photos“. But how long can the illusion be maintained? And at which price? Besides the human suffering, the care of the disabled cost billions of dollars. At present the claim for cost sharing seems absurd. However the existing law would suffice, if the functions and effects of the mirage are debunked.

And then not only headwind threatens, as in the discussion about plastic waste, but a crash with maximum height of fall. From charity to child abuse. The mere suspicion - even without a court conviction - would be fatal for the image.

Ambivalent wealth

Far fewer than 1 per thousand of all babies are shaken. If the other 99.97% grow up healthy and happy with the help of Pampers, everything seems okay. And with the 0.03%, the presumption of innocence applies.

The main problem lies with the majority anyway, who like to be pampered and are not shaken up as long as there is gasoline at the pump and electricity flowing from the socket. Isn't that wonderful? We are extremely mobile without having to move ourselves!

E-scooters, elevators, cars, airplanes take us comfortably everywhere. Traveling can be an expression of freedom and happiness, broadening the horizon - - - hopefully not in the direction of the abyss...

As divided as we are in many things, there is paradoxically a unity on two topics:

- "Back to normal as quickly as possible!", both vaccination opponents and proponents wanted during the Corona pandemic. "Moving freely again!"
- Even the most enthusiastic travelers, however, banish mass tourism. This wastes resources, harms the climate, destroys arable land, and spreads viruses so rapidly around the globe that health systems collapse....

People suffer from obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, depression, etc. partly because of physical inactivity. And the globe - ironically - is taking a bad hit because of our excessive mobility. And who is to blame? - No one, because no one embodies the mass, feels belonging to it - or even co-responsible for the damages caused by the masses.

We believe ourselves to be free. But some (the masses?) follow unsuspectingly the inner urge to chase that sense of belonging, which they missed as a baby. Logical that original, unspoiled nature and way of life are particularly attractive to tourists.

The tourist destroys what he seeks, by finding it.
(H.M. Enzensberger)

The existential de-bonding to other people and nature is probably rooted in early childhood, when the bonding hormone oxytocin flowed too meagerly. "Back to normal" cannot mean expansion of mass tourism. If normal is what everyone does, there is hardly anything more normal than mass tourism. However, if we consider as normal what is natural and sane, the mass - consisting of isolated individuals - is on the wrong track.

Wealth is questionable when the practice of pampering with luxury becomes normal - and, conversely, attention and tenderness toward babies come up short because the child is otherwise supposedly "spoiled." Fondling the smartphone for hours? Why not, communication worldwide is more interesting than tight EC*. Tenderly rocking the baby to sleep? Dangerous, he might like it, "then he always wants to be pampered and gets spoiled". Nonsense, physical closeness and tenderness are essential for babies' (humans'!) survival like air and food and have nothing to do with spoiling them....

Humans and technology

For all the criticism of civilization, soon 10 billion people will not be able to return to the caves. Progress also brings many advantages. How can the balancing act between culture and nature succeed?

Wouldn't it be a smart forward strategy for **Procter & Gamble** to restore **EC*** (elimination communication) combined with diapers? Diapers not as substitute but as supplement to **EC***? Not „either/or“, but "as well as“.

Pampers guarantee „premium protection“ for sensitive baby skin. But best protection - better than any diaper! - provides fresh air. That's why doctors recommend - whenever possible - diaper free kicking and crawling to prevent or heal diaper rash. Does this mean regression and loss of sales for **P&G**? - Not necessarily.

A new generation of child- and eco-friendly diapers could not only combine swaddling and diaper freedom, but also high-tech and primal humanity. The existing Pampers Lumi with a sensor chip signals the right time for changing diapers, after „it happened“. Why shouldn't „Lumi“ help to explore the right time before "it happens"? By comparing vital signals with the chip's technical information (perhaps + nightly video recording)? Precious diapers are saved for further use by applying them merely as a backup. -

And far more important: **EC* empowers the faith in self-efficacy and the sense for co-operation. By contrast: Pampering spoils and weakens, because children get accustomed to be served.**

We make the world a better place when technology helps nature instead of suppressing and destroying it.

Time to say goodbye

Pampers are more than 60 years old. Time to retire. Pampering is outdated. Progress must no longer be hostile to nature. The brand Pampers should be replaced by a less embarrassing name. The child abusing, misleading „proof photo“ on the packaging ought to disappear and give way to real help. It sounds paradoxical, but just the once revolutionary Pampers are able to carry out the necessary counterrevolution back to normal. Like the hypnotist who recovers patients from hypnosis, Pampers must relieve from the illusion about charitable pampering. In tough times, people are grateful for the hope, that at least the offspring feels safe and comfortable in Pampers. Error! The newborn feels safe and belonging in the arms of a familiar person, but screams in panic if Pampers allow to put down the baby, because elimination communication becomes superfluous. So the diaper effects the exact contrary of what the happy baby on the packaging promises. Instead of the misleading advertising, a phantom image of a screaming baby ought to warn, that

diapers don't replace human affection (similar to warnings on cigarette packs). Words alone cannot correct the illusion. Images have a deeper and more lasting effect than words. After 60 years millionfold „proof photos“, the belief in the boon of Pampers is firmly anchored. But even more deeply rooted - for many thousand years - is the life-sustaining reflex of a newborn, who screams alarmingly, as soon as he misses closeness to an intimate person. The panic is coherent, because to be alone means certain death.

Small cause - big effect

Originally Pampers came to the market as relief for mothers. But the response was disappointing. Nobody wants to be considered lazy. The breakthrough was only achieved by highlighting the child welfare! Not for the own, but for babies comfort, mothers apply Pampers. Inverting the motive, was a promotionally very effective pretense. Gratefully devoured by troubled mothers. Convincingly established by the „proof photo“. The twist at that time, more than 60 years ago, is long forgotten and barred. Meanwhile the original fib became an irrevocable truth, probably even believed by current marketing strategists. So advertising spreads the inherited lie further at present - and for all eternity? -

It might become a „short eternity“, if the waste of resources, environmental destruction and arms race can't be stopped. It's paradoxical, the more all countries invest in safety, the more dangerous the world situation gets. We're sitting on a crackling powder keg. A fundamental change is asked: More cooperation - less rivalry. It's banal, we know, but as we are conditioned to compete (in sport, school, career...), our spirit of cooperation is retarded. We are preoccupied by contest, dividing people in winner and loser. And the very first, formative lesson for lost lone fighters may grow from disregard of a forsaken baby with an urgent need. So we omit the unique opportunity to waken and restore the innate ability to cooperate at a crucial moment. Is this ridiculous, trivial? - Or a prime example for small cause with big effect?

“The world has enough for everyone's need, but not enough for everyone's greed.” (M. Gandhi)

If insatiable greed were innate and incurable, the future would look grim.

Fortunately greed is not part of a basic „human hardware“, but just the morbid side effect of pampering. This brings hope. So we can achieve great effect with little change, if we allow children to live out the inborn ability to cooperate, instead of breeding greedy consumers by forced pampering. It's not about waiving and limitation, rather about liberation from addictions. Diaper freedom and **EC*** can help to guard against compulsive consumerism, addiction, greed, rivalry - and finally war.

Conceded, for some power-hungry old men in key positions, the revival of **EC*** comes to late. Moreover, actual greedy old men prove, that Pampers can't be main responsible for the current mess, because Pampers were invented after their birth.

Pampering, plastic waste and seductive advertising are well established in civilized societies irrespective of disposable diapers. **Procter & Gamble** are not to blame! It's just a tyranny of circumstances, for which no one is responsible. The mismatch between sedentary lifestyle and inborn nature. Different to precocial or nidicolous birds, human newborns do neither flee from nor stay in a nest, they ought to be carried. For thousands of generations, the carrying of babies was practical and without alternative, roaming through forests. As our ancestors settled down (who is to blame?), the constant carrying became obsolete. Laid down, healthy babies start screaming at once, obeying their genetic program. „Let them cry, it strengthens the lungs,“ doctors calmed the parents (to the chagrin of the babies! When the stress hormone cortisol hinders falling asleep and staying asleep, no "tender" diaper will help, only human affection. Cortisol hinders the release of the sleep hormone melatonin. The cuddle hormone oxytocin relaxes...).

Fortunately, "just let them cry" is out. Luckily that's over. Now many babies are carried almost around the clock, even if it's painful. Sacrifice is praised as a virtue. The drawback in this case: We bring up „little tyrants“, if babies get used to let us suffer for them. This is how we accidentally train sadists. And nobody is to blame. At least the „little tyrants“ whose innate spirit of cooperation might be frustrated, because they can't practice their strong grasp reflex. When our animal ancestors swung from tree to tree, the babies clung to their mothers owing to the grasp reflex and mothers fur. The grasp reflex is still alert, but there is no more fur to cling. The naturally cooperative interaction became a one-sided matter with the baby sling. Children mutate into passive passengers, mothers into pack mules. Bad for both. And there is no ill intend, no conspiracy. It's pure destiny. Nobody is to blame for the loss of furs and the preservation of the grasp reflex.

Solving the dilemma - and creating new business

Civilized parents are caught in a dilemma: To lay down a baby, who needs to be carried, is disrespectful, unnatural and cruel. But if carrying becomes painful, we risk to breed unintentionally „little tyrants“, who learn in early childhood, that it is normal to cause suffering. Heartbreaking baby cry- or devotional carrying? - Neither. To solve the dilemma, we can go two little steps back to nature:

- Settledness and diapers make constant carrying - from adult perspective - superfluous. With the revival of **EC*** (elimination communication) carrying makes sense again. EC* improves the single-edge carrying process to a cooperative interaction between parents (babysitter) and child. The „baby burden“ feels lighter, if the child - due to EC* - is emotionally closer and the effort is rewarded by useful EC*.
- With some baby sling concepts, the child is clogged tightly to the carrier's body. Arms and legs are immobile, similar to a swaddle method simulating the narrowness of the womb. This may have a calming effect. But the offspring was not born for permanent escape in prenatal state, he also wants to move and explore the world. It's not either or. A sensible supplement to constricting slings might be clothes and/or accessories (for example epaulettes with fringes) suitable as a holding option for the baby.

With **EC*** (first step back to nature) diapers are saved. The drop in sales could be compensated by higher price for compostable diapers, equipped with reminder chip (two steps forward in technology).

The second step back to nature, the resurgence of the grasp reflex with appropriate utensils, does not jeopardize any business. On the contrary, it opens a new market. And a research area for parents to find the optimal balance between baby's rest and activity. The sling must not be a shackle and the grasp accessories not force a training. As free and relaxed as possible, nature and culture become cooperatively linked. If **EC*** and diaper freedom go awry once, it's no use for anger and rant. Compared to industrial and warlike pollutions and devastations, an **EC*** failure is worth a mild smile (combined with the hope that children who are not accidentally spoiled will one day act in a more humane and environmentally friendly way).

Alternative to tight slings on the back or belly, a lateral squat-spread posture above the hip allows the baby to look around and interact with the surroundings - or turn to the familiar carrier and retreat. This way of carrying fits perfectly with EC*. It facilitates communication and deterring the baby in case of need.

Development cooperation

Since the nineties, development aid is going to be replaced by development cooperation. With good reason. In order to prevent imminent collapse, we must not impose our over-exploitation on peoples who still live more in harmony with nature.

Partnership-based development cooperation between countries is vital for human survival. We help "primitives", for example, to obtain clean drinking water and in return we may learn from them to recover valuable resources that have been inadvertently buried in our civilization.

Depletion, rivalry and arms race are suicidal. Perhaps what is to shine one day in the great world politics must start with the baby?

Unintentionally but systematically, our innate willingness to cooperate is suppressed in favor of the competitive system. Meanwhile, many "exemplary" homo sapiens degenerated so "successfully" into ambitious "homo oeconomicus competitors" that one might think the latter was our true nature.

Managers of leading corporations are forced focussing on measurable numbers in the next quarterly financial statements. Human happiness? Environmental protection? Fair wages? Mustn't cost too much, otherwise you'll be driven out of the market by more unscrupulous rivals and no one will be helped. Besides, happiness is surreal, not measurable, not really real - and life for future generations very far away. Therefore irrelevant? -

The reintroduction of **EC*** (elimination communication) instead of pampering with Pampers does not take effect overnight. It is therefore uncertain whether we have enough time to prevent collapse.

A crash programmed by continued overexploitation would have unforeseeable consequences, but does not have to mean the end of the world. There is also the salutary shock. Chaos and war can dehumanize, but conversely, they can also rouse people from dull indifference and awaken previously suppressed human traits. Necessity is the mother of invention. Adversity is the school of wisdom. Later, egoists purified by shock could meet offspring who, thanks to **EC***, have already developed a more humane social behavior from bottom up...

However, the change for the good can only happen if help comes from above as well. **P&G** has levers to end the pampering (and covert spoiling) of kids. When top-down and bottom-up act together, rather than against each other, miracles come true....

Witch burning and burnout era

Common objection to EC...

"...I simply don't have the time!" Understandable, women are more often affected by burnout than men. When mothers are released from multitasking after giving birth, they find peace precisely thanks to **EC***. Calmness that the child needs just as much to feel secure. Thus, the supposed disadvantage becomes an invaluable advantage. And **EC*** can be delegated (unlike breastfeeding) e.g. to sensitive grandparents.

We look back with disgust on witch burnings in earlier times. Perhaps future generations will once be just as puzzled about today's predilection for competition?

Until the beginning of the 19th century, tens of thousands were spectacularly burned for witchcraft at public festivities in Europe as a warning. Today millions burn out unspectacularly, insidiously and secretly. Thus no one is warned that the omnipresent competition is fueling the widespread disease **burnout**.

A lot of talent, vitality, resources are burned up in senseless counteraction. If humanity is to survive, we can no longer afford to suppress our innate spirit of cooperation, to mistreat babies pampering. Especially if pampering means material oversupply instead of human affection and spiritual nourishment.

Learning from birds?

Swarm intelligence in birds and fish is based on a non-hierarchically structured connection of the individual animals with the collective. Intelligent use of slipstream, waves, flows saves energy. - And humans on earth between fish and bird? - We do not impress with swarm intelligence, but rather suffer from mass debility. The individual human being might be clever, but due to a lack of connectedness, collective missions don't prosper, e.g. in saving energy.

The bonding hormone oxytocin not only strengthens human cohesion, it also has a relaxing effect, helping to sleep calmly. Anyone who relies on the care of the "super absorber" in diapers at night and cultivates less closeness, physical contact with the infant, risks a hormonal switch from happiness to stress hormones in the baby when he wakes up and is frightened alone. Nocturnal overdoses of the stress hormone cortisol do not help promote healthy sleep and wise social behavior, but rather inner restlessness, bad moods, relationship weakness and mental poverty.

Fortunately, the end of an illusion brings hope for reality....

Conclusion

Humanity is falling apart
and is in danger of extinction
without the natural use
of the bonding hormone
oxytocin.

Procter & Gamble in combination with EC*
(elimination communication)
can become a lifeline.

*PS: EC, the abbreviation for elimination communication rhymes nearly with easy. EC is to bring relief to the baby, the mother and the earth. EC is an interplay, say play! If it becomes a cramp and causes additional suffering, it makes no sense...