In place of current theories to account for the development of a child's tie to his mother, notably a secondary drive derived from food satisfaction, it is proposed that a baby is equipped with a number of primary instinctual responses that become focused on his mother and result in proximity-keeping. The question then arose: If the disruption of the bond between child and mother leads to distress and anxiety and, if prolonged, to personality disorder, how best can we understand the nature of the bond disrupted?

During the 1950s the relationship between child and mother was always referred to as "dependency," was regarded as childish and so should be promptly outgrown, and was assumed to develop only because the mother feeds him. My observations of the way young children relate to parents, and especially the way the relationship develops as children grow older, did not square with these ideas. Hearing of the work of K.Z. Lorenz2 on the imprinting of goslings to parents, which occurs without the parents providing food, led me to study the ethological literature on the development of infant-parent relationships in other species, notably in nonhuman primates.

As a result, I advanced the view that the tie between human child and mother develops as a consequence of a child being born equipped with a number of primary instinctual responses that lead to his keeping in close proximity to his familiar mother figure. The responses listed were sucking, clinging, and following, and also crying and smiling, which lead his mother to maintain proximity to him. Proximity-keeping, referred to as attachment behaviour, was recognized as persisting into later years and regarded as a valuable part of human nature. These ideas met with a cool response from clinicians but, after elaboration,6 have led to exciting research by developmental psychologists.7 Attachment, with its function of protection, has now replaced dependency as the preferred concept.