

1923

## A New Book on "Meal Planning and Table Service"

Florence E. Busse  
*Iowa State College*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/homemaker>



Part of the [Home Economics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Busse, Florence E. (1923) "A New Book on "Meal Planning and Table Service"," *The Iowa Homemaker*: Vol. 3 : No. 12 , Article 3.  
Available at: <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/homemaker/vol3/iss12/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Publications at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Iowa Homemaker by an authorized editor of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

# A New Book on "Meal Planning and Table Service"

By FLORENCE E. BUSSE, Professor of Home Economics

"DO YOU know that Miss Bailey's book is off the press?" was an enthusiastic query a few days ago. Those who knew Miss Bailey personally were sure that her enthusiasm would reflect in the pages of her book; others were anxious for a bound copy of the lectures and work offered in her classes.

Miss Bailey came to the home economics division four years ago with a broad experience and training and during each quarter of her work she analyzed the methods which she used. Her laboratory was made into an experimental course in table service. Her book gives the results of these analyses.

Home economics teachers are not unified in their methods of service. One school fosters one plan, another has opposing methods. Miss Bailey has made an effort to bring these conflicting views together by analyzing the fundamental processes and establishing basic rules. These pages will offer a challenge to these instructors in meal service. The teacher must answer the "why" of her methods.

Instructions are concisely given. One



BETH BAILEY McLEAN

housewife remarked, "I do not have to hunt thru a mass of unrelated material before I find the fact I want."

Each of the six chapters is interesting

and useful. The "Word to the Host," and "Lest We Forget" are especially commendable.

"The Choice of Equipment for the Dining Room" gives the essential facts but is somewhat brief. The detailed outline of a representative menu is given and the plan for service is outlined with utmost care and leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader as to the exact plan to follow. The new bride serving her first dinner can follow the directions easily. The illustrations are attractive and the drawings of the set tables are especially good.

The homemaker will welcome this book because she can learn table service thru careful reading. She should be able to plan good meals from the principles suggested and enlarged. The home economics teacher will want it because it will help her in her decisions of what really is the best method of service.

It is a book we have long needed in the home economics field, one that will teach the average American housewife how to plan her meals and to serve those meals with ease and charm.

# A Bill of Rights for the Child

By LULU R. LANCASTER, Assistant Professor of Home Economics

ARE YOU acquainted with the Twentieth Century Child? Can you describe his physical, mental and social characteristics and promises? Can you foretell the future in terms of the present? Ellen Key has said that this is a century of the child. A Boston physician doing research work and child welfare says that there is no neglected age of childhood any more, altho he does admit that our interest in the pre-school child is greater than our knowledge of what ought to be done. Have we done all that we can for childhood? Are the above statements actually true? Are you willing to place Uncle Sam's child beside the children of other countries? Is our splendid commonwealth spending the right proportion of wealth in conserving childhood?

What does childhood say on this matter "Four and one-half million of us, or three-fourths of us are malnourished; five million of us have defective eyes; one million of us have defective hearing; one million of us have tuberculosis; one-fourth million of us are handicapped by organic heart trouble; one-fifth million of us are mentally defective; five million of us have diseased tonsils or glandular defects; and four million of us have weak spines or defective joints. We do not know how many of us are really well."

As adults does not that indictment make us squirm a bit? But we say, shrugging our shoulders and attempting to dislodge the load, "No doubt the other countries are just as bad." But are they? Take the one item of infant mortality; our rate is higher than France, England, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Finland,

Scotland, Denmark, Ireland, Australia, Sweden, Norway, and New Zealand. The last named has an infant mortality rate of sixty-two deaths per thousand, while United States has an infant mortality rate of one hundred and twenty-four per thousand.

That condemnation should be a challenge to every adult, child lover or not. All grown folks are parents of all childhood. All grown folks are making their contributions to future generations whether they will it or not, either a negative or positive contribution, it is being done.

Why do we have so large a proportion of our children handicapped? What is the matter with the twentieth century parent? Perhaps it is because he does not take the trouble to frame the Bill of Rights for Childhood—and if he did, what would he include? He must first realize what healthy childhood means?

Childhood contends that its first right is to be well-born. By that it means that it has a right to two parents who have sane minds and sound bodies, and grandparents and great-grandparents who can point with pride to a clean bill of health, mental as well as physical. Childhood does not want a heritage of sick body or sick mind which will make the life race doubly difficult. What parent should be allowed to give a child a brain or a body which only partially functions? The number of feeble-minded children alone is enough to make one shudder—one who is interested in a future of splendid Americans.

Also, childhood contends that it has a right to that kind of environment which

will allow, and further assist it to grow normally from infancy thru adolescence. That, of course, includes a long list of needs. It means adequate shelter. Adequate shelter does not only mean a place in which to eat and sleep, a place to go to at night, and a place to go from at other times. Young America is being continually blamed for its preference for living away from home. Do you suppose the young American would live on the streets if he had a home that was as interesting to him as the streets are, or if he felt as free in there as he does on the streets? Better homes for children shall mean less trouble for the court officers, a decided advancement in the reorganization of family life. One corner in every home where a child could call his own might be a controlling factor in winning him back to his home. Adequate shelter means a decent degree of comfort, it means sanitation that will prevent unnecessary sickness, and it also means such provisions as will make possible a child contentment in his home.

Childhood says that it should also have the right to proper food, that which will maintain and promote proper growth. Despite the fact that small children in our schools are talking glibly about vitamins and calories, and that the reading public is being continually faced with foods which advertisers say contain iron, vitamins, our children are not properly fed. If ignorance is the cause of the failure we must do more educating. If it is indifference, it is inexcusable. Nor can we expect our children to eat the food which we as adults refuse. Of course, Johnny refuses spinach when