

The Child, the Narrative, and the Global Biopolitical

BY

Tracey Layng-Awasthi
B.A, Rockford College, 1982
MATESL, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1994
M.A., Carnegie Mellon University, 2002

THESIS

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English Studies
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Chicago, 2011

Chicago, Illinois

Defense Committee:

Ralph Cintron, Chair and Advisor

Todd DeStigter

Stephen Engelmann, Political Science

Robert Johnston, History

Maria de los Angeles Torres, Latin American and Latino Studies Program

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
1.1	Children.....	1
1.2	The Child as Beneficiary	5
1.3	Pathos.....	8
1.4	Organization.....	11
1.5	Theoretical Constructs	14
Chapter 2	Ideological Foundations: Constructing the Narrative	19
2.1	The Historical Child.....	19
2.2	The American Child.....	30
2.3	The Historical American Child.....	34
2.4	Children’s Money	41
2.5	The Sentimental Child	43
2.6	Child Saving.....	51
2.7	Conclusion	55
Chapter 3	Educating the Sentimentalized Child	59
3.1	Control	59
3.2	American Foundations of Education	61
3.3	Nineteenth Century Conditions and Reforms.....	74
3.4	<i>Choix-Force</i> in Action	79
3.5	Conclusion	89
Chapter 4	The American Narrative In Action	92
4.1	Hyper-Sentimentalization in Action	92

Table of Contents (continued)

4.2	Danger and Safety	93
4.3	Children’s Spaces.....	100
4.4	A Side of Education	109
4.5	The Library	112
4.6	The Museum	118
4.7	The Store.....	121
4.8	Like Nothing Else	128
4.9	Conclusion	132
Chapter 5	Domestication of the Foreign	136
5.1	Sovereign Nations.....	136
5.2	Humanitarian Agency	143
5.3	Global Narrative.....	148
5.4	Global Education	156
5.5	Safety and Education of the Global Child	162
5.6	Conclusion	172
Chapter 6	Conclusion	175
6.1	Responsibility	175
6.2	Global Conceptual Apparatus.....	179
6.3	Imagined Community	182
Works Cited		188
Bibliography		199
Vita		206

SUMMARY

The Narrative of the Child, pathos, and the imagined community of the child create a space for the global biopolitical to function on behalf of the child. The Narrative is situated within a conceptual apparatus formed from the rhetoric of pathos, Lee Edelman's assertion that children shape the political and are the recipients of political interventions, Slavoj Žižek's *choix-force* and the psychotic move, Viviana Zelizer's nineteenth-century sentimentalization and sacralization movements, and Masser and Creed's song "The Greatest Love of All." Using both academic and popular sources to articulate the Narrative and its intuitive reproduction within communities shows that while the Narrative is the organic outcome of nineteenth century social reform and child labor movements, it is still applicable today.

The Narrative is not merely present within popular culture and academia, but is also informing practical decisions in education, politics, and humanitarian agencies. As the theoretical and practical applications converge, three categories of the child emerge: the National Child, the Known Child, and the Global Child. These three categories, the imagined community of the child, and the Narrative of the Child form the mechanisms through which a nation becomes part of the global community that treats all children as the Known Child. Through the use of the *choix-force*, the child as recipient of all decisions, and the Narrative and its activation of pathos, the child becomes the bond which both creates and holds the global community together and activates the global biopolitical on behalf of the world's children.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Children

In August 2004, a Chicago community that never knew a murdered infant gathered in St. Luke's Cemetery to bury him. According to Cmdr. Sam Christian, when the infant was initially found, he looked like a doll lying on the sidewalk, and "it was just a tragic event to see the baby helpless like that, not given a chance." In response, a Chicago community banded together to "give a respectful burial to the baby... [who represented] all the used and abused kids that never [had] a chance" (Brachear). Chicago police officers who were "initially unable to find any family to bury the baby, took the task on themselves, arranging the funeral, even giving the baby a name", and as Adam Henkels, the officer who found the child, carried the tiny casket through the cemetery, "congregation members at a local Lutheran church turned out to honor a child they [had] never known" (Brachear). Elizabeth Vittel, assistant director of victim services, was emotionally touched by the community's response: "I've seen communities do great things, but I've never seen anything like this before...this is the baby's community, where he would have lived if he had survived. Who could not be moved by this?" (Brachear).

Two years after the infant was found in Chicago, another community, this one in Indiana, banded together to honor its children. The Marion County Children's Guardian Home unveiled a memorial "dedicated to 699 children buried without gravestones between 1892 and 1980" (Staff Photographer). On the memorial is written "every life touches someone and no life should ever be forgotten especially the life of a child" (Staff Photographer). Then, in May 2007, twenty-two

years after six children were killed in a house fire, the town of Hoffman Estates was raising money for a memorial to remember not only those six children, but to honor “all children who have died in the suburb’s 48-year history” (Manson). And in October of the same year, “two years after the remains of a preschool boy were found in a laundry bag ditched in a dry creek bed, about 150 people gathered at a Winfield cemetery...to mourn and to ensure that a nameless child was not forgotten” (Working). And lest we think that these outpourings of remembrance are confined to events which occurred relatively recently, in August of 2007, Canadian researchers finally positively identified the Unknown Child, the “poignant symbol of the children who perished on the Titanic” in 1912 (Staff). The child is Sidney Leslie Goodwin, an English boy whose family also perished on the ship. Further in keeping with historical remembrances, in October of 2007, the *Chicago Tribune* ran the story of three boys who were murdered in Chicago in 1955. According to the media at the time, the murders occurred in an “age of innocence.” After a week of the city being in a virtual lockdown after the murders, the *Chicago Daily News* stated “This hideous crime remains, however [sic] the blackest stain ever inflicted upon Chicago as a place where innocent children could live in safety and their parents in peace of mind” (Franklin). This mournful remembrance is representative of the sentimentalism with which Americans view children, or at least the idea of children, and all of these instances illustrate that the death of a child, no matter how far distant, resonates in the present. As further evidence of the sentimentality adults have come to have regarding children, Huntington Hospital in Melville, New York, reinforces the idea that children are a joy and a blessing by playing “18 seconds of Brahms’ Lullaby” every time a baby is born. According to Nina Goldsztejn, assistant director of nursing at the hospital, “No matter how bad the day is, you hear that and it just makes you feel like, ‘Wow, another baby was born.’ It’s therapy for everyone else. It could lift anyone else’s spirits, comfort their soul, in that

way it's very powerful medicine" (Whitehouse). Children are not just children, they are a social force that connects and heals the fears and paranoias of adults and provides a mechanism for the redemption and renewal of adult life.

While these examples show the power of the idea of children in American society, they also show that all is not well for American children. As evidenced by the above examples, children are abused and neglected as well as cared for and loved. However, despite the number of cases of child abuse and deaths by violence or by defective or dangerous toys and furniture, one of the most powerful narratives Americans believe in is the Narrative¹ of the Child. This Narrative arises from some commonplaces² Americans hold regarding children. A few of these commonplaces are voiced by the people involved in the cases mentioned previously, such as funeral director Art Staniec's observation that "Once [children] are here, they deserve all the chances" (Brachear), and by Maj. Mark Edwards of Naperville Township and his detectives who are incredulous that a toddler found in a laundry bag has gone unclaimed: "somewhere along the line, somebody has got to be missing this child, and there's no plausible explanation as to why they [sic] haven't come forward looking for him. And since we're dealing with a child, that total abandonment is what gets to them" (Brachear). This inability to understand how someone could completely abandon a child, a Known Child, overshadows and even negates the practical legal implications of child abandonment, and this perplexity coupled with the inability to come to terms with those who have injured or abused children is a clear manifestation of the rhetorical narrative

1 I am using the term Narrative, not as an unrelenting force which shoves everything else out of its way as it moves through time, but as a combination of discourse and story that shifts with the times and with new ideas. In identifying the Narrative as a discourse, I locate where it occurs and analyze those occurrences for their purpose in regard to children. In addition, by also identifying the discourse as a story that unfolds, with all its complications, paradoxes, and aporetic moments within American society and globally, I can look at the story of the child and the effects of the discourse in combination with each other to see how the sentimentalization of children in American Society has changed over time and how this sentimentalization also functions on a global level.

2 I am using Crowley and Hawhee's definition of commonplace: "any statement or bit of knowledge that is commonly shared among a given audience or a community" and "statements which circulate within ideologies" (21).

surrounding children in the United States. This outrage surrounding the harming of a child is not restricted to law enforcement officials or Americans of a particular class or social grouping. Even people outside the law, those incarcerated for various crimes, are not tolerant of inmates who have been convicted of harming a child. Child molesters, abusers, and pornographers face dangerous jail time and risk physical attacks from other inmates who consider this type of crime worse than all others.

The sentimentalization of children by Americans and our perceptions of the role of children in society, two important aspects of the Narrative, are closely tied to the historical events and reforms that were happening at the turn of the twentieth century. As ever, many Americans were consciously thinking about what it meant to be an American, what Americans wanted as their image (at home and abroad), and on creating reforms to enact and reflect that image. As reformers were thinking about what it meant to be an American and how to enact those ideas, they found that some of those ideas were at odds with one another. One way of resolving this tension was through redefining children and childhood. Sentimentalizing the child, redefining the child as economically useless³, creating mandatory education, and defining the ages of childhood, through both physical and developmental stages, in effect the sacralization of the child, were essential to communal ideals regarding children.

Children who fit the nineteenth century model of the sacralized child were the ones who were the beneficiaries of the public good. Children, whose time could be spent being educated, whose parents had the time to devote to training them in their early years, and whose families had

³ I am using Zelizer's terminology here when I refer to the economically useless child. She says that "in strict economic terms, children today are worthless to their parents" (3). As children were removed from the workforce, their economic value to the family became non-existent, but their social and sentimental value increased significantly. In addition, Zelizer and other historians use the terms "sentimentalized" and "sacralized" to describe children that are now economically useless, and I am using this terminology as well.

the resources to provide adequate food, clothing, and education were the recipients of the democratic legacy of rule. This nineteenth century ideal is still working today because the children of middle and upper class families are continuing to reap the most benefit from the schools and from non-school educational opportunities. Though all children have benefitted from the sacralization movement, the degree to which each child benefits is based on locale and class. Children whose parents can afford higher property taxes often have better school districts with newer class materials and more access to extracurricular activities than those who live in poorer school districts. No Child Left Behind is one measure designed to offset the disparity in the educational conditions among districts while at the same time attempting to bolster and support the economic forces of the State, but it has been met with a mixed response. Not all schools are achieving the minimum competency required by this law, and the economic factors associated with it are paradoxical for the school. If the school meets the level, it is funded; if it cannot meet the level, it runs the risk of not being funded by the State; however, for many underperforming schools, lack of funding at home as well as at school is a central issue to lack of performance. This, then, is another example where the Narrative of the Child encounters a mixed narrative of theory and implementation.

1.2 The Child as Beneficiary

As Edelman states in his book, *No Future*, children are the beneficiaries of all political decisions in a democracy, so, ideally, the State will see to the public good for all its residents including its children. This statement is reflected strongly in current American laws, educational mandates, and in the effects of the nineteenth century sacralization of children. This care of children by the State, not solely in terms of welfare assistance, is necessary for the State to survive

as a State; however, though the State must care for all its children, historically, it has not been true that all children have benefitted from the State's attention to the public good. For various reasons, such as race, class, ethnicity, gender, or place of residence, all children did not and still do not benefit from State reforms.

So, children who do fit the model of the sacralized and who are enfranchised will be more likely to form the basis of the State and of its engaged citizenry and may be more willing to fight for change in the State should the need arise. These are the children, who, as adults, will have a stronger opportunity to determine the course of their adult lives for themselves and to have access to the political system in a way that many children in the lower socioeconomic classes will not, and historically, have not. Thus, middle and upper class children⁴, as adults, will have the resources and the knowledge to work the system and to work within the system to ensure their rights are recognized and that their opportunities for a complete life are varied and available to them. They will, to a greater degree than lower socioeconomic class children, have the opportunity to fulfill the classic American dream: to be what they want to be and to provide for themselves and their families while doing it.

All of the above is an articulation of beliefs stemming from the Narrative of the Child, part of which has been articulated quite well by Lee Edelman in *No Future*. In his text, he identifies a dominant societal belief regarding American childhood and recreates it as a conceptual apparatus,

4 Middle class is variously defined today with many people identifying themselves as middle class, but with other entities defining middle class to suit their own purposes. According to *Parade Magazine*, February 15, 2009, middle class has been variously defined by President Obama as families that earn up to \$200,000; Senator Schumer as families who earn up to \$160,000; Senator McConnell as married couples filing jointly who earn \$65,000-\$180,000; Harvard College as families earning from \$60,000 to \$180,000, and U.S. citizens themselves as those who earn between \$45,000 and \$200,000 a year, which comes to about half the population defining itself as middle class. The U.S. Census Bureau gives the figure of \$61,355 as the median income for American families. While middle class is variously defined solely in economic terms, middle class values are defined in communal terms, but always encompass a right to good education, a stable job, and the ability to not only fulfill a family's needs, but also to fulfill a fair number of its wants.

though he does not identify it as such. A conceptual apparatus is what allows a dominant communal thought to eventually become intuitive (Harvey). In order for this to happen, the conceptual apparatus “has to be advanced [so] that [it] appeals to our intuitions and instincts, to our values and our desires, as well as to the possibilities inherent in the social world we inhabit. If successful, this conceptual apparatus becomes so embedded in common sense as to be taken for granted and not open to question” (Harvey 5). The thought becomes so ideological that we do not think outside of its functioning, and those who do are considered at least odd and at most a dangerous aberration (having made a psychotic move within the *choix-force*, which I will explain later).

The conceptual apparatus that I am using as the basis of my analysis is based on Edelman’s assertion that “the image of the child invariably shapes the logic within which the political must be thought” and “that the child remains the perpetual horizon of every acknowledged politics, the fantasmatic beneficiary of every political intervention,” (Edelman 3), on Zizek’s *choix-force* and the psychotic move within it, and on the popular song “The Greatest Love of All.” Many people recognize the chorus of this song if not the lyrics, and, in fact, when I tell people about the topic of this dissertation, those who know me well will begin to sing the chorus of this song, and those who do not know me so well will mention the song in the course of our conversation. The chorus maintains “that children are our future/Teach them well and let them lead the way/Show them all the beauty they possess inside/Give them a sense of pride to make it easier/Let the children's laughter remind us how we used to be” (Masser and Creed). In using these very different sources, academic and popular, to articulate the Narrative of the Child with which I am working, I plan to show that the Narrative is not solely theoretical and academic, but is the organic outcome of

nineteenth century social reform and child labor movements; therefore, the Narrative's true strength lies in its intuitive reproduction in historical and current popular culture.

1.3 Pathos

Because children are viewed as the future, they evoke pathos as the sentimental child and as the focus of political and social actions on the part of adults. Because they are the focus of adults, the Narrative requires that adults ensure that their actions are designed to support and nurture children emotionally, intellectually, and physically. Therefore, as parents and citizens of the United States, we have a vested interest in ensuring that what we do does not negatively impact our children as individuals or as members of the American democracy. The pathos the Narrative so strongly evokes encompasses a yearning on the part of adults to “remind us how we used to be”; to remind us of the innocence and joy of childhood, regardless of whether the joy of childhood was real or not. This joy in childhood is what we wish for ourselves, and it is that which Americans are trying to create, or re-create, not only for our own children, but for all children, at least in theory.

However, even though the topos of the child has become a conceptual apparatus of idealization, the implementation of the Narrative has always been tightly woven with issues of control; hence the Narrative is not static. As the times change, the Narrative changes; it slides, expands and contracts in relation to communal beliefs, practices, and economic conditions. Though the core of the Narrative remains firm—the protection of the child—the edges of the Narrative shift with the times, and one clear change has been to the emotional attitudes regarding childhood. Sentimentalizing the child allows pathos to function very effectively within the Narrative. In evoking the child, the rhetor activates the Narrative as conceptual apparatus

combining the emotional effect of invoking the child with the need to protect children to form an ideology of control, not a disciplinary authoritarian model of control, but one based on biopower—the control of the child for the benefit of the child and the State. Thus, the sentimentally priceless child needs to be protected, nurtured, and disciplined according to the lights of his/her culture, and to be the focus of a pathos-based response in adults in order for the future to be protected. This focus on the sentimentalized child falls into one or more of the following categories: the National Child, the Known Child, and the Global Child.

The National Child is the child of Edelman and the child of Benedict Anderson's imagined community. Anderson states that, at the very least, a workable definition of nationalism is essential for understanding the emotional attachments people have to their nations and the influence of nationalism on culture, for he says, "indeed, nation-ness is the most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time...nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts [sic]" (Anderson 3-4), and he bases his definition of nationalism on "an anthropological spirit" because nationalism is based on relationships of individuals to one another, rather like the kinship groups in anthropology (Anderson 5-6). In light of his anthropological leanings, he proposes his definition of the nation as "an imagined political community" (Anderson 6) which is "*imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson). And this image of the nation's communion is present in the National Child: a child unknown to every individual, but able to evoke feelings of pathos and of nationalism in regard to education, safety, and the future of society and of the State.

The second category of the child is the Known, or familial, Child. This child is the child a person actually knows or one that one feels a kinship with on a pathetic level. The discarded

infant one reads about in the paper, the abused child one hears about on the news, and the educationally deprived child one reads about in books are the Known Child, for they bring a metaphorical face to the National Child, and this Known Child is the one for whom the Narrative is most effective in demanding recognition. The Known Child is the reason why pathos was invoked so strongly for the unnamed infant. This is the child of Jonathan Kozol, who invokes the Known Child to activate the pathos necessary for educational reform. Simply speaking of the deplorable conditions of some schools would not be as effective as giving specific examples with specific children, for without those specific examples, they are as Delpit says in the title of her book, “other people’s children,” but by invoking the pathos of the Known Child, they are no longer other people’s children, but our own. They are our children, the children of our imagined community, of our known community, and of our future.

The last category of the child is the Global Child, an imaginary construct, which is interesting because it combines the National Child with the Known Child in order to invoke pathos. The Global Child does not evoke the imagined community of the National Child, nor does it invoke the familial aspect of the Known Child, so it would seem paradoxical that together those issues should comprise the Global Child. Yet, it is the elements of the National and Known Child which form the Global Child. In order for the Global Child to be considered worthy of consideration, the idea of the global community must be invoked. The global community uses the Narrative and expands the imagined community beyond its national borders to create a space where everyone is responsible for everyone else’s children. And this responsibility is necessary for the future of the earth and the safety of individual nations as well. The global community must not simply use the National Child as its core, but must also incorporate the pathetic feelings associated with the Known Child. This is done in the same way the National Child becomes the

Known Child by putting a face and a context to the Global Child. Showing children in war zones as current victims, in regimes which limit children's access to education and healthcare, and as future victims and even perpetrators of atrocities they cannot now even know about creates the conditions necessary to evoke an emotional response in adults.

1.4 Organization

Adults' emotional response to children in need and in danger forms the organizational structure of my dissertation. In order to see how issues of pathos and control function within the Narrative, I have created the following chapters: the historical construction of the Narrative; the implementation of the Narrative in the schools; the Narrative in American society; and the Narrative as domestication of the foreign. In creating these sections to explain the Narrative and its functioning, I will look at how the physical control of children, the control of perceptions about children, and the control of children globally create paradox and *aporia*⁵ within the Narrative. The construction of the Narrative is strongly historical, and while it is not possible (and maybe not even necessary) to construct a truly linear timeline of how the Narrative came about, it is possible to pull together details which hint at a linear framework to help clarify how historical events influenced the Narrative of the Child. I have chosen certain details that allow me to create as clear a historical picture as I can of childhood and the creation of the Narrative. Historical events are important "because historical contents alone allow us to see the dividing lines in the confrontations and struggles that functional arrangements or systematic organizations are designed to mask" (Foucault, *Society* 7). One of these arrangements was children who were not overtly allowed into

⁵ I am not using the term *aporia* rhetorically as a pretended doubt or deliberation, but as I see it in Rescher's *Philosophical Reasoning*: as statements or positions that are plausible or make sense individually but cause an argumentative or actional impasse when they are used or held together (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2010).

the category of the sentimentalized child, but are still within the Narrative in regard to pathos and control. African-American and Native American children were excluded from the sentimentalized child; however, the emotional response to these children and the perceived need for control of these children within the Narrative can be clearly seen though in a different and more disturbing way than with other children. Girls, too, do not figure as prominently in the initial stages of the Narrative possibly because they were always under more control and more closely watched than boys, yet the need for the benevolent control of children has worked within the Narrative to the point where the sentimentalization of all children is an American commonplace.

In the second chapter, I discuss how the Narrative works within the educational structure of society and the schools. Education is viewed as essential for the continuation of the State, the economy, and the community, and much is written and spoken about the National Child in regard to education, but the National Child does not have the same force of pathos as the Known Child. Thus education is filled with statements regarding what should be done in general in contrast to what is actually done in a particular community. Writers, such as Kozol and Delpit, seek to alter the view of children and their education by making the problem a problem for the Known Child rather than for the imagined National Child.

The third chapter, Outside Education, shows how the Narrative has influenced children's spaces outside of education and how parental fears of safety have affected how children are treated in the home and on the street, the expectations for their future, and the how the backlash against those fears has created new spaces for children and a call for a return to the "way it used to be when I was a child." This call, though nostalgic in nature, does have valid points regarding the control of children and their spaces. All memories of what it was like when "we were kids" are not colored through a nostalgic lens. Children really did walk to school by themselves, played in the

neighborhood with friends without constant parental supervision, had spontaneous play times (not scheduled play dates), and rode bicycles without helmets and kneepads. But safety issues are not the only factors at work here. Households where both parents work are more common now, the need for some type of further training after high school is generally necessary for a living wage job, and global issues are more of a daily concern due to constant media reports concerning the events of the world. In addition, the fear of a lawsuit brought against an individual or company whose product or actions cause injury or death to the sacred child is also a significant factor in keeping children safe.

The chapter on the Narrative and the Global Child highlights all of the issues in the second and third chapters by using the first chapter's sentimental and sacred child to show how the Global Child becomes the Known Child. This process of the domestication of the foreign child illustrates how the use of "local tactics of domination" becomes "structures of power as global strategies" (Foucault, *Society* 46) in order for the domesticated foreign child to become subsumed by the Narrative. I also show how Benedict Anderson's imagined communities coupled with a slight twist of Foucault's historical construction of the nation⁶ become the community/nation of the child in the global sphere. The Narrative then becomes, for Americans, the overriding ideology in regard to children, and issues such as child labor, child soldiers, and child safety are no longer national-state issues but are now the communal issues of a global community, including those who choose to challenge the Narrative. This means that there are those whose actions are outside the

6 Foucault writes in *Society Must Be Defended* "at this time, [late eighteenth century], the nation is by no means something that is defined by its territorial unity, a definite political morphology, or its systematic subordination to some imperium. The nation has no frontiers, no definite system of power, and no State. The nation circulates behind frontiers and institutions. The nation, or rather 'nations', or in other words the collections, societies, groupings of individuals who share a status, mores, customs, and a certain particular law—in the sense of regulatory statutes rather than Statist laws" (134) and "this vague, fluid, shifting notion of the nation, this idea of a nation that does not stop at the frontiers, but which, on the contrary, is a sort of mass of individuals who move from one frontier to another, through States, beneath States, and at an infra-State level, persists long in to the nineteenth century" (142).

Narrative and whose beliefs about children are not part of the Narrative for themselves. These individuals who abandon, abuse, molest and kill children are functioning outside the Narrative, but they are judged by society as being accountable to the Narrative; therefore, their actions are placed under the rule of the Narrative.

1.5 Theoretical Constructs

In order to analyze the individuals' whose actions are outside the Narrative and how these actions are placed under the rule of the Narrative, I am using Slavoj Žižek's idea of the *choix-force* as an over-arching theoretical construction for all my chapters. In addition to using Žižek's *choix-force* as part of my theoretical foundation, I am also using Foucault's genealogies as an analyzing mechanism because I am combining "scholarly erudition and local memories to construct a historical knowledge of struggles and to make use of that knowledge in contemporary tactics (Foucault, *Society* 8). In other words, I am creating a genealogy of the Narrative of the Child using Foucault and Žižek as the erudite scholars and a variety of popular texts and historical proximate authorities as my sources of local memories for the knowledge of the struggles involved in forming the Narrative of the Child. I use all these sources in order to discuss not only how the Narrative came to be but also to analyze the "contemporary tactics" of the Narrative both in the United States and globally. The paradox of the Narrative occurs in contemporary times at the moment when the child "an individual who is naturally endowed (or endowed by nature) with rights, capabilities, and so on" is put at the center of the State in a "subjectified power relationship" (Foucault, *Society* 43), yet is simultaneously confined to edges of the State due to its being what it is—a sacred, sentimentalized child. Yet the Child is not a subject in sovereign terms because neither the State nor parents have "the right to make live and to let die" (Foucault, *Society* 241)

over the Child. In addition, the child has the future, and future power is a strong component of the global biopolitical. The demand of the nation is “no longer [articulated] in the name of a past right...[but] in terms of a potentiality, a future, a future that is immediate, which is already present in the present because it concerns a certain function of Statist universality that is already fulfilled by ‘a’ nation within the social body, and which is therefore demanding that its status as a single nation must be effectively recognized and recognized in the juridical form of the State” (Foucault, *Society* 222). The Narrative of the Child is the mechanism through which the nation of the Child, composed of all children, demands to be recognized and represented in the State, not the territorial State, but the Global State. The Global State’s “ability to administer itself, to manage, to govern, and guarantee the constitution and workings of the figure of the State and of State power...[finds the] conditions of existence in a group of individuals” (Foucault, *Society* 223), but not its historical existence, which is Foucault’s point, but its future existence in the hands of its children.

In *Society Must Be Defended*, Foucault describes the shift from man-as-body to man-as-species as the shift from disciplinary power to biopolitical power. Biopower’s domain is the “more subtle, more rational” control over individuals extending to “control over relations between the human race...and their environment, the milieu in which they live” (244-245), and not with the “contracting individual and the social [and literal] body” (245), but with man-as-species. Because of the shift from disciplinary power to regulatory power, in order to “achieve a sort of homeostasis”, the biopolitical needs to install “security mechanisms around the random element inherent in a population of living beings so as to optimize a state of life” (246) and the *choix-force* is one of the security mechanisms providing safety and security in the biopolitical world of children-as-species.

In *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, Žižek discusses “The Forced Choice of Freedom,” and in his argument, he takes the Lacanian perspective of freedom as the “real-impossible” (165) dividing the action of choice into two types, the *choix-force*, or forced choice, and the choice that is already made. While these two choices are atemporally the same (they are an unconscious choice), they are distinct when they become temporal, as they must, or they prevent the subject's ability to exercise conscious will. The individual's exercise of conscious will is an integral aspect of Žižek's argument regarding evil as are those who commit the acts that society views as evil acts⁷.

The realization of a choice can be problematic for the subject and the subject's community as in Žižek's recounting of the case of a Yugoslavian student called to military duty. Because the student's atemporal (unconscious) decision regarding his patriotic beliefs became temporal (conscious) in his act of refusal to sign the oath of loyalty sets up the problem of the “...act which never took place in reality [but which]...must...be presupposed, 'constructed', afterwards to account for the present state of things” (169) which caused the student to be punished for the action of his conscious decision. This distinction in the forced choice, that “you have freedom to choose, but on condition that you choose the right thing” (165) provides an explanation which accounts for why the student's refusing to sign the oath is problematic for him and for his community, but is not evil. Žižek's point here is that the individual in society is “never actually in a position to choose: he is always treated *as if he had already chosen*” (166) which leads to a subjugation of the subject to the will of the community, thus removing the subject's ability to act temporally on atemporal

⁷ I do not wish to attempt an analysis of what is evil and how evil is determined in American society because evil has a religious aspect to it that is not part of my analysis. As a result, I am using the word “evil” to describe actions that fall outside the rule of the Narrative of the Child. I am using the commonplaces that Americans hold regarding children to identify any actions that fall outside the commonplaces and outside the rule of the Narrative as “aberrations” from the norm of the commonplace.

(unconscious) decisions, unless they are in accord with the community, which, in effect removes will and conscious choice from the subject. According to Žižek, in order for a choice to be a true choice, action must be taken as a result of that choice; therefore, a choice unrealized, one that does not become conscious, is not a true choice. If the subject never realizes a choice has been made, then the “game is over *before* we waken ourselves into consciousness” (168).

The choice that is already made is not applicable to my argument because it is not a true choice because the individual has no control over the atemporal choice, the choice just is⁸. But the *choix-force* is very much in evidence in regard to children. While the atemporal⁹ choice is irrelevant because a choice unrealized is not a true choice, it is the *action* of a choice that renders it a true temporal choice in the eyes of the community. An atemporal choice must become conscious to the subject as that which was already chosen, either by himself or by his community. At this point, the subject can choose to accept and act on the atemporal choice or can choose to deny and act against the atemporal choice. The act of decision making is in itself neutral, neither positive nor negative, but the ramifications of the choice become significant in regard to the subject's community, for either accepting or denying the atemporal choice can result in a forced choice depending on the subject's “relationship to the community to which he belongs” (165). Thus a conceptual apparatus can only function when atemporal choices become temporal and are acted upon and evaluated within the accepted mores of the community. However, the realization of a choice can be problematic for the subject and the subject's community because, again, the

8 Žižek uses the example of love to illustrate the paradox of the choice that has already been chosen. He states that the subject can neither be ordered nor consciously decide whom he will love. He can only say later, “*I've already chosen*” (166). However, once the choice has become temporal, or realized, the subject can choose to act on this choice. He can continue to love his atemporal choice or can choose to not act on this choice, or not to love, if his community would demand that he had already chosen someone else.

9 I am defining “atemporal choice” as a pre-conscious decision that is made outside of linear time, but at an undetermined moment becomes conscious and part of linear time.

importance of the *choix-force* is that the freedom to choose is based on making the right decision, and this making the right decision is an integral part of the pathos and control of the American Narrative of the Child. Because the individual in society is treated as if he/she has already chosen, the subjugation of the individual to the will of the community becomes a subjugation to the ideology of the sentimentalized child. For Zizek, the subjugation of the individual to the will of the community is a negative condition because subjugation removes the subject's ability to act temporally on atemporal decisions, unless they are in accord with the community, which, in effect removes will and conscious choice from the subject.

But in American society there is currently no commonplace that allows for an individual's conscious choice to be the individual's freedom to harm a child – any child. So, as the individual's choice becomes conscious, the individual can either choose to accept and act on the atemporal choice of harming a child or can choose to deny and act against the atemporal choice. Thus, in the eyes of the community, if the subject makes the absolute choice¹⁰, he is, as Zizek says, “a *psychotic* subject...who is not really caught in the signifying network” (166), and the signifying network of the sentimentalized child is extremely powerful in American society. The Narrative of the Child as conceptual apparatus attempts to control any aberrations by ensuring that the right choice of the individual is to protect the child. This power can be seen in the laws, historical and current, enacted to protect children, the American community's emotional response to children in danger, and its desire to implement the Narrative globally.

¹⁰ In this case, the absolute choice is the wrong choice.

Chapter 2

Ideological Foundations: Constructing the Narrative

2.1 The Historical Child

The topos of the child, which manifests itself in the power of the malleable child as the reproducer of democracy, did not arrive complete in the American democratic state, but has historical foundations beginning at least as early as Socrates, Plato, Cicero, and St. Augustine. Though Socrates, Plato, Cicero, and St. Augustine were not democrats, their thoughts, beliefs, and arguments regarding children reflect the topoi that define today's children; specifically, the topos that children are important to the future of society and to the future of the State, and this topos resonates strongly with current American democratic ideals. Without the pressure to create and maintain the State and to protect its future strength, the care of children is solely familial. While the care of the child was essential to maintaining the Colonial, Puritan, and working class families, the care of the child was also integral to the issue of the State and its maintenance and is connected to the rise of the Narrative of the Child.

One of the ideals that is important to the democratic State and to the rise of the Narrative is asserted by Plato through the lectures of Socrates when he states that education is essential for all citizens (though he views a true democracy as unwieldy) because "the beginning of any job is the most important part, especially when we are dealing with anything young and tender...for that is when it is especially malleable and best takes on whatever pattern one wishes to impress on it" (Plato). Therefore, being careless with children and their education does not serve the State and its future well because children are the future caretakers of the State. Thus, one could ask how then should children be educated to fulfill the requirements of being good citizens and capable of

continuing the State? As with any question, there are several answers to this that are dependent on the individual or organization one is currently consulting, either historical or contemporary, and their frame of reference and personal/organizational beliefs, but all of the positions involve some essential elements without which the child cannot reach the goal of the good citizen and competent caretaker of the State. Some of these essentials are religion (or a lack of it), personal duties, education, and physical control of the body and its desires.

In order to clarify how the topos of the child arose in American society and how the above aspects became essential to the future of the American child and the American State, it is necessary to trace a historical path from classical to modern thinkers. Because the span of time is long and there is a goodly amount of historical information available on children, in this chapter I have decided to create a rather sparse linear history of childrearing practices and ideas focusing primarily on major practices and trends. So, to begin a discussion of the time and the essentials, I have chosen to start with St. Augustine's religious position because while the pathetic argument is an important part of religious discourse and the child narrative, Augustine takes a somewhat eclectic approach to raising a child, for he advocates both religious and secular means as important for gaining wisdom. For Augustine, the most important method of gaining wisdom is curiosity. Though he declared that education must have a strongly Christian component, it cannot be restrictive, for "free curiosity has greater power to stimulate learning than rigorous coercion," and he is adamant that the child not "study one particular sect but to love and seek and pursue and hold fast and strongly embrace wisdom itself, wherever found" (St. Augustine) through whatever teachings the child is exposed—although he would assert that most non-Christian teachings cannot contain wisdom of the sort he advocates. However, he does say that experience and education are essential to gaining wisdom, and it is good that a child not be coerced into a particular mindset, for,

the child as an adult will not then force his (and today, we would include her) will on others, but will do unto others as has been done unto him or her. For Augustine, religious instruction was essential to the complete child, but was not all the child needed to be educated. In addition to religious instruction, Augustine believed that the child must be taught the ways of the State because one must ensure that the duties required, but not coerced, from the State be inculcated into the child when the child has reached the point of maturation. The point of maturation is the developmental point where the child has the ability to reason but is still malleable to the good and beneficial teachings of adults.

For Augustine, Cicero, and Plato, and for many parents and educators today, too, the education of the child as future citizen is focused on the life of the mind, with the practical as a matter of course arising from appropriate thoughts and theoretical constructs. While this is still the major focus of the schools, the focus on the body, hearkening back to Socrates and his concerns with the gymnasium and nutrition, is becoming more and more important again as communities are implementing programs designed to increase exercise and healthy eating in children in response to a rise in the weight of Americans in general, but specifically in children. Again, the belief is that if one can teach children what adults believe or know to be beneficial to them as children, such as eating healthy foods and exercising regularly, as adults these lessons will become habitual and will be taught to future generations, thus maintaining the public good through longer lives, lower medical costs, and increased happiness.

This focus on controlling the child and his/her environment so he/she can become a healthy, happy, future citizen echoes Locke's examination of the life of children and his instructions regarding the practical, day to day education of the child and his or her body. Locke uses the idea of the State and the citizen to focus on the individual child. Hence, it is the relatively

recent development of the nation that raises the stakes of the Narrative. He examines the individual child, but views the child both as part of the group of children and as part of the future group of adults/citizens to a much greater degree than either Augustine, who recounts his own education as a model to be followed (or in some instances avoided); or Plato, who is concerned with finding how the good and the just influence education, but not necessarily how these function in the day to day education of a particular child; or Cicero, who is addressing his own son with fatherly and civic advice. Though Locke does want his ideas to be applied to the child as citizen and to the State as protector of the citizen, his statements are significantly more detailed, especially in regard to the control of the child's body, than the others, who tend to focus ultimately on the mind.

All the authors discussed so far, including Locke, would agree that moderation in all things, the ability to reason, an adherence to virtue, and the submission of the will are essential to the educated adult and the engaged citizen. These qualities are not antiquated ideals which no one bothers with anymore, but are still supported by many Americans today, especially in regard to children. This conservative position is paradoxical because it is acceptable to many Americans in regard to children, but not in regard to adult behavior or to the function of the State. For what citizen wants his State to be submissive in its dealings with other nations? And what citizen in a democratic state wants to be completely controlled by the State? The answer to these questions can be seen in much of the popular opinion in the United States today: the State must strike out against terrorism; it must defend itself from being dominated by foreign economic forces; and the citizen must protect his/her rights by voting, speaking out, rejecting full body scans at airports, and by protecting parents' rights to raise their children as they see fit.

But Locke does not focus solely on the mind with bodily control to follow as a matter of course, he is extremely detailed regarding exactly how one should control both the body and the mind of the child to inculcate the ideas of virtue, moderation and reason into the child and make these ideas habitual actions. According to Locke, in order to create the good citizen (because good citizens are, indeed, created and not just born), the child, from its infancy, must not be coddled because “most children’s constitutions are either spoiled, or at least harmed by cockering [pampering] and tenderness” (11); however, the child should not be ignored or abused either. The father, and mother, too, “must caress and commend them when they do well [but] show a cold and neglectful countenance to them upon doing ill” (Locke 36). In this way, children will figure out right and wrong, guided by their parents, but “none of the things they are to learn should ever be made a burden to them or imposed on them as a task” (Locke 51) because learning that is viewed as a task or as unpleasant will never become habitual.

Like Augustine, Locke believes that “curiosity should be cherished in children” and that a “slavish discipline makes a slavish temper” (Locke 34). Children must have plenty of air, exercise, and sleep, a plain diet with no wine or strong drink, very little or no medicine, clothing that is not too warm or too confining, and anything asked of them must be accompanied by “reasoning suited to the child’s capacity and apprehension, [what is] plainest, easiest, and most efficacious is to be set before their eyes [as] the examples of those things you would have them do or avoid” (Locke 25). Because children learn by imitation and practice, it is the responsibility of the parents to live the habits they wish to instill in their children and to demonstrate those habits daily to their children. These are still beliefs held by American parents today, though not uniformly in terms of degree, but all would agree on role modeling as beneficial, not over-medicating children as good, and exercising and getting fresh air as necessary for a healthy

child. In addition, many parents today would agree that one should appeal to the child's developmental level of reasoning by giving children choices from a young age and developmentally appropriate explanations of why the child is being asked to do something, but would disagree with Locke on some of his more stringent bodily controls, such as ensuring that children have constantly wet feet and cold heads (20) to strengthen their physical constitutions. Locke desires that children be taught reason and obedience, but adults must always keep in mind that children are children, and their "tempers, strength, and constitutions must be considered" (21) when molding their behavior. Locke's use of constitution includes both the intellectual and the physical being of the child, and he readily acknowledges, as can be seen in the above statement, that they are physically and mentally undeveloped. However, even though they are undeveloped, they are still capable of being taught "to have all the deference, complaisance, and civility one for another imaginable ... [and to be] kind, liberal, and civil to others" (81). These qualities, interestingly enough, are hallmarks of a democratic society and ones which Americans still espouse today.

His idea of the adult/child relationship is that to be an educated adult, one must be an educated child, and to be an educated child, one must have had educated adults as role models and/or instructors. This is basically the same idea that Americans subscribe to today. We view adults as role models for the correct behavior of children, and no one is more responsible for the raising of the child than parents and teachers though the child's community is also a strong influential factor in determining future behavior. This belief echoes Locke's argument that while parents are most important, good teachers are essential. The teacher's influence on the child is a "great work" designed "to fashion the carriage and form the mind, to settle in his pupil good habits and the principles of virtue and wisdom, to give him by little and little a view of mankind and work

him into a love and imitation of what is excellent and praiseworthy, and in the prosecution of it to give him vigor, activity and industry” (70). These then are the essential qualities of an engaged citizen, one who is capable of fulfilling his or her role in social and political life, qualities that are strongly supported by the American State and its citizens still today. Though Augustine, Plato, Locke and Cicero were discussing the education of future leaders and not of the masses, many Americans want for the masses what Augustine and the others were expecting of their future leaders. The shift in perspective lies in the belief, not the reality mind you but the belief, in the American dream: that America is the land of opportunity where everyone is created equally and any child can grow up to be _____ (one can fill in the blank with one’s own dream: doctor, lawyer, teacher, President, etc.). That the space to be filled in is usually occupied by the educated elite in a profession that is typically identified as having a leadership role is an irony that cannot be dismissed, for the education required for these professions is generally accessible only to the elite and paradoxically undermines the commonplace of equality in American society.

Augustine, Plato, Locke, and Cicero all focus on the citizen and his or her responsibilities to the State. While they don’t say that the State has no responsibilities to the citizen, the emphasis is on the individual’s actions and their effect on maintaining political and social order, in effect presaging John F. Kennedy’s “ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country” (1961). For it is with the citizen and his (now her) responsibilities to the State that citizens working together for freedom can maintain the State. This is in direct opposition to the monarchical state, and Machiavelli’s comments on it, which focus on how a strong prince can have a strong state. According to Machiavelli, if the prince cares for himself, then, and only then, can he have a good State. The strong prince must not be too compassionate, for this indicates weakness, and a weak State is a vulnerable State. The rise and fall of the State, for Machiavelli, is

encapsulated in the body of the prince, not within the body of the populace. Educating the populace is not essential; educating the prince is. However, both types of governance stress that education is necessary if the State is to endure, for the democratic state can only maintain itself if it supports and educates its citizens. This role of the State as educator is important to the evolution of the Narrative and the emphasis on children as future citizens.

Cicero maintains that instruction in the duties of the citizen to the State can only occur when the child is developmentally capable of understanding those responsibilities. According to him, in order to understand and implement the duties of a citizen, the child must be able to understand the duties required of it and to understand the explanation of how these duties are essential for maintaining the social and legitimate political order. For Cicero, “no part of life...can be free from duty” (3) which means that while duty supersedes religion, the focus on the Other is still of paramount importance, for one purpose of the State is to protect its citizens thereby protecting itself, and the purpose of the citizens is to protect and support the State. Because Cicero places his emphasis on the child’s ability to reason, it becomes the most important way of maintaining the beneficial State/citizen relationship, and so it is essential for children to be taught to reason. Children must be taught “first, [that] impulse must obey reason; [for] nothing is more suited to ensuring the observance of one’s duties than that” (54), for if the State, or society, asks, or even demands, something of its citizens that appears unreasonable, the engaged citizen needs to be able to assess the State’s position to determine if the request/demand is actually unreasonable, and in order for the citizen to fulfill his or her duties to the State, he or she must be able to put aside personally impulsive behavior for the greater good. Cicero’s emphasis on reason persists in a modified form in modern schools through the critical reasoning curriculum, which teaches children to make informed, critical decisions about themselves and their actions, and the actions of

those around them, including the State. Critical reasoning curricula encourage children to question, assess, and challenge all statements presented to them. In addition to reason, focus, economy, and efficiency are necessary, for Cicero says that “we must keep in mind the importance of the thing we wish to achieve, so that we employ neither more nor less care and effort than the case requires” (55), and “the third thing is that we should be careful to moderate all things that may affect our appearance and standing as a gentleman” (55), or, in other words, as a civilized being, who is polite and an important, supportive part of the State.

Later writers, such as Rousseau and Lenin continue the discussion begun by earlier writers by discussing how children can be educated outside the State and be raised without direct instruction from the State and yet still step into their appropriate position within the State and choose the best form of government for themselves and for the State when they are adults. While the types of States that Rousseau and Lenin advocate are very different, they strongly believe in the power of the child to make the “correct” decision as an adult regarding the form of the State.

Rousseau’s focus is even more narrow and specific than Locke’s, for his is the education of a specific, though fictional, upper-class child, whom he calls Emile. His concern is not necessarily with women or with the general populace of the State for “the bourgeois is contrasted by Rousseau, on the one side, with the natural man, who is whole and simply concerned with himself, and on the other, with the citizen, whose very being consists in his relation to his city, and who understands his good to be identical with the common good” (Bloom in *Emile* 5). While Rousseau does not advocate removing oneself from one’s State, he also does not advocate educating children in regard to civic duties or bodily control though even he espouses moderation and virtue. Yet his very rejection of control does not absolve him from actively exerting control over his Emile, but it is a benevolent control much like biopower. While Locke sees children in

need of direct instruction provided by parents, as does John Stuart Mill for that matter, Rousseau believes that happiness is individually determined, and though it can be guided by an adult, it must mostly be discovered by the child himself or herself, rather like the pursuit of happiness, not the guarantee of it. Rousseau asserts that the pursuit of happiness on the individual's terms will guarantee that "whoever does what he wants is happy if he is self-sufficient; this is the case of the man living in the state of nature. Whoever does what he wants is not happy if his needs surpass his strength; this is the case of the child in the same state. Children in the same state enjoy only imperfect freedom similar to that enjoyed by men in a civil state" (*Emile* 85), and this is the foundation of Emile's education and Rousseau's belief regarding the purpose of the State.

As a result, children, for Rousseau, are in the paradoxical position of being natural while at the same time being subject to others. The child needs to be "forced to learn by himself, [so that] he uses his reason and not another's; for to give nothing to opinion, one must give nothing to authority" (*Emile* 207), yet authority is what is controlling him and forcing him to learn by himself. For Rousseau, the goal of education has not changed; it is still the goal that everyone else has: to become Good and to see the Good. For Rousseau, "it is in doing good that one becomes good" (*Emile* 250) and one becomes good through discovering his own freedom. Rousseau, too, asserts that children are not simply miniature adults, in direct contrast to the belief of many eighteenth and early to mid-nineteenth century Americans, for he states that "humanity has its place in the order of things; childhood has its in the order of human life. The man must be considered in the man, and the child in the child. To assign each his place and settle him in it, to order the human passion according to man's constitution is all that we can do for his well-being" (*Emile* 80) – the child is important because he is a child who has not yet fully realized society and his place in it. It is here that the child can do what the adult cannot; he can create his own place and possibly re-create

society to be at least different and at most better than it is. For Rousseau, placing the child into the social structure from the outset is not in the best interest of the State or the child. Though Rousseau's education of the child is dependent on the child's being reared away from the city and the State, he or she will eventually become part of the State, and Rousseau acknowledges that developmental point by differentiating between natural puberty and civic puberty. Though Rousseau extols the virtues of the natural man (arising from the natural child), civic puberty is the point at which the child becomes an adult for "civil puberty is attained only when a man is able to love a woman faithfully, rear and provide for children, and participate knowledgeably and loyally in the political order which protects the family" (*Emile* 17) through his ability to reason, thus resulting in an unresolved tension between natural desire and civic duty.

Both Rousseau and Mill espoused the idea that "anything that could be found out by thinking [or examining]...was never told" (Mill 31) to Emile or Mill until they had exhausted their own efforts at finding the solution. Even then, they were to assess the information given to them, not just accept it from the source, which is in direct contrast to nineteenth century American pedagogy which required a significant amount of memorization and rote recitation. While Rousseau's education of Emile seemed to be fitted to doing rather than just knowing, Mill states that his education was based on knowing rather than doing, and both Rousseau's and Mill's educational experiences were based on thinking, but on different types of thinking. In rhetorical terms, Emile's and Mill's education differ in their use of doxa¹¹. For Emile, doxa is important because the child is finding out for himself what to believe and not using a formal system of analysis. Mill, on the other hand, is focused more on endoxa, as he tests the arguments of others to arrive at the same conclusion, but on his own. Locke would add that the physical, the doing, is

¹¹ Doxa are communal beliefs and opinions, whereas endoxa are commonly held beliefs of a population accepted by the wise or learned.

also essential to the development of the child, and that is reflected in today's beliefs regarding children and the necessity for organized sports, daily exercise, and vocational learning.

2.2 The American Child

The idea of the nurturing of the entire child, stemming from the emerging nineteenth century narrative that sentimentalized and sacralized¹² children and the nation's imperative to produce the "National Child", was controlling reform movements deep into the twentieth century in America. As part of the historical construction of Americans' perception of the child, nineteenth century reformers took on the whole child, not just the laboring child as did Cicero, Augustine, Plato, Locke, Rousseau and Mill, insisting on all types of safety: working conditions (if children were even to be allowed to work), street safety, safety from predators, the educational knowledge needed to become engaged citizens, and the provision of a room of their own without constant and rigorous adult supervision. These types of safety expand the notion of safety beyond merely physical safety and into intellectual, political, and emotional safety as well. In the nineteenth century, creating a safe space for working-class children and extending the beliefs and expectations for middle-class children to working-class children began to seem a logical move within society. Not that this transition was smooth, seamless, or without resistance on both sides but the beliefs were there and reformers were arguing for their use across class lines, if not across racial lines. The reforms which created the sentimentalization of children came from women's movements, juvenile courts, and other institutions, but with some of the strongest calls for reform

¹² Here again I use Zelizer's definition of sacralization as the "sense of objects being invested with sentimental or religious meaning" (11).

literally coming from the children themselves, especially in regard to working conditions, free time and the use of token money (Nasaw).

The writings and teachings of philosophers and thinkers like Cicero, Augustine, Plato and Locke, Rousseau and Mill influenced the idea of the American child because within their desire to educate the child is the element of control of the child. A child cannot be properly educated if he/she is not properly controlled by society and taught to be self-controlled within society, but the tension is between traditional disciplinary control and control through the apparatuses of biopower. Historically, in America, a strong part of the disciplinary methods of control involved religious education, and the “Puritans believed that parents were responsible for their children’s spiritual upbringing” (Mintz ix). Today, many American parents have a mixed response to their role as spiritual guides, but not to their responsibility of raising future citizens of the State. As a society, Americans are not only committed to the ideal of raising engaged citizens in a deliberative democracy, but also to creating citizens who are truly engaged and fulfilled as individuals, both as a child and as an adult. “Contemporary parents hold themselves responsible not only for children’s physical well-being but also for their psychological adjustment, personal happiness, and future success” (Mintz ix). We are trying to extend the idea of the sentimentalized child into adulthood and to use the mechanisms of biopower to optimize life by melding a liberal democracy into a community of psychological good health: well-adjusted, self-fulfilled, yet socially responsible individuals who care for each other and for themselves, for in this way only will the Republic survive. Yet we have still the paradox of race and class to be resolved; we are still wrestling with the aporia seen between “the deep love we feel and express in private [for our own children with the lack of] any sense of ‘public love’ for children. [We do this] by refusing to extend parental altruism to other people’s children...The sacred child is thus a private luxury;

children in need of public support are treated unsentimentally, assisted only if the investment is justified in economic terms” (Zelizer 216). Zelizer’s analysis of the American parents as focused on their own children to the exclusion of others is not completely accurate as it leaves out the pathos induced response to the Known Child. The emotional response to a Known Child is strong within American society, and it is this response that allows children who are strangers to us to feel as if they are part of us. It is also this response that has allowed the Global Child to become the Known Child and to be used as a powerful tool for humanitarian agency.

Today, because of the strength of the Narrative of the Child and the power of the Known Child, I maintain that virtually all parents would subscribe to the white middle-class nineteenth-century topos of a societal commitment to the child. This commitment evidenced itself in the nineteenth century by extending the length of childhood, providing youngsters with time to play with and have access to manufactured toys, and to prolonging children’s education through high school (Clement) while controlling their access to the “street” because the street is still dangerous. Today, Americans are concerned for the public child, but the goal we have for ourselves as a society is tempered by the reality we still see in the streets. In this respect, we have subscribed to the child-saving beliefs of the nineteenth century reformers, but we, too, are still having trouble implementing them for all our children. However, these elements of nineteenth century thought formed the basis of the sacred child, and as children have become the beneficiaries and the inheritors of adult political action, the sacralization of the child has been pushed to the limit of sentimentalization and of control.

One clear instantiation of the sacred child is American society’s current concerns with child safety. While parents no longer worry about their children being injured on the job as did nineteenth century parents, they do still worry about children being in danger on the street, in the

schools, and even in their own yards. Americans' fears for their children are partially founded on the belief that the current era is more dangerous than any other—regardless of whether this is true or not. Americans believe that as a global community, we are more sophisticated and more technological and, therefore, more capable of creating dangerous situations which allow undesirables dangerous access to children. This belief causes Americans to reduce the past to palatable labels that create the idea of an era without the substance of the era. For example, the idea of the flapper, the depression, the hippie generation, and the nostalgic 50s are all more powerful as nostalgic devices than the reality of any particular era. Historically in the United States, WWI and WWII, the Depression, the industrial revolution, the war for independence, pioneer life, unclean drinking water, less sophisticated medical care, and the explosion of the population of the cities were all serious dangers to children, yet we think that today is significantly more dangerous. By euphemizing an era, it is possible to flatten those eras and reduce the actual danger present at that time to “nothing worth bothering about” or to a romanticized perception of the past.

This attempt to use terms of safety to flatten previous eras, when control of the child's world was assumed, has pushed the Narrative to the point of aporia. The tension resulting from this aporia manifests itself in public arguments that demand action through the creation of policies, programs and laws to protect children in order to recreate the perceived safety of the nostalgic past. And adults and the State respond within the category of the National Child by empowering children through education to be wise in the ways of politics by creating a nurturing stable environment to facilitate emotional balance, and by passing legislation to protect children from guns, drugs, and other dangers in order to protect the future of the nation, as well as to protect the individual child—in essence to use Foucault's security mechanisms to optimize the life of the

child and the life of the nation, an optimization epitomized by a nostalgic view of the past. The idea that the sentimental child is useless is challenged here by the functionality of the use of the child-as-future adult in the role of the National Child. The National Child has a job to do in protecting the future of the State through the biopolitical; yet the individually driven contribution does not come until the child is an adult. The National Child is a biopolitical mechanism through which the current child is prepared for the future job of the adult. The ideology of the Narrative supports both the National Child and the idea of the Global Child as necessary for future safety because the Narrative asks, “For whom are we saving ourselves and our world if not for the children?” And the answer comes from a mythologist, Joseph Campbell, who states that “in saving ourselves, we are saving the world” (Heroes), and the Narrative completes the answer by ensuring that “ourselves” includes our children.

2.3 The Historical American Child

As a result of the need to control the experiences and the environment of the highly sentimentalized child, the Known Child has gained in pathos as parents, encouraged by the State, have not just taken more responsibility on themselves for the safety of their children, but also now feel solely responsible for the happiness of their children—more so than parents in the past. We have the idea that the child “as school boy or schoolgirl whose self and individuality must be preserved by nurturing, whose capacity for self-control, deferred gratification, and logical thought must be extended, [and] whose knowledge of life must be under the control of adults, [must] at the same time, [be] understood as having its own rules for development, and a charm, curiosity, and exuberance that must not be strangled—indeed, is strangled – at the risk of losing mature adulthood” (Postman 63). We tend to view “childhood [as] a ‘project’ in which the young must

develop the skills, knowledge, and character traits necessary for adulthood success...academic skills, knowledge, and competencies” (Mintz 383), yet due to the pathos surrounding children, we have a hard time determining exactly what those character traits should be and how they should be taught, especially when those issues are expanded to include the Global Child in the imagined global community.

The beliefs and tensions mentioned above regarding children have been a part of the historical construction of the Narrative, and current beliefs and practices regarding the American child are a result of the reform movements of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. As children moved from being part of the economic system as workers to being part of the education system as learners where their only work was to become educated for both practical and citizenship roles, the role of the child in American society changed dramatically for all children, not just the upper classes. The ideal of the upper class child as an innocent who needs to be protected and nurtured into adulthood has now been applied to all children. “Children ought to be children, and nothing else” states Lucy Larcom (1824 – 1889), a factory-girl, New England poet and author of *A New England Girlhood*, a “sketch written for the young...[for] girls of all ages, and...women who have not forgotten their childhood” (5). This statement is a far cry from Locke’s argument that “the objective [of society] must be to the poor through confinement in a workhouse whose employments will transform idleness into industry and debauchery into sobriety”, and that this controlled circulation of working-class children in the workhouse must begin “the earlier the better: children from the age of three ought better to be confined to a house of correction than left to the hazards of parents of dubious character” (Montag 119). Statements such as this, and those who believe them, are being repudiated by nineteenth century reformers and this repudiation of Locke’s ideas is firmly supported by contemporary Americans who would be

aghast at such statements being applied to any National Child, Known Child or Global Child. My assertion for this chapter is that the reform of the family and of the role of the child within the family came through social programs, education, and employment, not through Locke's workhouse, and the change in beliefs regarding the working-class family are partially the result of a shift of ideology in America in regard to industrialization and urbanization of children and working-class families and partly a reanimation of the beliefs of the American colonists regarding children. As movements such as the Progressive Movement and the City Beautiful Movement took hold from the turn of the nineteenth into the twentieth century, they sought to create an image of a truly democratic, moral America, and children became one of the beneficiaries of these movements especially in regard to the school and the home.

The place of children in the American family is reflective of the ability for people, both contemporary and historical, to hold competing views within themselves regarding children, both National and Known—to reach aporia and apparently not care. Analyzing the colonial family's view of children shows that the views of nineteenth century reformers and of twenty-first century parents are part of a continuous thread of emotional attachment regarding children that was present in both Colonial and Puritan families. The emotional attachment or lack of it that these earlier parents had for their children was a point of tension in modern academic arguments regarding the children in both Puritan and Colonial times. The main tension existed between those who believed that the Puritans and Colonists were distant from their children and did not consider them as persons or have emotional attachments to them because of high infant mortality rates, and those who maintained that the relationship between the child and his or her parents was deep and emotional. The historical consensus is now that colonial parents did have a strong emotional bond with their children despite high mortality rates. I maintain that the Puritans and Colonists

held a paradoxical view of their children based on their pioneer situation. Both Zelizer and Mintz maintain that in colonial times, parents “were never indifferent to the death of their children, [but] they maintained a degree of aloofness and detachment from the child” (Zelizer 25), which was supposed to help alleviate the grief over a child’s death. But other sources show that colonial parents were not detached and indifferent to their children. They cared deeply about their children’s welfare and did everything they could as parents to ensure the child’s survival. If, however, as was often the case, the child did not survive, they mourned the child deeply. Perhaps the perception of detachment comes from a difference in viewing the purpose of childhood. While Colonial and Puritan parents cared for their children, they did not, as we do, consider childhood a period of leisure or playfulness. Children were “adults in training who needed to be prepared for salvation and inducted into the world of work as soon as possible” (Mintz 10). This is the second tension among scholars: were children simply miniature adults, and so treated as adults with the expectations of adults; or were they adults in process, and treated as children who needed to be formed to become active participants of society?

According to Postman and Mintz, the colonial child was the unformed adult, and parents and the schools were designed to foster in children those traits desirable in adults. Religion was an essential determiner of how children were viewed and raised, and “the capacity to control and overcome one’s nature became one of the defining characteristics of adulthood and therefore one of the essential purposes of education; for some, the essential purpose of education” (Postman 47). Because the nature of the individual was essentially an evil one (original sin), the control of the soul manifested in the control of the body became an essential part of education, and “quietness, immobility, contemplation, [and] precise regulation of bodily functions, became highly valued” (Postman 46). This did not mean the child was uncared for; in fact, the opposite can be

maintained. Because the Puritans and colonists cared deeply for their children, obedience was essential to safety, and the control of the body not only reflected control over the evil nature of the soul, but also the ability to survive infancy and childhood. The obedience and control of the body required by parents of their children was to be gained through loving reproof, not through excessive physical punishment (Postman).

Ultimately, the goal of the child and eventually the adult was to become socially and economically useful. In eighteenth century America, the infant was viewed as a future productive member of the family and as parental insurance in old age. Children as young as six were expected to be productive and even were sometimes apprenticed out to learn a trade. This was reflective of the harsh conditions of the settlement where everyone needed to pitch in if the family were to survive. In addition, the family was a unit in which individual rights were subsumed by the family's needs. Colonial life was difficult, and in order for the family to survive every family member was required to participate in maintaining the family as soon as he or she was able. Though children had the right to life and care, they did not have "the right to independent legal identity, a degree of autonomy from parents, and the right to a free, serene, healthy, bread and butter childhood unburdened by heavy labor" (Mintz 183) that late nineteenth century adults began to believe children should have and that twenty-first century adults firmly believe.

The eventual nineteenth century change from the Colonial view of children began with some respected voices, such as Noah Webster and Benjamin Franklin, who advocated the importance of education for all children, but their beliefs did not gain the impetus needed to effect wide-spread societal change until the advent of the industrial revolution. Until this time, and even after reforms were put in place, children, especially working class children, rural children, and children in the American West, were needed to augment the family income for the family to

survive, but this did not mean that as the sentimentalization movement progressed these children were not sentimentalized. They were theoretically sentimentalized but did not have the time or the leisure to be actually sentimentalized, for they were needed to work in factories, on the streets delivering notes and selling newspapers, and at home doing piecework or caring for younger siblings (Nasaw). When children did work in the factories, they worked in the same factories, working the same hours and doing similar, if not the same, jobs as the adults. Though both boys and girls did work in the factories, many girls and younger children put in long hours doing piecework at home with their mothers. Boys and girls were also used to run errands for shopkeepers and take messages here and there, and to run payments from the department store floor to the cashier (Nasaw). In addition, according to Nasaw, both boys and girls (though mostly boys) hawked newspapers, candy, shoe shines, and what-have-you on the streets. In other words, they were a cheap labor force enabling higher profits at a time when slavery was no longer legal nor acceptable.

The child as cheap labor was undermined by the mechanization of the industrial revolution which contributed to a shift in the child from being an economically useful child who was an integral part of the survival of the family to being an economically useless child who was sentimentalized and protected from labor. When the industrial revolution mechanized many of the jobs once done by adults, the adults needed the jobs done by children, and many children were displaced by adult or older adolescent workers. For everyone, but especially for reformers, the question then became what to do with the children who were now idle and on the streets. Children, once a major component of the work force in factories, shops, and department stores, were being pushed onto the streets (Nasaw) in the sense that they were on the streets with nothing useful to do. This not only caused a rise in hooliganism, but also put the children in danger

(Nasaw). With many children on the streets during the day because their homes were too small and too crowded for them to remain inside, the incidents of children being killed by street traffic rose dramatically (Nasaw). This clear danger to children could not be removed from the streets, but the children could be. The obvious answer for the reformers was to have the children in a controlled environment where they would be safe under the eye of an adult. This place became the schoolhouse with compulsory education the result. In conjunction with compulsory education came child labor laws, and “by 1915, some seven states, the District of Columbia, and several cities had passed laws restricting children from trading on the streets” (Nasaw 70). However, because the families still needed the income from child labor to survive, “many children, more often than not, simply ignored the laws” (Nasaw 70), and so did their parents. This caused tension between the reformers on one side and the working class parents, children, and factory owners on the other side. The factory owners could hire children more cheaply than adults, and the money was welcomed by the families. However, “for child labor reformers, children’s early labor was a violation of children’s sentimental value...a laboring child is simply a producer, worth so much in dollars and cents, with no standard of value as a human being...How do you calculate your standard of a child’s value...as something precious beyond all money standard?” (Zelizer 57). But sentimental value does not feed the child or the family, and the need for children to work was not evidence that they were valued only in monetary terms, but that they were valued as essential for the survival of the family, but the money that children earned and their use of it was a controversial topic for reformers, parents, and for the children themselves.

2.4 Children's Money

As reformers began ever more strongly asserting that children as children are part of the family and are important to the family, but not in financial terms, working-class parents were still in the position of needing the money their children earned from working. However, as the debate over child labor continued, the “the correct manner of managing individuals, goods and wealth within the family” (Foucault, *Governmentality* 92) became a highly charged issue for the working-class family and for reformers. If children were working, they were not sacred enough, but if they were not working, they and their families were not eating, which resulted in a stalemate between poor families and reformers. According to Nasaw, working to earn money and turning it over to parents for the benefit of the family did not threaten the hierarchy of the family, but children having money of their own to spend as they pleased was a threat because having money of their own gave them an independence from the family that parents found not only disturbing but also considered dangerous to the well-being of both the family and the child. The core of the issue within families was children's access to spending money and whether or not “they were free to purchase what they wanted—when they wanted it” (Nasaw 119). Though the reasons were different, the tension of children's money unified working and middle class adults in regard to the economy of the “wise government of the family for the common welfare of all” (Foucault, *Governmentality* 92). Adults were generally in agreement that children were “too young, too irresponsible, [and] too susceptible to the temptations of the city to be left alone with their nickels and dimes... [and that] children with money got spoiled. And, they maintained, money erased the distinctions between childhood and adulthood and, in so doing, tore apart the hierarchical basis upon which the family rested” (Nasaw 131). This tension between the role of the adult and role of the child in society is a significant point in the Narrative of the Child because working-class

parents and reformers are finally unified in their beliefs regarding what is good for the sacred, sentimental child, and it was not free access to what money could buy. But, in the end, children's voices were strong enough to effect a compromise, and children began to be allowed to keep a portion of their money for their own use. This money was called token money because it was only a portion, a token, of the entire amount earned. In addition to restricting children's access to the marketplace, the issues over token money caused reformers and working-class parents to agree that there was a distinction between childhood and adulthood with the result being that children were children and not miniature adults. This threefold movement from the economically useful child to the economically useless child to the child as consumer with his/her own money coupled with the emerging societal view of children as precious allowed perceptive adults to capitalize on this new situation to create a child focused market, to increase the manufacturing of goods for children, and to create spaces designed to cater to children's desires. Spaces, such as nickelodeons, were erected to draw in children and their spending money; thus shopping and entertainment and the physical area they inhabit became more the sites of childhood desire, and children were more than willing to capitalize on their personal desires, but the market was still adult controlled.

Like today, acceptable toys were those that were educational, but in addition reflected "the principles that some adults hoped children would learn...positive traits of character such as piety, honesty, temperance, truth and chastity" (Clement 154). Though toys and entertainment were, and still are, considered an important part of creating the well-adjusted psychologically happy child, they are not all that is required. For the traits that adults want children to have come not primarily from the toys they own and the entertainments they experience, but from parents and adults who are the primary guiders and role-models for children. Adults today would agree with the sentiment of Larcom's assessment of her childhood when she states that

the happiness of our lives was rooted in the stern, vigorous virtues of the people we lived among, drawing thence its bloom and song and fragrance. There was granite in their character and beliefs, but it was granite that could smile in the sunshine and clothe itself with flowers. We little ones felt the firm rock beneath us, and were lifted up on it, to emulate their goodness and to share their aspirations (92).

Parents can agree with her beliefs because the ideal parents of today are authoritative parents who set clear expectations, provide earned praise, and spend time with their children. While Larcom's idyllic state was not the actual state of many children, especially urban children, the sentimental feeling that she evokes is integral to the reforms of the day and highlights the responsibilities that adults have as role models for children. Factory life is not the life for a child according to the Narrative and according to nineteenth century reformers. It is also not the life an adult should wish for a child. This belief is carried through American society today and out into the global community through the work of humanitarian organizations.

2.5 The Sentimental Child

This shift from economic usefulness to economic dependency coupled with the sentimentalization of the child augments the sacralization of the child. This augmentation is due, in part, to the rise in technology, the economic dependency of the child, the national imperative to maintain the economy, the growth of government, and to a reaffirmation of the belief that all beings are sacred to God. As infant mortality was dropping, child fatalities due to factory and car accidents were on the rise. For working-class children, there was no place to play or work but on the streets, and there was no room of one's own because there was no inside space for children

because apartments were small and crowded (Riis). Because the children and their families depended on the street for extra living and playing space, society began to view differently the accidental killing of a working-class child and that of a middle-class child. Initially, the working class children were seen as wild and uncontrolled, and the “accidental killing of these children was characteristically attributed to irresponsible lower-class behavior...It is one of the awful facts of this whole sad business that women so often neglect or refuse their obvious duty...until a limp, crushed body has been put into their arms” (Zelizer 47). This perspective was held until the number of deaths became so numerous that reformers began to realize that it was the conditions in which the children lived and not necessarily the inattention of their mothers. This realization coupled with the national imperative for the growth of government and the State’s protection of the child caused reformers to begin strongly advocating a separate space for children where they could play and be safe. The need to create a separate “sacred” space was linked to the “new value of child life and the deepening moral offensiveness of killing children [because] properly loved children, regardless of social class, belonged in a domesticated, nonproductive world of lessons, games, and token money” (Zelizer 11).

Thus the killing of a child, even accidentally, became “obnoxious and almost [a] sacrilegious crime” (Zelizer 49) in which social class did not matter. The sacralization of children was in part due to the resurgence of the Christian ideal that every life is sacred, no matter the class, and part of what should be done with a child is to train them in the way they should go, and the only way to do this uniformly was through the schools. “By the 1930s, lower-class children joined their middle-class counterparts in a new nonproductive world of childhood, a world in which the sanctity and emotional value of a child made child labor taboo” (Zelizer 6). Reformers strongly believed that the ideal home for all children included a room where the child “can be by himself

[because] children require a place, also, where they may carry on their own legitimate activities unhindered and unhampered...a place where they may play or work without interference from or conflict with the activities of the adult members of the family...The goal was to assure the child's physical space within the home" (Zelizer 54). As an adult, Larcom echoes this belief when she recounts having to leave her childhood home after the death of her father. Leaving the house was difficult enough, but

it was hardest for me to leave the garret and the garden. In the old Houses the garret was the children's castle. The rough rafters...the music of the rain on the roof, the worn sea-chests with their miscellaneous treasures, the blue-roofed cradle that had sheltered ten blue-eyed babies, the tape-looms and reels and spinning-wheels, the herby smells, and the delightful dream corners, -- these could not be taken with us to the new home (147).

This child-friendly space was relinquished as she and her family began their new lives in Lowell, Massachusetts, and she began working in the Merrimack Mills.

For working-class urban children, there was no garret, so one way of addressing this lack of inside space was to create outside space. As a result of the new need for children's sacred space, the city streets, which used to be the children's playgrounds, were replaced (or attempted to be replaced) by actual playgrounds. The Playground Association of America, founded 1906, had, by 1910, created thousands of playgrounds for older children, and by the 1920s, there were tot-lots for small children (Zelizer 34). Though playgrounds were constructed because the working class child did not have an in-home space in which to play, the playgrounds were not always located close enough to the children's homes for them to play without supervision, which their families could

not provide (Zelizer). While reformers saw children on the streets as completely unsupervised, the reality was that to a great degree the entire neighborhood supervised all the children. Zelizer maintains that shopkeepers knew the children on the block; the children watched out for each other, and mothers could take a minute and look out onto the street to check a child. Playgrounds could require children to travel several blocks away from home where they were not known by anyone. As a result, playgrounds were not as successful as the reformers had hoped, and anyway could not have replaced the child's personal space. Today, we encourage child-only spaces in the form of bedrooms and/or playrooms of their own. But nineteenth century working-class children lost the streets and gained nothing in terms of space. This lack of home space and safe outside spaces left the schoolroom as the main safe place left for children though the schoolroom was not the ideal solitary space that reformers had decreed as necessary for the child because it was still under the control of an adult—often more controlled than the home. However, the schoolroom did become the sacred space of childhood for working-class children, and, outside the home, the schoolroom is still a major safe space today for all children, and the only safe space for some children. Though urban working class children of the nineteenth century were now economically useless to the family, they were not completely domestically useless, for school lessons and chores at home were still expected of children because both prepared the child for adult life.

As children were deemed the responsibility of the school system, now that working was no longer socially condoned or accepted, the schools began to reflect the ideas of the progressive reformers who deemed non-assimilated immigrant cultures as a political threat to the ideals of the American democratic republic. Of course, the call for reforms were not reflected across all racial groupings and implementing these reforms was not a smooth transition, and one could argue that in the nineteenth century, not a complete transition for working-class, African-American, or

Native American children. It must be said that Native-American and African-American children were outside the view of many of the progressive reformers, and those children were treated as workers or as threats to the uniformity of society. In many such cases, these children were warehoused to be molded into an acceptable American ideal which they were unable to fulfill due to societal beliefs and practices even after they were deemed acculturated, or they were left to their own devices and were not considered as part of the reforms.

However, in the case of working class children of all ethnicities and religions, the Narrative was working through charitable organizations, such as Charles Loring Brace's New York Children's Aid Society founded in 1853 (Holt 42). Brace was a minister who went to New York to complete his seminary training and was horrified by the situation of many New York children. According to Marilyn Irvin Holt in *The Orphan Trains*, "in 1848-49, an estimated ten thousand vagrant children roamed New York City; further in eleven of that city's wards at least three thousand minors made their living by stealing" (21). These conditions are in direct conflict with the sentimentalized child of the nineteenth century reformers and with the way the Narrative was evolving to support the need for protected, nurtured children.

In response to the plight of these unprotected children, Loring Brace created several mechanisms for helping New York children including "placing out" children into rural American families who needed and wanted children. In adopting placing out for New York children, Loring Brace states in his 1855 declaration of purpose that "our objects have been, the improvement and elevation of the vagrant and poor children of the street, boys and girls; of those engaged in the petty out-door trades; those who beg, or pilfer, or pick the streets for a living, and those who are driven by homelessness and poverty to the prison, or who are confined there for petty crimes" (Holt 187), and this is in not only in concert with the Narrative's purpose and goals for children,

but was also the optimizing path for these children, for the placed out children were to be “treated as *sons* and *daughters*” by their new families (italics in text, Holt 105) . In choosing this path, Loring Brace believed that he could help the most children, but it was not his only path as he also hoped “that the organization could improve conditions for children in the city” (Holt 45). However, placing out was not the optimal choice for all children as some children did not want to remain in rural towns, and “many of the placed out refused to stay where they had been sent...[and there was] a general belief that those who freely returned or were lured to leave their homes would be used by unscrupulous adults in criminal schemes, worked to death as child laborers, or returned to institutions” thus the children were encouraged to break all ties with those left behind (Holt 127). Despite the children for whom placing out was not right, who were free to reject potential adoptive parents, for many children placing out was successful, and the placing out movement was the path that fulfilled society’s need for children to be nurtured and protected from the city streets and its dangers.

This being said, criticism has been voiced regarding the placing out movement’s removal of children from their families and from everything that was familiar, but it must be noted here that for many of these children, there were no families and their familiar world was one of fear, hunger, and loneliness. Of those children who were not orphans but had been removed from their homes and placed out due to parents’ inability to care for them, some had family members keeping track of them, and these children were collected by their relatives and returned to their families as situations improved. Though just as there were those who did not wish to stay, there were also those who did not wish to return. As one girl who was returned to her father in New York from a Nebraska home remembered “I had a nice room, good meals, ...going to quilting parties, also County Fairs...For three short years, I had love” (Holt 130). As this example shows each child is

different and what was right for one child was not right for another, yet it is simply not possible to choose the optimal path for every situation and every eventuality. What the orphan trains attempted to do was to remove the child from the streets and give him or her someplace to belong and something to do. And for most children, the placing out was optimized within the Narrative as working within the best interests of urban children and rural families.

In contrast to the sacralization of eastern urban children, frontier children were not able to be sacralized much at all, even if their parents desired it, though they were loved and cared for which made these families Loring Brace's choice for the orphaned and uncared for children of New York. The frontier children were in the same position as the colonial children; if the family were to survive, the children must work. Often these children took on jobs that adults were unable to do due to time constraints or injury, and the jobs were adult in nature and required an independence of children that the East was not willing to grant them. These children were still economically useful and still very much economically essential. However, the prevailing attitudes in the East regarding children and their position in society affected the West as well. Parents were concerned that their children were growing up wild, and reformers from the East had the same concerns. The children, however, were often satisfied with their independence and skills and knew that they were essential to the family and its survival and so resisted the efforts at reforming, or in their eyes, controlling them. In addition, their access to formal schooling was sketchy at best, thus many frontier children would not have met the essential goals of the new schools and of mandatory education (West 71, 127, 166, 203).

Though I will discuss the role of the schools and education in more depth in the next chapter, schools were such an integral part of constructing and implementing the Narrative that a brief discussion of the goals of schooling and their effects on the Narrative and on children also

belongs here. One essential goal of the schools was to ensure that students were “literate enough to read about and elect good leaders” (Clement 83); otherwise, the Republic could not survive. “The goal of most eighteenth century Anglo-American parents was to develop honest, republican virtues of self-discipline and self-reliance in their children” (Hiner and Hawes 54), and the nineteenth century was no different. If parents could not uphold their part of inculcating honest, republican virtues in their children, the nation and the government would take control of the child’s education. In “Governmentality,” Foucault discusses the role of government as akin to the governing of the family. The family was ruled by the father who concerned himself with all of the aspects of the family, births and deaths, marriages, and property but as a benevolent entity who wished only for what was good for the child and the family. This method of ruling the family was applied to the ruling of the state, but just as the rule of the father disappeared as the model for government, so, too, did it pretty much disappear as the model for the American family. In regard to government, the household economy model was disbanded because it could not “respond adequately to the importance of territorial possessions and royal finance” (98). In a similar manner, using only the rule of the father as a governing tactic was not effective, for it could not respond adequately to the changing role of children in American society.

So reformers placed the new power over children into the hands of the schools. This added to their importance in protecting children, but the schools alone were not enough to protect children from “abuse, exploitation, and neglect” and so reformers “invoked the State’s police powers” (Mintz 156) to form the United States Children’s Bureau in 1912. The Bureau’s goal was to make the preservation of children’s lives a national concern because a “governor should only govern in such a way that he thinks and acts as though he were in the service of those who are governed” (La Perrière in Foucault, *Governmentality* 96). In keeping with La Perrière’s

benevolent government by forming the Children's Bureau, the State put itself in the position of being obligated to its children for its own survival. In implementing this biopolitical security measure, society is able to create the conditions necessary for the optimal life of the sentimental child. In so doing, not only are society and the State saving the child, but it is also saving itself. And because preserving and optimizing life, especially the life of a child, is the goal of the biopolitical implementing the apparatuses of child saving is the next step.

2.6 Child Saving

All the reform and child saving movements crystallized during the Depression when the security apparatus for maintaining homeostasis was found lacking, and Hoover's attempts to maintain the optimal conditions of pre-Depression America failed. During this time of extreme hardship when parents were not able to care for their children, the nation agreed that "the federal government had a responsibility to promote children's well-being" (Mintz 235). This moved the focus of child protection away from the family and onto the State and what the American government and society believed was right and good for the useless, sacred child, and it is here that the State uses both its benevolent and disciplinary power to impact the family and family life. Because this movement was so strongly in the favor of the State's control of the child, attempts to implement child-saving reforms were not without controversy, for not only were race and class an issue, but within classes, people had differing ideas regarding the role of the child and the role of the parent over the child. But despite this state of aporia, the welfare of the child won out over the individual rights of the parent, for "if parents are delinquent in furnishing their children with this opportunity, it is the clear duty of the state to interfere...Earth holds no greater tragedy than the ruthless destruction of a sturdy human life not even conscious of its own existence..." (Zelizer 27).

Thus children deemed to be neglected by the State or, harking back to the beliefs of colonial times, to being punished excessively, the State could remove the child from the home, and institutions were established for just such children. In fact, the idea of the right of the child to a sheltered childhood was eventually “the result of a determined political struggle by a broad-based coalition that included educators, physicians, psychologists, union leaders, and pioneering feminists, and it required government action in the form of compulsory education laws and restrictions on child labor” (Mintz 153) to enforce it.

Current policies found in today’s welfare departments are historically the result of the three types of reforms that were put into place to help children: family tutoring, child saving, and family saving. These three reforms were based on the idea that the best way for children to become responsible, engaged citizens of a deliberative democracy is through the household economy of the family and its ability to guide, nurture, and protect itself. Government agencies, such as the Children’s Bureau and the Juvenile Court System, worked hard to ensure that the protection of the child within the family and society was backed by “a compulsory school law, an equitable child labor law, provisions for a detention home for children and an adult delinquency or negligence law” (Ben Lindsey in Hiner and Hawes 157) thus ensuring that the *choix-force* was the freedom to choose what was right for the child, and what was, and still is, right for the child is a responsible, caring, protective parent and a healthy environment.

Control of children’s environment and their parents, too, was the key to transforming the child’s character (Mintz) into a good citizen and a good person. Nurture was more important than nature, and if children were nurtured properly, according to American psychologist and behaviorist John Watson, children could be developed into whatever the parents and/or society wanted them to be. Possibly his most famous statement regarding the nature versus nurture

argument falls unequivocally on the side of nurture when he states “give me a dozen healthy infants, well-formed, and my own specified world to bring them up in and I'll guarantee to take any one at random and train him to become any type of specialist I might select--doctor, lawyer, artist, merchant-chief, and, yes, even beggarman and thief, regardless of his talents, penchants, tendencies, abilities, vocations, and race of his ancestors. I am going beyond my facts and I admit it, but so have the advocates of the contrary and they have been doing it for many thousands of years” (82). This malleability of the child, which was to be controlled by proper nurturing overrode the belief in the primacy of the nature of the child and was ostensibly to be used by the schools for creating the engaged citizen, yet the environment of the nineteenth century schools was not a nurturing one, and not only did the pedagogy of the schools prevent this, but the physical space did as well. The physical space of the schools was so terrible that Jacob Riis, a *New York Tribune* reporter and urban reformer of the late nineteenth century, used the New York schools and their effect on children to call for reforms: “In New York we put boys in foul, dark classrooms, where they grow crooked for want of proper desks; we bid them play in gloomy caverns which the sun never enters, forgetting that boys must have a chance to play properly, or they will play hooky; we turn them away by the thousands from even such delights as these, and in the same breath illogically threaten them with jail if they do not come” (Riis in Button and Provenzo 198). Riis found this situation to be so intolerable that he demanded that “sufficient land be condemned around every school in the city to build a playground, a “people’s park” in which children could play during their recesses and where mothers living in the neighborhood could take their babies during the day” (Button and Provenzo 191). In this way the community of the street without the dangers of the street could be reimplemented for children and their parents. However, the flaw in

the plan was that parents, especially working class-mothers, did not actually have the time to take their children to the park and supervise them while they played.

That the primacy of parental responsibility was only equaled by the responsibility of the schools to protect, to educate, and to create responsible, engaged citizens of its children was not in question; however, the methods through which this was attempted initially left a lot to be desired. According to Nasaw, when the children were on the city streets, children of every ethnic, religious, racial, and language group played together in a melting pot environment, and “kids whose parents would not have dreamed of socializing became the best of friends” (31) because the block was the social organizing unit, not race, gender, or ethnicity. Though one may think that the block was organized along racial and ethnic lines, Nasaw maintains that this was not so and that working class children of a particular block befriended and defended each other from racially and ethnically diverse groups of children from *other* blocks, and that the block was the true divider and unifier of children.

In the block, we can see the beginnings of the American melting pot, but we can also see its dissolution in the structure of the schools. The schools took the social organization of the block and unwittingly used it to divide children rather than unite them. The school’s goal was to “take children from the streets and the streets from the children” (Nasaw 26) but the schools, controlled by adults, reinforced adult social ideas of what and who was right and proper, and did not create space for the ideas and experiences of the children themselves. Mintz asserts that this division resulted in “every aspect of childhood [being] shaped by class—as well as by ethnicity, gender, geography, religion, and historical era” (2) and not by the unifying environment of the block. And according to Nasaw, the school’s task was to catechize children in the duties of citizenship, instruct them in manners and morals, and, most important, teach them to read, write, recite, and do

sums, not to encourage ethnic diversity. The end result was that while the streets were dangerous, the schools, whose “primary responsibility [was] to satisfy the growing demand for a skilled, educated labor force” (Zelizer 8) and “to cultivate a respect for diversity and a critical, engaged intelligence that would prepare young people to participate in community affairs” (Mintz 175), actually ended up being a dismal place in which the disciplinary control of the body as well as the mind became the focus of education, not the creation of an engaged, critical thinking ethnically aware citizen.

2.7 Conclusion

As a nation, we believe, ideologically, that children are basically innocent and incapable of consciously doing serious wrong, and we believe that children should be protected from the evils of the world, but yet we also want them to have a well-grounded, clear, and understanding view of the world and their place in it for them to be engaged citizens in a deliberative democracy. The legacy of the industrial revolution and the reforms of the progressive movement on our ideas of sentimentalizing and sacralizing children today are both part of the evolution and the paradox of the Narrative. We have taken the idea that children are important as children, and not just as “the next generation’s adults,” but as “competent social actors who take an active role in shaping their daily experiences” (Barrie Thorne in Zelizer xii), and we grant children more rights under the law and more say in shaping their own education and in making decisions at home. In fact, children are so included in the belief in the universal rights of citizens in a democratic state that children are beginning to be able to exercise these rights almost as adults long before they are legally considered adults. This evolution of the Narrative is not only reflected in societal beliefs, but also in the laws enacted to protect them; thus the idea of child-saving is still strong in the United States

and is strengthened in actuality by the judicial system, but it is still tempered by the aberrant behavior of some adults, and these behaviors are psychotic moves within the Narrative.

Economically, we believe that children are useless, but we also hold them emotionally priceless. We believe that children should not work to contribute money to support the household, yet “most parents today would concur with the belief of nineteenth-century working-class parents that adolescent children should work some outside the home to earn money, if not to support their families, at least to pay for their own leisure-time activities” (Clement 226), which is the direct result of the nineteenth century belief in token money and the appropriate uses for it. Parents allow their children to work, even before the legal age of employment, by lawn mowing, newspaper delivering, baby-sitting, and even earning good grades in school because these jobs are not hard labor nor are they full-time. In addition, they contribute to the child’s education in that work is rewarded, and reinforce the American belief that if one is to be a productive part of society, one must work. In addition, the money that children earn will teach them about finances: saving, spending and the value of their purchases. And working at age appropriate tasks such as chores, lessons, babysitting or mowing the lawn, teaches children to be responsible, and responsibility is a key lesson that parents, teachers, and future employers all agree children must learn to be valued members of society.

Thus the aporetic aspects of childhood in the United States today can be seen in the historical unfolding of the Narrative of the Child and are the result of the historical positioning of the child outside the family and into the political and being forced out of the economic structure and into the domestic sphere. This shift seems to have been most widely voiced in the United States by reformers during the industrial revolution and continuing into the twentieth century. It is, again, not that the Narrative was not present earlier, but social and economic changes caused it

to gain momentum and acceptability. The most widespread of these changes was the industrial revolution itself which moved the child from an economically useful family member who was an integral part of the survival of the family to an economically useless child who was sentimentalized and protected from labor. This shift in the economic positioning of the Child caused a significant change in the view of the Child's purpose in family life and in society. The movement of the child from economically useful to sentimentally priceless became a source of tension both in the family and in society with parents having the first responsibility for upholding the moral standards of the nation and for teaching their children these same morals while also ensuring that as adults, their children had become capable of being responsible, engaged members of the Republic.

All these movements crystallized in the decades leading up to the Depression, during which the nation agreed that "the federal government had a responsibility to promote children's well-being" (Mintz 235). This biopolitical move shifted the focus of the child solely from the household economy of the family and onto the State and what the American government and society believed was right and good for the economically useless, sacred child. As the Narrative of the Child gained in strength, socially and politically, the role of the parent became more controlled and more focused on the child as an individual with political and legal rights. This move set the *choix-force* of the Narrative firmly within American society leaving no space for the deliberate harming or endangering of a child. This move was reflected in the reforms which refocused children's work from the factory and its dangers to the school and schoolwork. In addition to viewing children as important because they are "the next generation's adults," Americans have also shifted their beliefs regarding the nature of child to encompass both Larcom's statement that children ought to be children and nothing else and to espouse the idea that

children are important as children, and they are important as competent, active social actors.

Today, adults hold the somewhat contradictory view that children should be children as children were in the 1950s, yet also support the granting of more rights to children under the law and more say in shaping their own education and in making decisions at home. At this point, the Narrative of the Child is no longer simply part of the familial society, but has also become a significant and powerful driver of the political life of the country.

Chapter 3

Educating the Sentimentalized Child

3.1 Control

As can be seen in the previous chapter, the sacralization of the child did not diminish the need for control of the child, but heightened it by emphasizing the fragility of child-life and the burgeoning hazards of industrialization. As the fragility of children was coupled with their sentimentalization, the Narrative of the Child began its shift from an acceptance of God's will should a child be harmed or die, to a desire to control as many forces as possible in order to protect the child. This made the Narrative's key function not solely Edelman's claim of the future citizen, but also created the child as the embodiment of the need for control and the manifestation of biopolitics. The arguments over token money discussed in the previous chapter are one practical example of the struggle for control that was happening in nineteenth-century America. Working class parents needed the child to work; often the child wanted to work, and the State needed the child placed outside work, for the core of this struggle was the economic future of the State and the control of the individual as a resident/citizen of the United States. On a smaller, yet just as important level, economy became the issue as the family needed the money the child earned to survive; the child wanted the money he earned for his own use, and the State wanted to remove money, both earned and token, from the child so adults could have control of the family economy and of the child. Though today, adults still have control over the child, the issue of children and their money has changed dramatically as the market has realized the power of the child as a consumer.

However, this monetary battle was necessary for the Narrative to gain the hold it has on American society. Removing the child from the workforce and enacting governmental economy by putting the child under the control of the State in the form of the public schools was a necessary movement for the Narrative to become a conceptual apparatus, for the role of the schools and the pathos surrounding children were driving the sentimentalization that was necessary to create the Narrative in the form we see it today. Therefore, it is no surprise that the Narrative of the Child is strengthened by its replication and implementation within the educational system since schools, both public and private, tend to the development of children. Though, historically, the pedagogical and disciplinary practices of the traditional public school make it a paradoxical supporter of children and of the Narrative, its function of protecting children from the dangers of the street and of the factory and removing them from the economic structure made it an integral part of childhood reform movements, including the sacralization movement.

Late nineteenth century and early twentieth century's educational pedagogy readily encompassed Locke's views on producing docile subjects as an important part of educating future citizens, and traditional public schools wholly endorsed the disciplinary control of the mind and of the body of the child while in the classroom. Bodily control, as Locke saw it and later as Foucault describes and analyzes it as disciplinary control, was not subscribed to wholeheartedly by all adults but, nevertheless, was a widespread practice in the schools. The strength of the control of the body was the result of the widely held belief by school personnel that bodily control was not only beneficial to children currently, but also for their future. The State, as Foucault argues, is defined "no longer in terms of its territoriality, of its surface area, but in terms of the mass of its population with its volume and density" (Foucault, *Society* 104). The State is defined in terms of its nations (groups of people inside the State), and with the biopolitical control of that population,

not the disciplinary control of nineteenth-century educational practices. For working class children in particular, the educational control was supposed to be biopower in action—education of the mind coupled with reform movements calling for a childhood of light, space, and unstructured play. What they got was the disciplinary control of the body without the light and space.

Reformers and researchers of the time, such as Rice and Dewey, were reacting to the sentimentalization of children versus the stringent bodily control of children by examining how education produced different subjectivities and relations of power within American society, though they did not use these particular terms. Their ideas, such as the school as a community and as a laboratory for children to explore their world and satisfy their curiosity, were at odds with this current nineteenth-century pedagogy of control, but they were educating children at the same point in time. In looking at the negative impact of controls on children and advocating change, they were working within and replicating the Narrative in their own manner. This tension set the paradox of public education that continues today in the schools.

3.2 American Foundations of Education

Historically in the United States, the State wanted to control the body of the child in order to control the mind of the child in order for the child to be safe and to become a productive adult and an educated, engaged citizen within the political realm. Though the educational system of the day worked hard to produce the obedient social adults the State determined it needed to survive as a state, not everyone agreed that educational practices in use at that time were best suited to children's natures or for forming future citizens. In addition to the State's needs, the economic job of the school to prepare children to be factory workers as adults not only did not create the type

of citizens required for a democracy, but its structure and pedagogy of control did not even allow for such a citizen to be created. Therefore, as notions about children and their place in society shifted, so, too, did ideas and notions about the purpose of education and its place within the family and within the social structure, but these issues were seriously debated and pathos played a key part in the shift in ideology.

In order to form as clear a picture of the Narrative's beginnings and implementations as I can, I will intersperse the new nineteenth-century views on education and their purpose with the history of educational practices in the United States before the industrial revolution. I will begin as I did in the first chapter with the Colonial era and juxtapose those and other issues with the modern day manifestations of these historical practices. Reminiscent of the tensions regarding the positioning of children within the family, the same tensions regarding education and the family in colonial times has appeared in recent scholarly debates. Philip Greven in *The Protestant Temperament* has argued that for some families in colonial times, "family government was authoritarian and rigorously repressive. Parental authority was absolute, and exercised without check or control...Obedience and submission were the only acceptable responses for children" (32). This assessment of the role of colonial parents and how they used authoritarian control over their children to achieve the desired results sounds very much like the descriptions of schooling during the late nineteenth century and could allow us to assume that the traditional public school was simply an extension of the colonial beliefs on child rearing. Yet Greven continues his description by pointing out that other less evangelical and more moderate colonial parents were "respectful toward legitimate and essential authority within the family, yet aware of the need to limit the exercise of authority within certain established boundaries. Children were reasoned with, not ordered about. They were to be treated leniently if possible. They were to be loved and were

seen as being essentially good” (151) thus negating the idea of original sin and the authoritarian position on child rearing.

Historically, the paradoxical views held by adults in the same communities show that childhood as we determine it should be today was not a revolutionary move on the part of nineteenth-century reformers, but was more of a gaining momentum and implementation of thoughts and practices already present in American society. This paradoxical view of child raising still divides society today regarding child rearing. Though the Narrative has smoothed some of the edges of what is considered acceptable disciplinary practices, the tension in this division that continues to today is reflected in the American school system.

Currently, some parents believe in leniency in regard to discipline and schooling so as to allow the child to develop his or her natural interests and skills while others believe that children should have a fairly strict upbringing in order for them to conform to parental cultural beliefs and to be adults who are prepared to be part of society. And while all Americans do not believe that children have no voice and that parental control is absolute, some Americans do believe that the school system should teach only what the parents believe is correct and no more while others believe that children should be exposed to all points of view and what is taught at home should supplement and clarify what is taught in the schools. This is the argument regarding authoritative versus authoritarian parenting in which child researchers view the authoritative parent as essential to the well-being of the child as a child and as an adult, and the authoritarian parent as being seriously detrimental to the child as an adult (Baumrind). This, coupled with differing child-rearing practices, puts the schools in the aporetic position of requiring a curriculum that teaches core skills as well as providing opportunities for enrichment while treading the fine line of acceptable content and disciplinary practices. Discipline falls into this space because schools and

the children in them need to be controlled enough for the school and the classroom to be a safe space, but the school also needs to be extremely careful regarding this implementation of control. But whether we like it or not, control is still the overriding factor in the schools – control of educational content, control of pedagogy and control as part of disciplining bodies and behaviors.

In the Colonial era, elementary school was open to both boys and girls, but after elementary school, only boys went on to the Latin Grammar school. The curriculum of the Grammar school was controlled by Latin, Greek, and the Classical literary tradition, including rhetoric. The rationale behind the teaching of a Classical curriculum was not only that Latin was necessary for “theology, for medicine, and for foreign correspondence”, but also that “schools...do not answer only to the social and cultural needs of the moment...[they] are in themselves social institutions with customs and conventionalities of their own” (Button and Provenzo 26), and these conventionalities and traditions were more important than any parental desire or whim society may have regarding the education of children. The notion that schools are social institutions with their own rules and customs and are removed from the social and cultural needs of the moment is not reflected in educational practices today. While schools are an institution devoted to children, issues of control ranging from religious to personal to dietary are gaining a stronger, sometimes it seems unassailable, place in the school and in the classroom. Thus, the ever closer binding of school to societal norms and pressures weakens the position of the public school as its own institution with the result that private and charter schools are gaining in popularity because they still are capable of having their own conventionalities and traditions without general public pressure.

But one can see from historical discussions that colonial parents, like parents today, were not uniform in their parenting or educational practices and that ideas about raising children have

always been tempered by family background and belief systems. But not all learning issues were divisive in colonial times. Just like today with the majority of Americans agreeing that reading is essential to fully participate in society, literacy in colonial times was considered extremely important, and one that was pretty much agreed on by all colonial parents. Education, literacy, and being able to recite what one has learned were important to colonial families because children needed to be literate in order to be useful to society and to the State. This idea of “being of benefit to the State” still survives though altered by rights and individual freedoms; however, education is still seen as the key to being successful as an individual and fitted for public service. One significant historical change in education that furthered the development of the Narrative occurred with Benjamin Franklin’s 1749 proposal for an Academy to expand the role of the Latin school by teaching not only Latin and Greek, but “the English tongue, grammatically and as a language, ...French, German, Spanish...history, geography, chronology, logic and rhetoric, writing, arithmetic, algebra...natural and mechanic philosophy [science], drawing...and every other useful part of learning” (Button and Provenzo 47). This move to the practical was a reflection of the shift in American thinking from the Puritan theological child to a well-rounded, well-educated, secular¹³, romanticized and sentimentalized child. The idea of a child being educated in catechism and Christian ideals gave way, though not entirely, to the Romantic idea of the child as “a garden plant, to be cared for and cultivated so that it would develop, grow, unfold, and bloom” (Button and Provenzo 52). Thomas Jefferson took this idea a step further and seems to have coupled it with the colonial practices regarding public service (though not with religious practices) and created a plan which would “provide basic instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic for

13 In this case, I am using secular to mean a non-religion-based school. Not the liberal secularism of today’s agnostic school where God cannot be part of the curriculum in a proselytizing manner, but a school in which religion is present but is not the foundation of curricular instruction.

every male citizen, as well as more specialized training for those individuals of unusual ability. [In addition,] a basic, uniform political education would be provided to the entire citizenry” (Button and Provenzo 68). Jefferson’s ideas regarding the separation of Church and State were suited to this shift in pedagogy. He wanted no religious indoctrination by the schools, just a focus on the basics of education and the creation of an engaged citizenry for the new country. Though Jefferson’s ideas were not immediately enacted, his ideas were respected enough that they were eventually used in the schools and are still firmly entrenched in the modern school system as the separation of Church and State, and his idea of “teaching the basics” so that each child can reach a minimum measurable standard of achievement is fundamental to current local and federal educational mandates and reforms.

Taking Jefferson’s ideas of basic education for all boys a radical step further, Mary Wollstonecraft argued that education for girls was imperative because, as women, they needed to be the intellectual equals of their husbands because women were the primary caregivers and first influence on children. Her voice, pushing the Narrative forward, presaged the movement later in the 1800s which shifted the control of early childhood education from the father and onto the mother. Janet Carey Eldred and Peter Mortenson in *Imagining Rhetoric* articulate the main premise of the movement as one of a natural progression arising from the early mother-child relationship. Since the mother was the one who spent the most time with a child when it was young, they maintain that her ethos was established as the most important influence on the young child; therefore, it was important that she be educated in order to instill the qualities necessary to become a good citizen in a democratic society. And one of the areas that was necessary for her education was rhetorical studies in order for her to couple logos with the pathos associated with the

child. By doing so, the mother was, again, fitting the child for citizenship and all the responsibilities it entailed¹⁴.

In 1826 in Philadelphia, Wollstonecraft's call to action was realized when a Pestalozzian school was opened. Though Pestalozzi, a Swiss educator, was not directly influenced by Wollstonecraft or the romanticism of the era, his belief that children were the products of their environments, not of innate nature as in G. Stanley Hall's writings, supported a progressive education and answered Wollstonecraft's pleas. This belief in the strength of environmental influences assisted in the construction of the Narrative and can be seen in the shift in belief that moved the blame for injured or uncared for working-class children from their mothers onto the dangers present in a society where mothers were forced to work instead of care for their children. As a result, his educational pedagogy was based on "the idea of providing children with healthy and supportive environments, which would allow them to develop their personalities and characters to the fullest extent" (Button and Provenzo 72), which are hallmarks not only of the nineteenth-century sentimentalization movement, but continue to be spoken of as the goals of education today. Pestalozzi stressed the importance of love and the idea of the practical and object lessons in the learning process. Schools nurturing curiosity and creativity, starting hands-on-schooling at kindergarten, creating vocational classes in high schools, and identifying all children as intelligent in some fashion whether it be intellectual, kinesthetic, artistic or one other of the twenty-one multiple intelligences, all give a nod to Pestalozzi's initial ideas about education and children.

14 Wollstonecraft and the movement to empower the mother is not an essentialist movement. The aim was not to define the nature of the mother as unchanging, but to argue that women needed to be educated and considered an important part of society, and by focusing on the child as the future, it gave women a foothold in education and politics.

In the Philadelphia school, unlike the academies, education was free for all members of the community, including girls. Unfortunately, the school was a failure over issues of control of the school and its curriculum. The two directors of the school, Owen and McClure, had differing ideas about the ultimate goal of the school: whether it should be primarily a school of scientific inquiry or one of cultivating community cohesion. This division reflected the division within society at the time: the industrial, scientific, utilitarian versus the need to create a cohesive American community from disparate immigrant populations. Today, this division is part of the aporia of education and the community in regard to educating children to not only be good citizens of the United States, but also to be strong competitors on a global scale, especially within the global market, and yet still to be able to be a community recognizing the value of disparate races and ethnicities. This further complicates schooling today with issues of identity, but identity issues are not an issue in the same way as in the nineteenth century. In the nineteenth century the State tried to create in actuality the theoretical melting pot, “the promise that all immigrants can be transformed into Americans, a new alloy forged in a crucible of democracy, freedom and civic responsibility... the idea, so central to national identity, that this country can transform people of every color and background into ‘one America’” (Booth). Yet this attempt was not entirely successful as people were still divided into their ethnic or racial groupings for identification or discrimination purposes. “But despite this strife, many historians argue that there was a greater consensus in the past on what it meant to be an American, a yearning for a common language and culture, and a desire – encouraged, if not coerced by members of the dominant white Protestant culture – to assimilate” (Booth). Today, for better or for worse, Americans still want the term American to be a unifying term, but, with notable exceptions because today “there is more emphasis on preserving one's ethnic identity, of finding ways to highlight and defend one's cultural

roots” (Booth), and immigrants do not want “melting pot” to be a subsuming term within which ethnic and racial identities are ignored.

Regardless of the failure of the Philadelphia school, Pestalozzi’s ideas were influential to the changes called for by progressive reformers later in the century, and his beliefs still resonate today in educational pedagogy. Again regardless of how strongly Pestalozzi’s ideas remain inclusive and appealing to parents today, his ideas were seriously curtailed at the time by a society and educators that were influenced by the industrial revolution and society’s determination that the school could function just like a machine—well oiled and highly controlled—with religion as an essential focus within the structure of education. Since God was the ‘great Clock-maker’, deists reasoned, “it was commendable for a school to be a ‘perfect machine’ and for teaching to be mechanical and endlessly repetitive as the motion of a clock pendulum,” and traditional public schooling was born as “a new machine of immense power,” (Button and Provenzo 78) but dehumanizing and deadly dull for students, which undermined the power it was supposed to have. The school as machine led easily to the idea of the school as factory in which the principle of division of labor was applied to intellectual processes. However wonderful the industrialists and school administrators thought this plan was for creating the type of citizenry they desired, the students were not as excited about this as those in power thought they should have been, and often rebelled against it by being truant. They reasoned that if one could have the same experience in the factory and earn money, why go to school and not earn money? This mindset was often supported by working class parents who needed the children’s income in order to survive, but not espoused by the middle-class families who were in the process of sentimentalizing and sacralizing the child and shifting the focus from the child as economically useful to economically useless

(Nasaw). As the economically useless child gained in popularity, the role of the child as worker began to disappear but could not be entirely eradicated.

However sentimentalized the child has become and however strongly the Narrative has taken hold of the American mind, the kernel of the idea of child as worker never entirely disappeared, and recently there has been a resurgence of this idea but with school as the child's job. One of the new-old manifestations of child-as-worker is appearing in school districts around the country. Though parents have long been paying children for good grades, for the first time in October of the 2008-2009 school year, Chicago public school students received their first "paychecks" for earning good grades: \$50 for an A, \$35 for a B, and \$20 for a C with the possibility of earning up to \$4000 a year for each year of high school. The grades need to be in five core subjects: English, Math, Science, Physical Education, and the Social Sciences, and are assessed every five weeks. "Students get half of the money now and collect the rest only if they graduate, [kind of like a retirement plan] and the district has said that students have [already] earned \$265,986" in the first five week period (Sandovi). Chicago is not the only school district to begin paying students for grades. Several other cities are too, and "as children settle in for the 2008-09 school year, business interests are lining up behind pay-for-grades initiatives at schools in Atlanta, Baltimore, New York and elsewhere. The most ambitious project, funded by the foundations of ExxonMobil, Bill Gates, and Michael Dell, will pay students at 67 high schools in seven states \$100 to \$200 for scores on advanced-placement (AP) college-prep exams that are high enough to earn college credit. It also awards teachers for getting the right training to teach AP classes and pays them bonuses for each successful student" (Jones).

This movement is a paradoxical juxtaposition of the economically useless child with the child who will become an economically essential adult. By ensuring that more children view

school as serious preparation for being able to participate in the monetary rewards of the workplace, the nation is also attempting to ensure that education be viewed as serious preparation for the well-adjusted, well-rounded, individually fulfilled citizen. While we view work as the ultimate satisfaction of the adult, for a younger child the ultimate satisfaction comes from play. As the child becomes older, satisfaction starts to be equated with doing well in school. Thus schoolwork becomes the bridge to employment and the qualities of a good student are supposed to translate into the qualities of a good worker. The juxtaposition of the two ideologies -- child-as-worker and child-as-sacred – is the product of a shift in educational ideology that occurred in the 1830s as an odd juxtaposition between the traditional public schools and the Pestalozzi school—it was named the Common School by Horace Mann. Even though the Narrative was beginning to be voiced by those in power, Horace Mann’s nineteenth-century hope that the schools “would create a uniform political consciousness—one in which the potential for political, religious, and social discord would be eliminated” (Button and Provenzo 107)—did not happen and still has not happened today. While the Common schools continued to attempt to operate for the local community and its needs, they began to be absorbed into the larger school systems which regulated, and finally subsumed them into mainstream educational pedagogy. The pedagogy which replaced the Common School was strongly influenced by G. Stanley Hall. Hall’s writings regarding the psychological development of children and the ages at which they were capable of learning certain skills and of attaining certain levels of competency became influential with schools and resulted in the age-graded school. As implementation of the age-graded school spread, the Common School ability-graded one room schoolhouse began to disappear; however, its disappearance was gradual and students were still in one room schoolhouses as late as the 1940s. As the Common Schools were subsumed by larger school

networks, the idea of educating individuals to assume the responsibilities of citizenship, which was progressive, was subverted into a disciplinary maneuver designed to control immigrants by assimilation thus neutralizing them as political threats.

The separation of children according to age also lent itself to the schools being segregated in regard to race, religion, and class, which reflected the segregation of adult society. If children are separated from each other in the schools, it affects the creation of a uniform political consciousness within society as the imagined community is fractured from within. The sense of communal cohesion was truly giving way to the scientific and the industrial caused in part by the disappearance of the one room schoolhouse as children began to identify more closely with their age peers than with finding their place in the social structure of the schoolhouse and in society. However, as the age-graded classroom was taking hold in the traditional nineteenth-century American school, the idea of the sacred and sentimental child was crossing class boundaries, and progressive reformers' ideas about education were beginning to be recognized and implemented as the beginnings of educational goals for the National Child. These beginnings of change had a profound impact on American society and led to current beliefs and practices regarding education while also continuing the paradoxes that we still see in levels and quality of education in modern schools.

A positive change that took place in eighteenth century French pedagogy (Foucault) appeared as a negative influence in the American pedagogy of the nineteenth century. In "Technologies of the Self," Foucault's discussion of the political-historical in the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries set the stage for the changes in the family and its member's relationships to each other and their society. According to Foucault, in the Imperial period (1816-1913) in France a change took place in pedagogy, one that moved from a teacher-student

dialogue to student silence in which the “cultivation of silence [became] more and more important [and students] did not ask questions or speak up during the lesson, but . . . developed the art of listening” (236) because listening was considered the “positive condition of acquiring truth” (236), a move which, in American pedagogy, all but neutralized the engaged citizen. In its purest form, the skill of listening was to be perfected so the student could learn to listen closely to what was being said in order to consider the content of the lecture after it was over and also to learn to listen to “*logos* throughout adult life” and “to the voice of reason in the self” (Foucault, *Technologies* 32). This skill of the student listening to the master’s voice, and the master not asking questions of the student, did form the basis of education in American society in the nineteenth century, but in a perverted form. The Colonial idea of “to learn was to say” disappeared in the silence of the classroom, and the silence required of students in order for them to acquire truth began to be implemented through the rote memorization of facts recited on demand which became the pedagogy of preference.

The educational purpose of listening, according to Plutarch, (and later Foucault), was to teach critical thinking skills. By listening, students would learn to “tell what is true and what is dissimulation” (Foucault, *Technologies* 32), which is a valuable skill in a participatory State, but listening for this purpose was not what was implemented in the traditional public classroom. In the nineteenth century American classroom, the lecture implemented control through fear and did not encourage the search for Socratic truth but forced students to sit still and listen to the teacher and to concentrate only on the information that the teacher imparted. This was a reformed version of the now old “pedagogical game where the master/teacher speaks and does not ask questions, and the disciple does not answer but must listen and keep silent” (Foucault, *Technologies* 32). This new version required the teacher to ask questions after the lecture, but only to check for

retention of rote information—no actual thinking was required, either during the lecture or after it. All that was needed to have successfully mastered the material were the correct answers and the correct behavior of looking straight ahead. Oddly enough, answering by rote was considered by some educators to be one of the hallmarks of being an adult who would then be able to participate as an educated citizen in American society (Rice). This, of course, is diametrically opposed to many of today's classrooms in which critical thinking skills are encouraged and taught, even to the youngest students. The paradox of rote memorization and analysis in silence resulted in children being molded into pliable citizens and factory workers and being prepared for adult life in the most restrictive sense. The traditional public educational pedagogy of nineteenth century America did not encourage children either to think of themselves as individuals or to know themselves: qualities that Americans today say they want the schools to encourage and provide lessons for within the curriculum, yet for safety reasons they want this within a highly controlled environment that also allows for individuality and freedom of expression. This is aporia at its finest.

3.3 Nineteenth Century Conditions and Reforms

Joseph Mayer Rice, a pediatrician and school reformer of the nineteenth century, gives examples of this newfound pedagogy with which he is most decidedly not in agreement in his book *The Public-School System of the United States*. In 1892, he interviewed a school principal in New York and recounts in the interview that the principal reflected prevailing attitudes regarding children, their silence, and their role in their own education. Rice writes that “the principal’s ideal lies in giving each child the ability to answer without hesitation, upon leaving her school, every one of the questions formulated by her. In order to reach the desired end, the school has been converted into the most dehumanizing institution that I have ever laid eyes upon, each child being

treated as if he possessed a memory and the faculty of speech, but no individuality, no sensibilities, no soul...the children were not allowed to move their heads or arms or legs when they were having their lessons” (31). Apparently, the romanticized, sentimentalized working-class child was having a hard time of it at this point in public education. This is reinforced by another nineteenth century reformer, Jacob A. Riis, a police reporter in New York, who writes an account of his own first day at school in his book *The Battle with the Slum*, published in 1902. This account confirms Rice’s findings and highlights the paradox surrounding the sentimentalized child and the establishing of the Narrative. His account also shows the difficulties faced by reformers as they advocated for a change in pedagogical methods. Riis writes of his first meeting with the headmistress of the school he was to attend:

I remember...my reception by the aged monster—most fitly named Mrs. Bruin—who kept the school. She asked no questions, led me straightaway to the cellar, where she plunged me into an empty barrel and put the lid on over me. Applying her horn goggles to the bunghole, to my abject terror, she informed me in a sepulchral voice, that that was the way bad boys were dealt with in school. When I ceased howling from sheer fright, she took me out and conducted me to the yard, where a big hog had a corner to itself. She bade me observe that one of its ears had been slit in half its length. It was because the hog was lazy, and little boys who were that way minded—zip! She clipped a pair of tailor’s shears close to my ear. It was my first lesson in school. I hated it from that hour (341-342).

While Riis admits that “the barrel and the hog were never part of the standard curriculum in any American boy’s school” (Battle 342), he does maintain that this relationship was the main understanding between teacher and pupil and is not what was expected from the benevolent, biopolitical State. This is more in line with issues of State sovereignty and Foucault’s analysis of the sovereign as someone who can “let live or make die” (*Society*, 241), as the teacher is definitely letting Riis know that she has the power and he does not. The result of this relationship was the firm belief that the schools were principally to “lock children up in for the convenience of their parents” (Riis, *Battle* 342). This did not make school an appealing place to be physically, much less to be nurtured or to learn how to be a participant in government – more a lesson in fear and docility. It is hard to see here the narrative of the sacralized, sentimentalized child at work, yet it is present in its first instantiation in the schools. The school existed to train and to protect children, and future reformers were being formed by their childhood experiences. Though locking up children for parental convenience was probably not the sole, or even main, purpose of the schools, we can see a re-emergence today of the need for schools to fulfill the role of caregiver and watcher of children both during and after school. Many schools have gone to all day kindergarten and provide before- and after-school programs to care for children until parents have finished working for the day. Though the programs are not of the barrel-and-hog type, they do provide a convenience service for parents of all economic classes, not just the working-class.

Riis’ and Rice’s concerns as adults regarding the social positioning of the child and his or her sense of identity and self was also reflective of the City Beautiful movements happening in Europe and the By-pass variegated cities of the United States. The movement believed that if the poor could only be given clear, clean spaces with light and air, they would be healthier, happier, and more productive as workers and citizens, which is not completely idealistic or naive. One of

the ways in which City Beautiful movements were enacted was through the schools, which were responsible for inculcating cleanliness of the body though not, apparently, creativity in thinking. In *How the Other Half Lives*, Riis states that “In the Allen Street public school...the question is asked daily from the teacher’s desk: ‘What must I do to be healthy?’ and the whole school responds: ‘I must keep my skin clean/Wear clean clothes/Breathe pure air/and live in the sunlight.’ It seems a little less than biting sarcasm to hear them say it, for to not a few of them all these things are known only by name” (91). The idea of cleanliness and sunlight for working-class children is commendable, for as Riis states, “a man cannot live like a pig and vote like a man” (*Making* 206), but the practical implementation of it left much to be desired.

At the time Riis’ and Rice were writing about the slums and school reforms, their views were progressive and not espoused by everyone. School principals and school boards were still working as traditional public schools and continued to view children as vessels to be filled with knowledge and physically controlled. In 1892, Rice visited schools across America to get a view of American education for the National Child, and he found a classroom teacher in Chicago who was reflective of the prevailing attitudes regarding children and their role in their own education. The teacher was quoted by Rice as remarking abruptly as her students paused to think about their answers: “Don’t stop to think, but tell me what you know” (175).

But reform was happening, and shortly after Riis and Rice’s research was conducted and published, John Dewey was beginning to write about and study children and current educational practices. These practices in education were about to change again with the educational reforms of Dewey for whom “the world of the child was a world of individuals with personal interests, rather than a realm of facts and laws. The ideal school and teacher respected these interests on the part of the student. At the same time the teacher attempted to shape the direction of the students’

interests so that they conformed with social needs and requirements” (Dewey *School* 105), which is more of a biopolitical than educational disciplinary response. In order for children to fully develop within the school setting, Dewey loosened the pedagogy of control to make the school a cooperative community designed to help children attain “the complete and harmonious development of all powers” (Dewey *Democracy* 93), but this did not mean that the classroom was not organized or controlled in any way. While the child was still safely ensconced within the classroom, the control of the classroom was shifting from teacher as dictator to teacher as director as the child explored his or her own interests within the curriculum. This move of Dewey’s is reminiscent of Jefferson’s views on education which had been eclipsed over time.

One example of the way in which reformers and educationalists, such as Dewey, began to implement their ideas that children needed clean, clear spaces in which to play, to learn and to implement their imaginative and creative capabilities was to return to the Pestalozzian ideas of environment as an essential element of education. Through structural changes in the children’s home and community environments, such as building playgrounds and opening children’s museums, the total bodily control of children during educational lessons began to loosen though not to the point where the children were put in danger at any time. Institutions such as children’s museums were conceived and implemented, and The Brooklyn Children’s Museum (which opened in 1899) was the first children’s museum to open its doors to children and their families. Its plan was “to build up gradually for the children of Brooklyn and the surrounding neighborhood a collection that will delight and instruct the children who visit it; to bring together collections in every branch of natural history that is calculated to interest children and to stimulate their powers of observation and reflection; and to illustrate by collections of pictures, cartoons, charts, models and maps, each of the important branches of knowledge that are taught in the elementary schools”

(Brooklyn 418). In addition, the children's museum would bring children into contact with objects that would "appeal to the interest of their daily life, in their school work, in their reading, in their games and rambles in the fields, and in the industries which are carried on about them" (Brooklyn 84). This type of education, interactive and personalized, was a precursor of Dewey's ideas regarding children and education and is the precursor of current middle-class ideas that all of a child's experiences can be turned into a learning moment. In Dewey's school community, "students were encouraged to search for information themselves, as well as to draw upon the skills and knowledge of highly trained and competent teachers" (Button and Provenzo 200). These ideas are currently reflected in teacher training programs that encourage student-focused curricula and certification requirements that ensure teachers are knowledgeable in their fields.

3.4 *Choix-Force* in Action

Because experiences like Riis' and the school's implementation of the pedagogy of intense bodily control are not condoned today, and Mrs. Bruin's methods are no more, and schools are more progressive than they used to be, it may seem that Riis' and Rice's experiences have no contemporary counterparts; however, while nineteenth-century discipline and pedagogy are not practiced in schools today, we are still seeing the paradox in the ideology of the sacred child and the actual child as strongly today as it was 100 years ago. Within the educational system, children are the focus and the future, and society demands that education rise to the challenge of the future and prepares children to be the workers, leaders and citizens America needs. The *choix-force* of the Narrative remains strong and focused regarding children and education, and anything that goes against that is considered an aberration which must be rectified. But, according to Bill Gates in March 4, 2005 Op-Ed piece for the *Wall Street Journal* article, "our high schools are obsolete"

meaning that they were designed “50 years ago to meet the needs of another age. Even when they work exactly as designed, our high schools cannot teach our kids what they need to know”. He proposes implementing the ideal of the Narrative and demands action on the choice that is already made by requiring schools to acknowledge that “all students can do rigorous work”, and that successful schools are “organized around three powerful principles: Ensure that all students are given a challenging curriculum that prepares them for college or work; that their courses clearly relate to their lives and goals; and that they are surrounded by adults who push them to achieve” (WSJ March). Within the Narrative, the choice for the sacred child has already been made; it is up to adults to reject the aberration of the obsolete school and become progressive again. The argument of the Narrative demands that children as children and as the future of the State need to be educated to face a changing world, but large scale change is challenging especially when it puts the National child and the Known child in tension with one another.

This tension can be seen in *Savage Inequalities*, published in the early 1990’s, by Jonathan Kozol who identified how poorly many American schools are educating children, and he maintains that substandard construction and maintenance of the school’s physical space, and standardized testing are contributing to the problem. In one of Kozol’s interviews with a teacher in one of these substandard schools, the teacher stated that “in the education catch-up game, we are entrapped by teaching to the tests... [The State] requires test results. It ‘mandates’ higher scores. But it provides no resources...What is the result? We are preparing a generation of robots. Kids are learning exclusively through rote. We have children who are given no conceptual framework. They do not learn to think, [sic] because their teachers are straitjacketed by tests that measure only isolated skills” (143). In addition to the problems of testing, Kozol’s descriptions of the horrors of some public schools highlight the psychotic move within the forced choice of freedom in regard

to schools. According to Kozol, children attending public school in East St. Louis or South Side Chicago or even Washington D.C., are simply trying to survive their schooling experience, and their teachers are trying to do the best they can with the little they have. And in some cases Kozol states, it is very little, indeed—no books, no chalk, no heat, no food for Home Economics, no chemicals for Chemistry, and no working toilets.

In many of Kozol's twentieth century American schools, a student does not need to think as he or she answers a question because the knowledge the students are offered does not require any sustained thinking due to the lack of teaching materials and inadequate facilities. These prevent teaching the basics let alone any kind of engaged teaching. In Kozol's descriptions, pathos is activated as the National Child becomes the Known Child and the lack is personalized. Kozol's description of the physical space of some schools is eerily similar to Rice and Riis descriptions of nineteenth-century schools as Kozol gives example after example of the disgusting and dangerous physical spaces of poor schools, the overcrowding, the lack of materials, and the lack of any kind of hope at all for conditions to improve. Just as Rice states that the nineteenth century schools are dark, foul and dehumanizing, Kozol opines, "one would not have thought that children in America would ever have to choose between a teacher or a playground or sufficient toilet paper" (79), but, apparently, they do.

Yet the mere fact that teachers are strongly voicing their concerns and objections to the current methodologies and have concerns regarding the physical space of the schools and that people like Kozol are making these issues public indicates that the Narrative is present, active, and is attempting to force change by calling on the pathos of the sentimentalized Known Child. The problems identified in the obsolete school do not indicate that the Narrative is not functioning, but that it is functioning and functioning well. It is functioning so well that other writers, such as

Giroux and Goodlad, and documentarians like Davis Guggenheim (*Waiting for Superman*), join Kozol in working firmly within the Narrative when they argue for change in the schools, and the forced choice for education is highlighted in their writings. Their accounts, like those of Rice and Riis, are a dramatic recounting of current school conditions designed to evoke the pathos of the Narrative by shocking us, disgusting us, and reminding us of the hog-and-barrel school in order to force action on the part of adults to assist the National Child. By bringing to our attention the plight of many American children, they are removing the anonymity of the National Child and activating the pathos associated with the Known Child.

The mere fact that there is so much turmoil surrounding education: No Child Left Behind, funding issues, grade inflation, the need for challenging and engaging curriculum, to pay or not to pay students for grades, assessing teachers, and creating inviting, comfortable classrooms all highlight the paradox of the Narrative of the Child – the call for the protection and education of the Known sentimentalized Child versus the practical implementation of this call for the National Child. People seem in general to be against a taxation system that takes their money away from their local schools and their Known Child and divides it among all districts in a state or the nation to assist the National Child. They believe that the best people to protect the sacred child are the people in the community in which the child lives. The ideas of Franklin, Jefferson, Pestalozzi, Wollstonecraft, Dewey, and Riis still inform education today by reminding us of the atrocities of the past and by calling us to act on behalf of the child and the State, which includes modernization. All the above reformers were interested in preparing children for the future and in creating schools which could recognize the skills important to the industrial era and beyond. Today, people want children to have the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic in order for them to be prepared

for the technological world. And one aspect of preparing children for the technological world is protecting them from that very technology until they are capable of navigating it safely.

In order for children to be prepared for their role as adult citizens and for the continued implementation of governmental economy, there is no argument debating the need for education of the National Child or the Known Child. Their success in the domestic workforce, the global economy, local communities, and as individuals is dependent on the benevolent economy of the government requiring that all actions that are taken on behalf of the schools be designed to help the schools better prepare and care for and educate our sacralized children. These actions are external manifestations of the sentimentalization movement, which was integral to the formation of the Narrative, for without continuous and unanalyzed pathos, the Narrative could not be. Pathos and the benevolent governmentality of the sentimentalized child have helped the Narrative become such a strong conceptual apparatus that the argument is never really whether we should fund education or limit it because that is a move against the Narrative, but it is a discussion regarding how to implement the funding and changes to make education efficient not only for the current generation of children, but for all future children. The issue of funding within this argument hinges on the idea of the National Child and the Known Child, a knee-jerk reaction to no new and no higher taxes and a perception of the schools as obsolete in the technological era. Yet, more significantly, the argument is a pathos-based response to the National Child and to the sacred status of one's own child.

The *choix-force* puts us in the paradoxical position of viewing children both as units of social production producing immaterial goods (rational, thinking and fully participating members of a deliberative democracy), and future units of economic production (productive, contributing, working member of society). The sentimentalization of the child within the Narrative allows

children to be carefully tended social and economic producers; yet the conditions of our educational infrastructure and pedagogy do not always effectively implement our ideas. Children cannot communicate and form relationships if they are ignorant of their neighbors or if they substitute blind faith for critical reason (Giroux 28). In order to combat this and address the charge of obsolescence, teachers who have the resources are attempting to adopt methodologies which are designed to create engaged citizens while at the same time ensuring that student performance on standardized tests is at an acceptable level. This premise is the foundation of the old-new educational methodologies, such as the Paideia Proposal and multi-age classrooms, and of the American schools that are designed not simply to increase student competence in academics, but also to teach critical thinking skills and to create an environment within the schools which is tolerant and respectful of diversity. The belief that all children have the capacity to become developed, engaged citizens of a deliberative democracy is present in society, but its practical implementation does not occur equally for all children due to unequal funding based on a property tax value system. Because a liberal democratic society depends on its children to do better and achieve more with each succeeding generation, the Narrative demands that it educate its children in how to use their reason and fully develop their intellectual freedom to maintain the State and their communities. A sovereign state, especially a liberal democratic state, cannot be in the business of creating docile bodies, exercising power detrimental to itself and its people, or providing substandard education for any of its children, National or Known, if it wishes to survive. But it can, and should be, in the business of implementing the Narrative of the sentimental child by setting “up an economy at the level of the entire state, which means exercising towards its inhabitants, and the wealth and behavior of each and all, a form of surveillance and control as attentive as that of the head of a family over his household and his goods” (Rousseau in Foucault,

Governmentality 92). This encompasses the need for safety and the benevolence required from the head of the household; for the Narrative does not allow a dictatorial household any more than it allows a dictatorial government, especially where children are concerned.

Yet the aberration of the production of docile bodies is still occurring in education today and much of the school's physical space is also reflective of the school as factory; it has been tenacious throughout the years and can still be seen today in many schools that are not necessarily in impoverished areas. However, the psychotic move of these aberrations are duly noted and condemned by those such as John Goodlad's findings in *A Place Called School*. He emphasizes that modern classrooms maintain much of the traditional public and factory qualities: desks in rows; bells signaling change, tardy, release; the focus on obedience and docile bodies; the division of the school day into discrete operations. Thus, the Narrative as conceptual apparatus and the sentimentalization of the child finds that these conditions are contradictory and fall under the psychotic move of the *choix-force* albeit not one for which society would require punishment, but one that does need to be changed. The choice has been made but the actions of the choice are the wrong ones—the obsolescence of the schools has been identified and change has been demanded by teachers, by adults, and even by older students. An attempt to rectify the unacceptable temporal action of the atemporal choice has been made by standardizing curricula and tests; however, the nineteenth century industrial ideas of efficiency and measurement of productivity, while not unacceptable in the workplace, are not deemed acceptable for the sentimentalized child. When these measures of productivity are placed within the Narrative of the sentimentalized child, they and the vestiges we have retained of the industrial-focused school combine to form a rationale

for why NCLB has not been as popular or effective as its creators hoped¹⁵. However, NCLB embodies the Narrative in spirit as it attempts to ensure that all children in American schools are assured basic competencies in reading and mathematics, but all tests, such as the ISAT (Illinois Standards Achievement Test) and No Child Left Behind, which assess minimum competencies in the students and schools, result in schools being funded or not funded based on these scores.

Using the scores on these tests to fund schools is acceptable for the National Child, but not for the Known Child, especially when the Known Child is attending one of the schools Kozol discusses.

For example, the tensions regarding standardized testing can be seen in college preparation tests such as the SAT. The SAT is a standardized test that is typically administered to Juniors and Seniors in high school as part of their preparation for applying for college and, as a national assessment, is regarded as a good measure of success in college, yet issues arising from the test when applied to Known Children lessen its value and effectiveness. And the younger the child, the more intense the pathos, and the less acceptable and successful is the test. While the SAT is administered to upper level students, the PSAT is administered to Sophomores as a chance to help them prepare for and familiarize themselves with the SAT, but in October of 2008, the College Board announced its new test, the Readistep, which it began administering to eighth graders as of Fall 2009. Though the College Board denies that the test is a “pre-pre-pre SAT” and claims that it is “a diagnostic tool to provide information about students’ strengths and weaknesses” (Rimer),

15 Recently, (September 2010), the woes of education have been at the forefront in the news. The lack of student progress is of great concern. President Obama is one of many voices highlighting the current problems. In a September 28, 2010, interview on the NBC Today show, he said that “American students are falling behind some of their foreign counterparts, especially in math and science, and that’s got to change.” And Fairtest, the national center for fair and open testing, reported in 2008 that “results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) show little overall improvement in math and reading since No Child Left Behind became law, and no closing of score gaps between racial minorities and whites. This parallels state and national results on the same tests (Examiner, October 2007). Two international reports also demonstrate no change in U.S. scores since enactment of NCLB. Taken together with the extensive evidence of many harmful consequences from NCLB, these findings show the federal education law needs a thorough overhaul”.

many educators believe it truly is a pre-pre-pre SAT designed to compete with and even replace the “ACT-related test that many schools already administer to ninth and tenth grade students” (Rimer). The modern need for testing is part of our Positivist orientation toward society in which scientific methods can be aimed at society in order to better understand it and to reengineer it for the betterment of the State and the individual. However, while this focus on testing and the creation of a competitive atmosphere for children serves the competitive aspect of the State and its global aims, which cannot be denied as one aspect of preparing children to care for the future of themselves and of the democratic State, a strong focus on testing as the measure of success does not sit well with the Narrative, the ideology of the sacred child, or the beneficial economy of the government.

According to Giroux, the factory school of today is further complicated by attempts to “destroy critical education as a foundation for an engaged citizenry and a vibrant democracy” (29) through a standardized curricula. As society paradoxically seeks both to maintain the structure of the school and to move schools away from an overtly traditional public model, there is also an attempt to “use the language of business as a model for running schools” (Giroux 29), which is evidenced by some school districts hiring business managers to run the schools. This business mentality is the modern version of the factory mentality and can result in the same type of rote learning as children become not only the product of the schools, but also the product of society and possibly solely of the needs of business. This type of managerial style, capitalistic and profit driven (though the schools are not yet expected to make an actual monetary profit), is particularly damaging to poor students in poverty stricken neighborhoods because they are still caught in the biopolitical/disciplinary nineteenth-century paradox of being taught to be obedient while being expected to act as engaged, critical, reasoning, thinking citizens of a deliberative democracy with

the added disadvantage of not even having the basic materials with which to learn. It is another moment of aporia in which the schools are teaching to the test, but for many students, it will be a test they cannot pass.

While the teachers-as-laborers do their best to instill the necessary knowledge into the student-as-product, the problem with testing is the same for both the factory product and the school product; often there is no extrinsic motivation for either product to not be defective. The product of the factory is inanimate and is inspected by management; the school product is an active participant in the inspection with no other motivation than intrinsic motivation, and for many students, the stimulus is not strong enough to create the managerially desired response; thus, the implementation of programs paying students for grades is a way for students to become extrinsically motivated, especially as all the checks they receive for their grades do not need to be saved for future schooling, but can function as token money to be used by the student as he or she wishes. And the furor surrounding the idea of treating students as widgets is stating that the administration has chosen, but it has made the wrong choice. The sacred, sentimentalized child cannot ever be a widget.

In an effort to change the dynamic of student as test-taker and widget, a shift in pedagogy is moving schools away from the teacher-as-lecturer and as the one who simply prepares students to take standardized tests toward education as dialogue and teacher as coach. As this shift progresses, its objective is the idea that education does not simply prepare a child for adult life, but prepares him or her for a complete life. At this point, the Narrative's sentimentalization of the child has expanded to require the child's happiness not only in childhood, but also as an adult. Today, the child is not seen solely as a repository of knowledge, but as a learner and future active member of society. A liberal democratic society's responsibility to provide an exceptional education for all

its children, socially, philosophically, emotionally, and economically is the Narrative as conceptual apparatus, and the preparation of children for a complete life is the current manifestation of the sentimentalized child.

3.5 Conclusion

At one time, biculturalism and old world ways were the threats, and a uniform American education was to be the equalizer of the citizens. We still hold this belief today that education is the great equalizer, yet we are, as always, in the aporetic moment as we try to equalize and recognize the diversity of America. Through education and the tenets of a liberal democracy, Americans believe, at least within the Narrative, that children can become whatever they want to become—they can even become president. This idea has been strengthened immeasurably by the election of Barak Obama as President of the United States and has been reinforced by Obama's repetition of it in the public sphere as he did when he recognized the strength of education as an equalizer of citizens. In his August 28, 2008, Democratic National Convention acceptance speech, he said "Michelle and I are only here tonight because we were given a chance at an education." The Narrative of the Child is working here in the belief that children are the future leaders of the country, and their future rests on a solid educational foundation.

The temporal action of the *choix-force* in the Narrative as conceptual apparatus is so strong that arguing that education needs no overhaul and that the schools are doing a fine job educating children is, in Žižek's terms, a psychotic move. No one argues that there are schools maintaining academic excellence for their students and doing the job society wants; yet the uneven education the National Child is receiving has been a continual political point in the past few presidential campaigns and has manifested itself repeatedly in political speeches. The campaign and election

of Barack Obama as president was no exception. Barack Obama voiced the Narrative of the Child as a conceptual apparatus when he asserted that “now is the time to meet our moral obligation to provide every child a world class education because it will take nothing less to compete in the global economy” (DNC Speech). And he voiced the conceptual apparatus of the Narrative of the Child as *choix-force* in the same speech when he promised “I will not settle for an America where some kids don’t have that chance [for an education]. I’ll invest in early childhood education. I’ll recruit an army of new teachers, and pay them higher salaries and give them more support. And in exchange, I’ll ask for higher standards and more accountability” from the schools. According to the Narrative and President Obama’s voicing of it, this is our time as adults to make sure that the temporal actions of the *choix-force* are the best choices not only for us today, but for our children and our children’s children. This is Edelman’s child: the fantasmatic recipient of our actions and choices.

But Obama did not voice the Narrative in only one speech, but again voiced the Narrative of the Child as a conceptual apparatus in his acceptance speech on election night November 4, 2008, when, as President-elect, he activated the pathos of the National Child and of the Known Child when he stated

America, we have come so far. We have seen so much. But there is so much more to do. So tonight, let us ask ourselves —if our children should live to see the next century; if my daughters should be so lucky to live as long as Ann Nixon Cooper, what change will they see? What progress will we have made? This is our chance to answer that call. This is our moment. This is our time—to put our people back to work and open doors

of opportunity for our kids; to restore prosperity and promote the cause of peace; to reclaim the American Dream and reaffirm that fundamental truth—that out of many, we are one; that while we breathe, we hope, and where we are met with cynicism, and doubt, and those who tell us that we can't, we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes We Can. (CNN).

The Narrative and *choix-force* as conceptual apparatuses demand that we, as Americans, cannot simply hope that all will work out well for our children. Obama's "hope" is not enough for the National, the Known or the Global Child. We, as adults, need to manage the biopolitical apparatuses to work specifically for children within education so that they can learn the skills they need to do even better for their children than we have for ours. In Foucault's terms, the Narrative is a "regime of truth" working its way through history because the narrative is in a circular relation with power, each producing, sustaining, and extending the other (*Truth* 133). This is the Narrative at its strongest reflected in education and in politics, and in the action of the *choix-force*, for there can be no other way for the future of the State and American society to continue than through the temporal actions of the *choix-force* and the biopolitical working for child both educationally and communally.

Chapter 4

The American Narrative In Action

4.1 Hyper-Sentimentalization in Action

The need for control of the sentimentalized child reached its zenith in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries with the advent of the helicopter parent¹⁶. The Narrative as conceptual apparatus and as *choix-force*¹⁷ produced significant changes in the way Americans viewed children. The sentimentalization of children gave way to hyper-sentimentalization by parents and to a certain degree by society. Children needed to be kept safe from all harm and needed to be focused on their futures—or at least to have someone focused on their futures. From this hyper-sentimentalization came an emphasis on the learning moment, a rise in child psychology, the child as a consumer of educational toys, and the construction of highly controlled, safe environments outside of the school building. I use the term school building because the term “schoolhouse” doesn’t apply in the same way as it did in the nineteenth century. These new environments are not the controlled environment of the nineteenth century schoolhouse or the uncontrolled space of the street, but are an expansion of child-space into the enriching controlled environment of the sports field, the art and chess club, the dance class, and of enrichment or remedial tutors. A large part of this move within the Narrative resulted in the expansion of children’s spaces and a shift in the purpose of these spaces instead of simply encouraging curiosity as in The Brooklyn Children’s Museum and providing a place for children to play as in the

16 Helicopter parents are the parents who over-parent. They pay too much attention to their child in terms of over-protecting them, being too involved in their lives, keeping them from harm, and generally assisting whether or not their children need them. While most parents perform these actions for their children as a matter of course, helicopter parents do it to the degree that it interferes with their children and their development and independence.

17 *Choix-force* is a choice that has already been made though the individual may not realized he/she has made a choice until forced to act on it. As Zizek says, the individual is free to choose as long as he/she chooses the right thing in society’s view. If not, then the choice is a psychotic move and some form of punishment is required by society.

neighborhood playground. These spaces were a new, controlled, safe extension of the educational day outside the school building and these new spaces became highly educational, competitive, and in many cases, put in the paradoxical position of containing a strong consumer component. This move was in part due to the rise of a middle class after World War II with the aspiration to better themselves and create more wealth for themselves through education and diverse cultural exposure. This rise in the number of people in the middle class and middle class wealth is a significant force in changing the Narrative and moving it away from solely workplace safety and school conditions and into society in the form of enrichment spaces, toys, and spaces for enrichment classes and hands-on experiences.

4.2 Danger and Safety

The hyper-sentimentalization and the actions of the *choix-force* have created the aporetic moment in American society as American parents butt heads with each other over what is the appropriate way to raise, protect, educate, and enrich a child. This aporia is caused in part by an intuitive certainty that the world and the people in it are more dangerous now than they ever have been, and this fear has increased the need for control of children and their environment and has put emphasis on the Known Child rather than the National Child. While the National Child is still important, especially in regard to education and the future of the State, the Known Child has gained in importance with the advent of the helicopter parent and the focus on the nuclear family. As people become more mobile and move away from extended families, the nuclear family takes on a prominence it cannot have in the extended family, and the household economy becomes more important than the State. The nuclear family embodies the Narrative in a way that no other entity can, for it prioritizes the sacred child above all else.

One way the nuclear family prioritizes the sacred child is in regard to keeping the child safe. Every day one can read in the newspapers and popular magazines about children and safety issues. For example, in the March 21, 2010, issue of *Parade Magazine*, there are two articles on children and safety: *How Safe are Cellphones?* [sic] and *Are School Buses Unsafe?*. In the first article on cell phones, Dr. Ranit Mishori cites several contradictory studies on cell phones and the incidence of cancer possibly caused by cell phone use and concludes that “the research record on cellphone risk remains ambiguous” and that a “different *kind* of data” (6) is needed in further studies to determine the true risk of cellphones as cancer causing agents. Nonetheless, his final recommendation is that he doesn’t “expect everyone to give up their cellphones, but as we await more research, [he recommends] that you limit your use and especially that of your children” (6) because the danger to them is greater due to their size and rapidly growing bodies. In the unauthored article on school buses’ lack of seatbelts, the writer quotes Jonathan Adkins of the Governors Highway Safety Association as saying “It’s extremely expensive to retrofit buses, and that money is better spent on other areas” (8), yet the article goes on to state that “one study of annual emergency-room visits found more than 17,000 injuries to children from school-bus accidents, and, on average, six young riders lost their lives each year” (8). Dr. Alan Ross, the president of the National Coalition for School Bus Safety, activates pathos in parents and others with his statement that “without restraint, your child is a missile waiting to launch on a school bus—very unsafe” (8), and the Academy of Pediatrics and the American Medical Association have called for seatbelts on school buses. These groups and parents, too, not only find the lack of seat belts on buses unacceptable, but they also find intolerable the statement made by Adkins that money that could be spent on saving children’s lives is better spent on some amorphous elsewhere.

Within the Narrative the question must be asked: where else could there ever be a better place to spend money than on saving children's lives? The article does not say.

This belief, that keeping children safe is of the utmost importance, is what caused many parents to name Leonore Skenazy "the worst mom ever" for allowing her nine-year-old son to ride the New York City subway alone. She says she had no idea of the problems this would cause people in the United States. In her April 10, 2008, column in *The Huffington Post*, she writes that two days after her initial article about her son's subway ride appeared in the paper, "said son and I found ourselves on the Today Show, MSNBC and FoxNews, trying to convince anchor after anchor after anchor that: 1) This was not a crazy idea - as they could see from the fact the kid was sitting there, grinning. And 2) I am not a crazy mom, as they could see from...Well, that's the point. Not all of them could see. The mere fact that I'd let my son out of my sight made me seem nuts to more than a few people, who wondered why didn't I follow him, or keep checking in with a cell phone, or wait until he was 34 and balding before I let him go out on his own." Skenazy's assessment of the people who could not even begin to imagine her letting her child out of her sight was supported by an NBC poll she cites in the same article. The poll "on the NBC website asked whether any other viewers would let their kids do this amazingly dangerous thing - a thing that was normal behavior just a generation ago, when kids were allowed out the door without a security detail -- and 51% said no. Another 20% were on the fence. That left about a third on my side" (Skenazy).

I realize that this poll is limited to those people who actually went on NBC's website and voiced their opinions, but in talking with parents I know (some of whom have 9 year old boys) in both Chicago and Edwardsville, Illinois, they were wholeheartedly against anything along the lines of allowing their children to travel the cities unattended. The idea of the dangers possible to

children being out alone is not restricted to urban centers, but is reinforced by incidents in small towns as well. In the March 19, 2010, *Alton Telegraph*, an article appeared about a “Child reportedly approached near school” stating that an elementary school boy was approached while walking home from school by a man in a truck who offered him a ride. His parents reported the incident which resulted in the Sheriff’s department making “contact with the school and [increasing] patrols around the school and the surrounding neighborhoods” (A3), and Captain Brad Wells of the Sheriff’s department issuing the following statement: “This is also an opportunity to remind parents to refresh their conversations with children about this type of activity, and to remind parents for the need to have safety plans in place for their children in the event that something happens when they are not with their children” (A3). The last part of this statement is a pathetic move which reinforces the helicopter parents’ arguments that they need to be vigilant in regard to their children’s safety.

The argument that the vigilance of the helicopter parent is sound practice is justified and encouraged by companies that sell devices allowing parents to keep track of their children when they are not with them. A Verizon commercial, which I saw on television multiple times, shows a mother and a daughter at the mall with the voiceover asking what 3G network allows you to keep track of your daughter when she shops alone in the mall for the first time, and the commercial shows the girl going down the escalator to meet friends with a Verizon map over her head while her mother watches her go and shows the phone with a map of the mall and where the daughter is at that moment. It is a tracking device designed to ease parents’ minds regarding their children’s safety. The fact that the setting for this commercial is a mall is interesting as well, for the mall is supposed to be a place of safety for families, and the mall space attempts to reassure families of their safety by providing children’s play areas, special events and activities, and clothing and toy

stores specifically for both younger children and teens; yet the perception of harm is strong enough to have crept into the space of the marketplace and, in regard to teenagers, overrides the parental concerns regarding the possible danger of the items in the market place.

The strength of this perception of danger is reinforced not only by television, but also by the internet. For if one enters “studies on child danger” or any version thereof, including “child safety studies”, in Google, as I did on March 16, 2010, one gets eight million hits and the entire first page has nothing to do with research or studies on danger to children and the lack of it. The first twenty-two entries are all about how much danger our children are actually in right at this very moment. For example, one site, ChatAlert, has compiled statistics from other studies indicating that the world is, in fact, extremely dangerous for children. According to ChatAlert, “children are reported missing at the rate of 750,000 per year, 62,500 per month, 14,423, per week, 2,054 per day, and 85 per hour or 3 children every 2 minutes. They are at a higher risk to be victims due to the internet than most parents realize. Chat and Instant Messaging are the new playgrounds for predators and paedophiles. Anonymity fostered by the internet, coupled with the huge pool of targets, make these communication tools an ideal channel for predators and paedophiles to target children. The statistics... are designed to help parents understand the scope of the dangers their children face” (March 16, 2010). At three children every two minutes, children should be disappearing like flies, but they don’t appear to be which could indicate that though ChatAlert’s statistics are culled from valid sources such as the U.S. Department of Justice, JAMA, and the FBI, they are reflective of ChatAlert’s purpose of putting fear into the hearts of adults, so adults will buy their product, which is a monitoring system to check a child’s online instant messaging, chat room, and web texts for potential dangers to the child. If a potential dangerous conversation or approach

is detected, ChatAlert sends an immediate message to the parent's device of choice so the parent can take the necessary action to protect the child.

When I searched for "research on child danger," I got only two hits that were actual studies refuting the severity of the danger to children. One site, CNET, recounted a study by the Center For Safe And Responsible Internet Use that challenged the Attorney General's statement that children are vulnerable to predators online. The other site, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., presented a paper on childcare facilities and the danger to children who received substandard preschool care. Despite these two sites, overwhelmingly, the hits were about the social, emotional and physical dangers to children that we, as parents, should currently be concerned about from strangers, from those we know, and even from ourselves. One site, Warrior Concepts Online, states that there are "10 Really Stupid Things That Parents Do To Place Their Children In Danger Without Evening [sic] Knowing It! And How To Make Sure You're Not Doing Them Too!" (March 16, 2010). The site, directed at parents, reads:

Let me ask you a question...

Parent's [sic] are more connected today. They have more information from experts than parents just a generation or two ago. And yet...

*...we have an **even greater problem** with child-safety than **ever** before.*

How is that possible?

Perhaps, just perhaps...

... it has to do with the lessons that parents communicate (or not) to their children.

Maybe, just maybe...

...it has to do with parents abdicating their responsibility to guide their children's growth...

...TO THEIR CHILDREN! [sic]

MAYBE... it has to do with the fact that parenting is done VERY differently today than it was several decades ago. Maybe... (March 16, 2010)

This site is an advertisement by Jeffrey M. Miller, a self-proclaimed “children-safety & self-defense expert,” to convince parents to buy his book, and it is purposefully playing into parental fears regarding strangers abducting and/or harming their children by stating that parents themselves could ultimately be responsible for the harm that comes to their children because of their own inept parenting, which is reminiscent of nineteenth century claims against the inept working-class mother. These sites feed into the Narrative, for they use pathetic arguments to cement the sacralized child in our thoughts and actions and to credit the actions of the helicopter parent. These sites not only tout the danger to children from strangers, but also stress the danger to children from other sources such as children’s spaces.

However, despite the fearmongering of these sites, issues of safety do give rise to discussions about keeping children too controlled while also trying to decide when to give them some freedom. In the Skenazy case, it was an unresolved issue, partly because parents felt that the loosening of control was also dependent on the responsibility level of the child, but with the majority agreeing that nine is too young, and part of the issue was the space in which the event occurred. The New York Subway system is perceived as a dangerous space for children. Any subway is dangerous for children in terms of platform and track safety and in regard to abduction concerns. If the child is prevented from getting off at his stop, who knows where he would end up? For the parents who participated in the survey, and for many others, the fear of what will happen if they let their children out of their sight is strong enough to overcome any crime statistics showing a drop in crime rates or an expert claiming that children are safer now than they have ever been. In a June 24, 2009, *Huffington Post* article, Skenazy cites U. S. Department of Justice statistics to show that crime in general is down, and according to the Crimes Against Children

Research Center, crimes against children have decreased between 1990 and 2007 with all crimes down over at least 50% with the exception of child neglect which was down only 6%, but the researchers say “while the long-term trends are encouraging, the reason for them remains unclear. An improving economy, advances in psychopharmacology, changes in social values, and more effective interventions, are among the factors that, most likely working in concert, may have contributed to this downward trend in child victimization” (CACRC March 22, 2010). But couple those studies with media reports on missing children, babies injured or killed by infant equipment, the recalls of thousands of toys by multiple companies, and the dangers to children of BPAs and mobile phones, the results of Google searches, the dangers of un-safety railed, unpadded children’s spaces, etc, etc, etc, and the fear caused by these reports makes those studies hard to credit.

4.3 Children’s Spaces

One aspect of child safety that parents are particularly concerned about is the child-centered spaces they and their children frequent, sometimes on a daily basis, and the new world of suburbia. Some spaces that are child centered may still be a source of danger even when the parent is present, spaces such as playgrounds and children’s museums and even the neighborhood block. A British property developer said that “North Americans have no sense of place, or of history...British people and business are tied by an invisible thread to places: the Bank of England or just to a set of streets, some shops, a restaurant” (Peter Hall 397-8), but it is not, I think, an accurate statement. Though this was spoken in regard to gentrification issues and the tension between tradition and history and restructuring spaces for new uses, the statement was meant to apply to all Americans suggesting that our short history as a country and the formation of

our country though the creation of new ways and new spaces prevents us from respecting tradition and the community of spaces. Rather it is the opposite that is true. Americans have a very strong sense of place, which is based on the feeling of having had and lost physical spaces where people knew each other and had a commonality which caused them to be a community—that “set of streets, some shops, a restaurant”—, and communal space is important especially in regard to children because in American minds the physical space of the community as well as the people in the community equals safety. In a space where everyone knows everyone else, much like Nasaw’s description of the street discussed in chapter one, all the adults in that space are responsible for all the children in the same space.

A good example of this communal feeling of trust can be found in Harper Lee’s *To Kill A Mockingbird*, where children are free to run around the community because there are adults who know them and watch out for them, where children can avert adult violence to other adults by their mere presence, and where an ill recluse will leave the safety of his cocooned space and put himself in danger to save a child. American’s feel that this sense of community and the trust it brings, especially in regard to children, has somehow been lost to suburban sprawl and urban decay. This feeling of loss causes Americans to either complain about how times have changed for the worse or causes them, fueled by nostalgia, to attempt to recreate these places, which may not be all that bad. This filter of nostalgia supports the idea that there was a time of cultural purity, and it is the attempt to return to this stage of purity that leads to a manipulation of societal elements to recapture this imagined purity in order to create a national culture and a national identity that defines America, one that is uniformly adhered to by all its citizens and is reflected in its physical spaces.

This sense of nostalgia as purity in American culture is voiced clearly by Jim Maynard, a guest columnist for the June 13, 2010 edition of the *Alton Telegraph*. Maynard reminisces about middle class life in America in the 1950s, which has come to be the utopian time in the United States for children and for just about everything else. In contrast to today's economic situation, Maynard writes that World War II was over and the Korean War was ending and his "parents talked with great enthusiasm about a better way of life than they had ever experienced. Employment was high, and for many families there was enough money available for a better house, a new car, an automatic clothes washer, and above all, a television set!" He states that boys in the "50s usually had part-time jobs of some sort," and the money they made, a dollar an hour, was similar to the token money of the nineteenth century because it was not only used for entertainment, but could also be used to supplement the family's income. The token money they earned from their parent and society sanctioned jobs was for their future as well because Maynard states, "we were taught to save at least half of our earnings, but the remaining cash would buy movie tickets and Milk Duds, a ticket to the public swimming pool, several hamburgers and chocolate malts, and if needed, socks or a shirt."

For Americans, the 1950s are held up as the epitome of safe times for children, yet even in this perfect era, children were the victims of crimes and abuse. One example is the *Chicago Daily News* article reporting the murder of three boys in Chicago in the 1950s. This article highlights the shattering of the peace of mind for Chicago parents and is representative of that sheltered, encapsulated feeling of security adults had in regard to children. The conceptual apparatus of the Narrative was already in place as anyone who would harm, let alone murder, a child was, without a doubt, making a psychotic move. While Chicagoans were reeling from the murders, in Maynard's unspecified utopian town worries about children's safety were still not a concern, for

they “rode their bikes everywhere in town because it was safe to do so. On hot summer afternoons, we fished in the local slough for catfish and bluegill and caught a few fish, but we did get a lot of naps under the cottonwood trees (and sometimes, poison ivy too!)” (Maynard). Riding bikes unattended and without safety gear? Fishing in a slough? Taking naps under some random cottonwood tree? Exposing oneself to poison ivy? These are all a helicopter parent’s nightmare and causes current American parents a bit of unease as well. Maynard remains firmly nostalgic to the end and bemoans the lost innocence and safety of the 1950s, which also instilled in him and in his friends the middle class values of hard work, physical activity, obeying and respecting your parents and other adults, and acquiring an education. “Ah yes, the ‘50s was a great time for a boy to grow toward manhood. Most of us made it just fine and had good careers and families based on those early values learned the hard way—by physically being involved in life and by having to be accountable for our actions” (Maynard). While he does mention that life lessons were learned the hard way, nothing in his article indicates that life was all that difficult for him or for his friends. Nostalgia triumphs, and current times are no longer the age of innocence for children, and spaces that were the child’s playground then are now sources of possible injury or worse for today’s children.

Maynard’s recounting of his childhood space is reflective of Hall and Sorkin’s discussion of place as a combination of factors. For Hall, and for Sorkin, place is the center of their arguments regarding community regardless of whether they are discussing place as a physical space that is being reconstructed to exclude the marginalized and include the privileged, or as an idea being used to create new communities in old urban spaces, and Zukin discusses place as a combination of factors which include geographical location, people and economics, and “social conflict and cohesion” (12), and ends with a “useful concept in social theory [that] place expresses

how a spatially connected group of people mediate the demands of cultural identity, state power, and capital accumulation”, (12) or in other words, create an imagined community. These spaces and ideas can be articulated as part of the current reality of a culture and are, as Zukin states, a palimpsest on which “themes of power, coercion, and collective resistance” (19) are written, erased, and rewritten. This concept is realized in Hall’s discussion of the theory and practice of urban planning. Urban planners can plan all they want, but the demands of place can derail them, especially when communal identity and social equality are at stake. This derailment is reflected in Hall’s discussion of a Chicago Housing Authority’s plan, or lack of planning, which failed “because it did not correctly identify the real power structure in the city; its elitist view of the public interest was totally opposed to the populist view of the ward politicians” (364) and that “in practice, local democracy proved to be an infinitely messier business than theory would have liked” (364).

This messy business of democracy is further muddied when place, social equality, and communal identity are mixed with the sentimentalized child. For example, in Sorkin et al, communal identity and social equality are essential to their arguments regarding the social division of city spaces. Many of the articles in Sorkin discuss how people are removed from public places, especially the street, whether through force or through architectural design, and the authors assign a value to this division of above and below, and of inside and outside, which is rooted in the idea that the streets were always places for people of different classes and ethnic groups to come together harmoniously thus creating social equality and a communal identity, but were always dangerous for unsupervised children. This idea of public space, community identity, and social equality is a nostalgic view of the past. The street is Jane Jacob’s street, and it seems to be the

desire of Sorkin and others to recreate this street in today's cities, but without the dangers of the actual historical street.

Though the conceptualization of this street is nostalgic, it does not prevent planners and developers or even artists like Cassily (founder of the City Museum which I will discuss later) from trying to realize this image. One way in which this recreation of community is being attempted is through gentrification, and one side effect of gentrification is the safety of the street for children. When one creates nostalgic places to recreate a "lost" communal feeling that appeals to those in the middle to upper classes, one homogenizes the space by class, which becomes a security apparatus of biopower and reinforces perceptions of safety. To do this, gentrification must take the best that an area has to offer, encapsulate it, add a dash of quaintness, remove historical taint (or at least sanitize it), and add the strong appeal of nostalgia in order to remake an old space into a new communal space which is as closely reflective as possible of the nostalgic ideal which fueled its creation. But just like democracy, gentrification and nostalgia are messy issues. Communal identity and issues of social equality and social justice, in short, issues of place, appear when the pathetic sense of a nostalgic place comes at the expense of the community currently occupying the contested space.

But once the contested space is determined, it can be analyzed in its new instantiation as a landscape of power. Cultural geographers "regard all landscapes as symbolic, as expressions of particular localities over a span of time" (Zukin 18) and examine particular spaces in regard to a community and its beliefs on a particular topic or commonplace. By analyzing spaces in light of children and American's beliefs regarding them and how these spaces are affected by the Narrative of the Child, one can find that children's spaces have changed significantly over time and are symbolic of a shift in the perceptions of the role of children in American society. As the child

moved out of an economic role in the domestic sphere, the child changed “from being the smallest and least considered of human beings...[to becoming] endowed with qualities which made it Godlike, fit to be worshiped, and the embodiment of hope” (Wordsworth in Fletcher and Hussey 2). This Romantic shift in the perception of the child and its role in society changed the landscape of the child and its spaces. The shift in the perception of the child from worker to learner to hyper-sentimentalized being not only changed the role of children in society, but also their physical landscapes and broadened the spaces in regard to children and the dangers they face. The danger to our children is not then limited solely to the danger from people, but also includes the danger from things and the spaces in which children play, learn and live.

In order to combat the issues of child hazards, spaces that are child centered have reworked themselves to ensure that they are child-safe as well. As an added requirement, the sites must also be educational. This change in safety issues is not completely altruistic, but falls within the purview of the Narrative as parents whose children have been injured by unsafe conditions are in a strong position to sue the institution. The *choix-force* of the Narrative where the injury occurred requires that child environments be controlled for safety and controlled for learning experiences; consequently, society now requires children’s spaces, even those outside the school building, to be educational, interactive and safe. And one can see this at pretty much any museum or tourist space, for railings, bars, barriers in various forms, and security personnel are present to prevent people, especially children, from being injured or from injuring themselves.

In addition to the overall concern regarding education and safe play (or lack of it) is the commodification of children’s activities and children’s spaces. Many of the places for children not only provide the obligatory interactive, educational experience, but they do so for a fee, and they also contain items for purchase so children can take the experience home with them and

continue learning. Because the implementation of the Narrative outside of the schools is still strongly tied to educational practices and beliefs, it is difficult to completely separate most children's spaces into educational and unstructured, but I have categorized four spaces in terms of learning and of safety issues and I also discuss how these spaces replicate and support the Narrative. Three of the spaces are in Chicago and one is in St. Louis. All four spaces are either specifically designed for children, such as American Girl Place, The Children's Museum, and the City Museum, or have a large space set aside for children as in the Thomas Hughes Children's Library within the main Chicago Public Library. I have chosen the three spaces in Chicago because they are part of a particular category of children's spaces that can be found across the United States, and I have chosen the space in St. Louis because it is, to my knowledge, not like any other children's space, but is a reflection of the movement against the over-parenting and the over-stimulation of children and is a reflection of the need for children to have unstructured play. This space is unique in that it is a space comprised of non-child based structures which the museum has made completely child focused. The three spaces I analyzed in Chicago are reflective of this "play as education" focus, but with the added necessity of bringing revenue to the city. The Harold Washington Library, which opened on October 7, 1991, is the main public library in Chicago; the Children's Museum, which opened at Navy Pier in 1982, is currently working on moving from its current location to Grant Park, and the American Girl Place, which opened in 1998 as the first American Girl Store, moved to Water Tower Place in October 2008, only a block and a half away from its previous store. The last space is the City Museum, which opened in downtown St. Louis in 1997. It is an artistic urban reclamation playground designed for children that is also appealing to adults. It is not only the ideas behind the spaces that make them rhetorically interesting in regard to children, but the actual physical space and the symbolism

built into the buildings and the beliefs regarding children as voiced by those in control of this space.

In order to analyze these spaces as representative spaces, I have categorized them first as authentic spaces¹⁸ or as tourist spaces and secondly as learner spaces or as consumer spaces resulting in four possible combinations: authentic-learner, tourist-learner, consumer-learner, and authentic-consumer. The dichotomy between the authentic space and the tourist space is that the authentic site has a genuine use value for its community and the value is not traded as a commodity; whereas, a tourist site does trade its use value for the revenue it brings to the city and the cachet it brings the user by being in the know.

Though the three Chicago and one St. Louis spaces all bill themselves as interactive and educational, they have differing functions: the library functions as an authentic-learner space, the Children's Museum as a tourist-learner space with a consumer component, the American Girl Place as a consumer-learner space with a tourist component, and the City Museum as a tourist-learner space with a minimal consumer component. An example of the final category, authentic-consumer, would be a retail store, such as Toys 'R' Us, Geppetto's Toy Box in Oak Park, Illinois, or Once Upon a Toy in Edwardsville, Illinois. These stores are for the children in the community for which they were built and do not try to attract tourists though they won't turn them away should they wander in. The sole focus of this type of space is retail sales and the consumer market; these stores do not make any claim to either being a tourist site or having a significant educational component, other than selling educational toys next to commercial toys.

18 I am not using the term *authentic* in regard to authenticity issues or claims to authenticity. I am simply defining it here as a place that has been designed for the community it serves, and any tourist traffic it receives is purely coincidental. Libraries are a good example of an authentic space because they are not designed to bring tourists or income to a community, but are to provide educational and entertainment services for their communities, and in order to fully use a library, one must reside in the community the library serves.

4.4 A Side of Education

While this chapter is titled implementation outside education, children and learning are so tightly intertwined in American society that it is not possible to completely separate education and educational practices from a discussion of children and their spaces within American society.

G. Stanley Hall, a psychologist in the late nineteenth century, in his article “The Old Childhood and the New Adolescence,” stated that from ages two or three to about six or seven, children need bodily care, not intellectual care, and that kindergartens should be designed to “fill more of the day, and should strive to kill time” (368). Hall’s statements are in direct opposition to the enrichment classes of today’s schools and after-school programs, such as the WISE program in Oak Park, Illinois. He also states that kindergarten is merely a preparation stage for higher level classes because he asserts most strongly that intellectual pursuits are not warranted until the child is eight or nine, and when the child is old enough for intellectual pursuits, class time should be “devoted to drill, habituation, and mechanism” (Stanley Hall 370); however, even though most schools in Illinois (and I suspect elsewhere) are still working within Hall’s age-graded classrooms with appropriate age level materials, more parents, such as those in District 97 in Oak Park, are requesting multiage classrooms from their school districts. In addition parents are also requesting, sometimes quite strongly, all day kindergartens because they do not view kindergarten as a way to kill time, but as an essential component for their child’s educational progress. They feel that their children are behind educationally if they only attend half-day kindergartens; therefore, all day kindergartens are necessary if they want their children to be competitive for college. It can also be noted that as many families have both parents working outside the home, all day kindergarten serves a necessary care need, as do the enrichment classes that many schools offer after school ends. This is another example of the paradox surrounding children’s education.

Apparently, the sentimentalized child needs time to have unstructured play in a space of his/her own without direct adult supervision in order to be healthy, yet parents both need and want adult directed enrichment classes with children scheduled to take advantage of this time in their lives when they learn the best while at the same time preparing for the future. It is an aporetic move to want to structure the child's day and activities on the one hand and yet provide time and space for imaginative play on the other. This is where the children's museum comes into the mix by providing safe, controlled, play in a structured environment with elements of unstructured play within the exhibits and museum spaces.

The Chicago Children's Museum (CCM), which does not deal in memorization or drilling in any way, attempts to ensure creative and constructive learning opportunities for children in the community by "reach[ing] out beyond its walls [to make] a significant investment of resources in neighborhoods across Chicago, particularly to children who might not otherwise have access to the museum's rich array of resources" (CCM). The Chicago Children's Museum does this by collaborating with the Latino Neighborhoods Initiative, ArtReach, African-American Communities Initiative, Poetry in Schools, Passport to the World, and the Family Language Arts Program (CCM). While the Children's Museum's mission statement is all well and good, the museum does charge an admission fee of \$10.00 per person for all visitors over one year old, which is up from the \$7.00 it charged just a few years ago. The Museum does have one family night per week when admission is free for everyone and on the first Sunday of every month, the museum is free for children 15 and under. Otherwise, one can buy a museum annual family membership for \$90.00 (up from \$65.00) which allows up to four family members unlimited visits to the museum and reinforces middle class access to the museum. This significantly limits the number of people in the community who can afford to take advantage of the benefits of the

Museum, though the Museum does partner with the library as one of the museums available with the Great Kids pass.

Though children's museums have been around since 1899, they are not the first constructed learning sites for children. The first spaces for children, besides schools, were public libraries, which were not interested in the child as a consumer of goods, but as a consumer of ideas—non-fee based ideas. This is an ideal we still hold today—that children should have free access to the library. Libraries, despite some library claims to being tourist spaces, are authentic sites because they were designed by and for communities to serve the adults and children in the community, and they do not cater to or have an overt tourist market. On the other side of the consumer spectrum are the Children's Museums in the United States which are not completely authentic spaces because, though they have a strong community learning component, they have a strong consumer component and are often placed at tourist sites and expect to draw tourists to the area they serve. The American Girl Place, of which there were only two - Chicago and New York- has now expanded to seven stores, one each in Los Angeles, Atlanta, Dallas, Boston, and Minneapolis. These are not authentic sites because even though they draw locals to them, they depend on tourists to maintain their retail value and so have a strong tourist component, though as Mattel opens more stores, the tourist component may become less important.

The place of children's spaces in construction of the Narrative of the Child in American society is tightly tied to the educational reforms I mentioned earlier in chapters one and two. The social and historical foundations of schools and educational pedagogy were attacked in the late nineteenth century by Jacob Riis and others who were interested in improving the lives of children. While his focus was on the "foul, dark classrooms of New York", his observations could also be applied to schools in other big cities, such as Chicago. Though legislation had been passed in

1887 for public parks with playground equipment, none had been built by 1894 when Riis called for the playgrounds to be built so that “instead of being repelled, children would be attracted to a school that was identified with their playground. Truancy would cease. Ideally, children would come to identify with the school. An identity and a new sense of self, rather than being shaped in the alleys and back streets of the tenement district, would be formed in the fresh air and wholesome environment of the playground” (Button and Provenzo 193). Riis’ call for the implementation of the 1887 public parks law and the opening of the Brooklyn Children’s Museum in 1899 set the stage for more space to be set aside for children.

4.5 The Library

As both the repressive and progressive issues of the child were being debated and acted on at the same time, free libraries were being established by Andrew Carnegie in Pennsylvania. The first Carnegie library in the United States opened in “Braddock, Pennsylvania in 1889, which housed one of Carnegie Steel Company's major steel mills, the Edgar Thomson Works. Since this library primarily served the employees of the Carnegie Steel Company, and their families, the company funded the library” (Walsh). The second Carnegie library in the United States was “given to Mr. Carnegie's adopted hometown of Allegheny, Pennsylvania...The Carnegie Free Library of Allegheny...was dedicated by U.S. President Benjamin Harrison on February 20, 1890...the City of Allegheny was required to subsidize this library, making it the first publicly-funded Carnegie library in the world” (Walsh). The libraries were designed to be free to all people because Carnegie

believed that libraries added to the meritocratic nature of America.

Anyone with the desire to learn could educate themselves and be

successful in America like he had been...[and] immigrants like himself needed to acquire cultural knowledge of America which a library would enable immigrants to do. Carnegie indicated that it was the first reason that was the most important to him. 'It was from my own early experience that I decided there was no use to which money could be applied so productive of good to boys and girls who have good within them and ability and ambition to develop it, as the founding of a public library in a community' (Carnegie Foundation).

The Narrative appears here in Carnegie's comments as he invokes the topos of meritocracy by stating that libraries are spaces for boys and girls and will foster their abilities and ambitions for their own future and for the future of capitalism and liberal democracy. For Carnegie, his belief in the meritocratic system is profound as he uses himself as an example of how it works without acknowledging that there are those who were, and still are, excluded from the meritocratic system through race, ethnicity, or gender.

However, by the time Andrew Carnegie established his first public library in 1889, the city of Chicago had had a public library for more than fifteen years, since January 1, 1873. The Chicago Free Public library was the result of the Chicago Fire. The subscriber library of the time was destroyed by the fire, and Thomas Hughes, author of *Tom Brown's School Days* and a frequent visitor to Chicago, was distressed by the devastation caused by the fire. So he supported

A.H. Burgess of London...[who] formulated a plan that came to be known as the "English Book Donation." Burgess' statement describing the donation appeared in the Tribune on December 7,

1871: “I propose that England should present a Free Library to Chicago, to remain there as a mark of sympathy now, and a Keepsake and a token of true brotherly kindness forever...A circular appealing for donations was sent to British writers, booksellers, and publishers and was printed in the Times. The response was enthusiastic and overwhelming. In all, the English Book Donation numbered over 8,000 titles representing works in the classics, fine arts, theology, philosophy, natural sciences and English history (Chicago Public Library).

This book donation led to the “Illinois Library Act of 1872, authorizing cities to establish tax-supported libraries throughout Illinois. With this authorization, the City moved swiftly to establish a library. In April 1872, the [Chicago] City Council passed an ordinance proclaiming the establishment of the Chicago Public Library” (Chicago Public Library). Its original intent was to be an “educational institution that should provide an opportunity for “mental improvement” to the citizens of Chicago. In the spirit of democracy, the Library was all-encompassing, providing books and related reading material for popular education, civic awareness and scholarly research. The Board of Directors also saw the Library as a place “where working men and the youth of the city might employ their idle time” profitably in reading instead of wasting it in the “haunts of vice and folly and places of ill reputation” that characterized the Chicago of the 1870s. From the beginning, the mandate of the Chicago Public Library was clear--to serve the populace of Chicago” (Chicago Public Library) including its young.

The Chicago Public Library, then, is a public space with a strong child component, and it is an authentic-learner space because the current Harold Washington Library Center, opened in 1991,

was designed with community input so that it could meet the needs of the city of Chicago, and it has learning and discovery as its educational foci. It is not consumer based because there is nothing for sale and services are free. All people regardless of income or residency can visit and use the library, but one cannot loiter there. The issue of the indigent using the library for purposes other than its intended use is part of the pathos of the child and of issues of control. The library's goal is to provide materials for educational and entertainment purposes, and its mission statement is "We welcome and support all people in their enjoyment of reading and pursuit of lifelong learning. Working together, we strive to provide equal access to information, ideas and knowledge through books, programs and other resources. We believe in the freedom to read, to learn, to discover" (Chicago Public Library), and one cannot do this if one does not feel safe. Because of the pathos surrounding children, the presence of the homeless and the indigent present a perceived safety threat; the issue is not whether the threat is real, but that it is present in the form of the homeless who have already chosen to be outside society. Whether or not they have actually chosen is not the issue here, but that in the eyes of society and parents, they have made the wrong choice which makes them a threat to children and also to adults.

The building itself also symbolically reinforces that safety and learning are important in regard to children. Though in neo-classical style, the building is constructed of red brick, which is reminiscent of the red brick schoolhouse, but with oversized ornaments on the roof which link the tall arched windows to each other. The ornaments are at each of the four corners and in the centers of three of the sides. The State Street ornament is a sculpture of an owl, which in the United States symbolizes wisdom. The owl symbolizing wisdom comes from the Greek Athena, the goddess of wisdom, and owls are also included in the ornaments on the four corners. The Congress and Van Buren Street sides "incorporate seed pods, which are symbolic of the natural

bounty of the Midwest” (Chicago Public Library), are “descended from the ancient classical tradition in which significant features found within or derived from nature...[and] are placed in prominent locations upon an important building to symbolize the forces of life and eternity” (Weldingworks). This return to the classical period as the foundation of education is traditional in large public buildings and is designed to invoke ideas of democracy and learning, both of which are integral to American educational practices today.

In actual physical space, the Washington library has ten floors and approximately 576,000 square feet of which 18,000 are devoted to the Thomas Hughes children’s library. This is a space for children and their parents to read, to learn, and to discover on children’s terms, but the idea of the Children’s library did not originate with modern libraries. Just as the origins of modern pedagogy date from the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries so, too, does the children’s library. The first library to have a children’s department was the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh which opened in 1895 (Walsh). But the first room completely dedicated to children opened on May 1, 1901, in the Andrew Carnegie Free Library in Carnegie, Pennsylvania. “This Children's Room was specifically designed for children, including low bookcases, so that children could reach the books themselves. Hence, the Andrew Carnegie Free Library was the first suburban library in the world to open to the public, complete with a room specifically designed to be, and dedicated as, a Children’s Room” (Walsh). Today, all new libraries and many of the older libraries have spaces that are specifically dedicated to children, but children are not restricted only to children’s library spaces. True to its mission of learning and discovery, the Chicago Public library building and its services are available for children to use without cost to them.

In addition to providing free materials to library users, the Chicago public library provides monthly enrichment activities for children and their parents and has also partnered with the Kraft

Corporation to create the Great Kids program. The enrichment activities target children from six months through their teen years. Each month the library provides new activities and programs for parents and children, or just children. Children's story time, a favorite with parents and children, is a regular fixture at this and other libraries. Along with having story time and programs like the Great Kids program, libraries maintain a monthly calendar of free educational activities for children ranging from author visits, to arts and crafts, to pajama parties. According to the Chicago Public Library 2008 Annual Report:

The Chicago Public Library of today brings families together with nature where they can borrow fishing poles, binoculars and birding backpacks. It conducts family reading nights in Chicago's parks, has downloadable audio books, music and video available 24/7, provides financial literacy guidance to adults and teens, hosts Chicago's renowned blues musicians for free noontime performances and is home to a vast and eclectic collection of public art created by talented Chicago artists. The Library is a place where families check out free passports to Chicago's outstanding museums and where musicians and students can reserve free sound-proof rehearsal spaces.

All these activities encourage children to come to the library to learn and to enjoy doing so in spaces designed for them and for their families. And it seems to be working, for "in 2008, over 52,000 children read and reported on 1.2 million books in the 2008 Summer Reading Program, and

55 accredited teachers provided 500,000 homework assistance sessions in over 55 neighborhood locations” (CPL 2008 Annual Report).

The library’s Great Kids program reflects the educational requirements of the Narrative as the program is designed to help underserved children learn to read and to expand their educational experience outside of school. The Great Kids program provides a Museum pass to eleven museums in Chicago and can be checked out for one week and allows free admission for eight people to places such as The Field Museum, The Adler Planetarium, and The Children’s Museum amongst others. This public service is reflective of the current trend in educational pedagogy which maintains that children need to be exposed to as many experiences as possible when they are young and the more interactive the experiences, the more the child will learn. It is also reflective of the power of the Narrative as even large corporations see the power of the sentimentalized child as consumer. Though at the library the child is not a consumer, the child is a consumer elsewhere and corporations know this. This funding of free, educational activities by for profit entities is a win-win situation for the entity and the child. The child receives the benefits of what the Narrative requires and the entity gets the approbation of society for helping children and increases revenue when the child is an adult and purchases the company’s products.

4.6 The Museum

The next space that is learner based is The Chicago Children’s Museum at Navy Pier. Navy Pier is a significant tourist destination in Chicago, and the Children’s Museum, founded in 1982, has been an anchor tenant for the Pier since 1995, but will be relocating to the Daley Bicentennial Plaza at the north end of Grant Park, which is still a tourist space. Like libraries, children’s museums date from the turn of the nineteenth century. As I mentioned in chapter two,

the Brooklyn Children's Museum was the first children's museum in 1899, and its plan to build a collection to delight and instruct children has been carried on by the Chicago Children's Museum (CCM) but with a shift in form and function. The CCM no longer has collections of items to satisfy curiosity, but it does have sections of the museum dedicated to particular activities and learning. While the Chicago Children's Museum does remain true to the origins of children's museums as interactive learning sites, it lost its authentic designation by placing itself within a tourist site and charging admission, but this may change somewhat when the museum moves to Grant Park though when they will move is uncertain. Grant Park is a dual purpose park as it is the frontyard/backyard space for Chicago residents while also being a tourist space, so the museum may gain more as an authentic site, but will still remain a tourist site. The museum must begin construction on its new facility by mid-2014, but the recession and lack of funding has postponed current plans for construction and the Museum is attempting to extend its lease at Navy Pier through at least 2013 (Hintz).

Currently, the Museum is a learner-tourist space because its focus is almost entirely educationally interactive, with a limited consumer component that the library does not have. The museum at Navy Pier funnels its visitors in and out of the museum through the gift store. In fact, the gift store is so prominent inside the Pier that it is not immediately apparent that there is a museum attached to the store. Though the store is prominent, the museum administration does not focus on its store as strictly a consumer space, but on its being an extension of the museum learning experience: "Our new and improved Museum Store is the place to shop for unique educational toys that extend the museum experience" (CCM Website) because even the store is interactive, and children are allowed to play with and test out the toys before deciding which one to purchase and take home. But in order to attract visitors and to increase revenue, the museum does

advertise itself by carrying “a variety of CCM logo merchandise.” The museum also creates a special consumer niche for itself by carrying “exhibit-related games, books, and toys you won't find anywhere else” (CCM website). The 57,000 square foot space has three floors comprised of these exhibits that are housed in rooms opening off large central areas. Children are encouraged to run and play and to touch everything. The main restrictions are control issues where the museum has play spaces that are graded by age, not by ability, so that small children can play safely and experience exhibits that are designed for them. Thus the age grading of the school is seen in the age grading of the museum's exhibits.

The Museum's mission statement asserts that the

Chicago Children's Museum's mission is to create a community where play and learning connect. The museum's primary audience is children up through the fifth grade including their families, along with the school and community groups that support and influence children's growth and development...Fifteen permanent exhibits and programming spaces provide innovative learning experiences for children and their caregivers (CCM).

It would appear from this statement that the Museum has a rather loose definition of “community”, as it is reminiscent of Anderson's imagined communities: a community in which all the people do not know each other and have not met, but nevertheless consider themselves a community, but in this case, instead of being the community that forms a sovereign nation, it is an imagined community, and embodiment of Foucault's nations, centered around children. While the actuality of this community is suspect, the ideological import of this again reinforces the strength

of the Narrative. These are not, as Delpit states, “other people’s children”; they are our, universal, communal children.

4.7 The Store

American Girl Place, on the other hand, is the least overtly educational of the three children’s spaces. Though it does have a learner component, it is primarily a tourist-consumer based space. According to the American Girl Place website, “American Girl Place is the place for girls! It’s where the magic of the past and present come to life in dazzling ways. Much more than a store, it’s the place where imaginations soar from boutiques to special events, from the Café to the Theater and beyond.” The American Girl line of dolls was started by Pleasant T. Rowland in 1985 in Middleton, Wisconsin. Rowland, “a former educator and publisher of educational materials...created the American Girl brand as a way to educate and entertain girls with quality books, dolls, and toys that integrate learning and play experiences while emphasizing important traditional values. Since that time, American Girl has become one of the nation's most respected brands and has earned the loyal following of millions of girls and the praise and trust of parents and educators” (American Girl). While this sounds lovely, the “traditional values” they espouse in this statement are not clearly delineated. From looking at the AG line of dolls and toys and how and to whom they are marketed, it would appear that the traditional values they espouse are motherhood and the nurturing of children, but the AG fiction books put a bit more independence into the AG line, and the American Girl Magazine and non-fiction books definitely lean toward the independent, intelligent girl who will become the independent, intelligent woman.

In order to create this juxtaposition of traditional values with girl-child empowerment, the American Girl company not only makes and sells dolls; it also coordinates the dolls with

historically accurate books which teach girls about the historical place of girls in particular eras and about the women's movements in those eras, such as the suffrage movement. The dolls and accessories are grouped into lines targeted for certain age groups: the Historical American Girl, the Doll of the Year, and the American Girl Today dolls are for girls eight years old and older and the Bitty Baby collection is for girls three to seven. These age defined lines not only sell more dolls, but also enhance the educational claims of American girl and make the consumer aspect more palatable, thus gaining the trust of educators and parents, as their company information site asserts. In addition, though the dolls and their accessories are available only through mail order or at the proprietary stores, the American Girl books are available at many different bookstores and libraries, thus providing those who cannot afford the dolls access to the same historical information as those who can. In this way, the American Girl line of products and its educational message is available to all girls regardless of class either for purchase or through library borrowing.

Of the three lines of dolls for older girls, the Historical, the Doll of the Year, and the Just Like Me, the historical dolls play on the pathos of the mother for her daughter and the sentimentalization of the child. The creation of the doll in an historical era by AG has flattened those eras for the girls and reduced any actual historical dangers to a romanticized perception of the past; however, if the girl moves away from the toys and into the books, the issues of the historical time are addressed, but those issues are not evident in the dolls and the clothes; one must read the books to get this part of the package. While the original historical dolls were pre-turn-of-the century and turn-of-the-century nineteenth and twentieth century dolls, the current historical dolls are designed to play on the fond childhood memories of grandmothers and mothers: Kit from the 1930s, Molly from the 1940s, and Julie from the 1970s while skirting the

dangers present in those eras: the Depression, World War II, and the Vietnam War. All three lines of dolls are racially, ethnically, and communally diverse, which expands their consumer base, but the historical dolls are less so than the Just Like Me line. In fact, the Just Like Me dolls are AG's answer to the challenge of diversity in today's society, as a girl would be hard-pressed to not be able to find a doll that looked like her, regardless of her genetic makeup, and the Doll of the Year highlights and explores this diversity each year by creating dolls such as 2001's Lindsay Bergman (Jewish), 2005's Marisol Luna (Latina), 2006's Jess Akiko McConnell (Japanese-American, Irish-Scottish), 2010's Chrissa (unspecified Caucasian American), and 2011's Kanani (Hawai'ian American). They further recognize diversity by creating friends for the dolls, such as Julie's friend Ivy Ling (East Asian) and Chrissa's friend Sonali Matthews (Southeast Asian), and AG provides the opportunity to purchase accessories that cater to and promote a variety of interests and reflect society's current concerns, such as the current focus on healthy living.

In addition to the dolls and their accompanying accessories and books, there is also an *American Girl Magazine* that is designed to be fun, interactive and educational. It has sections that are informative and games to play, and is "an age-appropriate, advertising-free publication designed to affirm self-esteem, celebrate achievements, and foster creativity in today's girls" (American Girl). There is also an American Girl Club which costs \$20.00 to join and is a safe place where girls can message each other and share information about themselves. These sites either require or encourage parent involvement, and the American Girl Club has a section specifically for mothers. In fact, a friend of mine and the mother of a 7 year old girl told me that "going to the American Girl store is as much for me as it is for her" (conversation June 11, 2010).

In addition to the books which accompany the dolls, American Girl also publishes books that are specifically for girls which discuss issues such as self esteem and body image. According

to a press release regarding their release of *Real Beauty*, American Girl states that “in a departure from beauty books that focus on makeup and fashion, *Real Beauty* provides girls with insightful advice on topics like how to focus on being healthy instead of skinny, and how to question the stereotypes of beauty they see in the media. Through tips, quizzes and quotes from real girls, the new book helps readers see that real beauty comes from liking yourself, feeling strong and healthy, and from knowing what’s beautiful in everyone around you,” (American Girl) and is a serious and successful attempt to mediate the current concerns regarding eating disorders and to value the racial, ethnic and/or communal identity of each girl.

However, the consumer component is still its primary function, and in order to have the total American Girl Place experience, the girls need to: have their pictures taken with their dolls, have their dolls’ hair done, buy clothes and accessories for themselves and their dolls, have brunch, lunch, afternoon tea, or dinner with their dolls, and until the move to Water Tower Place attend the American Girl Theater production of the American Girl shows—a of which have a price attached. The goal of American Girl is to sell a package consisting of the doll, the accessories, and the book and its educational content. In addition to selling its products, American Girl works hard to create a feeling of belonging to a particular group when the girl becomes a doll owner. It is an exclusive group as the target market is those girls and their families who have the money to buy the expensive dolls and accessories. The prices of their products range from \$7.00 for a small hairbrush designed to be used on AG dolls to a \$349.00 storage cabinet for the doll and her clothes. The average price for accessories is around \$11.00, for doll clothes around \$27.00, and the doll itself costs \$95.00 (AG website June 13, 2010). Though the underprivileged are not the target market for the American Girl line of products, the American Girl company does have “a long-standing commitment to children's charities nationwide. The company has generated

millions of dollars for programs that support education, literacy, environmental awareness, multicultural appreciation, and fine arts through innovative partnerships with nonprofit organizations” (American Girl). The programs that American Girl supports include the American Girl Fashion Show that any non-profit can hold to raise funds for itself, United Way of Dane County, Wisconsin, Special Olympics, Kids in Distressed Situations (K.I.D.S), HomeAid American, the Madison Children’s Museum, the Fund for Children to fund arts and environmental education in Dane County, and donations of products as raffle prizes to schools, libraries, and hospitals for fundraisers.

The American Girl Place in Chicago is one of seven stores which are only in the United States. The American Girl Place which used to be on Chicago Avenue, just off Michigan Avenue, was, according to the AOL cityguide, “three floors of revenue generation” where no girl could leave feeling complete without a doll. Now, American Girl Place has moved across the street into Water Tower Place and onto Michigan Avenue, Chicago’s premier tourist street, where AG took over the old Lord and Taylor’s ground and first floors resulting in a store that is significantly larger than the Chicago Avenue site. AG Place now has a Bistro section in addition to its Café and has expanded its bookstore, hair salon and photo studio; however, they have removed the theater and its shows, the American Girl Show for older girls, and the Bitty Baby show for younger girls. Both shows, while showcasing the AG characters, were of a communal nature as their content was about family and friends and learning which was in keeping with Pleasant Company’s mission, but which has changed with the purchase of American Girl by Mattel. Though Mattel is keeping with the core of American Girl, the new store is more commercial than the old store and has more of a department store feel rather than a toy store or boutique feel.

The first American Girl Store in Chicago, opened in 1998, had 35,000 square feet and was designed so that its facade looked like a hotel or upscale boutique. It had dark red awnings over all the windows, and upon entering the store, customers passed through a lobby area which included a concierge desk and red circular sofas. The customer's movements were controlled in this space because the first floor consisted only of the lobby with books for sale, the concierge station, the photographer's studio, and the elevators which were the only way up to the Café and clothing boutique, which one was required to pass through to reach the doll rooms. Every space was designed to showcase the dolls and accessories in such a way as to make them appealing to the girls and their mothers. On the lower level were the "Peek into the Past" displays which showcased AG doll sized recreations of the world of specific dolls, and also the dioramas which were miniature scenes that included dolls and toy animals and accessories—all of which could be purchased. So despite the company's statement regarding its strong educational component, American Girl Place has a significant focus on consumption.

In fact, AG has been so successful that the Pleasant Company was acquired by Mattel in 1998, and according to the Associated Press, in "Mattel Profit Up on American Girl Sales on Forbes.com, in the last two quarters of 2004 Mattel made a significant profit from the American Girl line. In the second quarter, "sales at the American Girl business increased by 18 percent to \$49.1 million, mainly because of sales generated by the new American Girl Place retail store in New York," and in the third quarter "worldwide gross sales for the American Girl division came to \$61.5 million, up 9 percent" (AP "Mattel"). American Girl's profit numbers have increased each year with 15 percent growth in 2005, 7 percent growth in 2008, and current 2010 numbers are just as impressive, with gross sales of 70.2 million, which are up 6 percent over last year's reports (Mattel). This focus on retail sales and profit ensures that American Girl will be considered a

consumer-tourist space first and an educational space second. This focus can be seen in its new space in Water Tower Place. The new space is larger at 52,000 square feet than the old space and looks more like a store than like a cozy boutique. The main arrangement of the store has remained the same though the details have changed and some new areas have been added.

The revenue generation for Chicago is significant as nearby hotels and restaurants also cater to American Girl Place customers and reap the benefits of families visiting American Girl Place. For example, Wyndham Hotel has an American Girl special package which includes a monogrammed Wyndham Hotel bathrobe for the American Girl doll upon check-in, and the Sheraton Chicago Hotel and Towers' has an American Girl Getaway Package "that includes a one-night stay at the hotel, use of an American Girl doll travel bed, a free American Girl-themed dessert for a girl (and one for her doll) at a hotel restaurant, complimentary health club [access] and valet parking [for her mother]" (Wyndham). The hotel and American Girl partnership is beneficial to both entities because American Girl customers who would need a hotel room are interested in having the "American Girl Experience"¹⁹ (AG website), and the hotel allows them to bring that experience out of the store and brings in revenue for themselves. The packages at the hotels change over time, and the Wyndham, as of January 2010, was also offering an American Girl Pajama Party package. In checking the availability of rooms for various weekends at the Wyndham, I found that those packages were completely booked into June 2010. In addition to the PJ Palooza Party still being offered, Wyndham, as of March 2011, is also offering an American Girl Hairstyling Special package. American Girl and hotels like the Wyndham do cater to

¹⁹ The "American Girl Experience" is having brunch, lunch, tea or dinner at the restaurant with one's doll, having one's photo taken in AG's photo studio and put on a souvenir *American Girl Today Magazine* cover, having the doll's hair done at the hair salon, possibly getting its ears pierced, and shopping for accessories for the girl and her doll.

Chicago residents, but they also want to profit from the tourists who will spend a significant amount of money on their sentimentalized child.

4.8 Like Nothing Else

The City Museum in St. Louis, Missouri, is the next learner site I want to discuss because it is unique. I have classified it as a tourist-learner space because it does want to attract tourists to the city of St. Louis, but it also has a very strong learning component to its mission. It does have a small gift shop in the museum because the museum shed its not-for-profit status so it could have more control over its exhibits and is now solely funded by admission fees and souvenir purchases. The City Museum of St. Louis opened in 1997 as the “brainchild of internationally acclaimed artist Bob Cassilly” (citymuseum.org). The museum is housed in the factory of the former International Shoe Company and is an urban reclamation project. According to the City Museum, “Cassilly and his longtime crew of 20 artisans have constructed the museum from the very stuff of the city; and, as a result, it has urban roots deeper than any other institutions’. Reaching no farther than municipal borders for its reclaimed building materials, CITY MUSEUM boasts features such as old chimneys, salvaged bridges, construction cranes, miles of tile, and even two abandoned planes!” The museum collects these items and installs them in the museum as interactive exhibits. Children can touch, climb on, or slide through almost every item in the museum. The World Aquarium exhibit, which has some animals in addition to the water creatures, does have some “Do not touch exhibits”, sharks, crocodiles and the like; however, many of the animals and fish can be touched, petted, or fed and betting on the turtle races is highly encouraged.

The museum itself is different from either a traditional museum or children’s museum in that, as mentioned above, almost everything is open for exploration and touching, and upon

entering the museum one is struck by the lack of artificially lighted spaces and primary colors. Primary colors are often the main color palettes for children's museums, especially in the entryways, and they are usually brightly lit unless a specific exhibit requires special lighting. The Children's Museum at Navy Pier is an example of this. Its storefront is brightly colored, and their exhibits, such as the Birdwell Island exhibit from *Clifford the Big, Red, Dog*, were well lit both through artificial lighting and through many windows, and the structures of the exhibit were brightly painted. The City Museum, on the other hand, differs in both lighting and color. Its color palette is definitely muted with the main colors being grays and browns. It is not devoid of color, for it has soft blues in the aquarium and on the giant whale sculpture, and it does have brightly painted conveyor belt platens as the railings for the main staircase, but despite touches of color on certain exhibits such as the circus ring, it still looks much like what it was – a factory. The floors are cement; the exhibits are urban and industrial; the lighting is dim in comparison with other children's spaces; and it has large empty spaces for children to run and play. In addition, it has crawl spaces for children (into which many adults cannot fit) behind and under exhibits that are less lit than other places in the museum. It is an antidote to the overstimulation of children while providing them with the stimuli to investigate and play in a loosely structured environment. Though the museum is planned, it promotes unstructured play and physical activity, for there are no rooms for directed play, such as the store or camping rooms in the Chicago Children's Museum. This museum presents objects such as the world's largest pencil with a sign that says "world's largest pencil" and what looks like skateboarding ramps connecting to it with crawl spaces underneath. That's it, and no other implements or instructions are available; children simply choose to do what they will in this space including climbing on the pencil and rolling and sliding

down the ramps, crawling underneath and grabbing a sheet of paper from the art room to rub against the pencil.

According to Carolyn Steinhoff Smith in “Through the Dragon’s Mouth: Exploring the City Museum of St. Louis”, the museum “redefines visitor participation” and contains larger principles and implications for the role of the child in society. Steinhoff Smith makes grand claims for the museum’s effects on its clientele, especially from the climbing environments, and she lists several principles arising from these areas of the museum—principles that embody the Narrative:

- The centrality of relationships, as the environments invite explorers to connect with one another
- The value of uniqueness, as they let each person respond in his or her own way
- Inclusiveness, as they encompass all ages and abilities
- The rediscovery of capacities, as they present challenges that are exhilarating to meet
- Integration of the arts and beauty, as they incorporate murals, sculptures and mosaics
- Unification of mind and body, as explorers use their intellects, senses, imaginations, spirits, emotions and bodies
- The combining of work and play, as the challenges of the environments are pleasurable to meet
- Constant learning, as explorers expand their abilities and relationships
- Relaxation of time pressures, as the exhibits are so absorbing that visitors want to stay as long as they can
- Improvement of the environment, through recycling

These principles are fairly wide ranging and not all of them clearly apply to the museum, but some of them do encompass some commonplaces regarding children. The commonplace of the learning moment is reflected in the type of installations in the museum and the hands on environment it provides, but the centrality of relationships is unclear as the museum does not necessarily promote children who are strangers to each other playing together—it doesn't hinder it, but it does not overtly plan for or encourage it either. And beauty is definitely in the eye of the beholder here. The City Museum is amazing with the variety of items it contains and the types of activities in which children can engage, but I would not call it beautiful; one gets the sense of playing in a place where people dump unwanted stuff, rather like going into an old warehouse of unwanted items and finding interesting and unusual objects around every corner to play with and satisfy one's curiosity while at the same time not worrying about safety. The exhibits are designed for children to explore them safely enough, but there are no soft landings if they fall. The museum is definitely reflecting society's requirements for children's spaces to be a place of learning, for all its exhibits subtly teach about the environment, recycling, loss of historic places, art, architecture, nature, commercialization, and many of the exhibits can be used by children of varying abilities though not all the exhibits are available to children with a physical challenge as there are many climbing exhibits, but there are ramps in the majority of the exhibits and the numerous large spaces in the museum are navigable and playable by those using wheelchairs. However, the museum is also pushing against the Narrative by creating this space that is unlike any other children's space in order to encourage unstructured, unscheduled play, to ease the worry about children's safety, to promote creativity, and to minimize consumerism.

As the thoughts of parents and educators join this shift back to the unstructured play of their youth, the experiences of childhood, tempered by today's beliefs and expectations, are

making the independent child more appealing. The City Museum is capitalizing on this nascent move for independence and on nostalgia by calling their visitors “explorers” instead of museum-goers or patrons. True, this independence is seen through the filter of nostalgia for a time when one did not have to fear for one’s child every minute of every day, but nostalgia can be a strong force in creating change. This is in keeping with the Museum as its focus is to value the past, which is shown in its exhibits, and to remind its explorers that the past is important for the future, and to evoke positive memories in adults. This is not merely sentimentalism on the part of the Museum, for it also reinforces current environmental issues, such as recycling and reducing waste. In addition, the Museum is also encouraging an appreciation of art as functional and fun and not merely to be art for art’s sake, thus incorporating the child-as-learner portion of the Narrative. The idea of the child as explorer is also part of the evolution of the Narrative to ease back from the over-sentimentalization of the child, but not to de-sentimentalize the child. The child is still very much the sentimentalized child of the Narrative, but it is not the overprotected, reined in child of the helicopter parent. The child is now the explorer who is forging his or her own way and using all the resources at hand to face the challenges of the space while learning constantly in an engaging, exciting environment and developing skills and learning strategies that will benefit the child and the community, both currently and in the future.

4.9 Conclusion

As evidenced by the Children’s Museum and American Girl Place, the divide between education and consumerism is not as clearly defined as one would expect especially in regard to children and children’s spaces. Though tourist destinations have often been educational in nature, traditionally they have been the look-but-don’t-touch type of museum; however, they have always

had a consumer learning component with souvenirs available through the museum store. With the refocusing of educational pedagogy on the child as learner, both as a cooperative and as an independent learner, tourist sites for children have become more interactive, hands-on spaces for children to learn about and discover their environment and history, but the issue of safety is ever present. The Chicago Public Library, the Chicago Children's Museum, the City Museum, and the American Girl Places all address the parents' desires for their children to learn and the need for children to play and to learn through unstructured play. Rather than being simply educational or revenue generators, these sites have combined the consumer culture of America today with the drive for educational excellence to create a new site which encourages education in conjunction with consumerism, and have done so successfully. Thus, these children's spaces are the physical manifestation of the Narrative of the Child reflecting not only the desire of parents for their children to learn not only during the school year, but also while they are on vacation, accommodating the commodification of the child in regard to his or her desire to take home a souvenir, and fulfilling the city's need to draw people with children into the city in order to maintain revenues. By making urban spaces appealing to parents through their educational nature and by again creating safe urban spaces for children, cities are using the Narrative of the Child to rejuvenate themselves as cities and to ensure their future as they become landscapes of power that can fulfill educational and entertainment needs of the family.

In fact, the shift that has occurred is so focused on all children's activities being controlled, part of the learning moment, and safe that there has been a backlash among some in society and among education specialists and psychologists, such as Elena Bodrova and Deborah J. Leong, who are advocating unstructured play both in and outside the classrooms. They maintain that unstructured play, play uncontrolled by adults, is necessary for "the development of cognitive and

social skills that are prerequisites for learning more complex concepts as children get older” (6), and overscheduling children is detrimental to their ability to function independently later in life (Bodrova and Leong 6 and Gibbs 54). Nancy Gibbs, in her *Time Magazine* article “The Case Against Over-Parenting”, echoes the dubious WarriorOnline concepts when she states “You really want your children to succeed? Learn when to leave them alone. When you lighten up, they’ll fly higher. We’re often the ones who hold them down” (54). This clearly vindicates Leonore Skenazy by advocating the loosening of the helicopter parent mode and allowing children a space of their own in which to play without adult supervision – which is the attitude held by the nineteenth century reformers that I mentioned in chapter one. This relaxing of parental involvement—called by many names such as slow-parenting and free-range parenting—is viewed by Gibbs as a “great rebellion born of private acts of civil disobedience that inspire rebel bands to plot together” to create a “new revolution under way” aimed at “rolling back the almost comical overprotectiveness and overinvestment of moms and dads” (54). These acts of “insurgency”, such as Skenazy’s, are Zizek’s psychotic moves in the eyes of many people, such as that 51% in NBC’s poll; however, these acts of rebellion are not truly acts of rebellion because they do not seriously challenge the *choix-force* of the Narrative. None of these people advocate sending children out to play in the street with toys covered in lead paint or in children taking their tricycles on major highways, but they do wish to remove the hyper-sentimentalized child from society, and this call is echoed again and again in articles on over-parenting, unstructured play, child independence, and the pedagogy and function of education. But this movement is not truly a psychotic move because it does not violate the *choix-force* of the Narrative. Those attempting to reform the way American society views children are not advocating anything truly radical, for they all advocate safety helmets, seat belts, car seats and children’s spaces that are “a found blessing, a

place to free up [parent's] time so they can run out knowing their kids are safe and doing something productive” (Starks and Rubin). Again, this movement is not a move against the Narrative, but against excessive parenting and hyper-sentimentalization—not against the complete removal of the sentimentalized, economically useless child from society. And the question is the same now as it has always been: how can we best serve our children and prepare them for their future as adults and as our future keepers of the nation? Apparently the answer is the same as it has always been, by treading the fine line between holding on and letting go.

Chapter 5

Domestication of the Foreign

5.1 Sovereign Nations

It seems so simple. People, including children, are hurt, are in danger, are dying. Humanitarian rights are being violated. People need help, and it is the responsibility of the world to help with whatever is necessary to rectify the situation. But, of course, nothing is ever that simple. All people are members of a State, and the State has international rights guaranteed by the United Nations and by the international community. And the international community has different ideas in regard to what are human rights violations, what should be done if an action is a violation, when it should be done, or if it should be done at all. Part of the issue with humanitarian intervention is that the states comprising the international community and the United Nations are not always in agreement in regard to what constitutes human rights violations. A further complication to this situation, addressed by Nicholas Wheeler in *Saving Strangers*, is that the UN Security Council “requires a finding that there is a ‘threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression [that threatens] international peace and security’” (15) in order to intervene in the sovereignty of a state. Interventions into the actions of a recognized state are subject to negotiations within the international community to determine if a particular situation is a violation. If it is a violation then the international community must determine what can and should be done about it. This is problematic for humanitarian efforts, especially in regard to children, yet the Narrative demands immediate action whenever a child is in danger.

The idea of the nation and of the State has reigned supreme because it has had the power to eclipse the ethnic and the personal to create a sovereign unity. Though not untroubled by ethnicity

and rights claims, the State, according to Habermas, has been historically defined as a “power that possesses both internal and external sovereignty at the spatial level over a clearly delimited terrain (the state territory) and at the social level over the totality of members (the body of citizens or people)” (Habermas, *Inclusion* 197). In addition, the “concepts “nation” and “people” have the same extension” and that the people of the state constitute “the connotation of a political community shaped by common descent, or at least by a common language, culture, and history” (Habermas, *Inclusion* 197). Like Habermas, Benedict Anderson believes that a workable definition of nationalism is essential for understanding the emotional attachments people have to their nations and the influence of nationalism on culture. He says, “indeed, nation-ness is the most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time...nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts [sic]” (Anderson 4). And it is these cultural artifacts that create a national consciousness, crystallized around the notion of a common ancestry, language, and history, but only the “consciousness of belonging to “the same” people, makes...citizens of a single political community...into members who can feel responsible *for one another* [sic]” (Habermas, *Inclusion* 113). While Anderson does not discount the effect of culture on the nation, he relies more heavily on the idea of anthropological kinship groups to define the State than spatial terrain. In Anderson’s nation, the make-up of the State is the relationship of individuals to one another, rather like the kinship groups in anthropology. By using kinship groups as the organizing structure of the nation, Anderson allows a move further from the idea of the sovereign nation as the organizing structure and closer to the family group and to the idea of biopower and the household economy. In addition, governmental and household kinship groups shape and define communal responsibility in a way the State cannot. Therefore, kinship groups are in a better position to maintain and perpetuate the role of the sentimental child within the State. As a

result, Anderson's imagined political community can be juxtaposed over the imagined community of the child, a community that has no topographical borders, but which functions within a global biopolitical. Activation of the biopolitical within the imagined global community in regard to children comes from the strength of the Narrative of the Child in the United States. The Narrative in the United States has replaced the idea of nation-ness in its need to domesticate that which is foreign to create a global communal space of children.

There is no doubt that the political is important in regard to the hegemony of the child, but it is initially through the social, the kinship group, that the political functions on behalf of the child. The Narrative demands that the adult citizen moderate between what is good for the State and what is good for society and by extension what is good for the child. The Narrative also supports Cicero's insistence that "when choosing between duties, the chief place is accorded to the class of duties grounded in human fellowship" (62), which means only the State which acts humanely (biopolitically) in regard to its people can be assured of its citizens' support. Only a humane State can be trusted with its children and with its own future. The State should not put its citizens in the position of having to choose between it and the greater good because within the Narrative the sentimentalized child is the greater good and should always trump other State issues. This is the crux of Amartya Sen's theory of development as freedom. He asserts, unlike Kennedy's statement, that a liberal democratic State has more responsibilities toward its citizens than its citizens do toward it because the goal of the State is to provide "adequate social opportunities, [so that] individuals can effectively shape their own destiny and help each other" (Sen 11), and by helping each other, they help maintain the State for their own benefit and for the benefit of their children. But within the Narrative, it is not enough to protect the children of the State, for the State must join with other states to protect the children of the world. The Narrative demands that

all children be accorded the same sentimentalization as American children, and have the same protections and the same opportunities as American children in effect creating a global homeostasis in regard to children²⁰. These opportunities include Sen’s assertions that governments must provide basic education for their children in order for the children to be able to provide the necessities of life for themselves as adults and to keep the economy of their State stable. In addition, basic education allows people to participate in the traditions societies’ value and to “expand the individual freedoms and . . . to make the social arrangements more appropriate and effective” (Sen 31) for their individual good, not just for the good of the State. This participation “requires knowledge and basic educational skills, [so] denying the opportunity of schooling to any group—say, female children—is immediately contrary to the conditions of participatory freedom,” (Sen 32) to the Narrative and to the biopolitical. This is so because knowledge is essential for citizens to make true choices that will create and maintain the imagined community both national and global. “The success of a society is to be evaluated ...primarily by the substantive freedoms that the members of that society enjoy” (Sen 18) and not on factors such as utility, procedural liberty or even real income. Because Sen is an economist, his focus is on the State and its citizens, primarily adult citizens, in economic terms, but in assessing what Sen says about adults, the application to the Global Child can be clearly seen. The ability to provide for oneself and one’s family and for the State to provide for itself and its citizens “cannot be treated as an end in itself. Development has to be more concerned with enhancing the lives we lead and the freedoms we

20 I am adapting the term “homeostasis” from biology and applying it to a sociological condition. In biological terms, homeostasis is the body’s ability to maintain an internal equilibrium in response to external changes. In regard to children, much has been written by psychologists, sociologists and even Op-Ed contributors about the importance of stable home environments for the proper emotional and intellectual development of children. In these views, the internal environment of the child, his or her home, must maintain a positive balance of love and correction for the beneficial development of the child regardless of the external changes in the child’s nation, state, and in the world. By creating homeostasis for the child, adults ensure a safe, calm space for the child to grow and develop into a well-adjusted adult.

enjoy” (Sen 14) than with the marketplace, which is in contrast with American capitalism both as it was defined historically in the nineteenth century and how it is viewed today. According to Sen, the purpose of the State is to create a hegemonic free society (not a free-for-all society) in which education is essential for all citizens, including women and children, thus allowing the State to provide for its citizens while maintaining itself, a basic implementation of the apparatuses of biopower.

It is at this point that Sen, along with Foucault and Rawls, differs from historical thinkers such as Cicero, Plato, Locke, and Machiavelli about the State, not only in regard to the form of the State, but also in regard to the focus of the State. For Sen and for Rawls, the focus is taken off the male citizen and refocused onto all citizens of the State, with special emphasis on women and children. For Sen, and for others such as Susan Okin, a society cannot be successful if all its citizens are not educated, and it is especially important for women to be educated because they were and still are, the foundation on which the nurturing of children and of childhood rests. This is so because in many societies today, some more than others, women are still the primary caregivers of children, especially young children, regardless of physical or social place. More women care for young children full-time in the home as mothers or nannies than do men, and more women teach in preschools and elementary schools than do men. In fact, in American society alone, seeing men as teachers or caregivers of young children is sometimes viewed by many individuals as an odd, even suspicious, career choice for a man, in short a psychotic move within the *choix-force*. This predominance of women as caretakers is reflective of Mary Wollstonecraft’s, and other reformers’, nineteenth century American admonitions for women to be educated, not only in the domestic sphere, but also in math, science, and rhetoric because women and these subjects are the educational foundation of childhood. Sen affirms these admonitions by

asserting that education is essential for all women, not just because they are mothers and caregivers of children, but because they are also citizens of the State, and it is the State's responsibility to provide basic capabilities for all its citizens. Currently, according to Sen, the States of the world (including the American State) are not fulfilling their responsibility to their female and child citizens because more women and children live in poverty than men. There is a poverty that is not "merely a lowness of income," which bases poverty solely on economics and the marketplace, but a poverty of "the deprivation of basic capabilities" such as the ability to read, to write, or to reason. Sen, then, defines poverty in both economic and capability terms, the latter based on age, gender and social roles, to account for his assertion that more women and children live in poverty.

In keeping with Sen's analysis, in order to eradicate poverty and achieve the public good, education is essential for the individual citizen. For it is through education that social change can occur, and the malleability of the child increases the likelihood that an educated child, one who has been given at least basic capabilities, will maintain a legitimate social and political order beneficial to itself and its economy. For Sen, the only political order that can do this is a democracy because it allows, and even demands, the instrumental freedoms--economic, political, protective, and social transparency --for all its citizens. Though Sen maintains that a democracy is the best form of government, it must be coupled with his theory of development as freedom to allow an eclectic approach to governing, and an eclectic approach to governing is for the public good because development as freedom "can take note of...utilitarianism's interest in human well being, libertarianism's involvement with processes of choice and the freedom to act, and Rawlsian theory's focus on individual liberty and on the resources needed for substantive freedoms" (Sen 86). He also maintains that an eclectic approach to government is preferable for the State and its

citizens because the only valid assessment of the State's success is through "explicit reference to outcomes and processes that they [the citizens] have reason to value and to seek" (Sen 86). Thus the State is not in the same position of sovereign, disciplinary power that it is in Cicero, Augustine, Machiavelli, or even in Locke. For Sen and his democracy, the citizen and the State work within the biopolitical and have reciprocal roles in ensuring their own success and continuance and the safety of their children.

Spinoza's assertion that "It is not, I repeat, the purpose of the state to transform men from rational beings into beasts or puppets, but rather to enable them to develop their mental and physical faculties in safety, to use their reason without restraint and to refrain from the strife and the vicious mutual abuse that are prompted by hatred, anger or deceit. Thus the purpose of the state is, in reality, freedom" (223) is part of the fundamental beliefs of the liberal democracy of America and the beliefs of its people which they extend out to the global community. Freedom in the instantiation of rights is at the core of the American belief system, but it is the forced choice of freedom, not anarchical or chaotic freedom. Here the Narrative is positioned most strongly to allow the American State to apply the *choix-force* not just to itself and to its children, but to the global kinship group of children. Since the State and the Narrative cannot use military power to force other nations to accede to its beliefs regarding children, it disseminates the requirements of the Narrative through the global biopolitical security apparatuses of humanitarian intervention, such as NGOs, international laws, world courts, etc., designed to protect children and ensure that their individual rights and their rights as children are recognized within the Narrative.

5.2 Humanitarian Agency

Humanitarian agencies are not without ideologies in their dealings with other countries and their peoples, and humanitarian efforts have not always been appropriate or successful in achieving their aims. Part of the blame for failed humanitarian efforts has always been placed on the recipients of aid as well as on the implementing agency, but it is hard to place the failings of humanitarian interventions on a child. And one can hardly expect that ideological change will happen smoothly and just the way one wants it to because one has the force of arms, money, or ideology behind one. Ostensibly, humanitarian interventions are designed solely to alleviate suffering, but alleviating suffering is not as simple as it would appear. The refugee camps in Burundi (which included children among their numbers) after the Rwandan massacre are a prime example of this. The perpetrators, as well as the victims, of the atrocities were sheltered in the camps and nothing was done to them even when they began killing again. In fact, at one point, in *We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed with Our Families: Stories from Rwanda* Philip Gourevitch states that the aid workers actually began to sympathize with those responsible for the killings and began to mediate the severity of their actions. In this same vein, de Waal in *Famine Crimes: Politics & the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa* states that “relief agencies have a powerful tendency to go much further [than] “succoring the poor and vulnerable, protecting human rights, preventing war, etc.” and “conflate their own interests with those of the people they avow to help” (66), which in the case of children should be one and the same. This problem was particularly evident in Somalia when the “relief agencies took liberties with the truth in their description of the situation. Figures for aid looting were exaggerated, the port was declared closed when careful negotiation would have readily reopened it and figures for those likely to die from starvation were hyped, just as death rates due to famine were tapering off” (de

Waal “Wrong”). Not only did the relief agencies hype the situation in Somalia in order to provoke governments to military action where it was not necessarily needed, but they also downplayed the situation in Rwanda which prevented military action where it was desperately needed. As a result, the international community made a mess of Somalia and dismally failed to guard the human rights of the Tutsi adults and their children. The actions of Hutu Power should have been an unquestioned example of the moral obligation of the international community to react to human rights violations. But the international community did not respond to the call of its moral obligations, so the genocide proceeded unchecked by the international community because it was mired in questions of international law and state sovereignty. The international community, including humanitarian relief agencies, should, both individually and collectively, “accept not only a moral responsibility to protect the security of their own citizens, but also the wider one of ‘guardianship of human rights everywhere’” (Wheeler 12), including the rights of children, and should also accept the responsibility of representing the need for intervention as accurately as possible. In the above cases, the ideologies of humanitarian organizations overshadowed the needs of the children resulting in a psychotic move within the humanitarian organizations themselves.

In addition to conflating their own interests with those they are supposed to help, humanitarian relief agencies also, as shown in Paul Farmer’s *Pathologies of Power*, tend to bring their social, political, and cultural beliefs to the intervention regardless of whether those beliefs will be effective or not, and this is the core of both the trouble with humanitarian interventions and the purpose of the Narrative. The Narrative of the Child is effective in humanitarian interventions only if the right choice is made by humanitarian agencies on behalf of the Global Child. But when beliefs are not in accord with the Narrative, the best efforts of intervention can go awry.

Farmer's experiences in Guatemala are an example of this. He recounts an incident in which a group of Guatemalans were attending a workshop where they "were being asked to respond to an agenda imported from capital cities, from do-gooder organizations...[and] from U.S. universities with the 'right' answers to their every question" (Farmer 4), yet they could not respond because they were in an aporetic moment when theory and practice collide. This is only one example of the need for a "change in the mentality", not of the local peoples affected by humanitarian emergencies, but "in the hearts and minds of those with power—and [in Farmer's example] they were not here in [Chiapas] but in Guatemala City and Washington D.C." (Farmer 4). This approach, Farmer maintains, and this focus of power is the wrong approach to creating a self-sustaining humanitarian policy. However, the Narrative of the Child as conceptual apparatus would override local power if the local choices were not choices that are in the best interest of the child and that is a change in mentality that will stand no dissent.

Wheeler also takes up the disconnect between intervention and its outcomes by stating that it is crucial to investigate "how far there is a contradiction between the motives and means of intervention on the one hand, and a positive humanitarian outcome on the other. In the case of the French intervention in Rwanda, the point is not that lives were saved but that *more lives could have been saved* had France selected military means that were appropriate to its humanitarian claims" (239). When the French did launch Operation Turquoise late in the conflict in Rwanda, this particular "guardian of human rights and moral obligations" was "cloaking self-interest in the guise of humanitarianism" (Wheeler 232). The citizens of Rwanda, namely the Tutsis and the Hutu sympathizers, were not able to "experience *the fair value of their rights* and the reciprocal recognition of different cultural forms of life" (Habermas, *Inclusion* 118-119) because they were being systematically and brutally killed while the rest of the world looked on. The main difficulty

with the French action in Rwanda was that the French selected military means inappropriate to its humanitarian claims, because “the non-humanitarian motives behind the French intervention led to means being employed that conflicted with its humanitarian purposes” (Wheeler 239) and any motives that result in the deaths of children are, again, psychotic moves against the Narrative of the Child.

The fact that the motives behind humanitarian intervention are not always humanitarian is a serious concern in regard to humanitarian interventions, especially when they involve children. As Wheeler says, if the self-interest of governments promotes humanitarian outcomes, then there is no problem with nations serving their own interests while addressing gross humanitarian violations, but this idea, if put to the test, would seem to be fraught with troubles especially within international negotiations regarding the use of humanitarian force. Wheeler uses former Prime Minister Blair’s Chicago speech as a classic example of the voicing of this balance. Blair defends state actions as being able to be both humanitarian and self-serving: “our actions are guided by a...subtle blend of mutual self-interest and moral purpose in defending the values we cherish...[our] values and interests merge” (267) for the benefit of all. And Alex de Waal challenges Blair’s assertions by stating that “the West’s conception of humanitarian intervention is so ideologically biased that the ‘silent genocide’ of death through poverty and malnutrition is rendered natural and inevitable” (de Waal “Wrong”) and paradoxical within the Narrative. The Narrative supports de Waal’s critique of the silent genocide and further identifies it as the inevitable result of the freedom to make the wrong choice. As the natural and inevitable silent genocide apparently does not meet Blair’s requirement of the “subtle blend of mutual self-interest and moral purpose,” no intervention is required, but as children are always a part of these issues within the State, the “moral purpose” to intervene is always present, and if humanitarian force is

necessary to protect a child, it falls within the Narrative. If self-interest overrides a moral obligation and an ideological construct blinds states to human rights violations, and state sovereignty precludes negotiations, then it would appear as if humanitarian intervention will be a rare occurrence indeed, and the Global Child will suffer for it. Add to the mix Nicholas Wheeler's comments that "changing norms provide actors with new public legitimating reasons to justify actions, but...do not determine that an action will take place" (9) indicating that the current government of a nation determines whether or not to intervene in humanitarian emergencies based on the nation's current political climate. If determining whether or not an event is a humanitarian rights violation is dependent on current political climate, international negotiation, and relief agency representation, and if, as former President Clinton said, "each bloodletting hastens the next, and...the value of human life is degraded and violence becomes tolerated, [and] the unimaginable becomes more conceivable" then the "endangered peoples who depend on the international community for physical protection stand defenseless"(Gourevitch 350), and the most defenseless of the endangered peoples are the children. But humanitarian organizations assert that they are in a particular country to protect the defenseless and that they are not tied to a particular political agenda and that their purpose is freedom. However, the humanitarian efforts in regard to children are the result of pure pathos; they are not implemented solely on altruistic terms, for the ideologies of the NGOs are always functioning within the organization either overtly or below the surface. This can be seen in regard to American humanitarian organizations, as their efforts are strongly influenced by the Narrative and apply the American beliefs of the Known Child, sentimentalization, education, safety, and sacralization, to the Global Child.

5.3 Global Narrative

The construction of the Narrative as it occurred in the United States is being replicated in the workings of not-for-profit organizations (NPOs) worldwide as child labor is becoming unfashionable and the image of the child as worker is being replaced with the image of the child as economically useless, or as the International Labor Organization (ILO) terms them “economically inactive”; in education with the building of schools and training of teachers to replace the illiterate child with the educated child; and in regard to child safety as the indoctrination of child soldiers and the selling of children is being replaced by the saving of the Global Child. As the issues that confronted nineteenth century Americans were dealt with on American soil, so the Narrative would have the same issues dealt with on a global level activating the imagined community of the kinship grouping of the Known Child to provide the necessary ideological framework to enact the sentimentalization and sacralization of the Global Child. The efforts of the Narrative are not functioning alone ideologically in the domestic sphere of the state and forcing itself on the world because it has allies in other countries, such as Britain and Australia, and in organizations such as UNICEF, Save the Children, Doctors without Borders, and the United Nations. These entities are focused on providing food, health services, safe places for children to play, and opportunities for them to learn as much as they can to better themselves and their families. All of which are commonplaces within the Narrative. This support within the Global community for the Narrative can be seen in global initiatives going back to 1924 when the League of Nations adopted the Geneva Declaration on the Rights of the Child, in the 1959 UN General Assembly adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, in the 1989 UN General Assembly approval of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and by the UN General Assembly’s 2000 adoption of the two Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

In addition to using the terms and articles of the Conventions, humanitarian agencies spearhead their efforts and their funding drives by activating pathos. As I mentioned earlier, the issues they discuss as important appear in their literature as direct appeals to pathos through the Narrative. UNICEF mails appeals for donations several times a year, and their letters contain statements such as that by Caryl M. Stern, president and CEO of UNICEF who in visiting Haiti in the aftermath of the earthquake activates the Known child by using herself to activate pathos in the reader: “As a mother myself, I was in awe of their [Haitian mothers] strength and resiliency. I don’t know how I would face the challenge of being a new mom while struggling against enormous hardship to survive,” and she voices the importance of children found in the Narrative in the next paragraph when she says “But the mothers didn’t feel angry or helpless [in the midst of devastation], because they have hope. They see their babies as a promise—of possibilities for a future in Haiti that is better than what exists now” (May 7, 2010 UNICEF appeals letter). The children are the future and what is done now is important not only for Haiti, but for the world. Stern’s statement activates a global biopolitical responsibility of the world for its children. UNICEF is a family focused manifestation of the narrative, but it does not expect to be alone in its mission because in the letter it says “With your support, schools will be rebuilt and re-stocked with books, paper, pencils. Hospitals will be restored and supplied with medicines and medical equipment. And water systems will be reconstructed so families will have clean water for drinking, cooking, and sanitation... That’s why your support is so important. Your gift today to the U.S. Fund for UNICEF... supports UNICEF’S efforts that save children’s lives and give them a chance for tomorrow” (May 7, 2010 appeals letter). This appeal is the most recent in a long line of UNICEF appeals I have received in the mail. The activation of pathos and the claim that UNICEF needs *me* to help them solve the problems of the world’s children is always present in the

letters. Regardless of what I think about humanitarian efforts in general, the letters always maintain that it is my obligation as a world citizen to help global children, not just my own child. I am responsible for other people's children to ensure that they are safe, healthy, and educated—a manifestation of the biopolitics of the household economy and of the global biopolitical.

For its demand that countries implement programs for child-saving²¹, UNICEF relies heavily on the results of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). In 2009, the CRC marked the 20th year since it was ratified by 193 countries (the United States and Somalia not included). According to several different sources, including the American Association of Pediatricians and the Harvard Human Rights Journal, even though then-president Bill Clinton signed onto the treaty, the United States still would not ratify the CRC because of sovereignty issues, not because of child rights issues, but many of the objections to ratification are tied to concerns about parental rights²². But the United States is still soundly condemned by human rights organizations and by many Americans for not ratifying it, which is again the *choix-force* of the Narrative in action. Objections such as fears that parents will lose all rights to raise their children as they see fit in regard to religion and homeschooling, and that the United Nations' wishes will supersede American laws and the Constitution are cited as the main reasons ratification has not happened. However, "On May 25, 2000, the United Nations adopted two

21 The CRC defines a child as all individuals below age 18. This is in concord with US law which also defines childhood as below age 18.

22 In my view, the issue of non-ratification stems partly from the fact that the U.S. already has child protection laws in place which are regularly being enforced and partly from parental concerns and child rearing. Many of the issues preventing ratification revolve around the rights of parents to raise their children as they see fit in regard to religious beliefs and education. The arguments presented for not ratifying the CRC consist of parental concerns regarding the right of children to choose their religion (Article 14) and the requirement for compulsory education (Article 28). Some American parents view these articles as removing their right to raise children within the religion of the family without exposing their children to other religious beliefs and as removing their right to choose homeschooling and to exercise parental choice in regard to school curricula. In addition, some American parents are also concerned about Article 18 which appears to give the State the right to determine what is in the best interests of the child thus overriding parental decisions about what is best for the child.

optional protocols to the CRC. The first protocol called on States Parties to curb children's involvement in armed conflict. The second protocol required States Parties to prohibit the sale of children, child prostitution, and child pornography. For purposes of signing and ratification, these optional protocols are treated the same as any other U.N. treaty" and in "July 2000, President Clinton signed both protocols, and both the U.S. Senate and House adopted resolutions calling for prompt ratification of these protocols [and in 2002] the United States, under the leadership of President George W. Bush, ratified both optional protocols" (Rutkow and Lozman). The ratification of the Protocols by the United States reinforces the strength of the Narrative in global issues by condemning the abuse of children and emphasizes that the objections the United States has to the ratification of the CRC are sovereignty, federalism, reproductive and parental rights issues and individual rights issues, not child rights issues.

The tension between individual rights, States rights, and sovereign rights of the State over its citizens has long been issues in the American democracy, and anything that challenges, or appears to challenge, those rights will be hotly contested, for the United States values its independence and does not wish to return to a state of dependence on others. While the stance of maintaining independence is non-negotiable for most Americans, it is more of a perceived independence rather than an actual independence as American humanitarian, military, and market forces are globally intertwined with other States. The problem with ratifying the CRC, then, is that the perceived independence will become official dependence with other countries again determining what is right for the United States and its citizens in all the above mentioned areas including the reproductive and parental. While these objections are issues preventing the ratification of the CRC, the most problematic one for my purposes is the perception that the child will have so many rights that the parents will have no place in the child's life and that parents will

have been removed from the world of their sacred Known Child. The World will be able to intervene in the households of American parents, and children will be encouraged to reject parental nurturing and guidance for their own desires. This rejection of parental sentimentalization of the child appears to undermine the Narrative by removing the need for the Child to be sentimentalized in the first place, but it does not undermine the Narrative for the CRC explicitly states that parents are the primary source of nurture and care for children, and the Treaty will only operate when the parent makes a psychotic move within the *choix-force*, which is already the case in the United States in regard to state and federal child protection laws.

However, even though 193 nations have ratified the CRC, not all who signed have implemented the changes required by the treaty. UNICEF has a State of the World's Children section on its website that currently contains a video about the current state of the CRC, and in the video, several directors of UNICEF divisions, including Dan Seymour the Director UNICEF's Gender Rights Unit in the Division of Policy and Practice, are quite plain about their role, in "changing the way the world works" in regard to children. They are quite open about influencing the fledgling governments of States to create child friendly and child saving measures within newly formed or rewritten constitutions, in effect inserting the mechanisms of biopower into the political to serve the nation of the child. This move coupled with the treaty of the CRC formalizes the global biopolitical in regard to children. Dan Toole, Director of the South Asian Region of UNICEF, states that Nepal has absolved its monarchy and "that creates an amazing opportunity for UNICEF to change the constitution in a way that's child friendly, in a way that's child supportive, and the CRC is the basis on which we do that" (UNICEF website). Controlling the disposition of the state and its people by an entity that is outside the State, yet does not want to be in continual control of the state is biopolitics in the guise of humanitarian agency, and that is not all bad. Ann

Veneman, Executive Director of UNICEF, writes in the Forward to “The State of the World’s Children Special Edition (2009)” that

The agenda for children’s rights is far from complete. Millions of children remain without the essential services to help ensure their survival, reduce their vulnerability to disease and under-nutrition, provide access to improved water and sanitation, and enable them to obtain quality education. Many children lack the protective environment required to safeguard them from violence, abuse, exploitation, discrimination and neglect. The problem of violence against children is particularly alarming, with between 500 million and 1.5 billion children estimated to experience violence annually. Its consequences are pernicious, with many child victims experiencing long-standing physical and mental health difficulties later in life (ii).

Thus, for UNICEF, the CRC “stands as a universal standard for building a better world—a world in which the best interests of children are a primary concern for all” (ii). This is the global expansion of the Narrative relying on fact-based pathos. In this instance, as can be seen in Veneman’s statements, the facts of children neglected and exposed to violence are designed to activate the pathos of the Narrative in the individual through the emerging community of the Child. Though the CRC is not implemented entirely in any country, not even in those who have ratified it, the goal of UNICEF and other humanitarian organizations is the same: to have the “acceptance and acknowledgement that all children are born free and equal in dignity and in rights and that those rights generate a responsibility and a duty in every single other member of the

human family to acknowledge them and consider what you can do personally about them. If we could just get that acknowledgment in everybody everywhere that really is...the dream of the convention (Dan Seymour, Chief, Gender and Rights Unit, Division of Policy and Practice, UNICEF). Seymour's comments are telling in that they are embedded in the tenets of a liberal democracy when he states that everyone should acknowledge that all children are born free and equal, and when he states that children have rights, and these rights must be honored, he is activating the kinship groupings of the Known Child in calling us to act on behalf of the Global Child. We are responsible for the world's children, and the decisions we make must always be in the best interests of the child. Thus Seymour's child is Edelman's child with one basic difference. Edelman's child is the child of democracy, and Seymour's child is the child of the world, yet the statement is the same—decisions in sovereign states and in the world as a global community and as a global family of a Known Child, need to be made with children and their future and the future of the world kept firmly in mind.

As a result of this belief, the issue of the rights of the child is a conceptual apparatus for humanitarian organizations, and Elizabeth Wolgast's arguments in *The Grammar of Justice* that children have no rights are a psychotic move within the ideologies of these organizations and within the Narrative. The Narrative of the Child applauds the granting that children have rights and the necessity of the considering those rights when decisions are made about and for children, and the historical course of the global version of the Narrative proves that the Narrative has been present shaping and controlling the form of global response to children in danger and in need. While the Narrative would demand punishment for the mistreatment of a child, it does not abrogate the rights of the child because of the dependent nature of the child, but invokes pure pathos as the catalyst for the obligation parents have to care for their children. Wolgast would

agree that parental obligation to care for children is absolute, and if the parents do not fulfill that obligation, the State must interfere, yet at the same moment she asserts that children as children do not have rights because rights are a type of contractual agreement the terms of which require that both parties be independent, equal, and able to uphold, to their mutual benefit, the terms of the contract. This type of rights regime alienates and fissures the body politic and the community of the Global Child because individual rights are more important than communal rights. While she does not argue that children's rights are not beneficial to both parties, she does argue that children cannot have rights in this sense because they cannot agree to the terms of the contract nor can they enforce the terms of the contract should it be violated because "the child doesn't enter into its relationship with its parents voluntarily and isn't independent or a peer in relation to its parents" (37). She asserts that children are put in the position of demanding rights from those "on whom they depend" (37), yet are not in a developmental or social position to exercise them. Therefore, according to Wolgast, children cannot have rights in and of themselves, but only in relation to their caregivers who should be giving good parental care. If the children are not the beneficiaries of good and proper care, "we should speak to the wrongdoers here, we need to restrain and admonish them, teach or punish them, remind them of the value and seriousness of parental roles, of the trust put in them by children on the one side and by society on the other" (38), which is what States and Nations are already doing. Wolgast's statement functions as a commonplace in the United States, that forms part of the Narrative but it is coupled with a firm belief in children having rights of their own regardless of whether they, themselves, demand those rights or whether those rights are demanded on their behalf. This issue, she maintains, is important to the community because it "has a profound interest here, not least because of its connection with the stature of its future citizens. Making the child and parent adversaries, encouraging the one to claim its rights against

another, is hardly a good way to pursue this interest” (38). So, in effect, my view is that Wolgast’s argument is not an argument against children’s rights, but a refocusing of the essence of rights in regard to children and a critique of the atomizing of those rights in the world of children. Instead of realizing justice through the body politic or through the biopolitical, recognizing rights as a contractual agreement divides the State and involves humanitarian intervention in a contractual dispute over what rights children do and do not have and over who is in the position to enforce the contract of those rights. Within this framework, Wolgast would see the CRC as a contractual rights document that allows humanitarian organizations and a disciplinary body of world nations to enforce the contract on behalf of the children and not as an instrument that allows the global biopolitical to emerge in regard to children.

5.4 Global Education

The Convention on the Rights of the Child contains four core principles, one of which is the right to life, survival, and development. The life and survival issues are tied to primary care health issues and are covered by the World Health Organization, but the last part of the principle, development, is tied to education, which “has become a cornerstone of child development, with lifelong benefits for individuals and families” (UNICEF, Celebrating 9). This lifelong benefit for the individual and family is reminiscent of Sen’s development as freedom and of the statement “If you educate a man, you educate an individual; if you educate a woman, you educate a family” (attributed to both Dr. James Emmanuel Kwegyir-Aggrey and Robert Maciver) which was reflected in nineteenth century American beliefs as well. Though the family structure has changed in the United States and around the world, women are still the primary caregivers for young children, and girls are undereducated around the world. So, no matter how offensive one

may find this statement, there is an element of truth in it. Women and girls need to be educated, and they will pass on that education to their young children. Just as in the United States in the nineteenth century, the global focus of education today is shifting to a focus on girls. Though education is still needed and essential for boys, girls are less likely to receive an education than are boys in many countries. “In 2007, of the estimated 101 million children of appropriate age not attending primary school, the majority were[sic] girls” (UNICEF, Celebrating 18). And UNESCO confirms the assertion that of all out-of-school children in developing countries, 57% are girls, and “over 70 countries are at risk of not achieving the Education for All goal of gender parity by 2005, and some will not even meet this goal by 2015” (UNESCO 2010). This disparity is exactly the one that Sen addressed in *Development as Freedom*. Freedom is possible through parity in education, and the state owes its citizens, especially its underrepresented populations, access to schooling. “The connection between a parent’s education and the academic success of their children has been documented time and again,” said Helen MacDermott, Content Director for eLearners.com. “Although a mother’s education does not dictate the love she can give her children, it may impact her ability to assist with academic development, as well as role-model the importance of school” (PR Newswire, May 28, 2010). This finding is further confirmed by other sources, such as YuYu Chen and Hongbin Li from Beijing University who “examine the effect of maternal education on the health of young children by using a large sample of adopted children from China” (IDEAS, University of Connecticut, Department of Economics). Their assertion is that “adopted children are genetically unrelated to the nurturing parents [; therefore], the educational effect on them is most likely to be the nurturing effect.” The results of the study show that “the mother's education is an important determinant of the health of adopted children even after [they] control for income, the number of siblings, health environments, and other

socioeconomic variables. Moreover, the effect of the mother's education on the adoptee sample is similar to that of the sample containing mothers who kept their children, which suggests that the main effect of the mother's education on child health is in post-natal nurturing” (IDEAS, University of Connecticut, Department of Economics). By studying the mother-child relationship, especially the adoptive relationship, researchers have activated pathos for the Global Child and highlight the importance of education as part of the global biopolitical.

In addition to the Beijing Study, Save the Children’s State of the World’s Mothers 2010 report on how trained female health workers aid in reducing infant mortality confirms that “increased investments in girls’ education are essential...to empower future mothers to be stronger and wiser advocates for their own health and the health of their children. Educated girls tend to marry later and have fewer, healthier and better-nourished children. Mothers with little or no education are much less likely to receive skilled support during pregnancy and childbirth, and both they and their babies are at higher risk of death.” Creating the topos of investing in women in developing countries is part of the educational package necessary to make child saving a global conceptual apparatus.

One NPO/NGO that is working to ensure education for all is Pennies from Heaven, a NPO started by Greg Mortenson in 1993 to build schools in Pakistan and Afghanistan—schools for boys and for girls. He is the author of the popular book *Three Cups of Tea* based on his experiences in Pakistan²³. Mortenson’s quest began with a wrong turn coming down K2, a mountain in the Himalayas, and ended up in a remote Pakistani village. As the villagers helped him and nursed him back to health, he noticed that

23 The title of the book comes from Haji Ali, the village chief of Korphe and Mortenson’s mentor. He told Mortenson “here we say, take the time to have three cups of tea, the first cup you’re a stranger, the second cup you’re a friend, the third cup, you’re family” (Stone).

the village had no school; the children met outdoors on a patch of bare ground, even in the frosts of autumn. A part-time teacher shared with a distant village came only three days a week, but the kids — 78 boys and four girls — still gathered every day to study. A few had slates they wrote on with mud-tipped twigs, but most scratched their lessons in the dirt with sticks. No books, no pencils, no paper, no roof — just a fierce desire to learn. ‘I promised I’d build them a school,’ Mortenson says, ‘and fulfilling that promise led me to my life’s work.’ The Korphe school opened in the summer of 1997... In the village of Chunda, Pakistan, it took us eight years and thousands of cups of tea to convince the religious leader to allow one girl to go to school, he says. When the Chunda Girls’ School opened in 2007, there were 74 girls enrolled — and now there are almost 300 (Stone).

Education for all, but especially for girls, is the Narrative invoking the commonplace that educated children are necessary for communal and State survival. And the third cup of tea that bestows family status and evokes pathos turns the Global Child into the Known Child.

Nowhere is the commonplace of the necessity of educating a child stronger than in the NPO called Free the Children. Free the Children, founded by Craig Kielburger when he was twelve, states its mission is “to free children from poverty and exploitation and free young people from the notion that they are powerless to affect positive change in the world. Through domestic empowerment programs and leadership training, Free The Children inspires young people to develop as socially conscious global citizens and become agents of change for their peers around

the world” (FTC site). Here the children are not only the future, they are the present. According to Free the Children’s annual report, the largest number of donors to Free the Children is the children themselves with youths contributing almost 60% of their funding, with the rest of the funding coming from corporations, foundations, adults and the government in that order. Their motto “children helping children through education” is the fulfillment of the Narrative in its truest form. The sacred, sentimentalized, economically useless child has found its voice in helping other children to achieve their dreams and their potential on an adult scale. At least in this one spot, children do have the voice that the Convention on the Rights of the Child decrees they should have. The economy of the child as humanitarian and controller of him/herself is a new twist in the biopolitical as children are in control of other children in terms of helping them to be in control of themselves.

In addition to Pennies from Heaven, Save the Children, Free the Children, UNICEF and UNESCO is Oprah Winfrey and her Leadership Academy. Winfrey states that “education is the path to the future. I believe that education is indeed freedom. With God’s help, these girls will be the future leaders on the path to peace in South Africa and the world” (Leadership Academy). Winfrey voices the Narrative in her declaration regarding children and education and has enacted it by building the Leadership Academy for girls in South Africa. Her Academy is significant to the Narrative not just because it embodies the need to educate the child, but because of the turmoil of allegations of sexual abuse surrounding it. According to Sebastien Berger of *The London Telegraph* Winfrey’s Leadership Academy, which opened in 2007, was

was supposed to be the fulfilment [sic] of a dream, a school where the brightest, poorest girls of the ‘rainbow nation’ would receive the best education money could buy... But

instead reports of harsh discipline soon emerged, and...a dormitory matron at the facility, Tiny Makopo, appeared in court facing 13 charges including indecent assault and inducing underage girls to perform indecent acts...‘Those 15 girls bonded together and acted because they felt their voices had not been heard by adults,’ said Winfrey...‘A horrible situation has been uncovered and rooted out. They represent a new generation of youth in South Africa. This is what leadership is all about.’

Her Academy is the paradox of the Narrative – child saving measures coupled with child hurting aspects – the theory versus practice. In Winfrey’s academy, the forced choice of freedom is safe education for girls, and the abuse allegations are a psychotic move within the Narrative and within the *choix-force*. According to Winfrey, the allegations, later proved true, have “shaken me to my core”, and she added that when she “told [the girls] the dorm matrons had been removed, the girls cheered and wept, they were so happy”, and she urged the girls “to take [their] voices back.” In addition she stated that she was “prepared to do whatever is necessary to make sure that the Oprah Winfrey Leadership Academy for Girls becomes a safe and nurturing and enriched setting...a place capable of fostering a full measure of these girls’ productivity, creativity and of their humanity” (Perry). This episode not only undermines the Academy’s commitment to education, but also its commitment to child safety. By exhibiting a pathos-based reaction to the harming of Known Children, Winfrey and her academy chose correctly in regard to the Narrative and the *choix-force*, and have upheld the Narrative and the importance of the sacred child. But others have not.

5.5 Safety and the Global Child

Cheap labor. Obedient Soldier. Child Bride. These terms, used in UNICEF's video on the CRC, highlight the dangers still present for children around the world. Though the CRC has seen progress in changing conditions for children, the psychotic move of the *choix-force* is alive and well in developing countries, and issues of child pornography and abuse are still points of tension within developed countries. The goal of the CRC and humanitarian organizations is to move those outside the Narrative inside the Narrative through judicial and global punishment. The CRC protocols are designed to do just that by making it globally illegal to traffic in children for any purpose, such as slavery or pornography or to conscript children into armed conflict. Those egregious crimes against children are coupled with health concerns to make the safety of the Global Child of paramount importance. Again, though many countries have signed onto and ratified the protocols, the commonplace of child safety taken to such extreme measures in the United States still has a long way to go in many other countries.

In the United States, the concern over child safety is such a strong trope that not only have serious articles been written about the danger of childhood toys and products, and not just about lead paint, but parodies of America's commonplace regarding its preoccupation with child safety have been written as well. While the Strong National Museum of Play in Rochester, New York, in 2008 inducted a stick, quite possibly the world's oldest toy, into the toy hall of fame, the *Onion*'s February 20, 2007, article facetiously recommended that parents go around their yards marking all sticks with a note that says "this is not a sword" to inhibit imagination and play. And the *Onion* has not stopped with just American children; it has also printed an article that parodies making the world safe for the Global Child as well. On September 18, 1996, *The Onion* reported

“Under heavy pressure from safety-conscious parent groups around the world, the U.N. General Assembly approved a plan yesterday to make the earth child-safe by the year 2000. Renamed the Sportin’ Kids Family Fun Play Globe, the planet will be biologically and topographically overhauled to provide youngsters worldwide with a safe, unimposing, family-oriented environment full of colorful, round-edged objects and plush items. ‘This,’ said U.N. spokesperson Mayta Ghalili, ‘is the start of a newer, softer planet.’ The U.N. resolution was the result of thousands of phone calls from worried parents concerned about child safety hazards lurking in the earth’s widely varying terrain and ecosystems” (*Onion*). When taken to extremes as in helicopter parents and their concerns about child safety, the Narrative as trope and as conceptual apparatus is recognized by society and is parodied. And we laugh. The knowledge that the conceptual apparatus that is the Narrative has been taken too far in regard to the safety and protection of children is what is fueling the reforms in parenting that I mentioned above. If parents parent too much it could leave some of our children without the skills they need to be an independent citizen and adult, and this puts the State in danger, or so goes the counter-topos, yet many of the world’s Global Children could do with a bit of over-parenting.

While the sacralization and sentimentalization of children has been taken too far in some developed countries, the lack of security and safety is all too apparent in other countries as the incidence of child soldiers and workers and child abuse remains an issue for humanitarian groups and for the governments of the Global Child. Child soldiers are in a heinous position, but do not activate pathos in the same manner as the child laborer or the child bride.

The ideas of employment and marriage are ones that people in the United States can relate to for themselves as adults, though not for their young children. And while they find the thought

of the child laborer and the child bride²⁴ untenable, the idea of one's children as child soldiers is inconceivable. The idea of the child soldier is different because the memory of today's American parents does not include the experience of military conflict on US soil. And for those who do have memories of war, the memories are of conflicts on foreign soil and do not involve the American National or Known Child, but do involve the Global Child. And the image of children killing anyone or perpetrating any kind of violence is a psychotic move and tends to be blocked rather than acknowledged emotionally. The move that the humanitarian organizations needed to make and have made is to use *enargia*²⁵ to put child soldiers within the category of the Known Child and to tie this child as closely as possible to the Known Children of the groups they are trying to reach for funding. In order to activate pathos in their audiences, humanitarian agencies and the American news media have used the pictures of small children with guns and teddy bears or toddler type backpacks to more firmly connect the Known and the Global Child.

While active recruitment of child soldiers is supposedly on the wane, children who are raised in violent and/or war torn areas are nurtured in the violence and the hate. Take for example, the picture of the young boy (4 or 5 years old) on the cover of the January 22, 2007, *Newsweek* which shows the boy holding "a weapon in a Baghdad protest December 2006." The article in *Newsweek* reports that living with violence day after day takes a toll on children emotionally and psychologically. The danger is so great for children in Baghdad that "only 30 percent of the 3.5 million Iraqi elementary-age kids are attending school now, down from 75 percent last year [2006]" (31), and "sectarian warfare is reshaping Iraq in all sorts of malevolent

24 Today, the idea of the child bride is a psychotic move within the *choix-force*, for the legal age to marry is 18 in all states but two. Nebraska requires people to be 19, and Mississippi allows males to marry at age 17 and females at 15 (Cornell), but even as late as the 1920s, some states raised the legal age of marriage to 14 with most states using 16-18 as the legal age (Bullough).

25 *Enargia* is the use of vivid description to bring something to life right in front of you though you are not actually present at the event or occurrence.

ways day in and day out. But it is also forging the future by poisoning the next generation of Iraqis...nearly half the population is under the age of 18” (26), and the future is theirs to shape as they see fit – in avenging family deaths or in rejecting the violence they see around them. Tahka, an Iraqi child who saw his father murdered in front of him, states that he does not want revenge: “I don’t want to become like them [the murderers]. They are men without religion (34), [and he will not act in violence, but as the article continues] he is only one of many children, and other [children] like Ammar, whose neighbor and fellow Sunni disappeared at a Mahdi checkpoint and whose beheaded body reappeared much later at the mosque for burial, are not so resolved [against violence]. Upon recognizing the body of his neighbor, Ammar says he ‘ran into the garden and threw up...and then he vowed revenge’” (26). Ammar, 17, and Thaka, 14, are reacting to the violence as children on the verge of adulthood, but evoking pathos for the teen child is more difficult than for a younger child. The younger child is seen as defenseless and more dependent on the family, and the report in the January 11, 2007, *Wall Street Journal* by Philip Shishkin and Jafar Juhi emphasizes this and brings home the Known Child. They are reporting from Baghdad and begin their report as a news report, but one with a twist designed to evoke pathos. They write, “a year ago, a young gunman walked into Ali Hussein’s living room and drew a weapon. The intruder’s head was wrapped in a scarf, leaving a narrow slit for his eyes. His clothes were all black, the favorite attire of a powerful Shiite Muslim militia. He introduced himself as a commander, shouted the incantation ‘God is greater’ and warned Sunni Muslims not to fight back. With that he raised his plastic pistol.” The gunman, Hassoni Ali Hussein, was only four years old at the time of this incident of unstructured play, and while many Americans would be horrified at this type of play, his father was “happy to see him this way because it means he has courage” (Shishkin).

The story of Hassoni continues with escalating violence on his part. A year later, when he is five, Hassoni and his friends are playing Shiites against the Sunnis, and he is representative of other children in his slum neighborhood. His fascination with weaponry and war is heightened by the presence of real soldiers nearby and his involvement with them—running errands for them, bringing them food and drink, and listening to their war stories. His own “arsenal of toy guns has grown from one plastic pistol to include two AK-47 models and a sniper rifle with a scope, now his favorite weapon. Mr. Hussein [his father] gave him the rifle as a gift...Hassoni was so excited, his father says, that he paid no attention to a toy train and a toy piano given to him by his mother and aunt. The black life-size rifle looks completely real” (Shishkin). In the United States, boys having guns to play with, even real looking guns or BB guns, is not unusual, and many boys play the same games as Hassoni but with different names, cops and robbers, cowboys and indians, soldiers and aliens, etc., but the difference is the proximity to real violence and real soldiers in war mode. According to Shiskin and Juhi, “the line between the game and real life has grown increasingly blurry. In late November, suspected Sunni insurgents detonated five car bombs inside Sadr City, killing 240 Shiite civilians...The blasts occurred just over a mile from Mr. Hussein’s house”, and the family saw the smoke and heard the reports of the incident. This attack precipitated an attack by Hassoni on an unknown boy on his street. Hassoni stated “I heard the Mahdi Army saying that if you see strangers, ask them where they come from and what they are doing here...And that kid was not from our area’. When the boy tried to run away, Hassoni and his friends caught him and beat him up. Later, it turned out that the boy and his parents, all Shiites, were visiting relatives on Hassoni’s street” (Shiskin). These articles on Iraqi children make the child of conflict the Known Child and mentioning that Hassoni prefers guns to a toy train or toy piano allows parents to connect him with their children and to see the train as their child’s

brightly colored toy train of an unmarred childhood against the violence of the dark sniper rifle.

The violence from a five year old, from a child convinced that he needs to protect his area, from a child who sees or hears about nearby violence everyday is a psychotic move of the *choix-force* within the Narrative of the Child. And people respond to that.

The organization Human Rights Watch reports that “In 2000, children were being used or had been used recently as soldiers in an estimated 36 armed conflicts, according to the Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers. A new report issued Friday by the UN secretary-general, found that child soldiers are actively participating in armed conflict in only 16 countries. While the decline is in part due to a smaller number of conflicts, it also reflects a change in laws and practices. Some countries have demobilized children from their armed forces, adopted national legislation to raise the minimum age for voluntary recruitment, or changed policies to prohibit the deployment of children into hostilities” (HRW May 24, 2010). However, the total number of estimated children in armed conflicts has not decreased according to humanitarian groups.

According to a 2009 article by Jane Morse titled “Youth Worldwide Join in Call to Stop Use of Child Soldiers”, the estimated number of child soldiers in the world is set at 250,000-300,000.

This number is interesting because an Associated Press Article in the *Chicago Tribune* estimated the same number of child soldiers in 2007, and Human Rights Watch estimated the same number in 2000, so even though the CRC protocols were signed and ratified and the Paris Commitments in 2007 were approved by nearly 60 countries (AP Paris), the number of children in armed conflicts has not decreased. This is an issue that is repeated over and over on humanitarian websites and in humanitarian literature—the fact that despite signing and ratifying the CRC, many countries are not enforcing the measures demanded by the CRC. For some countries, like the Ivory Coast, the failed coup of 2002, which sparked a civil war, has made eliminating child soldiers difficult as the

government only controls the southern part of the country even though the country is one of seven that have been under a UN Security council resolution since 2003 that specifically requires the country to immediately halt the recruiting of children in armed conflict (United Nations). Because child soldiers are such a disturbing issue for many countries and for humanitarian groups, “participants at the conference also drafted another text—a guideline that gives governments, aid groups and educators concrete recommendations on how best to prevent the recruitment of children and reintegrate former child soldiers into society...The document urges caregivers to try to rekindle former fighters’ family bonds and offer a wide range of educational and vocational training, from literacy classes to apprenticeships” (AP Paris). However, the problem with this approach is that some former soldiers had no families to return to since they had been killed in the conflicts or were killed by the armies that took the children to serve them or fight with them, or for some, “in communities where the former child soldiers are going through rehabilitation there’s a lot of resentment, because people think it’s unfair these kids are being rewarded for killing and destroying property while their children get nothing” (AP Paris); yet the children who “got nothing” received everything in the eyes of the Narrative and of the world, for they remained with their families and were not forced into acts of violence against those they knew, did not know, and even against those they loved.

A different, yet possibly more pervasive, issue of safety for children is that of the child laborer, which includes the child soldier. The humanitarian organization EarthACTION activates pathos for its plea for funding by directly addressing its audience for its publication and by putting them in the position of the child: “You are six. You watch your brothers go off to school every day, but because you are a girl you must stay home. You are nine. Your parents send you to do exhausting work, not to school, because your family needs the money you’ll earn.” This pathos

activating passage from an EarthACTION Action Alert is significant because it states the main reason children work in the world is because families cannot live without their children's income. This is the same reason that nineteenth century American working class families had for having their children work—if the entire family did not work, the family could not survive. Child laborers suffer the same lack of education as many other groups of children and are required to complete their tasks quickly, efficiently, and correctly, and they, too, are taken from their families: some by force and some are sold by families because of extreme poverty. The estimated number of child laborers worldwide ranges from 150 million to 246 million depending on the source of the information. This discrepancy is due to the difficulty in locating all child laborers especially those under 10, but the ILO's latest estimate, which was in 2006, is that 218 million children between the ages of 5-17 are engaged in work. The ILO divides child labor into the following categories: agriculture, armed conflict, commercial sexual exploitation, domestic labor, and mining and quarrying, and estimates that of the 218 million children working in these areas, 126 million are engaged in hazardous work. As a result of earlier estimates regarding child laborers, in 1999 the ILO passed a Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention aimed at eliminating the use of child laborers in hazardous conditions. Article three of the Convention defines the worst forms of child labor that the convention is addressing:

all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labour, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict; the use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography or for pornographic performances;

and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties; work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.

In 2006, the ILO published numbers indicating that since the passage of Convention 182, the number of child workers fell 11 percent overall and fell 26 percent in hazardous jobs, but there is concern that the current economic conditions around the world have begun to erode those gains.

The solution that every humanitarian organization presents to eradicate child labor (as defined in Article 3) involves education and an acknowledgement of children's rights and children's needs. As in nineteenth century America, the idea of education has taken hold as the way to freedom and as a way to obtain those rights and needs to create a better life now and in the future. Development as freedom is alive and well in these organizations, and one aspect of development they find essential is the education of girls. Again in its You Are A Child packet, EarthACTION activates pathos on behalf of education for girls in their background flyer titled "Girls' Education." They write "13-year old Jasmine, from Bangladesh, dreams about becoming a doctor. But she will be forced to leave school because tuition is no longer free in her country. She knows that her father will invest his meager earnings to help her brother continue his education. And Jasmine knows that her father is likely to soon marry her off because leaving school, she will have little else to do. But Jasmine is luckier than many. Over 60 million girls worldwide have never been inside a school room." EarthAction and other organizations like UNICEF take the Convention on the Rights of the Child seriously and are committed to the enforcement of all articles, but especially of Article 28, which requires "governments to 'make

primary education compulsory and available to all” in part to prevent the continuation of practices such as the child bride.

The most common image of the child bride for Americans can be seen in the headline of the December 12, 2004, *Chicago Tribune* special report on child marriages titled “The Bride Was 7: In the heart of Ethiopia, child marriage takes a brutal toll.” The article emphasizes that in this case and many others, the child bride is truly a child in everyone’s eyes and not a teenager a year or so under the age of consent. The authors of the special report activate pathos and emphasize the image of the child bride by recounting the story of a particular child, an average little girl who could be a girl one knows, in effect, by making the child bride a Known Child. The story is of Tihun, a 7 year old Ethiopian girl who is to be married. She “doesn’t want to marry. She is adamant about this. But in her village nobody heeds the opinions of headstrong little girls... ‘I will have to run.’ But this is childish bluster. Tihun’s short legs can’t carry her away fast enough from the death of her childhood. Her wedding is five days away. And she is 7 years old.” The practice of child marriage is “one of the underlying sources” for “childhood AIDS in Africa, female genital mutilation, and child labor” and “remains largely ignored” (Salopek) because marriage is viewed positively overall by most cultures and because the children suffer in silence. According to Micol Zarb, a spokeswoman for the UN Population Fund (UNFPA), “all the misery and pain is occurring in silence. These are just kids. They don’t speak out. We never hear from them” (Salopek). UNFPA estimates that at least 49 countries “roughly a quarter of all nations face a significant child bride problem—that is, at least 15 percent of their girls marry younger than age 18, the widely recognized threshold of adulthood.” And the solution to the problem? Education again. Education is considered “the single most important key to unlocking the prison of child marriage. Essential for enhancing a girl’s income potential—and for broadening her

horizons—schoolwork also gives her body time to mature before the rigors of childbirth” (Salopek). Waiting to marry and waiting to work are best for children, according to the humanitarian organizations, and are a part of the Narrative of the Child, for the child is the future adult, not the current adult. And in order for the child to be the best adult possible, the child must have the time to be a child and nothing else.

5.6 Conclusion

Locke’s fourth proposition in his “Idea for a Universal History” states that “the means which nature employs to bring about the development of innate capacities is that of antagonism within society, in so far as this antagonism becomes in the long run the cause of a law-governed social order” (44) and a law-governed social order would seem to be a desirable outcome for such a state. In further explaining his proposition, he says that men also have a “great tendency to *live in society*, to isolate” (44) themselves from each other as part of the formation of a society, but a society based on antagonism and isolation is a nation in trouble. If this is the state of nature and by extension the nature of people in it, then this antagonism in a society must end up being reflected in the way the eventual State will treat its children. For if they, too, are not antagonistic then they will not survive as adults. Yet, within the conceptual apparatus of the Narrative of the Child, there is something fundamentally wrong with children being antagonistic from the beginning. Child soldiers are a clear example of this, for adults within the Narrative find the idea of a child being truly antagonistic to the point of violence to be inconceivable.

One way that States attempt to mitigate antagonism involving children is for children in a State to be in the position of being subject to the laws of the State, and often the object of the laws, while at the same time being isolated from the State and so not entirely subject to its laws. This is

an interesting situation for the future adult citizen of the state to find him/herself in as the deliberate isolation of children is designed to protect them from antagonisms of society, but the antagonisms of society often encroach on the world of the child as can be seen by the instances of child endangerment present even in times of peace within a State. By utilizing the Narrative of the Child to put in place the security mechanisms necessary for the biopolitical to protect and care for children, Locke's fourth proposition and the antagonisms it entails in forming a society are negated with the implementation of a global biopolitical for children.

The firm belief of Americans and humanitarian organizations that childhood is a time of exploration, imagination, play, safety, nurture and learning, and that children have rights as children and not solely as parties to a contractual obligation strengthens the relationship between the Known Child and the Global Child. Anything, such as child soldiers, brides or workers, that interferes with the beliefs of childhood arising from the Narrative is a psychotic move which must be rectified to ensure that the Narrative becomes a conceptual apparatus for the Global Child as well as for the American Child, and to ensure that the next step is to move the Narrative from being a conceptual apparatus within a particular State to becoming a conceptual apparatus for the world.

However, if the Narrative moves children out of the realm of law and out of the antagonisms of adults, it must have a place for them to be within the structure of the State until they are adults. The place it has chosen for them is the school. For the overarching belief for all humanitarian intervention on behalf of children is that they must have a voice, and the best voice children can have, besides the voices of enlightened adults, is their own educated voice. This educated voice hints at Wolgast's contractual rights, but is still not the atomizing rights of the contractual obligation. Educated children will have the knowledge and the voice they need to ensure that their rights are recognized, not as divisive rights, but as unifying rights. Education

and the ability to reason and assess are essential to the future of the child as an adult and to the future of the State. A lack of education results in citizens who are not able to make informed decisions about themselves and their families and leads to the continuation of practices such as child labor, child soldiers, and child brides, which are unacceptable to the Narrative for any child whether the child is a National, a Known, or a Global Child.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

6.1 Responsibility

As the Narrative of the Child moved into its place as a conceptual apparatus in the nineteenth century, the role of the parent became more important and more controlled by laws enacted to protect children and by social mores encouraging parents to sentimentalize the child. As these laws and social mores became widespread, the focus on children became intertwined with the idea of the child as the future. Children were now seen as the next generation's adults who would both change the country for the better and maintain what was good. Because of this focus on the child, education and play were now seen as essential to the development of the child. This shift of perspective included the belief that while children were young, they ought to be children and nothing else, not industrial laborers, and later on not soldiers nor child brides. Within American society, these beliefs allowed the Narrative of the Child to move outside the family and into the political life of the country. With this move, children became the responsibility not only of the family, but of the street, the neighborhood, the community, the nation, and, eventually, the world.

This responsibility included the child as the future adult and as the future manager of the State. In order for children to become the future managers of the State, capable of maintaining that in the State which needs to be maintained and changing that which needs to be changed, adults' view of children and childhood needed to change from seeing children as little adults, or inconsequential beings and move toward the realization that children have rights and developmental needs that are specific to childhood. In recognizing children's rights, and current

and future worth, adults also needed to be willing to “perform their laborious tasks only for the sake of the later ones, so as to prepare for them a further stage from which they can raise still higher the structure intended by nature; and secondly, that only the later generations will in fact have the good fortune to inhabit the building on which a whole series of their forefathers” labored (Kant 44) so that children can become the producers and protectors of the State and the seeds for the global community. Kant’s statement from 1784 is still applicable today as it reflects the current attitude in American society regarding children and the future of the State, but with the small exception of the word “only.” In today’s American society, self fulfillment for adults is considered extremely important, especially for women, because they are the primary caregivers of children, but both parents need to tend to their own needs as well as to their children’s needs. In order to be a good parent, the adult needs to be fulfilled and in a calm, relaxed state to parent effectively and to train and discipline children appropriately. This need is reflected in many women’s magazines in just about any month of the year, for there is always a rejuvenation section in the magazine which advocates creating a space of one’s own, taking five minutes or so to center oneself, and taking time for entertainment at least once a month that does not involve children. By taking time for oneself, the idea is that the adult is more capable of thoughtful, appropriate and dispassionate discipline, engaged nurturing of the child, and of providing a positive, healthy role model for the children. But this stance disregards the same issue as the nineteenth century reformers disregarded, that of the working-class family. In the nineteenth century, working-class families had very little leisure time available to them to rejuvenate because they were simply trying to survive. This is still the case for many families today both in the United States and globally, and time for fulfillment and internal peace are an economically based luxury, yet the importance of

parental nurturing and educating children for future adult roles within the nation and the world remains the same regardless of class.

In order to address this need of the nurtured child, schools have become an important partner with the parent in maintaining the economy of the family and of the State. Children are not only taught to be independent learners and to compete politely with their peers, but they are also taught to obey their elders and to question, within developmental and familial limits, the rules that constrain them. They are assured that their “freedom can be safeguarded only by submitting to coercion” (Kant 26), both societal and parental, but it is to be a beneficent coercion designed to assist them in becoming enlightened, throwing off the yoke of immaturity, and having the courage to use their own understanding to safeguard themselves, the family, and the State. This enlightenment, according to Kant, comes slowly through educating children in how to use their reason and fully develop their intellectual freedoms, but in order to do so it must overcome the aporia associated with children’s issues and ensure that the Narrative is working as a conceptual apparatus within the forced choice of freedom. The Narrative demands that education not be the hog-and-barrel type of education, nor that it be the institutional representative of a plan “to transform men from rational beings into beasts or puppets, but rather to enable them to develop their mental and physical faculties in safety, to use their reason without restraint and to refrain from the strife and vicious mutual abuse that are prompted by hatred, anger or deceit. Thus the purpose of the state is, in reality, freedom” (Spinoza 223). These words, as contemporary as they sound, seem to capture the length and breadth of the Narrative of the Child that I have been trying to describe in this dissertation. Hatred, strife, and deceit are aberrations within the world of the child while safety, development, and freedom are core components of the Narrative and are deemed essential to the well-being of children.

Thus education as development, a mainstay of the Narrative and the world of the child, is currently being constructed to enable “the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms” (UN), and one of those freedoms is the right to make choices and to act on them after they are made. According to education specialists, humanitarian organizations, and a large part of the global populace, knowledge is an essential element in choice. In order to make a choice, a *choix-force* or not, being educated is considered essential to the ability to reason critically and make an informed choice. And in order to be educated, there must be schools that are the main source of disseminating knowledge and that are “places in which we can civilly discuss our differences, religious or otherwise” (Ruenzel), and raising children is a large part of the otherwise. Because most Americans view democracy as the only viable form of government, the goal of education is to sustain a democratic society and its ideals. In this case, the only way to sustain the political framework of a democracy is for people who live and work together to either step into the Rawlsian original position²⁶ or to understand their differences and find commonalities which override these differences. While Rawls’ impartiality may be theoretically appealing, it is practically impossible, especially when coupled with the pathos that is associated with decisions involving children. Because of this lack of impartiality, education about others and understanding the Other is the only way to avert misunderstandings and the violence that can accompany it.

26 In *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls theorizes his account of justice as a social contract and maintains that the original position is an essential part of “justice as fairness.” A person in the original position is supposed to be fair and impartial when making decisions in regard to justice and the State and agrees to set aside any personal prejudices and don the veil of ignorance, which theoretically mitigates any knowledge which predisposes them to a particular position on a subject. By being fair and impartial, the most just decision will be made under the circumstances.

Because children are viewed as the future and violence toward children is not part of the future we envision for them, the sentimental child and the pathos he or she evokes is the focus of political and social actions on the part of adults. These actions are seen in education, American society, and globally through humanitarian intervention. Issues of education and safety for all children are part of the Narrative, and within the Narrative adults need to ensure that their actions are designed to support and nurture children emotionally, intellectually, and physically. In evoking the child, the rhetor activates the Narrative as a conceptual apparatus that combines the emotional effect of invoking the child with the need to protect children to form an ideology of control, not a disciplinary authoritarian model of control, but one based on biopower—the control of the child for the benefit of the child and the State, and extending into the global biopolitical.

6.2 Global Conceptual Apparatus

For children to be the beneficiaries of adult political and social choices, there needs to be a global biopolitical functioning as biopower and not as State violence (which is not for children). In order for the biopolitical to function globally, the world must become the global community, at least for children, that people talk about but that does not currently exist; thus the imagined global kinship grouping of children becomes more important than nation-ness or national sovereignty, and it must become more important than religious differences as even the pathos of religion will need to take a backseat to the pathos of the child and future peace. We need to “believe the children are the future,” and we need to “treat them well and let them lead the way” (Masser), for “if we are to reach real peace in this world, and if we are to carry on a real war against war, we shall have to begin with children” (Gandhi). As a result of caring for and educating children, the Narrative of the Child, as discourse and as story, coupled with the *choix-force*, becomes the

conceptual apparatus through which the Global Child and the National Child become the kinship community of the Known Child where all adults feel responsible for all children and act on that responsibility. This is, of course, highly idealistic, but it is the idealism that drives the Narrative and humanitarian efforts on behalf of the child.

This feeling of responsibility for all children and for making all children the Known Child is, as I have shown, not a new idea, nor is it limited to the real world, but it is also reflected in literary works. Our aspired idealism is highlighted at the end of Harper Lee's *To Kill A Mockingbird* when Scout (the main character, the narrator, and a child) stands on the Radley porch and puts herself metaphorically in Arthur (Boo) Radley's shoes. She recounts the events of the past year that have formed the basis of the story regarding how she and her brother became Known Children not only to their community, but also to the reclusive Arthur (Boo) Radley whom they had never met:

Daylight...in my mind, the night faded...It was summer time,
and two children scampered down the sidewalk toward a man
approaching in the distance. The man waved, and the children
raced each other to him. It was still summertime and the children
came closer...Summertime, and his children played in the front
yard with their friend...It was fall, and his children fought on the
sidewalk...winter, and his children shivered at the front gate...
summer, and he watched his children's heart break. Autumn again,
and Boo's children needed him (293-294).

The pathos of this passage is seen in the closing of the distance between Radley and the children. At the beginning of the passage, the children are seen running toward "a man" who is

actually their father, Atticus Finch, but by the end of the passage the children are Radley's children as he watches "his children's heart break." As the shift from the communal child to the Known Child occurs in the text, pathos is activated through the character of Radley to the point where he feels a responsibility to those children at the risk of his own life. This is the Narrative and pathos as a conceptual apparatus reflected in a fictional text that almost every American high school freshman reads in school and is also a reflection of the real pathos engendered by the actual harming of children.

This activation of pathos is not limited to American society or the American classroom but is also a global conceptual apparatus. The Narrative of the Child working as a conceptual apparatus on a global level can be clearly seen in a 2006 speech by Afghanistan President Hamid Karzai in which he "turned tearful after relating stories of children maimed by bombings" and "took long pauses between sentences and at one point covered both eyes with a handkerchief. 'Cruelty at the highest level,' he said, his lower lip quivering. 'The cruelty is too much.'" (Straziuso). His emotional response to the harming of children he has not met is the strength of the Narrative as the story of the child. It is what moves the Afghani National Child to the Known Child and engenders an unapologetic public emotional response by the Afghani President. Karzai's pathos and speech can be joined with a 1996 statement by Hilary Clinton who maintains that "as adults we have to start thinking and believing that there isn't really any such thing as someone else's child...for that reason, we cannot permit discussions of children and families to be subverted by political or ideological debate" (Goldberg), with Lee's fictional characters, and with the Convention of the Rights of the Child to show the very real possibility of the Narrative of the Child becoming a conceptual apparatus for the world. And this particular conceptual apparatus allows for all children become Known Children and be treated with the same emotional attachment

and parental responsibility that we feel for our own children. Add to the above Michael McConnell's insistence that "there is no neutral, objective vantage point from which to view the world; we are all prisoners of our own perspectives, [Gourevitch would add of the perspectives of others]; [so] the beginning of wisdom is to recognize the potential worth and value of others different from ourselves" (in Cinotti 522), including children.

6.3 Imagined Community

As these perspectives function as an integral part of new nations being formed, political frameworks being established or reworked, and citizens functioning within the physical, psychological and sovereign boundaries of their nation, the State needs to recognize the potential worth of others and to order "society as a fair system of social cooperation between free and equal persons viewed as fully cooperating members of a society over a complete life" (Rawls 9). This fair system of social cooperation is the core of the desire for a global community. Indeed, to culturally and educationally recognize and affirm different races, ethnicities, and comprehensive doctrines is essential, but this affirmation cannot negate the need for social cooperation, which is based on the reciprocity of "all who are engaged in cooperation and who do their part as the rules and procedure require" (Rawls 16), and it is these people on whom the unity of a culturally diverse society depends to peacefully maintain itself, and which must be extended to create and maintain the global community. Yet, there is always a controlling ideology at work within the State which influences the relative definition of a good citizen and a good government (even if it is the rule of princes), and the education and protection of the young is an essential component to forming or reforming a legitimate political order in which the political order is maintained for all

the people who comprise the nation, regardless of whether they are citizens, immigrants, permanent residents, or children, and by extension comprise the global community.

Thus global recognition that children are caught in ideological frameworks, not all of them acceptable to the Narrative, is essential to the implementation of a global biopolitical for children as a mechanism that can be used to save the world and ourselves while we're at it. The global use of biopower for the benefit of children everywhere is tied to this realization that "we are, each of us, functions of how we imagine ourselves and of how others imagine us, and looking back, there are these discrete tracks of memory; the times when our lives are most sharply defined in relation to others' ideas of us" (Gourevitch 71). This imagining makes citizens aware of each other and helps people to see how they and their neighbors fit into the political framework. I maintain, along with Gourevitch and Anderson, that the only way to sustain the political framework within a democracy is for people who live and work together to activate their imagined community in order to understand their differences and find the commonalities that can override these differences. "This isn't to say we're going to sweep our differences under the rug or claim that we're all really the same, but rather to learn about one another so that our deepest differences don't become points of conflict and even violence" (Ruenzel); in other words, we need to achieve stasis²⁷ in order to solve the contested points of childhood. To achieve stasis, the National Child needs to become the Known Child of each community and treated not as others' imagine them or others' ideas of how children should be treated, but as the same Child in order to create a Global Known Child that is important to individuals as well as to the State. This Global Known Child needs to be granted a true choice and to be given the knowledge he or she needs as an adult to make a true choice. For

²⁷ Stasis is achieved, in rhetorical terms, when the arguing bodies define the terms of the argument in the same way so they are not arguing at cross purposes by using different terms or moral constructs as the foundation for their position.

knowledge and choice are necessary for individuals to be able to assert their rights, protect the rights of their families, and to maintain the future.

According to Ignatieff, the whole idea of a liberal democracy is that there is commitment to “both the security of the majority and the rights of the individual” (8), including children, and to balancing claims of “risk, dignity, and security” (9) while ensuring that each action of the government is explained and justified and that each citizen is ensured a voice in what is happening. A liberal democracy is, according to Ignatieff, “committed to respect the rights of those who have shown no respect for rights at all, to show mercy to those who are merciless, to treat as human those who have behaved inhumanely” (34). This requires liberal democracies to endorse a comprehensive doctrine of tolerance and respect for all individuals regardless of their actions and to accord them rights as humans to be treated with dignity and respect. This does not negate the *choix-force* because Ignatieff’s position does not maintain that we should have no laws or societal beliefs or that society should not have consequences for those who have made the wrong choice, but that we should treat them humanely while still imposing consequences for their actions.

Choice and the humane, respectful treatment of persons, then, are essential elements in the maintenance of the future; however, “choice...is not merely a right individuals are owed, but is inextricably linked to our humanity since ‘to conform to custom merely *as* custom does not educate or develop in [the child] any of the qualities which are the distinctive endowment of a human being. The human faculties of perception, judgment, discriminative feeling, mental activity, and even moral preference are exercised only in making a choice’” (Mill in D’Onofrio 11), and this is exactly what the CRC intends for the Global Child—the right to choose not to be a child bride, a child laborer, a child soldier, a sexual victim. Because choice is part of the human condition, it would seem futile to try and stop choice either by forcing people to choose the right

thing or by treating them as if they had already chosen; however, this is the very ideology of humanitarian interventions and of the Narrative. The world must be approached as if it has already chosen the Narrative of the Child for all children, and the Narrative both defines and creates “who we are, how we view the world, [and] how we interact with each other [and we] are all related through this social and, biopolitical production” (Hardt and Negri 66) of safe, educated, sentimentalized children.

Therefore, the *choix-force* is not incompatible with democratic governments and their belief in the freedom to choose because democracies already have forced choices in place in regard to laws and socially accepted behaviors. In American society, for example, we agree that murder is not the right choice, that sexual molestation of children is not the right choice, that thievery is not the right choice, that laws protecting children are the right choice, that education is the right choice, and that vaccinations are the right choice; the list can go on as long as the laws we have and the beliefs we hold. We, as a nation, a democracy, and as the protectors of children agree on these issues and hold anyone who makes a psychotic move accountable for his or her actions, and this accountability is no more in evidence than in regard to children because the future of the State rests on them and because we have established those children who have been harmed as Known Children, and as Known Children, their well-being is a core component our freedom and our future as a nation.

Thus the *choix-force* combined with the connection between each member of the community formed through the communal bonds of responsibility are important in regard to the National Child, and by extension to the Global Child, for this relationship is a basic component to the imagined community of the nation, which is, again, a theoretical construct. Though the nation does exist (its existence is not theoretical), the seamless unity of any nation, moral or otherwise, is

debatable, especially in light of colonialism and current ethnic and religious differences within countries, but this does not mean that the nation is unworkable. The lack of unity that can be seen currently in many nations, such as Iraq, Afghanistan, India, Pakistan, Nepal, Rwanda, is not different instances of trouble, for they can all be traced to a differing definition of what constitutes a moral bond and with that bond what constitutes a moral responsibility of the State and its people. This is a problem for any nation, not only a liberal democratic nation. However, since a liberal democratic government “encourages among citizens and itself exhibits some basic civic virtues, chief among which are: respect for the rule of law, tolerance for differing points of view and styles of life, and a disposition to look beyond narrow self-interest in voting or conducting governmental affairs” (Cunningham), the strength of the State is in the biopolitical and the strength of the biopolitical is for the child. It is the biopolitical, the humanity in the face of inhumanity, and a commitment to rights inherent in the need for security and balance that is important for a global community and its Known Child.

The Narrative of the Child is consistently at work in education, in politics, and in the action of the *choix-force* in an attempt to create in actuality a global community that is now only theoretical. The demands and needs of societies and of nations are “no longer [articulated] in the name of a past right...[but] in terms of a potentiality, a future, a future that is immediate, which is already present in the present” (Foucault, *Society* 222). For us, the National Child, the Known Child, and the Global Child are the future that is already present. Therefore, the Narrative relies on the activation of pathos and the recognition of all children as Known Children as the core components of the global biopolitical functioning on behalf of children. The Narrative and *choix-force* as conceptual apparatuses demand that we, as a global community, cannot simply hope that all will work out well for our children. We, as adults, need to manage the biopolitical

apparatuses to work specifically for children so that they can do even better for their children than we have for ours. In Foucault's terms, the Narrative is a "regime of truth" working its way through history in a circular relation with power, each producing, sustaining, and extending the other (Foucault, *Truth* 133). Through the *choix-force*, the child as fantasmatic recipient of all decisions, and the Narrative as discourse and as story, the child becomes the bond for the global community, and it is the imagined community of the child which holds nations together and makes them communal, and it is the global biopolitical functioning on behalf of the child that is the mechanism through which the individual nation becomes part of the global community and the global biopolitical.

Works Cited

- Adler, Mortimer. *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*. MacMillan Publishing Company. New York, 1982.
- Adler, Mortimer. *Paideia Problems and Possibilities*. MacMillan Publishing Company. New York, 1983.
- American Girl. www.americangirl.com. November 28, 2004 – October 2010.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.
- AOLcityguide. “American Girl Place: A place for more than just dolls.” *America Online*. 2004. www.digitalcity.com/chicago/entertainment/venue. November 17, 2004.
- Associated Press. “Mattel Profit Up on American Girl Sales.” *Forbes.com*. 07.19.2004. November 17, 2004.
- Associated Press Paris. “In Pact, Nations Pledge Not to Use Child Soldiers.” Europe on msnbc.com. February 6, 2007.
- Associated Press. “Update 6: Mattel Profits Drop on Weaker Sales.” *Forbes.com*. 10.18.2004. November 17, 2004.
- Baumrind, Diana. “Diana Baumrind’s (1966) Prototypical Descriptions of 3 Parenting Styles.” First published in “Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior.” *Child Development*. 1966. www.devpsy.org/teaching/parent/baumrind-styles.html. 2010.
- Berger, Sebastien. “Oprah Winfrey’s school in child abuse scandal.” Telegraph.co.uk. November 5, 2007.

Bodrova, Elena and Dr. Deborah J. Leong. "Why Children Need Play." *Scholastic Early Childhood Today*. September 2005.

Booth, William. "One Nation, Indivisible: Is It History?" *Washingtonpost.com*. February 22, 1998.

Brachear, Manya A. "Brief life Touches a city's heart". *Chicago Tribune*. August 27, 2004.

Brooklyn Institute of the Arts and Sciences, The. *The Twelfth Yearbook*. Brooklyn, 1900.

Bullough, Vern L. *Encyclopedia of Children and Childhood in History and Society*.
www.faqs.org/childhood. December 8, 2010.

Button, H. Warren and Eugene Provenzo. *History of Education and Culture in America*. Second edition. Prentice-Hall. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1989.

Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero's Journey*. Mystic Fire Video. 1998.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. www.carnegie.org. November 28, 2004.

Carnegie Foundation. www.carnegiefoundation.org.

ChatAlert. www.chatalert.com. March 16, 2010.

Chen, Yu Yu and Hongin Li. "Mother's Education and Child Health: Is there a Nurturing Effect?" IDEAS. University of Connecticut. Department of Economics.
Ideas.repec.org.

Chicago Children's Museum. www.chchildrensmuseum.org. November 4, 2004.

Chicago Public Library. www.chipublib.org. November 28, 2004.

Chicago Public Library 2008 Annual Report. www.chipublib.org.

Chicago Tribune. "CPS Students Cash in on Good Grades". October 17, 2008.

---"Child Reportedly Approached Near School." *The Alton Telegraph*. March 19, 2010.

- Cicero. *On Duties*. Eds. M.T. Griffin and E.M. Atkins. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 1991.
- Cinotti, David N. "The Incoherence of Neutrality: A Case for Eliminating Neutrality from Religion Clause Jurisprudence." *Journal of Church and State*. Summer 2003.
- City Museum. www.citymuseum.org. 2009-2010.
- Clement, Priscilla Ferguson. *Growing Pains: Children in the Industrial Age 1850-1890*. Twayne Publishers. New York, 1997.
- Cornell Law School. "Marriage Laws". Legal Information Institute. Topics.law.cornell.edu. December 8, 2010.
- Crimes Against Children Research Center. University of New Hampshire Durham. March 22, 2010. www.unh.edu. March 22, 2010.
- Crowley, Sharon and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*. Longman. New York, 2003.
- Delpit, Lisa. *Other People's Children*. The New Press. New York, 1995. Section 1.
- DeWaal, Alex. *Famine Crimes*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- DeWaal, Alex. "The Wrong Lessons." *Boston Review*. December 2003/January 2004.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. The Free Press. New York, 1944. Read bits
- Dewey, John. *The School and Society/The Child and the Curriculum*. The University Press. Chicago, 1990.
- D'Onofrio, Eve. "Sex Education, Liberalism, and Natural Law: Toward an Overlapping Consensus." *EDRS*. August 2008.
- EarthACTION. "You Are A Child". EarthAction publication. 2002.

- Edelman, Lee. *No Future. Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Duke University Press. Durham, 2004.
- Editorial. "Test Scores get mixed grade in state". *The Alton Telegraph*. September 23, 2010.
- Eldred, Janet Carey and Peter Mortensen. *Imagining Rhetoric*. University of Pittsburgh Press. Pittsburgh, 2002.
- Farmer, Paul. *Pathologies of Power*. University of California Press. Berkeley, 2003.
- Fletcher, Anthony and Stephen Hussey. "Introduction." *Childhood in Question: children, parents, and the state*. Manchester University Press. Manchester, 1999. pp. 1-13.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. trans. Alan Sheridan. Vintage Books. New York, 1977.
- Foucault, Michel. "Governmentality." *The Foucault Effect*. Ed. Graham Bruchell, et al. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago, 1991.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected and Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. Pantheon Books. New York, 1980.
- Foucault, Michel. *Society Must Be Defended*. Trans. David Macey. Picador. New York, 2003.
- Foucault, Michel. "Technologies of the Self". *Ethics*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. The New York Press. New York, 1994.
- Franklin, Cory. "Boys' deaths altered Chicago". *Chicago Tribune*. October 16, 2007.
- Free the Children. www.freethechildren.com. June 13, 2010.
- Gates, Bill. Op-Ed piece. *Wall Street Journal*. March 4, 2005.
- Gandhi, Mohandas. *The Words of Gandhi*. New York: New Market Press, 2000.
- Gibbs, Nancy. "The Case Against Over-Parenting." *Time Magazine*. November 30, 2009.

- Giroux, Henry A. *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*. Paradigm Publishers. Boulder, CO. 2005.
- Gioux, Henry A. *America on the Edge: Henry Giroux on Politics, Culture, and Education*. Palgrave MacMillan. New York, 2006.
- Goodlad, John I. *A Place Called School*. McGraw-Hill. New York, 2004.
- Gourevitch, Phillip. *We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed With Our Families*. New York: Picador, 1998.
- Greven, Philip. *Spare The Child: The Religious Roots of Punishment and the Impact of Physical Abuse*. Vintage Books. New York, 1992.
- Habermas, Jurgen. *Between Facts and Norms*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA, 1998.
- Habermas, Jurgen. *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*. Eds. Ciaran Cronin and Pablo De Greiff. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1998.
- Hall, G. Stanley. "The Old Childhood and the new Adolescence." In *The Educating of Americans: a documentary history*. Daniel Calhoun, ed. Houghton Mifflin Company. Boston, 1969.
- Hall, Peter. *Cities of Tomorrow*. 3rd edition. Blackwell Publishing. Malden, MA: 2004.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.
- Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press. Oxford, 2007.
- Hiner, Ray and Joseph Hawes, eds. *Growing up in America*. University of Illinois Press. Urbana, 1985.
- Hintz, Greg. "Museum's Move Stalls Out." *ChicagoBusiness*. www.chicagobusiness.com. July 9, 2009.

Holt, Marilyn Irvin. *The Orphan Trains: Placing Out in America*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.

Human Rights Watch. Annual Report. 2006.

Human Rights Watch. www.hrw.org. May 24, 2010.

Ignatieff, Michael. *The Lesser Evil*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

International Labor Organization. ILO Convention No. 182. Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention, 1999. www.ilo.org. June 2010.

Jones, Del. CEOs Split on Paying for Good Grades”. *USA Today Online*. September 12, 2008.

Jubera, Drew, Rebecca Webber and Brooke Lea Foster. “Are School Buses Unsafe? *Parade Magazine*. March 21, 2010.

Kant, Immanuel. *Kant Political Writings*. Reiss, H.S. ed. Trans. H.B. Nisbet. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 2004.

Kennedy, John F. *Inaugural Address*. January 20, 1961. www.americanrhetoric.com. February 27, 2011.

Kielburger, Craig. “*The Story Behind FTC*. www.freethechildren.com. September 2010.

Kozol, Jonathan. *Savage Inequalities*. Harper Perennial Reprint Edition. New York, August 3, 1992.

Larcom, Lucy. *A New England Girlhood: Outlined from Memory*. Northeastern University Press. Boston, 1986 reprint edition.

Lee, Harper. *To Kill A Mockingbird*. J.P. Lippincott Company. New York, 1960.

Locke, John. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education and Of the Conduct of the Understanding*. Eds. Ruth Grant and Nathan Tarcov. Hackett Publishing Company. Indianapolis, 1996.

- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*. trans. Robert M. Adams. W.W. Norton & Co. 6th Edition. New York, 1977.
- Manson, Ken. Memorial to honor children town lost. All youths who died to be commemorated. *Chicago Tribune*. May 14, 2007.
- Masser, Michael and Linda Creed. "The Greatest Love of All". www.lyricsg.com. Originally published 1977.
- Mattel. Financial History, Annual Reports, and Proxy Statements. www.corporate.mattel.com.
- Maynard, Jim. "The '50s. What a Time for a Boy to Grow Up!" *The Alton Telegraph*. June 13, 2010.
- McDermott, Helen. "Does a College Degree Make You a Better Mother? Nearly a Quarter of Americans Say Yes, According to New Research from eLearners.com. PR Newswire. May 28, 2010.
- Middle Class. *Parade Magazine*. February 15, 2009.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Autobiography of John Stuart Mill*. Columbia University Press. New York, 1924.
- Mintz, Steven. *Huck's Raft*. The Belknap Press. Cambridge, 2004.
- Mishori, Ranit. "How Safe Are Cellphones?" *Parade Magazine*. March 21, 2010.
- Montag, Warren. *Bodies, Masses, Power: Spinoza and His Contemporaries*. Verso. London, 1999.
- Mortenson, Greg. www.penniesforpeace.org. 2010.
- Morse, Jane. "Youth Worldwide Join in Call to Stop Use of Child Soldiers." www.america.gov. February 18, 2009.
- Nasaw, David. *Children of the City*. Oxford University Press. Oxford, 1985.

Newsweek. "The Next Jihadists." *Newsweek*. January 22, 2007.

Obama, Barack. Democratic National Convention Speech. August 28, 2008.

Obama, Barack. Interview. NBC Today. September 28, 2010.

Obama, Barack. Presidential Election Speech Transcript. Politics. articles.cnn.com. November 4, 2008.

Okin, Susan Moller. *Justice, Gender, and the Family*. Basic Books. 1989.

Onion, The. Various Articles. www.theonion.com. Various dates.

PBS Home Video. *The Orphan Trains*. Artwork PBS. 2006.

Pennies for Peace. www.penniesforpeace.org. June 2010.

Perry, Alex. "Oprah Scandal Rocks South Africa." *Time Magazine*. November 5, 2007.

Plato. *The Republic*. trans. C. D. C. Reeve. Hackett Publishing Company. Indianapolis, 2004.

Postman, Neil. *The Disappearance of Childhood*. Vintage Books. New York, 1994.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. The Belknap Press. Cambridge, 1999.

Rescher, Nicholas. "Philosophical Reasoning". *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
Plato.stanford.edu. June 2010.

Rice, Joseph Mayer. *The Public-School System of the United States*. The Century Co.
New York, 1893.

Riis, Jacob. *How the Other Half Lives*. Unabridged republication of the 1901 edition. Dover
Publications, Inc. New York, 1971.

Riis, Jacob. *The Battle with the Slum*. Dover Publications, Inc. New York, 1998.

Riis, Jacob. *The Making of An American*. The MacMillan Company. New York, 1901.

Rimer, Sara. "Maker of SAT Aims Younger." *Chicago Tribune*. October 23, 2008.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile or On Education*. trans. Allan Bloom. Basic Books, 1979.

- Ruenzel, David. "Old Time Religion." *Education Week*. March 27, 1996. V. 15. Issue 27.
- Rutkow, Lainie and Joshua T. Lozman. "Suffer the Children?: A Call for the United States Ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child". *Harvard Human Rights Journal*. www.law.harvard.edu. 2010.
- Saint Augustine. *Confessions*. trans. Henry Chadwick. Oxford University Press. Oxford, 1998.
- Salopek, Paul. "The Bride Was 7: In the heart of Ethiopia, Child Marriage Takes a Brutal Toll." *Chicago Tribune*. December 12, 2004.
- Sandovi, Carlos. "Students in Chicago Receive 1st Paycheck". *Chicago Tribune*. October 17, 2008.
- Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books, 2000.
- Shishkin, Philip and Jafar Juhi. "In Baghdad Slum, Sectarian Strife is Also Child's Play." *The Wall Street Journal*. January 11, 2007.
- Skenazy, Leonore. "More from America's Worst Mom: 9-year Old On the Subway, Continued". *The Huffington Post*. April 10, 2008.
- Smith, Carolyn Steinhoff. "Through the Dragon's Mouth: Exploring the City Museum of St. Louis." www.terrain.org.
- Spinoza, Baruch. *Theological-Political Treatise*. trans. Samuel Shirley. Hackett Publishing Co. Indianapolis, 2001.
- Staff. "Canada: Researchers correct identity of child victim in Titanic disaster". *Chicago Tribune*. August 1, 2007.
- Staff Photographer. "Indiana: Remembering Indianapolis' forgotten children". *Across the Nation*. *Chicago Tribune*. June 6, 2006.

- Starks, Carolyn and Bonnie Miller Rubin. When is it OK to Leave Kids Alone? *Chicago Tribune*. February 12, 2009.
- Straziouso, Jason. “Karzai: ‘Our children are dying’”. *Chicago Tribune*. December 11, 2006.
- Stone, Judith. “Teach a Girl, Change the World.” *Good Housekeeping*.
www.goodhousekeeping.com. September 2010.
- UNICEF. www.unicef.org. June 2010.
- UNICEF. *The State of the World’s Children: Celebrating 20 Years of the Convention on the Rights of the Child*. November 2009.
- UNICEF. Various fundraising pamphlets and letters, 2007 – 2010.
- United Nations Security Council. Resolution 1479 (2003). May 13, 2003.
- Walsh, Glenn A. “History of Andrew Carnegie and Carnegie Libraries.”
www.andrewcarnegie.cc. November 28, 2004.
- Warrior-Concepts-Online.com. March 16, 2010.
- Watson, John B. *Behaviorism*. (first published 1924). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009.
- Welding Works. “The Harold Washington Library.” www.weldingworks.com.
November 17, 2004.
- West, Elliot. *Growing Up with the Country*. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque, 1998.
- Wheeler, Nicholas. *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Whitehouse, Beth. “Lullabies reinforce the cycle of life”. *Chicago Tribune*. July 9, 2008.

- Winfrey, Oprah. "Building A Dream." *Oprah Winfrey Leadership Academy*. www.owla.co.za.
October 2010.
- Wolgast, Elizabeth. *The Grammar of Justice*. Cornell University Press. Ithaca and London,
1987.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*. 1792. Forgottenbooks.org. 2008.
- Working, Russell. "Nameless, but not forgotten: Unidentified boy 'has squadron of angels
watching over him'". Metro Section West. *Chicago Tribune*. October 16, 2007.
- World Health Organization. www.who.int. June 2010.
- Wyndham Hotel Chicago. Special Offers. Forimmediaterelease.net. June 2010.
- Zelizer, Viviana. *Pricing the Priceless Child*. Princeton Paperbacks. Princeton, 1994.
- Zizek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. Verso. London, 2001.
- Zukin, Sharon. *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World*. University of California
Press. Berkeley, 1993.

Bibliography

- Ackerman, John. "The Space for Rhetoric in Everyday Life." *Towards a Rhetoric of Everyday Life*. The University of Wisconsin Press. Madison, 2003.
- Adult dosage for kids. *Chicago Tribune*. March 13, 2007.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford University Press. Stanford, 1998.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *State of Exception*. trans. Kevin Attell. University of Chicago Press. Chicago, 2003
- Anti-war work is up for British art prize. Bush and Blair call 'baby killers'. *Chicago Tribune*. May 9, 2007.
- Antczak, Frederick J. *Thought and Character: The Rhetoric of Democratic Education*. The Iowa State University Press. Ames, 1985.
- Aristotle. *On Rhetoric*. trans. George A. Kennedy. Oxford University Press. New York, 1991.
- Associated Press. "Obama presses for longer school years". *The Alton Telegraph*. September 28, 2010.
- Badiou, Alain. *MetaPolitics*. Jason Barker, trans. Verso. London, 2005.
- Banchero, Stephanie. Web site for donors a gold mine for schools. *Chicago Tribune*. January 22, 2007.
- Barbaro, Michael. "Game Changes for toy retailer: Toys 'R' Us uses new sales tactics." Business Section, *Chicago Tribune*. November 27, 2004. p. 1.
- Beauregard, Robert A. *Voices of Decline: The Postwar Fate of U. S. Cities*. Second edition. Routledge. New York, 2003.

- Barilli, Renato. *Rhetoric*. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis, 1989.
- Bender, John and David Wellbery. "Rhetoricity: On the Modernist Return of Rhetoric." *The Ends of Rhetoric*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, 1990.
- Booth, Wayne. *Modern Dogma and the Rhetoric of Assent*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago, 1974.
- Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric*. Blackwell Publishing. Malden, MA, 2004.
- Bosman, Julie. Some librarians find children's book, in a word, offensive. *Chicago Tribune*. February 18, 2007.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Scholastic Point Of View." *Practical Reason*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, 1998.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Production and Reproduction of Legitimate Language." *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA, 1991.
- Brain damage a possibility. *Chicago Tribune*. March 13, 2007.
- Briggs, Johnathon E. Guiding Kids onto pathways of success. *Chicago Tribune*. November 1, 2006.
- Byrne, Dennis. Children at Glorious Play. *Chicago Tribune*. June 25, 2007. Caputo, John and Mark Yount. *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions*. The Pennsylvania State University Press. University Park, PA, 1993.
- Central Asia Institute. www.ikat.org. June 2010.
- CharityNavigator. "Children's Museum Charity Summary." www.charitynavigator.org. November 17, 2004.
- Child Soldiers and Children's Rights Panel Discussion at the University of Illinois at Chicago. May 3, 2007.

CNET. www.cnet.com. March 16, 2010.

Conley, Thomas. *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago, 1990.

Crary, David. Fewer say kids key to successful marriage. *Chicago Tribune*. July 1, 2007.

Cruikshank, Barbara. *The Will to Empower. Democratic citizens and other subjects*. Cornell University Press. Ithaca, 1999.

Cunningham, Frank. "The Conflicting Truths of Religion and Democracy". 21st Annual Conference of the North American Society for Political Philosophy. Omaha, NE. August 1, 2004.

Davis, Aaron C. Whisper, Whimper, but don't scream. *Chicago Tribune*. April 7, 2007.

---- Deal lets mom keep custody of obese boy. *Chicago Tribune*. February 28, 2007.

DeFao, Janine. A bottle, a crib and 24-hour TV: Baby shows ignite a furor. *Chicago Tribune*. September 14, 2006.

Dewey, John. *Experience & Education*. Touchstone. New York, 1938.

Dewey, John. *The Public and its Problems*. Swallow Press. Athens, OH, 1954.

---- Doctor charged with molestation. *Chicago Tribune*. April 7, 2007.

Donzelot, Jacques. *The Policing of Families*. Pantheon Books. New York: 1979.

Dufka, Corinne. Flyer. Ending the Use of Child Soldiers. Human Rights Watch. 1999.

Embassy of India. Child Labor and India. www.indianembassy.org. April 30, 2007.

---- Explicit photos with baby get man 38-year sentence. *Chicago Tribune*. March 23, 2007.

Fanon, Franz. "On National Culture." *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory*. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, eds. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

---- Firstborn brains. *Chicago Tribune*. June 25, 2007.

Freire, Paolo. *pedagogy of the oppressed*. Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. Continuum. New York, 2003.

Gamel, Kim. Iraqi cops: Kids were decoy in car bombing. *Chicago Tribune*. March 22, 2007.

Gettleman, Jeffrey. The Perfect Weapon for the Meanest Wars. *The New York Times*.
Nytimes.com. April 29, 2007.

Goldberg, Jonah. Democrats love (to use) The Children. *Chicago Tribune*. January 25, 2007.

Greimel, Hans. Abandoned toddler spurs debate in Japan. *Chicago Tribune*. May 17, 2007.

Gutmann, Amy. *Democratic Education*. Princeton University Press. Princeton, NJ, 1987.

Holzgrefe, J.L. and Robert Keohane. *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal, and Political Dilemmas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Houston Chronicle. Cops: Mob fatally beats passenger after child hit by car. June 21, 2007.

Police: Few, not mob, beat man to death. June 22, 2007.

Johnson, Avery. New Impotence Ads Draw Fire—Just Like Old Ones. *The Wall Street Journal*.
February 16, 2007.

Johnson, Nan. *Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America*. Southern Illinois University Press. Carbondale, 1991.

Johnston, Robert D. “Contemporary Anti-Vaccination Movements in Historical Perspective”.
The Politics of Healing. Ed. Robert D. Johnston. Routledge. New York, 2003.
259-369.

Kuczka, Susan. A Beach ban, baby. *Chicago Tribune*. June 22, 2007.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Theory and History of Literature, Volume 10. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis, 1984.

---- Man gets 32 years for killing fetus. *Chicago Tribune*. March 23, 2007.

- McMahon, Colin. Letting Children be Children. Breaking the Cycle. *Chicago Tribune*.
July 1, 2007.
- McNamara, Chris. 5 things we learned from *e-parenting*. *Keeping up with your Tech-Savvy Kids*. *Chicago Tribune*. July 15, 2007.
- Melucci, Alberto. *Nomads of the Present*. London: Hutchinson Radius, 1989.
- Mitchell, Claudia and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh. *Researching Children's Popular Culture: The Cultural Spaces of Childhood*. Routledge. New York, 2002.
- Moss, Peter and Pat Petrie. *From Children's Services to Children's Spaces: Public Policy, Children and Childhood*. Routledge Falmer. New York, 2004.
- Mouffe, Chantal. *The Democratic Paradox*. Verso. London, 2000.
- Mulligan, Gail M., DeeAnn Brimhall and Jerry West. "Childcare and Early Education Arrangements of Infants, Toddlers, and Preschoolers: 2001". Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. November 2005.
- Munson, Nancy. Darien kids motivated to help. *Chicago Tribune*. November 1, 2006.
- Name Dropping. Harry Potter author... *Chicago Tribune*. May 14, 2007.
- Naqvi, Muneeza. 'Slavery' ends for 50 boys working at India Factories. *Chicago Tribune*.
December 29, 2006.
- Naqvi, Muneeza. 15-year-old performs surgery in India, sparking outrage. *Chicago Tribune*.
June 22, 2007.
- Nienkamp, Jean. *Plato on Rhetoric and Language*. Hermagoras Press. Mahwah, NJ, 1999.
- Noveck, Jocelyn. Another combatant enters the 'mommy wars'. *Chicago Tribune*.
April 11, 2007.

- Overanxious Moms and Dads Do Their Kids a Disservice. *The Wall Street Journal*.
 March 26, 2007.
- Pear, Robert. "Microsoft Chairman Challenges Governors to Improve High Schools". *The New York Times*. February 27, 2005.
- Pittsburgh blaze kills 5 children. *Chicago Tribune*. June 13, 2007.
- Plato. *Protagoras and Meno*. trans. W. K. C. Guthrie. Penguin Books. London, 1956.
- Prince-Cohen, Nancy. The Power of Play: How Spontaneous, Imaginative Activities Lead to Happier, Healthier Children. Review. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*. Spring 2007.
- Rawls, John. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Basic Political Writings*. (Discourses 1,2,3 and Political Economy - 3rd discourse). trans. Donald A. Cress. Hackett Publishing Company. Indianapolis, 1987.
- Sanchez-Eppler, Karen. *Dependent States: The Child's Part in Nineteenth-Century American Culture*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago, 2005.
- Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. *Death Without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil*. University of California Press. Berkeley, 1992.
- School Security. *Chicago Tribune*. April 18, 2007.
- Sesame Street Workshop. Flyer. Fundraiser. 2007.
- Should Mature Teens Have Adult Privileges? *The Wall Street Journal*. March 30, 2007.
- Skenazy, Leonore. "Why I'm Raising Free Range Kids." *Huffington Post*. June 24, 2009.
- Study questions efficacy of Megan's Law. *Chicago Tribune*. May 7, 2007.
- Tirman, John. "The New Humanitarianism." *Boston Review*. December 2003/December 2004.

---- To honor slain 5-year-old, courthouse workers give. *Chicago Tribune*. March 23, 2007.

UNESCO. www.unesco.org. September 2010.

---- UN official: Refugee camps will improve. *Chicago Tribune*. April 27, 2007.

VITA

NAME: Tracey Layng-Awasthi

EDUCATION: B.A., English, Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois, 1986.
MATESL, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1994.
M.A., English, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 2002.
Ph.D., English, University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois, 2011.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE: McKendree University, Adjunct Faculty, English Department, Lebanon, Illinois, 2010- present.
University of Illinois, Graduate Assistant, Office of External Education, 2006-2008.
University of Illinois, Teaching Assistant, English Department, Chicago, Illinois, 2003-2008.
Carnegie Mellon University, Tutor, Intercultural Communications Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 2001-2002.
Hononegah Community High School, Teacher, English Department, Rockton, Illinois, 1994-2001.
University of Illinois and Intensive English Institute, Teaching Assistant, Division of English as an International Language, Urbana, Illinois, 1991-1993.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS AND CERTIFICATIONS: Rhetoric Society of America
Modern Language Association
National Council of Teachers of English
American Society for the History of Rhetoric
Illinois Secondary Teaching Certification – English with endorsements in English as a Second Language, World History, Political Science, and Gifted Education

VITA

PRESENTATIONS:

“Reflecting India: Linguistic Innovation in the Indian Creative Text,” Modern Language Association Annual Convention, Chicago, 2007.

“Using Grammar in the Workplace,” Respiratory Health Association of Metropolitan Chicago, 2007.

“Sentence Identification Exercises for the Classroom,” First Year Writing Program Mile 8 Session, University of Illinois – Chicago, 2005.

“Tourist Spaces in Chicago,” English Department Colloquium Series, University of Illinois – Chicago, 2005.

“From Pit Bulls to Fish Bowls: Philosophical Issues of Space in the First-Year Writing Program,” The College English Association Conference, Indianapolis, Indiana, 2005.

“Contextualization in Classroom Planning,” First Year Writing Program Mile 8 Session, University of Illinois – Chicago, 2004.

Hononegah High School Presentations 1998-2001:

“Interrater Reliability Training,” English Department, Inservice

“Writing Across the Curriculum,” Staff Inservice

“Writing Across the Curriculum Part Deux,” Staff Inservice

“Departmental Rubrics for Writing Assessment for the English Department”, English Department Inservice

“Reliability and Validity in Testing,” Department Head Inservice

“Workshop on Differentiating Curriculum for Gifted Students,” Staff Inservice