

Introduction

Children in Society, Culture, and the World

This book, composed of essays written over the course of twenty-five years, results from the convergence of two major intellectual developments in the last quarter of the twentieth century. The first is the slow emergence and then the rapid development of children as important subjects of study in history and in several of its affiliated disciplines, such as sociology, English literature, philosophy, and art history. The second is the mental remapping that is taking place in many disciplines as we recognize the present moment as one in which the peoples of the world are coming into closer contact through trade, migration, and the media. This phenomenon, often referred to as “globalization,” seems to have sprung up in the last two decades as free-trade rules increased access to the world’s goods, its labor, and people while the media revolution that resulted from cable and satellite technologies transformed the speed of information. In fact, globalization has been developing for some time, certainly since the end of World War II, but its effects were in many ways hidden by the Cold War and its apparent division of the globe into East and West, a world that seemed hemmed in by curtains and walls. Of course, historians are aware that globalization is not wholly new and has deep roots, that the exploration of the globe since ancient times, and the expansion of Europe through conquest and trade since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has anticipated some (though not all) of our contemporary experiences.

New, however, is the speed with which the world’s peoples can now be in touch with one another; so is the fact that this experience is now reaching all levels of society. As a result of this democratizing of global awareness and connection, it is now possible to think of our world as the coherent planet the first moon walkers described in 1969. It is in this sense of the term “globalization” that the essays that make up the last part of the book should be understood. I am not arguing that globalization is entirely new or entirely a good thing. Rather, I believe that it has

become a significant form of experience, and a way of seeing in the twenty-first century that historians can adopt to enrich the questions, methods, and perspectives available to our work. To an American historian, globalization provides the occasion to think about how our own experience can provide insight into today's new world. For historians of childhood and children, the present global moment encourages an understanding of what children share and permits us better to understand what their differences tell us about social life, culture, and national identity.

i

When I began to write about children, in my study of youth culture almost thirty years ago, there was no history of childhood or children. Instead, children as historical subjects occasionally came into view, but mostly at the margins, as social historians opened up historical study to a variety of new topics and questions.¹ Even though Philippe Ariès's path-breaking book, *Centuries of Childhood* (published in 1960 in France and translated into English in 1962), was already widely known and read, establishing a major marker in the field, it stood largely alone.² Nevertheless, by the 1960s, American historians, together with their British and Continental colleagues, were no longer satisfied to concentrate exclusively on the more visible topsoil of historical research. That research had largely concentrated on events or on the personalities and activities of those who occupied high political office or pursued high-level intellectual and artistic activities. Social historians began to unearth materials about other groups and attend to other kinds of historical subject matter. Indeed, social historians proposed a much more inclusive and open history—open to theoretical perspectives drawn from sociology, anthropology, and economics—and one more vigorous in its pursuit of formerly hidden populations such as the working class, African Americans and other ethnic groups, women, and, somewhat later, gays and lesbians. The history of these people, they argued, was significant in itself and should not be forgotten, but it was also historically urgent because it contributed to various kinds of changes, to the civil rights movement, women's liberation, changes in demography and sexual mores, revolutions and riots, as well as to the political and legal process.

Social historians also urged a new consideration of the history of fundamental social and cultural institutions, such as the family, the school, expressions of popular culture such as movies, sports, and voluntary clubs, as well as prisons, hospitals, churches, and the courts. All these social spaces, we were increasingly learning from social scientists, were

crucial arenas for personal definition, social order, and occasionally for social change. How a society regulated itself and ordered its population, in the Durkheimian, Marxist, and Weberian senses, social historians came to believe, were quite as significant as, and probably more fundamental than, the actions of the more historically visible legislators, Supreme Court justices, presidents, philosophers, and reformers who had captured the attention of 95 percent of historians.

It was this self-consciously revolutionary perspective on history that made the history of children possible, despite the fact that initially few social historians in the United States followed Ariès in fully historicizing the experiences of children and the nature of childhood. Part of the reason, as I will suggest later, is that the social history agenda, liberating as it generally was, did not provide quite the right conditions for the history of children to grow. Those American historians who were stimulated to study the family and childhood were often caught up in a new interest in demography and participated in a psychological moment.³ When they studied children's history, they sometimes brought to their studies a psychological set of evaluations that both produced innovative work and initially limited the development of the field. But it was social historians who first helped to create the varied, complex, multilayered, and multivalent history that is familiar at universities, colleges, and to some degree even in high schools and lower schools in the United States today, and in which the field of children's history now takes part.⁴ Social history encouraged me to begin exploring the experience of young people, it allowed me to see that young people could be important historical actors, and it gave me the courage to argue for the central significance of schools in the American experience. Indeed, it was my interest in the school broadly defined as an institution in which young people are both directed and socialized, and in which they resist that direction and create their own agendas, that initially brought children and youth into my vision as historical subjects and actors.⁵

For too long, schooling had been presented as a story of educational success and of progressive developments initiated by reformers such as John Dewey and Horace Mann. More recently, it had become a pinched tale of social control, where the schools became agencies of order following a middle-class agenda.⁶ Too little attention had been paid to schools as social sites and lively arenas for experience, to those who inhabited the schools or the populations served by the schools. Moreover, those populations were often and repeatedly composed of immigrants, and the experience of immigrants and their children at school was, I believed, the necessary subject for understanding how American society was created and how the nation came to be defined. Immigrants, and minorities more

generally, were critical to the American social experience. How the schools responded to their challenge was a central American story.⁷

Reflecting the trajectory of my interest in youth and children as subjects of historical investigation, the first section of this book is devoted to three essays on schooling and traces my thinking on this subject from the 1980s to the 2000s. All the essays in this section evidence my lifelong engagement with the school as a fundamental component of social formation. All the essays are about the children of immigrants and all are located within the bounds of American national history. Indeed, it is the modern nation-state that has made schools a necessity almost everywhere in the world, and urgently so in the United States, with its repeated and varied immigrations.⁸ As I have become more engaged by the possibilities offered to our understanding of considering schooling in a global context, my views of the relationship between immigration and schooling has developed, as is evidenced in Part III, but the nation and the school remain inexorably interconnected. The three essays in Part I therefore correctly remain exclusively about schooling as a national project. Instead of organizing these chronologically either by subject or by date of publication, I begin in Chapter 1 with the latest of these essays (written in 2002), where this national framework is most clearly laid out. This is the most comprehensive of the essays on education, and the most recent. The last (Chapter 3) concentrates on a specific time and set of students' experiences and is most emphatically tied to the methods of social history. Indeed, only this essay in the entire collection draws its data from a large quantitative sample (in this case high school yearbooks), often seen as the hallmark of early social history. I have never believed that social history is coextensive with quantitative history, but in this instance I adopted this method as a necessary means to reconstruct and evaluate ethnicity as an experience in the social relations and school life of students in New York City high schools in the 1930s and 1940s. It is fair to define this section as I have, "Children in Society," since these three essays all draw upon the opening that social history gave to studying children in history and specifically the push that social history gave to examining minority groups and fundamental institutions.

ii

Social history encouraged historians to attend to the faint imprints of social life and listen to previously ignored voices from the past. In this way, social history allowed children, older children especially, to be heard within their institutional settings, such as the school and the family. And

the literature of the time by those historians who looked at family life such as Virginia Yans McLaughlin, or at small communities such as Philip Greven and John Demos, or at youth-identified issues such as Joseph Hawes, Joseph Kett, and John Modell began to lay the solid foundations for a real history of children.⁹ But an exclusively social history of children could never be more than partial and limited. With its bias toward empirically definable behavior patterns that made people in the past independent actors, and its emphasis on agency, social history could never entirely liberate children. Children are, at least in part, defined by their dependency and their helplessness, and their behaviors and identities are often structured by others. Their most important behaviors as children are only infrequently noted and less frequently given real importance. Just as significantly, their visibility, even when faintly apparent through the long haze of history, is usually masked by adult interpretation and mediated through adult reflection. Young children leave very few literate traces, and even artifacts like toys or prams are most often determined by adult choice.¹⁰ It is rarely possible (though not impossible) for historians to observe children or hear them speak directly to the present.

By the 1980s and 1990s, however, cultural history helped to make these disabilities less important. Historians of culture began to assert that this lack of direct contact with children's voices and beliefs was true for almost all subjects excavated by social historians, and that neither texts, nor paintings, nor even statistics are transparent. All of them were patterned through culture (adopting Geertz), all of them existed within a penumbra of power (learning from Foucault), or were already arranged through a conspiracy of texts (adopting Derrida). Moreover, how groups were defined, and the meanings given to identities, was at the very heart of what engaged the attention of the cultural historian. As cultural historians began to challenge the clarity of social historians' views of the hidden actors of the past on these and other grounds, they paradoxically made it more likely that historians would focus on children and on childhood. If no historical subjects ever spoke plainly in their own voices or acted entirely freely, then it was not such a great disadvantage to focus on children. If social historians had opened a much wider angled lens on the past, cultural historians had made it imperative to focus on all its details. In examining details we learned much more about the large patterns of culture. Above all, childhood itself was a pattern inscribed by culture through the ways in which dependency and age, sexuality and maturity, the body and the mind were defined and delineated.

Now in the context of both social and cultural perspectives, historians looked around the more open rooms of the past and saw more and more children. Children were everywhere, not just at school and in families, but

on the streets as David Nasaw demonstrated, and in the courts as Mary Odem discovered. They were deeply part of the developing social science agenda of the twentieth century as Hamilton Cravens demonstrated. But the contribution of cultural history was even more profound, because children often stood firmly in sight as historians found them deeply embedded in political language, sermons, and policy statements. The sexuality of adolescents, as Beth Bailey found, was a matter of real consequence and the subject of cultural instruction and control. And children came prominently into view in the custody and legal issues that Michael Grossberg and Mary Ann Mason explored and in the world of social welfare studied by Linda Gordon.¹¹ They were part of the literary landscape and the visual imagination.¹²

A newly enlarged and liberated political history also noticed the importance of children. By the twentieth century, whole federal agencies revolved around issues of children's welfare and rights, as Kriste Lindemeyer found, and the idea of the child lurks even in the concepts of legal responsibility that define criminal intent and political citizenship.¹³ Not only did many expressions of culture contain children, but there was a whole subset of cultural products focused on child rearing that gave children pride of place. And children's literature has a rich history of its own.¹⁴ These matters gradually came to the fore and have borne fruit in excellent studies of this literature and the concerns it enshrines.¹⁵ Cultural historians were confirming what Ariès had noticed two decades earlier: that culture defines the meaning of age and that childhood is embedded in that definition as well as in the larger belief systems of the society.¹⁶ And Ariès's insights, though not necessarily his conclusions, have remained a touchstone of cultural and social investigation.

The emergence of social and cultural history as central disciplinary perspectives by the 1980s, and a refashioned political history which looked at social policies and law, meant that by the early 1990s the study of children could proceed without much apology. As more and more history was written and new sources became usable, they even began to yield evidence of children's own culture and their independent "agency."¹⁷ The previous absence of children in our history became inexcusable. How could we have missed people who often make up 50 percent or more of the population and are fundamental to how a society defines itself and structures its institutions of power and continuity? How could we have missed children and the contributions they make to the family economy and the tensions of immigrant experience? The explosion of children's studies in history and other fields has followed this recognition and, while many historians still bemoan the fact that we are often more engaged in the history of childhood (how we imagine and portray children and frame their lives)

than in documenting the history of children's experience and activities, there is no gainsaying the extraordinary results. Children's history has become a visible and significant specialty, now firmly anchored within its own organization, the Society for the History of Children and Youth, a specialty which monthly produces innovative and interesting additions to our knowledge of childhood and children in all parts of the society. Today, we are even hearing children's voices in books like Steven Mintz's *Huck's Raft* and understand how deeply they are embedded in the everyday artifacts of the culture as we have learned from Anne Higonnet's work on paintings, illustrations, and photographs, Gary Cross's work on toys, and Rachel Devlin's work on popular literature.¹⁸ And this explosion has taken place far beyond the boundaries of American studies, among European historians who had been developing and challenging Ariès for decades, and increasingly also among Latin American historians and historians of China, India, and Japan.¹⁹ Indeed, as these studies progress, the picture of children's history and of world history has been wonderfully enlarged.

As someone who had been baptized in the historical study of children early, through social history, and who had long been committed to studying culture as an important component of social experience, I needed no special conversion to explore culture both in itself and as a means toward a richer understanding of social life. Nevertheless, its new applicability to children and its potential for enlarging the study of childhood was an important gift of the new cultural turn. Children are pivotal to how a culture defines itself and its future. With the new attention to a full range of cultural expressions, I turned to understanding how Americans defined their obligations to children, and I became alerted to how modern culture dealt with both the children it raised and the children it lost and especially to the strategic role of the modern media in defining parental obligations. The elaboration of cultural signals centered on fears about losing children is a peculiarly modern experience. While grief over the loss of children is as old as parenting and was elaborately expressed in the nineteenth century, anxiety as an anticipation of such loss was a product of altered modern parental expectations. Intrigued by the media obsession with portraying child abduction in the 1980s, I began to explore how the emotional attachment to children and the social commitment to childhood that became prominent by the late nineteenth century resulted in a potent new source of social anxiety, and the learning of new emotions.²⁰ In Part II of this book, "Children in Culture," I include versions of two episodes I explored in my desire to understand modern fears about child loss: the first a frightening tale of young people gone bad in the 1920s in the notorious story of Leopold and Loeb; the second an examination of the

strange contemporary interest in and redefinition of parental abduction. The final essay in this section, Chapter 6, also discusses anxiety about children by examining our increasingly ambiguous sentiments regarding children in the post–World War II United States. In it, I suggest that the planning and control of children that was a fundamental expression of modern parenting has now come to haunt us.

iii

The light that cultural history shed and the stimulus it provided for the study of children and childhood historically came with a broad beam. While culture has been used to illuminate small communities or subcultures, as in Clifford Geertz's famous study of the Balinese cockfight and Lawrence Levine's *Black Culture and Black Consciousness*,²¹ the concept of culture can and has been used to separate much larger social and historical units; thus we often speak about Western culture or Islamic culture, or Renaissance or Chinese culture. Once culture is understood to exercise deep powers over patterns of behavior, belief, and perception, it can easily spill beyond and between national boundaries. In American historiography, this perspective on the subcultural became important in the discussions about multiculturalism in the 1980s in which historians were active participants. If groups in American society had independent cultural sources that issued in diverse forms of expression, then the nation-state was an inadequate vehicle for an exploration of its sources and its consequences. The state certainly exercised one kind of power, but culture brought its own sources of persuasion and identity. As a result, throughout most of the decade historians and many policy makers worried about the disintegrating possibilities that this seemed to threaten. This threat passed by the 1990s, absorbed as so many other similar episodes in the deep well of American pluralism, and the growing recognition that the nation exercises its own powerful cultural influence as a form of identity.²² But by then the image of culture as a force for disintegration in the world was being replaced by new visions of culture in terms of global power. Once discussions of culture took a global turn, as it increasingly did in the 1990s, then it became significant not apart from nations but as a political strategy in discussions of the fate of nations.

This was the position that Samuel Huntington provocatively adopted when he became one of the first to use the idea of culture in order to see through the new lens of "globalization." By viewing culture, and within it the special role of religion, as the fundamental basis for historical development and contemporary identity, Huntington posited one of the pri-

mary issues of our time—a global war of cultures. His perspective has since been sharply rebutted, not least by Amartya Sen, although the current politically fueled perceptions of a world of deep cultural divides and conflicts has certainly given Huntington’s ideas new life.²³ But Huntington’s is not the only use to which a “globalizing” perspective can be put, as I demonstrate in the last section of this book. Globalization can prod American historians to think about American development, not as one of the global forces in Huntington’s conflict-based model, but as an alternative model. American social and cultural development can be importantly understood as having early instantiated and successfully mobilized the very factors that would eventually become crucial features of globalization. Indeed, America was in fundamental ways a new global kind of nation that anticipated the newer global world we are experiencing today. In rethinking American history in this manner, we can imagine a very different outcome than the culture wars that Huntington has posited. Indeed, once we recognize that culture in the United States has been a hybrid that resulted from contributions made by different ethnic, racial, and religious groups, American experience can be viewed as evidence contrary to Huntington’s vision of culture as homogeneous, univalent, and in hostile opposition to other cultures. The very diversity of American culture becomes not a fragile force in today’s world preparing to defend itself against other cultures, but a counter-model for what globalization can mean. It was the possibilities offered by this perspective on American history that first engaged my thinking about globalization in an essay, published in the *Journal of Social History* in 2003, and reprinted in this volume, as the first chapter in part III, “Children of a New Global World.”

“Globalization” as a term and as an idea is today fraught with some of the political weight that Huntington gave it and lends itself to contentious debates. But while Huntington sees it as a battle of armed cultures which Americans must win, many others view it as an aggressive threat by rich nations to local ecologies and autonomous cultural values. In this view, globalization is condemned as yet another expression of Western imperialism. We are made aware of this perspective every time demonstrators protest the meetings of the G-8 nations or the programs of the International Monetary Fund. In these instances, “globalization” is not a description of growing global awareness or even the complex interactions among the cultures of the world, but another instance of American and European hegemonic drives expressed through neoliberal economic policies controlled by bankers in the largest and most powerful economies.²⁴ From this perspective, globalization exploits the labor of the South while raining down a nasty brew of McDonald’s and Coca-Cola on their young peo-

ple that obliterates traditional tastes and traditions. I suggest other ways of understanding the role of these goods for young people in the last section of this book. But those who stand opposed to globalization as simply the dominance of capital creating a world in which differences will disappear cannot imagine that globalization may actually be enacted through the actions of young people in many places. This is happening today as young people who are participants in a smaller world become more familiar with difference.²⁵ There are some observers, such as Thomas Friedman, who view globalization as a beneficent as well as an inevitable force in the world today, but like so many others involved in this debate, these discussions tend to be without historical dimension.²⁶

If we could view globalization historically, as having begun in North America starting in the seventeenth century, and use the United States as a model of its initial expression, rather than as a contemporary political villain, it might be possible to reexamine globalization as a means of taming, not obliterating, difference and creating new cultural tolerance. In the United States, a successful nation-state learned to define itself amidst cultural differences and to embrace those differences as part of its creed. American historians are familiar with the many ways in which this has not been an easy process and the many challenges it has posed in the past and continues to pose in the present. My essays in Part III make these challenges clear. Nevertheless, during the last one-half century, the American model has remained resilient and even strengthened as an ideal at home, and grown more robust as a reality. Indeed, as Part I suggests, this model has even become very much part of the American experience of schooling, the national project par excellence. The essays in this book, especially those in Parts I and III, can suggest how American history can become a touchstone for thinking about contemporary globalization, and do so where it matters most, in relation to the young.

While American history can serve as an alternative model for understanding globalization, our contemporary awareness of the present global moment can also provide a stimulant to new kinds of historical inquiry and analysis. In the essays in the third part of this book I try to use the concept of globalization as a tool to open our historical insights in the twenty-first century, to encourage us to imagine a broader and more dynamic geographical canvas for our investigations, and specifically to encourage these things in regard to the writing of the history of children from a more global point of view. A global perspective for historians is a variant of the world history that some, like William McNeill, John Gillis, and Peter Stearns, have been pursuing for some time and that Stearns has recently applied to children's history with insight and verve.²⁷ And while children are often today used as symbols for the worst kind of globaliza-

tion (see Chapter 8), there is no better subject for an expanded global vision than the history of childhood and children. This is not only because the history of children is still a new field and therefore open to innovative ways of organizing knowledge about the subject. It is also a consequence of the nature and potential of children themselves, since children allow us to see ourselves in global terms.

At birth, all children are members of a world community, still unmarked by most social, national, and cultural boundaries. They are then at their most available to stimuli which, until fully localized within a household, a community, and a nation, could as readily take one shape as another. Thus children are by nature “citizens” of the world. How they become attached to specific identities is precisely one of the things historians want to know. Psychologists have taught us that they do this quite rapidly through personal attachment and language acquisition.²⁸ Adopting a wider, global perspective allows us to study this very process by looking at how children become bounded by nations and cultures, and how they contribute to those formations through their mental and behavioral actions and interactions. Today’s children are in fact stimulated by global ventures. Much more easily than at any time in the past, children today can travel physically or through their imaginations to other parts of the globe and into cultures other than those to which they were born. For children born today, the world really is a much smaller place than it was to earlier generations, and this new possibility of forming attachments across boundaries can provide historians and others with unusual guidance about how identities can be re-created and expanded.

I became very much aware, in editing the *Encyclopedia of Children and Childhood in History and Society*, that so much of what we need to know about children is more meaningful and useful when studied in a comparative or global context. This is true, for example, about mortality and birth rates, vulnerability to disease, forms of infant feeding and care, sexual patterns and practices, gender formation, and child-care arrangements. Moreover, once we look at children as children, rather than as potential grownups in a particular nation, they share many things in common that historians can only grasp by looking beyond previously defined historical boundaries. On the other hand, the distinctions matter a lot, and the differences among children may be better understood and made more meaningful when we see them in a global perspective rather than in isolated national containers. This is especially true because nation-states today reflect wealth as well as power, and the lives of children in wealthy nations are light-years away from those in impoverished countries. In this sense, a global perspective encourages us to appreciate the role, power,

and influence of nationality in the lives of children. It is important to note that adding a global perspective does not require that we give up national history or the history of specific groups. Looking at the globe gives us another way of seeing and another means to explore the past, but it is not exclusive or sufficient.

In the twenty-first century, globalization is also raising anew questions about the relationship between the school, the state, and the economy. In Chapter 6 I begin to suggest how families are rethinking education and consider it much more fully in Part III. As I suggest in these essays, the pressures on contemporary schools to better educate American children has developed, in part, from global competition and comparisons which are eroding the automatic expectations that American children once experienced simply by being citizens of a rich society. Schooling as a form of competitive skills acquisition now reaches firmly across borders both because of the migration of peoples and their ambitious children and in the form of investments in people in other places. These changes may undermine the close association that began to develop in the nineteenth century between schooling and state formation. In the nineteenth century, American schools helped to create American citizenship. By the middle of the twentieth century, schools expressed the successful economic identity of America as a world power. Americans invested in schooling because it confirmed citizenship while training future workers for an effective economy. And this correspondence forced parents to give over some control over their children in exchange for the successful integration of those children into the future national economy. Today, parents, especially in the middle classes, are more than ever concerned with the specific success of their own progeny, but the success of other children as important components of a national economy has become less compelling. As the skills on which our personal prosperity depends moves outside of national boundaries, the firm understanding of schools as basic components of an integrated society recedes from our sights. What the consequences of these changes will be for schooling is not yet clear, although the increasing fragmentation of schooling across the national landscape (into public, private, charter, and home-schooling projects) may be an indication of the loosening relationship between the economic and political spheres.

Finally, there is the matter of children's futures and our actions on their behalf. Since World War II, many organizations devoted to children's issues have grown from a new global vision and committed themselves to a universal perspective, as they look toward improvement by taking all children as the object of their investigation. This is true, for example, of the United Nations, which endowed children with their own rights as per-

sons in the Universal Charter of the Rights of the Child (1989), and organizations like the World Health Organization and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. We seem increasingly willing to grant to children what we are far more reluctant to grant to their parents, a universal appeal. And we are willing to approach their welfare with fewer inhibitions regarding borders and boundaries than we are other persons. This is, in good part, related to how we have come to imagine children, as I try to discuss in Part III of this book. This approach to children grows from increasingly universal commitments that began to take shape in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the Western world when the earliest globalizing trends became apparent. It is therefore somewhat surprising that so much of the literature on children and globalization (and there is now a minor industry in this literature) is at once firmly planted in this vision and then proceeds to condemn globalization and its consequences for children. This literature (and other forms of media presentations) often holds globalization responsible for the problems of children in the underdeveloped world. There are some participants in these discussions such as the educational anthropologists Marcelo Suárez-Orozco and Carola Suárez-Orozco who come with a different view, suggesting how children in many parts of the world benefit from the current moment of globalization to achieve higher skills and competitive advantages. Whichever side the writer is on, however, his or her perspective is almost always defined by a humanitarian commitment that developed historically and is the subject of the final essay in this book (Chapter 9). Indeed, it is useful to remember that this universalizing of concerns about children came in an American context that was deeply challenged by immigrant children and their needs. Thus globalization, as I define it here—the process of becoming more engaged with the world and its differences—is having striking consequences, even among those who oppose contemporary “globalization.”

There has never been a better or more urgent time to direct our attention to the history of children than the present moment, at the point of a new global awareness. Today, children are frequently presented in the media as the victims of globalization. How we appraise their present and their future depends on what we know about their past. It is important that the history of children and childhood that began with Western societies become part of the agenda everywhere in the world, and I am hopeful that the current attention to the children of the streets of Latin America, the brothels of Asia, the armies of Africa, and the factories of India will stimulate a serious historical inquiry that will forcefully bring children into the agenda of the historical profession. Children and childhood have important histories that only adults can write.

Thus, we are brought back to the question first opened up by social history in the 1960s. Those questions were certainly about method and subject matter, but they were also about our openness as historians and our values and commitments. For a very short moment, social history acted as if it could be value free, but its whole development in the context of its time was devoted to providing a history to those who had been forgotten, overlooked, or without manifest power. Historians brought to their studies a dedication to creating a history that, by definition, promised to empower through the vehicle of historical visibility those who had not been seen or noticed before. Today, the new global perspective allows historians once again to commit themselves, this time to a world of children without boundaries. It allows us both to examine the history of childhood in a worldwide perspective and to urge that *children be seen and that their welfare not be ignored*. In the last essay in this volume, I explicitly address just this issue: How can values that are culturally situated and historically derived be preserved in a very different time and a very different context? The new global world is indeed a different context, and it challenges us to think not only about what it means for how we study children historically, but about what this means for who we want to become.

NOTES

1. There were a handful of exceptions in American history, almost all of them related to the growing interest in the history of the family, including John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), and Philip Greven, Jr., *Four Generations: Population, Land, and Family in Andover, Massachusetts* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970); Bernard Wishy, *The Child and the Republic: The Dawn of Modern American Child Nurture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968). In 1970, the profession also saw the first serious attempt to organize the field in a documentary collection in Robert H. Bremner, et al., ed., *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970). But a real introduction to the field did not appear until Joseph Hawes's *American Childhood: A Research Guide and Historical Handbook* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985).

Even before the 1970s, two American historians had paid close attention to the subject, but their studies had not really opened up the field: Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family* (New York: Harper and Row, 1944), and Anne L. Kuhn, *The Mother's Role in Childhood Education: New England Concepts, 1830-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947).

2. Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, trans. Robert Baldick (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).

3. Many of these books followed in the psychoanalytic path opened up by Erik H. Erikson, who had written books that stimulated historians. See, for example, *Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History* (New York: Norton, 1958), and *Childhood and Society*, 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 1963). For an example of this influence, see David Hunt, *Parents and Children in History: The Psychology of Family Life in Early Modern France* (New York: Basic Books, 1970). For an extreme expression of this tendency to equate children's history with an evaluation of their psychological mistreatment, which nevertheless can often provide insightful readings about children, see Lloyd de Mause, "The

Evolution of Childhood," in *The History of Childhood*, ed. by de Mause (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1974), 3-74.

4. Two of the most important expressions of this development were in the journals *Journal of Social History* (1967) and *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* (1970). Both encouraged the new history, including family history, and published articles on children. For an early bibliography on children and youth in history, see C. John Sommerville, "Toward a History of Childhood and Youth," *The Family in History: Interdisciplinary Essays*, ed. by Theodore K. Rabb and Robert I. Rotberg (New York: HarperTorchbooks, 1971), 227-235. All the essays in this collection originally appeared in the *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*. The *Journal of Family History* joined these two in 1976.

5. My interest was first defined in my dissertation, "The Fruits of Transition: American Youth in the 1920s," Columbia University, 1974, which was revised as *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

Philip Greven's pathbreaking examination of how child socialization fundamentally influenced American politics and society came out at about the same time, and it too absorbed psychological perspectives while undertaking to reimagine American history with children as fundamental constituents. See *The Protestant Temperament: Patterns of Child-Rearing, Religious Experience, and the Self in Early America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977). The same year, Joseph F. Kett's *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), made clear that youth had a real role in history.

6. This view of schooling was especially indebted to the perspective established by Michael Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968).

7. This is the argument I made in *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989). The book grew from various studies I undertook on aspects of schooling, broadly defined to include public schools, private schools, universities, the United States military forces, and parochial education.

8. For a discussion of the relationship between nation building and schooling, see John Meyer, et al., "World Expansion of Mass Education, 1870-1980," *Sociology of Education*, 65 (April 1992): 128-149; John Meyer, *School Knowledge for the Masses: World Models and National Primary Curricular Categories in the Twentieth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press, 1992).

9. See Virginia Yans McLaughlin, *Family and Community: Italian Immigrants in Buffalo, 1880-1930* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977); Joseph M. Hawes, *Children in Urban Society: Juvenile Delinquency in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971); Demos, *Little Commonwealth: Kett, Rites of Passage*; John Modell, *Into One's Own: From Youth to Adulthood in the United States, 1920-1975* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

10. See Gary Cross, *Kids' Stuff: Toys and the Changing World of American Childhood* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), and Karin Calvert, *Children in the House: The Material Culture of Early Childhood, 1600-1900* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992).

11. David Nasaw, *Children of the City: At Work and at Play* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Mary E. Odem, *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Hamilton Cravens, *Before Head Start: The Iowa Station and American Children* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Beth Bailey, *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988); Michael Grossberg, *Governing the Hearth: Law and the Family in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985); Mary Ann Mason, *From Father's Property to Children's Rights: A History of Child Custody in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Linda Gordon, *Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence* (New York: Penguin Books, 1988).

12. See, for example James R. Kincaid, *Erotic Innocence: The Culture of Child Molesting* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998); Anne Higonnet, *Pictures of Innocence: The History and Crisis of Ideal Childhood* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1998).

13. Kriste Lindenmeyer, "A Right to Childhood": *The U.S. Children's Bureau and Child Welfare, 1912-46* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997). For citizenship and responsibility, see Holly Brewer, *By Birth or Consent: Children, Law, and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).

14. The literature here is large and growing. Two examples are Gillian Avery, *Behold the Child: American Children and Their Books, 1621-1922* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994); Julia L. Mickenberg, *Learning from the Left: Children's Literature, the Cold War, and Radical Politics in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

15. Among some of the best of these, see Julia Grant, *Raising Baby by the Book: The Education of American Mothers* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Ann Hulbert, *Raising America: Experts, Parents and a Century of Advice about Children* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003); Peter N. Stearns, *Anxious Parents: A History of Modern Childrearing in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2003).

16. Howard Chudacoff, *How Old Are You? Age Consciousness in American Culture* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989).

17. Henry Jenkins, ed., *The Child Culture Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

18. Steven Mintz, *Huck's Raft: A History of American Childhood* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004); Higonnet, *Pictures of Innocence*; Cross, *Kids' Stuff*; Rachel Devlin, *Relative Intimacy: Fathers, Adolescent Daughters, and Postwar American Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).

19. For important new work on Latin America and Asia, see Tobias Hecht, ed., *Minor Omissions: Children in Latin American History and Society* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002); Brian Platt, "Japanese Childhood, Modern Childhood," *Journal of Social History*, 38 (Summer 2005): 965-985; Anne Behnke Kinney, *Representations of Childhood and Youth in Early China* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004); Ping-Chen Hsiung, *A Tender Voyage: Children and Childhood in Late Imperial China* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2005).

20. Paula S. Fass, *Kidnapped: Child Abduction in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997; paperback, Oxford University Press, 2001). For a discussion of how this anxiety became learned, see my article, "Abduction Stories That Changed Our Lives: From Charley Ross to Modern Behavior," in *American Behavioral History: An Introduction*, ed. by Peter N. Stearns (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 42-57.

21. Clifford Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight," in Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 412-453; Lawrence W. Levine, *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

22. David Hollinger, *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism* (New York: Basic Books, 1995); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991).

23. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996). Amartya Sen's response to Huntington appears in "East and West: The Reach of Reason," *New York Review of Books*, 47 (July 20, 2000).

24. See for example, *Children on the Streets of the Americas: Globalization, Homelessness and Education in the United States, Brazil and Cuba*, ed. by Roslyn Arlin Mickelson (London and New York: Routledge, 2000); *The Anthology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism*, edited by Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud (Oxford, England: Blackwell, 2005).

25. See Joe L. Kinechoc, "Complex Politics of McDonald's," in *Kidworld: Childhood Studies, Global Perspectives, and Education*, ed. by Gaile S. Cannella and Joe L. Kincheloe (New York: Peter Lang, 2002). An alternative perspective is presented in Virginia Murphy-Berman and Natalie Hevener Kaufman, "Globalization in Cross-Cultural Perspective," in

Natalie Hevener Kaufman and Irene Rizzini, eds., *Globalization and Children: Exploring Potentials for Enhancing Opportunities in the Lives of Children and Youth* (New York: Kluwer Academic, 2002), and Ben White, "Globalization and the Child Labor Problem," Working Paper Series No. 221, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, The Netherlands, June 1996.

26. Thomas L. Friedman's most recent book about globalization is *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005). This is the third in a series that began with *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* (1999) and *Longitudes and Attitudes* (2002). For a very different perspective, which sees globalization today as no more than a continuation of earlier trends in industrialization and labor exploitation, see Jeremy Seabrook, *Children of Other Worlds: Exploitation in the Global Market* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), and a review of Friedman, "The World Is Round," by John Gray in *New York Review of Books*, 52 (August 11, 2005): 13–15.

27. John R. Gillis, *A World of Their Own Making: Myth, Ritual, and the Quest for Family Values* (New York: Basic Books, 1996); William H. McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, 1976; revised 1989); Peter N. Stearns, *Childhood in World History* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

28. Alison Gopnik, Andrew N. Meltzoff, and Patricia K. Kuhl, *The Scientist in the Crib: Minds, Brains, and How Children Learn* (New York: William Morrow, 1999); *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development*, edited by Jack P. Shonkoff and Deborah A. Phillips for the National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2000).