

## RAISING AMERICANS—RAISING EUROPEANS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Conference at the GHI, April 7–10, 2005. Convener: Dirk Schumann (GHI).

Participants: Christina Benninghaus (University of Bielefeld), Ellen L. Berg (University of California, Berkeley), Sibylle Brändli Blumenbach (University of Basel), Katherine Bullard (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), John Cornell (Butler University), Lynne Curry (Eastern Illinois University), Andrew Donson (University of Massachusetts, Amherst), Astrid M. Eckert (GHI), Eckardt Fuchs (University of Mannheim), Karl-Heinz Füssl (Technical University, Berlin), Brian Ganaway (Presbyterian College), Julia Grant (Michigan State University), Caroline Hinkle McCamant (University of California, Berkeley), Charles A. Israel (University of the South, Sewanee, TN), Carolyn Kay (Trent University), Till Kössler (University of Munich), Seth Koven (Villanova University), Christof Mauch (GHI), David MacLeod (Central Michigan University), Sonya Michel (University of Maryland, College Park), Robert Moeller (University of California, Irvine), Katharine Norris (American University), Christine von Oertzen (GHI), Manon S. Parry (National Library of Medicine), Rebecca Jo Plant (University of California, San Diego), Brian Puaca (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), Christoph Ribbat (University of Bonn), Till van Rahden (University of Cologne), Judith Sealander (Bowling Green State University), Jonathan Skolnik (GHI), Emilie Stoltzfus (Library of Congress), Richard F. Wetzell (GHI), Tara Zahra (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor).

The twentieth century, the century that Swedish author Ellen Key had hoped would be the “Century of the Child,” saw an unprecedented expansion of expert knowledge on and state activity in childrearing, education, and children’s welfare on both sides of the Atlantic. The appropriate methods of raising children and the roles of mothers and fathers in the process, as well as the scope and degree of state intervention, remained contested throughout the century, however. Recent years have seen an increase of scholarly interest in these issues in both America and Europe. The conference brought together historians from both sides of the Atlantic to intensify the dialogue between them, take stock of current debates, and identify paths for future research. It focused on three key questions: How did concepts and practices of childrearing change over the course of the century? What was the impact of pivotal political developments and ruptures, such as the change of political regimes and

wars? And how did transnational and transatlantic academic communication shape concepts and practices in individual nations?

In the opening paper "Children and the National Interest," Sonya Michel set the stage by discussing how children's welfare and the national interest became intertwined in the nineteenth century. Following the American Revolution, which had been cast as a revolt against a tyrannical father, public discourse in the United States again emphasized obedience. It also called for a "Republican Motherhood" that was to inculcate the values of the new state in its future citizens, and advocated state intervention to have the children of the poor raised properly. This, however, largely excluded African-Americans. While fathers continued to lose authority, mothers became the target of various kinds of advice-givers. Drawing on the work of Sylvia Schafer and others, Michel pointed out that in France, too, children came to be seen as precious national resources that mothers in particular had to care for and social policy had to focus on. In the secular moral order that the Third Republic attempted to create, the state would govern through the family. While these new concepts of state intervention began to give rise to new state bureaucracies, a complex relationship of agency and resistance unfolded. Constructions of plight and deviance in public discourse enabled the state to intervene in the lives of its citizens and thereby to exert more control but also to provide relief. As the subjects of these interventions were able to mold them to their own advantage, they contributed to the general expansion of this new state activity. Michel concluded by positing that this advance of social policy seemed to be "inexorable and unavoidable." The discussion of her paper centered on the reasons for and the character of the changes in childrearing and child welfare around 1900. Demographic developments, urbanization, the rise of empires, and the "New Immigration" in the United States were cited as key factors. Several participants also suggested that the fears these processes evoked among contemporaries, especially fears related to sexuality, deserved closer scrutiny.

The first panel of the conference examined concepts of the roles of fathers and mothers. In Wilhelmine Germany, as Carolyn Kay showed in her paper "How Should We Raise Our Son Benjamin? Advice Literature for Mothers in Early Twentieth-Century Germany," the rise of the sciences coincided with an increase in the number of advice books on childrearing that acknowledged the pivotal role of the bourgeois family for the strength of the nation. Drawing in particular on the works of pediatrician Adalbert Czerny and pedagogue Adolf Matthias, Kay argued that these books, written by academic experts from various disciplines and directed primarily at mothers, agreed that discipline was the precondition for attaining the other middle-class values. Only a minority of advice-givers, which included female authors such as feminist Adele Schreiber, empha-

sized the primacy of a nurturing environment over stern methods of punishment.

In her paper "From Mother's Enforcer to Boy's Pal: The Changing Ideals of Fatherhood in the American Middle Class, 1900-1929," Caroline Hinkle McCamant discussed how concerns about the stability of the middle-class family led a wide range of authors from the mid-1910s on to call for a fundamental redefinition of fatherhood in the United States. At the beginning of the century, a father's principal task was to connect his family to the outside world. He was supposed to show friendly interest in his children but keep his distance and act as the disciplinarian if need be. Under the impact of skyrocketing divorce rates, the upheaval of the First World War, and the rise of peer culture, advice-givers, fearing the dissolution of the family, advocated more democratic relations between its members. Fathers were now encouraged to become emotionally close and playful companions of their sons and win acceptance by their friends. Being such a "dad" would not only be fun but also keep fathers young themselves.

Rebecca Jo Plant examined a fundamental change of the definition of the mother's role in her paper "Toxic Mothers: Diagnosing the American family, 1930-1960." American experts warned that just as in their view authoritarian fathers had given rise to totalitarianism in Nazi Germany, overly protective mothers would weaken democratic fortitude in the United States. Citing the findings of psychoanalysis, they recommended close bonding between mother and child only in the very early years, but urged emotional distance thereafter to allow the child to develop its individuality. As letters to popular author Philip Wylie demonstrated, many mothers seemed to agree with the experts' position. Plant argued, contrary to the dominant position in present scholarship, that this redefinition marked a break with the tradition of "Republican Motherhood," as it devalued and pathologized mother love, and discouraged women from constructing their entire identities around their maternal role.

In his paper "Democracy and Authority: The Constitutional Court's Ruling Against Patriarchy and West German Political Culture in the 1950s," Till van Rahden posited a link between the legal dismantling of patriarchy and the evolution of West German democracy. While the chancellorship of Konrad Adenauer had initially been characterized by the restoration of the patriarchal family in response to its subjugation to state control both in Nazi and Soviet totalitarianism, it then, as van Rahden argued, became a period of "experiments and new beginnings" in which a new democratic fatherhood began to take shape. When the Constitutional Court ruled in 1959 that fathers and mothers had fully equal rights in the family, Catholic commentators at first voiced fears about a "fatherless society" but soon viewed a father who was playful and spent much

time at home with his children positively, as an antidote to the militaristic father of the past.

In his comments, Robert Moeller drew a sharp line between the post-1945 convergence of the United States and (West) Germany and their pre-1945 differences and emphasized the difference of military cultures as one key factor. He suggested a number of issues that deserved closer scrutiny: the differences between boys and girls; the audiences that the advice literature addressed; the role of sex in children's development; the influence of religion and popular culture; the definitions of the dysfunctional and abnormal as instructive contrasts to the standards advice books prescribed; and the impact of the Cold War. One key point of the following discussion was the question of how closely the advice literature mirrored the actual practice of childrearing in middle- and working-class families; another was the links between the American and the German debates that had not been mentioned in the papers. These included the explicit resistance against the German definition of the father in Wylie's work, the insistence on privatizing motherhood in the United States in light of the opposite situation in Nazi Germany, and the prominence of American advice literature (Spock, Gesell) in postwar Germany. Attention was also drawn to the many references of the post-1945 German discussion to Weimar and Nazi Germany.

The second panel addressed the relationship between parental rights and those of the state. Placing the infamous Scopes trial of 1925 in a new perspective, Charles A. Israel in his paper "Who Owns Children? Parents, Children, and the State in the United States South, 1875-1925" described conflicts about religious and moral education in the American South. At the turn of the century, this education was seen primarily as the task of parents, not of public schools. As Progressive reformers were focusing their efforts on public schools, which had been established in significant numbers only since the Civil War, conservatives in the South sought to give the Bible a substantial presence in the classroom. William Jennings Bryan, as Israel pointed out, fought against the teaching of evolution mainly because he regarded it as inspired by a Nietzschean materialism that allegedly had become the hallmark of German education, the superiority of which the First World War had called into question. Combining the arguments of the will of the majority and of parental rights, Bryan and his followers cast the state as "creature and servant" of parents and found courts sympathetic to their views.

Lynne Curry gave a detailed description of a case of child abuse and the failing responses of state agencies to it in her paper "DeShaney vs. Winnebago County: Child Abuse, State Action, and Children's Rights in a Family Tragedy." Four-year-old Joshua DeShaney suffered severe brain damage and remained partially paralyzed after a number of beatings by

his father and the women he lived with in 1983–84. This was not due to negligence on the part of the state agencies involved, however. Instead Curry argued that the reason was that the social worker who was in charge of the case and to whom the police deferred followed a “therapeutic” rather than an “authoritative” model in her actions. This model, which reflected the guiding principle of the training of social workers in Wisconsin in the 1960s and 1970s, gave priority to keeping a family together and to counseling its members over placing a child in state custody to protect it from abuse.

Dirk Schumann argued in his paper “Asserting Their ‘Natural Right’: Parents and Schooling in Post-1945 Germany” that parental involvement in school affairs made a contribution to the liberalization of educational methods and to political democratization in West Germany. As parents’ rights were acknowledged as “natural rights” in the new constitution and further strengthened by the influence of the concept of “natural law” on contemporary legal thinking, many parents became actively involved in school matters already in the late 1940s and 1950s. Even though they were always in the minority, these active parents did not hesitate to challenge school authorities on all levels, by participating in newly formed parents’ councils and in face-to-face encounters with teachers and officials. Corporal punishment by teachers became a particular source of conflicts. As parents’ actions demonstrated that authority could be legitimately criticized, they contributed to the gradual liberalization of education in the 1960s. In the liberal political climate around 1970, parents’ involvement was given a new boost, but it now largely failed to have a major impact, given the diversity of its goals and the increasing bureaucratization of schools.

In his paper “Reinventing *Kindergarten*: Early Childhood Education and Care in Reunited Germany,” John Cornell compared the development of the *Kindergarten* (nursery school and kindergarten in American terminology) in both German states after 1949 and following reunification in 1990. West German *Kindergärten* were for the most part half-day institutions, on the assumption that most women were not gainfully employed, and even on the eve of unification offered places for not more than 70 percent of all young children. They provided a realm of social learning in groups of mixed age and allowed for some experimentation in teaching methods. In marked contrast, their East German counterparts, set up to take in every child, relied on very traditional teacher-centered methods and rigid separation of age cohorts. Following unification, the East German system was partially dismantled, especially in rural areas, due chiefly to the declining birthrate. The western states of reunified Germany saw a marked increase in Kindergarten places (especially full-day) as a result of the growing number of working women. This has

brought about noticeable disparities in quality of care and questions about whether sufficient resources are being devoted to early childhood education. *Kindergärten* in both parts of Germany now were on their way to becoming truly child-centered institutions, Cornell argued.

Christina Benninghaus raised two general points in her commentary. She emphasized that despite the general acceptance of state interference in the post-1945 period, its concrete form still had to be negotiated with parents. She also called attention to the fact that the social class that parents belonged to must not be overlooked, adding that in the East German case the new childcare institutions allowed many women to be mothers, while at the same time limiting their control of their children. Addressing the individual papers, she wondered why evolution was such a delicate issue for those concerned about teaching moral values from a religious perspective in the American South, and wanted to learn more about the concrete work experience of the social worker in the DeShaney case. She also asked for more precise data on how many parents actually were engaged in school matters, warned against overestimating the democratizing effects of this engagement, and wondered to what extent parents at present were satisfied with the structure of German child-care institutions. Several contributions in the discussion addressed general issues related to the DeShaney case, such as the distance between academic experts and the practitioners of social work, the role of preconceptions like that of the "evil stepmother," and the epistemological question of how research on child abuse had to be guided by a normative concept of children's rights. Other comments pointed out the differences between Catholic and Lockean concepts of "natural rights" and between "natural rights" and "property rights" in conflicts over children's protection and education.

The third panel focused on the strategies and attitudes of various groups of experts. In his paper "Reform Dolls: Men and Women, Childhood and Politics in Wilhelmine Germany," Brian Ganaway, following a concept of consumption that stresses its empowering as opposed to its destructive qualities, discussed how those male businessmen who dominated the market for toys, 60 percent of which were dolls, were successfully challenged by female entrepreneurs. While the men offered dolls that were standardized and technologically precise versions of adults, intended to shape girls as rational future housewives, the female producers, most notably the later famous Käthe Kruse, used simple materials but individualized faces for their dolls, thus encouraging girls to take an active role in playing with them. As they found a sympathetic public and attracted even the interest of Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg, producers of the new "character dolls" and of hybrids with the traditional "techno-

logical dolls" became commercially successful on the eve of the First World War.

In his paper "Educating Catholics, Raising Spaniards: The Catholic Church and Child Rearing in Spain in the Twentieth Century," Till Kössler explored the ways in which the Catholic Church sought to change its educational institutions in order to retain its influence on Spanish society. Criticizing the prevailing view that simplistically casts the conflict between the church and liberal groups over education as one between tradition and modernity, he suggested conceptualizing it as a truly modern struggle about how to define order in a society in transition. As the Catholic *colegios*, for the most part boarding schools, introduced modern technology in their facilities, shed rigorous disciplinary methods, and offered study trips and courses in the field of industry and commerce in the 1910s and 1920s, Catholic pedagogy began to redefine education as a task that required the expertise of modern psychology. Kössler pointed out, however, that this wide-ranging modernization was fraught with the tension between opening schools to a liberal environment and fighting against liberalism itself.

Drawing on detailed case files and emphasizing the importance of analyzing negotiations between experts and their clients for understanding changes of childrearing practices, Sibylle Brändli Blumenbach described the emergence of new relationships between both groups in her paper "Negotiating Trouble, Negotiating Care: Parents, Teachers, Children, and the Medico-Pedagogical Institutions of Basel, Switzerland, in the 1970s." This decade was a time of transition in Basel for state services such as school psychology that dealt with children's behavioral and learning difficulties. The old concept of removing a severely troublesome child from their class or family gave way to an approach centered on counseling and therapy. Emphasis shifted to the psychological dimension of the problems and to working on relationships between all family members. This granted children a substantial degree of agency but also met with resistance from clients. The egalitarian thrust and experimental mode of interaction in many such encounters placed them firmly in the context of the 1970s. The therapeutic "intimate relations" generated in the consultation room revealed shifting expectations and demands of citizens from all strata vis-a-vis the state with respect to the education and personal development of children, and Brändli pointed out that these relations both registered and helped define new social relations between family members.

In her commentary, Julia Grant pointed out the difference between Ganaway's and Kössler's papers on the one hand and Brändli Blumenbach's on the other. While the former addressed a market situation in which "products" of different types had to be sold, the latter focused on

the changing emphasis on expert control in the activities of a specific profession, reminiscent of the situation of American psychology in the 1920s. While she called for a more precise conceptualization of “tradition” and “modernity” in all three cases, Grant emphasized that in Brändli Blumenbach’s case, discourse and power play had to be separated more clearly for analytical purposes. Much of the following discussion focused on children’s agency. Participants debated to what extent children had an active role in buying their toys and to what extent they could influence the process only by resisting choices others made for them. Childhood diaries such as those by Breslau pedagogue and émigré William Stern were seen as a valuable source for this purpose. It was also pointed out that the question of children’s agency could be historicized by analyzing experts’ changing views of childhood. Other issues raised in the discussion concerned the nature of the “markets” addressed in the papers, in particular the question of how in the Swiss case children became clients of school psychologists in the first place.

The fourth panel explored the links between concepts of education and visions of national futures. In her paper “Creative Children, Abnormal Children, and Criminals: French Visions of Child Psychology on the Eve of World War I,” Katharine Norris examined how child psychology became a key, if controversial, academic discipline in France on the eve of World War I. As demographic decline exacerbated fears of archenemy Germany, French children were regarded as a national resource of utmost importance, and practitioners of the emerging science of child psychology drew attention to the variety of ways in which their expertise could be used to improve education and child rearing. Attention to the importance of children’s spontaneity and imagination became the basis for fundamental reforms in the public-school art curriculum in 1909. That same year, newly developed IQ tests became the basis for tracking “abnormal” children into special classes within the public school system. When specialized juvenile courts were established in 1912, however, psychiatrists were stymied in their efforts to require that all accused juvenile offenders be submitted to psychological examinations. In the eyes of magistrates, educators, and politicians, child psychology was a helpful yet potentially dangerous discipline, and psychologists who sought to widen their institutional influence were often accused of trying to manufacture mental abnormality where there was none.

In her paper “‘Children Betray their Father and Mother’: Collective Education, Nationalism, and Democracy in the Bohemian Lands,” Tara Zahra challenged the traditional view that the concept of collective education typically stood in fierce opposition to that of education in the family. Absent a nationalizing policy of the government in Vienna, German and Czech nationalists set up their own networks of educational and

child welfare institutions prior to 1914 to make up for deficits of family education and win over children of binational origins. As tensions between the two groups grew after 1918, these institutional networks expanded and harnessed the expertise of more academic disciplines, including that of the new discipline of psychoanalysis. Following the Nazi takeover of Bohemia in 1938/39, all of its educational institutions were placed under state control, a measure that fundamentally changed views of collective education. Czech nationalists now called upon families, mothers in particular, to turn their homes into bulwarks of Czech nationalism, and Sudeten Germans, fearing that they might lose their cultural hegemony, likewise wanted their mothers to stay at home. After 1945, attempts to create distance both to Nazism and Communism created the myth of an apolitical private sphere that totalitarianism had tried to invade and destroy.

Katherine Bullard described the ambivalence of a new institution that was a product of Progressive reform in her paper "Children's Future, Nation's Future: Race, Citizenship, and the U.S. Children's Bureau." Founded in 1912 and particularly active in wartime, the bureau cast its programs, which provided advice and medical support, as necessary assistance for those representing the future of the nation. Citing several surveys conducted by the bureau, Bullard pointed out, however, that this concept of "social citizenship" was based on an explicit distinction between whites and non-whites. Representing the standard against which the health of all others was measured, white children were depicted in promotional materials in a clean and prosperous environment, whereas African-American and other non-white children were portrayed in primitive settings. The Children's Bureau ran special programs in the U.S. territories of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippines, justifying them by referring to similar activities in parts of the British Empire, not in those with large indigenous populations, however, but in those such as New Zealand that could more easily be portrayed as basically white.

In her commentary, Judy Sealander noted that the politicization of childhood as a "potent and easily manipulable icon" from the early twentieth century on was a common theme in all three papers. It established standards of normality and modernity, not the least against the backdrop of visions of racial suicide. While children were now regarded as "suggestible," it remained unclear, as Sealander emphasized, whether state social policy or the new social science professions were the first to take initiative in this direction. In each case, it was crucial to "follow the money" and analyze the interests of those who provided funds. Contributions to the discussion called for closer examination of international influences such as that of the USSR on Czechoslovakia after 1945 and that of colonialism. It was also suggested that definitions of what constituted

“abnormality” and “family” were pivotal for the developments that all three papers described. While it was acknowledged, in particular with regard to the activities of the U.S. Children’s Bureau, that laws were crucial for determining inclusion in and exclusion from programs, the actual in- and exclusionary effects of expert activities seemed to deserve closer scrutiny. It was also asked to what extent research activities reflected real concerns as opposed to merely the availability of children for empirical studies.

The fifth panel addressed effects of war on childrearing and education. In her paper “‘Linked with the Welfare of all Peoples’: The American Kindergarten and World War I,” Ellen L. Berg refuted the view that wartime kindergarten redefined Americanization as complete and potentially coercive assimilation. Prior to the war, the Americanization movement had discovered kindergarten as a powerful instrument, in particular because it allowed reaching many immigrant mothers through their children. As during the war the term “war work” became shorthand for the broader goals of kindergarten activities, it denoted for the most part the teaching of useful habits such as conservation techniques and calls to save for the Red Cross. Traditional Froebelians, who represented a teacher-centered style of work, regained some ground against Progressive reformers, and the patriotism that kindergarten promoted sometimes turned into jingoism. On balance, however, kindergarten remained committed to a concept of internationalism and world citizenship, symbolized by the fact that the institution’s German name “kindergarten” was kept.

Andrew Donson described the convergence of reform pedagogy with German nationalism and militarism in his paper “War Pedagogy in the Era of the *Burgfrieden* and the ‘Spirit of 1914.’” Prior to 1914, schooling in Germany was marked by an authoritarian style that featured rigid discipline and learning by rote, but as Donson pointed out, attempts by Wilhelm II and leading officials to inculcate it with an aggressive nationalism had met with resistance from teachers and the academy. The outbreak of the war, however, triggered a wave of patriotism that silenced pacifist voices among the teachers and led to ad hoc revisions of curricula and class-room activities that introduced references to the war and materials such as newspapers, previously shunned as too “political.” As teachers were encouraged to develop close relationships with their students and to experiment with curricula, key demands of reform pedagogy were fulfilled, albeit in a uniformly nationalistic and militaristic spirit. Drawing upon collections of the new “free” compositions, Donson argued that at least until early 1916 most students shared the violent militarism and nationalism taught in German schools.

In his comments, David McLeod emphasized the general point that gauging what societal changes were brought about by wars and how long

they lasted always raises difficult methodological issues. He found Donson's argument basically convincing but wondered what influence peer groups might have had on student's attitudes as well as social class, age, and gender. While he was not entirely surprised by Berg's thesis, he pointed to the tensions in American society at the time it went to war in 1917, something that could have been expected to affect kindergarten more profoundly. Contributions to the discussion pointed to the parallels between school reforms and reforms of the military in Germany, but they also questioned the impact of reform pedagogy on schools and called for a closer look at the relationship between continuity and change in 1916–17 and the influence of the new propaganda techniques, especially visual ones, on teaching. Since the hallmark of the period under scrutiny was reform in a Progressive spirit, it was also suggested that the students' agency needed better conceptualization.

The sixth and final panel addressed international transfers and exchanges. In his paper "Child Welfare and Juvenile Delinquency: the Mechanics and Effects of Transnational Educational Relations in the Early Twentieth Century," Eckardt Fuchs introduced a systematic framework for investigating the history and mechanics of internationalism. His case study demonstrated the continuities through three phases of international exchange: a first one from 1820 to 1870 that was marked by a "sainte alliance" of private and religious actors; a second one of institutionalized international cooperation between 1870 and 1914; and a third after 1918, in which the League of Nations took over many responsibilities. Organized chiefly by Belgium, international congresses served as the principal venue of international exchange prior to 1914, bringing primarily scholars and government officials together and leading to the widespread adoption of American juvenile courts in Europe. After the First World War, the League of Nations became the center and "clearing house" of this transnational network and played a key role in establishing international rules in the fields of child welfare and education.

Examining American photography of children in America and Europe in his paper "Back to Innocence: Photographers and the Faces of Children, 1939–1958," Christoph Ribbat put forth the thesis that the image of the innocent child was not a timeless concept but a (re)creation of the years of the Second World War. Victorian photographers had indeed portrayed poor children in the slums of London and New York as angelic creatures. In the interwar years, some photographers depicted the Great Depression by focusing on the plight of families; others, such as the New York photographer Weegee, showed children as strange and sexualized beings. *Europe's Children*, a photobook published in 1943 by American expatriate Therese Bonney, who had lived in Paris since World War I, then exemplified a paradigm shift. In an era when picture magazines

such as *Life* and photobooks were at the zenith of their influence, Bonney used this medium to portray children as innocent creatures and guiltless victims of war to make a poignant appeal for help. When American photographers again presented a complex picture of American children in the late 1950s, they now couched it in the “normalcy” of middle-class homes and schools, as Ribbat pointed out, while they depicted poor and suffering children as a phenomenon of parts of the world that were far away from the United States.

In his paper “From Michigan to Munich: German Exchange Teachers and Teenagers and Democratic School Reform in the Postwar Federal Republic,” Brian Puaca argued that exchange programs were a highly successful form of cultural transfers from the United States to West Germany in the first postwar decade. Focusing on West German school teachers and high school students, he gave a detailed account of their respective programs and, drawing upon reports and letters they wrote at the end or soon after their stays, of how those teachers and students assessed their experiences and how they changed their views of schooling in Germany. While some teachers criticized that fundamental facts and skills were not always given sufficient attention in America, both teachers and students were profoundly impressed by extracurricular activities in American schools such as student governments and newspapers, PTAs, and club sports. Viewing them as lessons in democracy, teachers and students expressed their intention to launch similar activities at their own schools in Germany, and often made concrete efforts toward doing this.

In his commentary, Karl Heinz Füssl raised the methodological question of to what extent a specific set of circumstances, including a yet underdeveloped part of a national educational system, was necessary for transfers to be successful. With respect to Puaca’s paper, he suggested examining the long-term influence of the programs, as evident from the careers of prominent politicians and scholars. He also suggested taking into account the frustration a number of German students felt after their return, prompting them to express the wish to emigrate to the United States. He suggested to Ribbat that he consider the reception of the images by their viewers. He asked Fuchs why Belgium played such a pivotal role in international exchange, and also pointed to pronounced differences of opinion between the United States and Europe on child welfare policy. Contributions to the discussion called for placing the three papers in a long-term perspective by examining how international exchange such as that organized by philanthropic organizations prior to the processes discussed was taken up later, what influence iconographic traditions such as depictions of suffering in the religious imagery of the Middle Ages exerted in the twentieth century, and what impact the socialization of children prior to their stay in the United States had on their

experiences. Ribbat's two contrasting types of images were not seen as mutually exclusive, while the places of race and gender in children's photography were regarded as deserving closer analysis.

In general comments on the conference, Seth Koven raised a number of conceptual and methodological issues. Emphasizing that the history of childrearing and education had to be placed firmly in its national and international political contexts, he pointed out that it was important to take a close look at how children were represented in political discourses—typically as mirrors or sources of world views and as investments or drains on wealth—and how funds were allocated accordingly. Educational institutions had to be conceptualized in such a broader sense both as sites of teaching knowledge and of providing social services, as well as points where international and national influences intersected. While pedagogical and political aims of educational reforms had to be dissociated analytically, there was no time period in which political aims were totally absent from such reforms, not even prior to the 1920s. Koven also called for dismissing Whiggish notions of modernity and modernization in the field of education, and opted for a periodization that emphasized unevenness and the plurality of modernities. In this context, the 1920s had to be seen as an academic laboratory in which the boundaries between the relevant academic disciplines were not yet drawn; when this happened later, it came with normative expectations. Citing scholarship on maternalist movements, Koven suggested that mothers should be conceptualized as having agency rather than as being denied it, while in the case of fathers, constraints on agency should be given more attention. He concluded by calling for more international comparisons, noting for example that the “democratization of education,” a key goal on both sides of the Atlantic, had different meanings in the United States and in Germany, and that race and immigration so far had not been adequately examined as factors in European education.

Adding a specifically American perspective, David McLeod drew attention to the problems of researching state activity in the field of child welfare and education. He underlined that, in addition to the differences between the fifty states and between the federal, state, and the local levels, it had to be taken into account that especially in the early Progressive era much legislation by state governments did not demand action by local governmental units (cities, counties, etc.) but merely permitted them to establish child-oriented programs. Since these local governments were the units that actually provided most child services, this legislative permissiveness contributed to enhancing the differences between urban and underdeveloped rural areas and left organizations such as the humane societies their own field of activities. McLeod pointed out that it was not clear why the United States did not create a stronger welfare state, given

that it built up a comprehensive system of public education. Perhaps the American ideology of individualism made this the most acceptable venue for child services. He tentatively suggested an overarching narrative that centered on “state surveillance” in the early twentieth century, “state provision” in the 1960s and 1970s, and “state demands” thereafter. European influences had an impact on this process up until the 1930s; from then on, influences from abroad made themselves felt only as “political shocks,” reflected especially in an erratic school policy. Citing policy discussions about child abuse and autism, McLeod warned against overemphasizing the criticism of parents and against constructing linear narratives.

The discussion that followed focused mainly on how to conceptualize the twentieth century as a distinct period in the history of childrearing and education. While the proposition to drop this notion altogether did not win acceptance, participants agreed that one common thread could be seen in the increase of state activity. This, however, did not necessarily entail the increase of state control, although the impact of totalitarian systems needed closer scrutiny. Traditional narratives that posited a teleological development of institutions of childhood welfare and education in a progressive spirit needed to be deconstructed. Examining the varying definitions of “citizenship” seemed to be one particularly useful approach; another seemed to be exploring definitions of “normality,” not the least that of gender roles, as mirrored in the fears that informed educational practices, most notably those related to sexuality and criminality. Parental authority could be constructed in various ways vis-à-vis state authority and that of experts. The rise of the latter was obvious, but their actual influence, in particular in the case of advice literature, needed to be explored, not taken for granted. Children could be conceptualized in multiple ways that reflected various degrees of intrusion and distance on the part of their educators and the fact that they now became aware of their own development. Given the importance of peer groups as a source of influence rivaling that of parents and teachers, it was pointed out that the specific discourses and interests at play here deserved particular attention, as adolescence was redefined by psychoanalysis as a part of childhood and hence as a period in which expert advice was needed.

The papers and discussions of the conference have shown how current research projects in the field redefine questions about the structure and function of the welfare state by focusing on discourse, representation, and agency. They have thrown into sharp relief the problems of periodization and conceptualization of the “Century of the Child.” The results of the conference will be published as a collection of essays.

*Dirk Schumann*