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This thesis examines how and why children tend to be isolated physically and socially from adult life in urbanized areas of societies in which the capitalist mode of production is dominant. It is also about structuralist methodology: what it means and how it is relevant to this inquiry.

In Chapter I, the author posits three structures which provide a framework for analyzing the isolation of children: the capitalist mode of production (the structural totality), family structure, and urban structure. This chapter also develops procedures which will be followed in analyzing each of these structures. These include the development of structural concepts through criticism, the description of transformations, and the analysis of structural relationships. In addition, fieldwork undertaken for the thesis, which consisted of interviews and other procedures with parents and children of six Vancouver families, is incorporated using Sartre's concept of regressive and progressive analysis. This involves positing a broad structural context (regressive phase), examining the experiences of individuals at an empirical level (progressive phase), and then moving to an analysis of the structures which mediate between the two levels.

In Chapter II, the author undertakes the regressive stage of the analysis by describing the capitalist mode of production. In Chapter III, the progressive phase begins with the development of profiles of each of the six families interviewed in the fieldwork. In Chapters IV and V,
the author examines the mediating substructures and elements of family and urban structure. In this process a series of characterizations of the isolation of children is developed, and their historical transformations described. In terms of family structure, some of these are: separation of children from production; prolonged dependence in adolescence; institutionalized learning; decline of apprenticed learning; institutionalized socialization practices; and play as children's activity. In terms of urban structure the characterizations are: residential segregation; decline in children's access to streets; decreased mobility of children; 'containment' by traffic; institutional organization of space which reinforces neighbourhood containment; and differentiated adult and child urban symbolism.

In Chapter VI, these characterizations are presented as conclusions. The advantages and limitations of the structuralist approach are reviewed.
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This thesis is as much a personal inquiry as it is "a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts." My first interest in the topic grew out of experiences in Ghana, West Africa, while my wife and I were on a teaching assignment from 1966-68. We were struck by how children seemed to be everywhere. This was not in the abstract sense of there being "lots of children," but rather that children were as much a part of the fabric of society as were adults. They slipped out of the early morning darkness to carry tomatoes, eggs, plantain and other goods to market; they followed their parents to work in cassava or corn fields, carrying machetes at ages four or five; they danced and sang at yam festivals in as prominent a way as any adult; babies were constantly carried on their mothers' or siblings' backs in the markets, on trails, in lorries and in the fields; and children played together under a full moon long after they would have been swept off the streets in any western society.

Images like these—or any alternate visions that a person brings back from another society—are constant reminders that what one experiences in one's own society need never be considered as "natural" or even logical. On my return to Canada, my own society appeared unnatural in its separation of children from the fabric of adult life. Children seemed to exist in enclaves of school, their own peer groups and defined "play spaces." The marketplace did not offer the vibrant interaction among people of all ages that I had felt in Ghana. It was on one level
an abstraction which had nothing to do with people, much less children; on the level of daily experience it was a series of automobile oriented consumer places which discouraged children from all but a narrow range of activities (e.g. candy consumption, comic books, etc.). The workplace, symbolized alternately in factories or office towers, was totally unknown territory for all children. Even large areas of residential space were forbidden and forbidding to children.

I began to explore some of the reasons for these differences when compiling a teacher's guide on Children's Rights in 1977. I was impressed by a film entitled Invention of the Adolescent, produced by the National Film Board, which in turn led me to the work of Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood. Both traced the development of schools in western society, the separation of children from the mainstream economy, and the emergence of the idea of the child as separate from the idea of the parent, adult and family.

By far the biggest impetus for understanding the relation between children and society at large has been the births of our daughters Meran, in 1977 and Elise in 1981. Although my primary focus in fieldwork has been on children in the age group six to twelve, my experience with our daughters has made me sensitive to the social forces that are at work on adults and children as soon as the latter are born. Hospitals frequently separate children from parents at birth. The demands of work, western notions of privacy and independence, and the relatively large size of many North American homes encourage an "ideal" of a child having his own room as soon as he or she is brought back from the hospital. The built environment of the city can hinder parental attempts to enlarge the
young child's world beyond that of the immediate neighbourhood. To appreciate this claim, one need only experience streets without sidewalks, sidewalks without curb-to-crosswalk slopes, restaurants without booster seats or changing facilities, parks or whole areas of the city without public washrooms and buses without room for strollers.

Most North American parents (sadly, too often only the mother), make decisions about their child's separation from or inclusion in the life of adults every day in situations like the ones just described. Often the decisions are unconscious. Sometimes they are more deliberate, and are couched in terms such as nurturance, independence, privacy, love or necessity. My good fortune—and at times great burden—has been that the subject of this thesis has been directly relevant to my day-to-day life. Its socio-economic focus has helped me to question many received opinions as they pertain to my own process of raising children. Reversing the equation, my experience with my daughters and the countless daily insights my wife and I have shared, have lent the thesis a personal significance far beyond whatever merit the theoretical formulations may attain in their own right.

The theoretical elaboration of this topic seems at times to break almost completely with any sense of daily life—most notably in the first two chapters. Yet it has always been written with the awareness that at any moment either of our children might open my study door, climb into my lap and with deft strokes of their favourite felt pens, edit parts of the manuscript so that it might reflect the everyday reality of family life.
NOTES


CHAPTER I

THE EVOLUTION OF A METHODOLOGY

I.0 PRELIMINARY NOTE

The objective of this thesis is to describe how and why children tend to be isolated physically and socially from adult life in urbanized areas of societies in which the capitalist mode of production is dominant. The thesis is also about structuralist methodology: what does it mean, how can it be applied in a particular instance, and what are some of its limitations. The fashioning of the thesis topic into the above statement and the construction of a structuralist methodology have occurred simultaneously and over an extended period of time.

This chapter presents the methodology as a process, or as stated in the chapter title, an "evolution." On the one hand it reflects the evolution of my own thought. Briefly, this development was as follows: I found empirical methods in themselves insufficient, I searched for alternate methods, gained a general notion of structuralism, gradually elaborated it to a point similar to Althusserian structuralism, and finally followed through with a structuralist approach to my particular topic. But personal history is not sufficient in itself as justification for this method of presentation. One could, after all, present the reader with the packaged statement and explication of the thesis topic, together with its methodological wrapping and ribbon. But structuralism is not easily defined. Its concern with totality, interrelatedness and the construction of concepts almost demands a presentation as process
rather than finished product. One has to go through successive approximations and dialectical elaborations to arrive at the significance of the term structuralism for purposes of a particular topic. For these reasons it seemed most appropriate to develop both the thesis topic and the concept of structuralism in this chapter in terms of an evolution.

The result may be frustrating to the reader, for the elaboration of ideas seems at times to take one away from what one perceives as the topic of discussion. Many of the questions with which I was confronted as I proceeded through the development of the methodology are posed on one page, and sometimes not resolved for several pages. The effect is somewhat like viewing the Pompidou Centre in Paris, with all its innards (air ducts, elevators, etc.) on the outside. One wonders at times where the actual building is. However, this form of architecture allows the viewer the privilege of seeing how the building functions. Similarly, the presentation of the methodology as a process helps clarify why certain points dealt with at length later in the thesis—for example, the entire chapter on the capitalist mode of production as a totality, the family profiles, the analysis of family and urban theories, and the genealogies of substructural elements—are essential to the lifeblood of the structuralist approach I have adopted.

1.1 "THE SEARCH FOR A METHOD"¹

For many students schooled in the empiricism of (American) social science, methodology is essentially a process of sample selection and verification procedures (often an abdication to statistics), or in more general terms, a concern with "rigour" in the gathering and interpreta-
tion of facts about the observable world. While these concerns are undoubtedly important, they bypass basic issues which must be dealt with in relation to methodology. The first issue is the clarification of the investigator's values about the topic he is researching. The second is his ontology or theory of what exists. The third is his epistemology, or theory of acquisition of knowledge. These issues cannot be separated, for one cannot examine a question about reality without clarifying what one believes reality to be, and how one legitimately acquires knowledge about that reality.

What has this meant in terms of this inquiry into the isolation of children? Dealing with values is initially a process of allowing them to surface, to rise into consciousness. Gunnar Myrdal advocates this process as a means to overcome the delusion that social research can actually be value free. As outlined in the introduction, I came to this thesis with a reservoir of personal experience and feelings not tangential to, but directly bearing on the subject. My conviction was that children are isolated socially and physically from the "adult" world in our rapidly urbanizing society, unlike an African society of which I had had some experience, and unlike earlier periods of Western society about which I had read. My value system held that this was detrimental for the child because if his experience of the physical and social world of adults were restricted, he could only emerge as a less complete and empathic adult. I assumed that at a societal level this would also have harmful consequences, for if one multiplies the problems of one restricted child, the whole society (as an aggregate of individuals) is restricted in its capabilities.
Once tabled, this declaration of values becomes a legitimate subject of debate. But the debate can proceed on two levels. On the first level one takes the values essentially as given and subjects the observations to which they relate to testing. Of course values would have to be clarified and related assumptions reformulated in the form of hypotheses prior to testing. For example, one would clarify the age range implied by the term children, the population or areal extent of "society" or "cities," and some index of isolation. However, to proceed in this manner would be to bypass the problem of ontology. It is in ontology that one also discovers a second level of debate concerning values. At this level one questions not the values themselves, but the context in which they are posited. In relation to what concept of reality are these values framed? In terms of this thesis, one needs to ask whether the term society can be the basis of a concept of a reality, and if so, in what sense. For example, does it exist simply as an aggregate of individuals? Is it a whole defined without relation to individuals? Does it have structure? Is it purely a social entity, or does it have a physical dimension?

These questions are inseparable from those of epistemology, that is, how one acquires knowledge of reality. The key problem here is to find the appropriate concepts or categories to serve as the tools of examination. The categories "child" and "city," which were used in the declaration of values, appear to be useful starting points for analysis, but in fact will be found to be inadequate. This is because the adequacy of analytical categories will depend on the concept of reality which is adopted. So epistemological and ontological questions have to be resolved
almost in a single motion. This resolution also helps refocus the concern with values, and leads to a more specific prescription of appropriate methodological procedures.

I.2 STRUCTURALISM

The attempt to deal with the problems outlined above led the author to an examination of structuralist methodologies. The term structuralism has been applied to methodologies in diverse fields, including mathematics, biology, physics, psychology, linguistics, geography and the social sciences. It is useful to outline those elements of a structuralist approach which apply across all or most fields. This gives one a sense—to use Piaget's words—of the "affirmative ideal that goes with the very idea of structure." But within any given field, the proponents of structuralism have also had critical objectives; the methodology has arisen in opposition to other approaches to knowledge. To understand the meaning of structuralism in the social sciences, for example, is also to analyze its opposition to empirical methods. The following discussion will deal with both the general nature of structuralism across many fields and the specific emergence of structuralist thought in the social sciences. This process of definition will help to resolve ontological and epistemological questions raised in the previous section.

I.2.1 Structuralism: Its General Nature

In Structuralism, Jean Piaget attempts to define elements which are common to all varieties of structuralism. As a first approximation, he defines structure as a "system of transformations" and emphasizes three
key ideas in the notion of structure: wholeness, transformation and self-regulation. Each of these ideas relates logically to the others.

A structure is a whole, not an aggregate. An aggregate is a composite of elements. Its character is simply the sum of the elements. A whole has elements, but these elements are subordinated to laws which define the whole. But what then is the nature of the whole and what relation, if any, does it bear to its parts? Piaget rejects the notion of an "emergent totality" where a whole is immediately perceived as such but without reference to how it is formed. (Piaget gives as examples of emergent totalities Comte's concept of "humanity" and Durkheim's "social whole.") Laws governing the behaviour of "emergent wholes" need have no relation to their parts. In opposing this view, Piaget claims that to understand the nature of the whole one cannot look simply at the elements themselves, nor at the whole, but must examine the relations among elements. It is in these relations and their development that the process or laws by which the whole is formed can be found.

One then asks whether the wholes have always been complete or are they always in the process of composition? Piaget argues that a structure is always undergoing transformation. Without the concept of transformation "structures would lose all explanatory import, since they would collapse into static forms." Summarizing Piaget's discussion of wholeness and transformation, David Harvey writes:

The relationships between elements within the structure are therefore regarded as expressing certain transformation rules through which the totality itself comes to be transformed. In other words, the totality is in the course of being structured by the elaboration of the relationships within it.
The third structural concept stressed by Piaget is self-regulation. Transformations in a structure act to preserve the structure, its laws and its boundaries, even though relationships between elements within the structure are constantly undergoing change. The fact that a structure has closure (i.e. its boundaries are preserved) does not prevent it from being a substructure of a larger one. Piaget states: "the larger structure does not 'annex' the substructure; if anything we have a confederation, so that the laws of the substructure are not altered but conserved and the intervening change is an enrichment rather than an impoverishment."¹¹

With this preliminary and general characterization of structuralism, am I any closer to resolving the ontological and epistemological problems posed in the previous section? Concerning ontology I have described reality as consisting of structures. Structures are not things; they cannot be observed. They are defined in terms of relationships between elements.¹² Furthermore, the concept of totality expresses a transformation process involving the elaboration of those relationships between elements; totality is not simply a composite of static elements. Thus at the outset I cannot depend on observation as the sole focus of my methodology because my concept of reality is such that it defies direct observation. Direct observation of the so-called concrete world of things and people is essential in the generation of knowledge, but it is not sufficient in itself. This matter will again be dealt with in the discussion of fieldwork in Section I.4.1.

I am not yet at the point of clarifying my epistemology, which deals more explicitly with how I intend to gain knowledge of reality.
For this I shall turn to a discussion of structuralism as it has arisen in the social sciences.

I.2.2 Structuralism in the Social Sciences

My topic concerns the relationship between the child and society. Explanation could logically be sought at the level of the individual child or at the level of society. Both because of my interests and academic skills, I have decided to focus on the latter level (although as will be seen in Section I.4 and in Chapter III, much of this thesis is an attempt to show relationships between these levels). My notion of structuralism is thus related to its development in the social sciences, which broadly speaking have society as an object of study. But how does one conceptualize society structurally? What structures does one talk about? What are the elements of those structures and how does one examine the relationship between them? How does one discuss the transformation of these relationships?

Piaget acknowledges that his definition of structure as a "system of transformations" is only a preliminary step, for by this definition all the social sciences yield structuralist theories since, however different they may be, they are all concerned with social groups and subgroups, that is, with self-regulating transformational totalities. A social group is evidently a whole; being dynamic, it is the seat of transformation; and since one of the basic facts about such groups is that they impose all sorts of constraints and norms (rules), they are self-regulating.13

He then proceeds to distinguish "global" from "analytic" structuralism. Global structuralism treats totality as a "primary concept explanatory as such,"14 whereas analytic structuralism seeks details of transforma-
tional interactions between elements of the whole. Secondly, global structuralism tends to be empirical whereas "authentic analytic structuralism" seeks to explain such empirical systems by postulating "deep" structures from which the former are in some manner derivable. Piaget criticizes the global "structuralism" of Durkheim, the statistical orientation of microsociologists, "whereby relations are, no doubt, quantified, but not in any sense explained," and the empiricism of functional approaches to economics and anthropology (for example, Radcliffe-Brown). On the other hand, he considers Lewin's work on "total fields" in social psychology and Lévi-Strauss' structural anthropology as legitimate examples of analytic structuralism.

This narrowing of Piaget's definition confirms the importance I have already attached to the concept of totality. It also emphasizes the point made earlier that structures are not observable "things"; they are "hidden." In this thesis I shall adopt what Piaget would call analytic as opposed to global structuralism. But I wish to return to another key idea that requires fuller development if the meaning of structuralism in social science is to be appreciated. This is the idea of transformation, and the related ideas of dialectics and history. Piaget criticizes Lévi-Strauss for minimizing the importance of historical development in social science as opposed to the present existence of structures. He stresses, in the domain of the sciences themselves structuralism has always been linked with a constructivism from which the epithet "dialectical" can hardly be withheld—the emphasis upon historical development, opposition between contraries, and "Aufhebung" ("dépassements") is surely just as characteristic of constructivism as of dialectic, and that the idea of wholeness figures centrally in structuralist as in dialectical modes of thought is obvious.
Piaget gives several examples of dialectical thought in mathematics and physics. In terms of social science and philosophy, however, he centres on the work of Marx. He says there is a structuralist strand in Marx, something just about halfway between what we called "global" and "analytic" structuralism . . . since he distinguishes "real infrastructures" from "ideological superstructures," and describes the former in terms which, though remaining qualitative, are sufficiently precise to bring us close to directly observable relations.¹⁷

Piaget claims that the development of these structuralist strands in Marx has been the task of modern interpreters such as Althusser and Godelier, "despite [emphasis added] the essential role [Marx's work] assigns to historical development in its sociological interpretation."¹⁸ There thus appears to be a tension between interpretations of Marx which stress historical development and those which focus on the so-called "structuralist strand."

If one wishes to understand the place of historical analysis in a structuralist examination of society, a major diversion is worthwhile in order to explore this tension somewhat further. This is all the more important in that modern social science with its empirical focus tends to ignore the historical element of structural transformation. An understanding of the Marxist literature may provide a way to resolve the history-sociology dualism.

I.3 DIALECTIC AND STRUCTURE IN MARX AND HIS INTERPRETERS

The dialectical strand in Marx was derived most immediately from Hegel and Kant. Kant's dialectic took the form of skepticism, a rejection of the notion that knowledge could have an empirical origin. He
proposed that the mind is furnished with innate theoretical principles which allow it to reorganize the sense impressions it receives from the material world. These principles are in the form of "categories" such as substance and causality, and provide a way for the mind to put some order into what is seen. The series of categories proposed by Kant were merely opposites or negatives of each other (e.g. universal-particular, finite-infinite). There was no sense of a relationship between these opposites which would give rise to movement and development.

Hegel argued that the categories proposed by Kant did not have to be "innately" received. The categories, he claimed, could be logically deduced from one another. They were not just opposites of each other in a passive, negative sense; the relation between the opposites could lead to yet another category. For example, "pure being" implicitly contains its opposite concept "nothingness," which negates it, but without which it could not exist. The logical passage between "pure being" and its negation "nothingness" gives rise to the concept of "becoming" ("pure being" becomes "nothing" or vice versa). This concept of "becoming" stands opposite or is negated by the concept of "something." Thus, considering relations and contradictions in turn, one can logically generate further categories by dialectical negation. In this way, a whole body of concepts develops, incorporating and relating all previous concepts.19

By insisting that categories and concepts need not be innate, Hegel made it possible to see that man could receive sense impressions from the objective world and generate concepts directly from primary sense material. Further, he showed that we were not just limited to knowing the
world of appearance, of phenomenon, but could come to know the "essence" of the real world. The way was open to understanding hidden (non-observable) structures. Hegel's dialectic was not, however, describing a dialectical movement of matter or the world of men, but how man thinks and orders the world he sees. For him, progress and dialectic development occur only in thought. History becomes synonymous with the progress of the "IDEA" (an abstract concept of a pure form of society developed dialectically in thought) rather than the analysis of the dialectical development of real societies existing in time. In this sense Hegel was an idealist, that is, he maintained that thought is primary.

Marx opposed this idealist notion of history and existence with a materially grounded dialectic. Poulantzas explains that historical materialism and dialectical materialism were founded in one movement. Historical materialism has as its object the development of a concept of history "through the study of the various modes of production and social formations, their structures, constitution and functioning and the form of transition from one social formation to another."

This materialist conception of history can be understood in terms of its opposition in the 19th century to the Hegelian idealist sense of history. It stood in opposition in a slightly different way to the empiricism of the British political economists (for example, Ricardo and Smith). Although their writings were materially grounded, they tended to ignore history by interpreting the economy of capitalism as if it were a natural order of things explainable by "natural laws." Marx argued that an understanding of political economy had to be historically specific. The same categories could not be used to describe a society dominated by
a capitalist mode of production as for one dominated by earlier (for example, feudal) modes of production.

Dialectical materialism was also developed in opposition to Hegelianism and empiricism. In order to generate an adequate concept of history, Marx needed also to define a theory of the production of knowledge. While the theory itself was never fully developed, dialectical construction was at the base of all Marx's attempts to produce new categories of knowledge. While he retained Hegel's dialectic and agreed that knowledge is produced by intellectual construction, he rejected Hegel by claiming that knowledge is produced in concrete, materially-specific historical situations. One can therefore analyze how and why particular categories of knowledge were produced in particular historical situations, and show how these categories are insufficient to describe an existing social or economic structure. The use of dialectical construction is most striking in Grundrisse, which is where Marx laid most of the theoretical foundations for Capital. Throughout Capital, Marx criticized and reworked many of the "natural" economic categories of British economists into categories which were capable of reflecting the underlying structure and movement of the capitalist mode of production. These criticisms and reformulations are testimony to his conviction that knowledge and science need to be constructed. Empirical methods which focus on the immediately observable fail in this respect.

I started this section by attempting to resolve the tension between historical and structural interpretations of society in Marxist derived literature. From the foregoing it should be evident that there is a unity of the two in Marx's work and that in fact their opposition is
artificial. When Piaget claims that modern structuralists have developed the structuralist strands "despite the essential role [Marx's work] assigned to historical development in its sociological interpretation," he ignores that Marx's purpose was precisely to develop a structuralist concept of history (historical materialism) by the construction of categories that could lead to historically specific analysis. Similarly, Marx's concept of the production of knowledge assumed that knowledge is produced in social situations (i.e. an explicit rejection of empirical assumptions which ignore the social context of the subject) and the dialectical elaboration of analytical categories and concepts through time. Thus just as historical materialism is nothing without the structural elaboration of historically specific concepts, dialectical materialism is nothing without explicit understanding of the historical situation in which the production of knowledge takes place. Knowledge is constantly structured and restructured in successive historical social situations.

Admittedly subsequent interpreters have emphasized various strands of the Marxist legacy, and as will be seen below, some of the most fundamental differences have centred on the relative stress on historical dialectical versus structural aspects of his work. This opposition, however, can be seen as a dialectical development in progress, for certainly the 1960s and 1970s have seen a flowering of both the dialectic and structural "camps." Although there is no resolution of this opposition in sight, one would assume that it will take the form of an enrichment or surpassing of both interpretations.
Both camps represent attempts to overcome "vulgar Marxist" interpretations of history and society. For example, we have Sartre's following critique of a crude form of Marxist structuralism.

There is no longer any question of studying facts within the general perspective of Marxism so as to enrich our understanding and to clarify action. Analysis consists solely in getting rid of detail, in forcing the signification of certain events, in denaturing facts or even in inventing a nature for them in order to discover it later underneath them, as their substance, as unchangeable, fetishized "synthetic notions." The open concepts of Marxism have closed in. They are no longer keys, interpretative schemata; they are posited for themselves as an already totalized knowledge.\textsuperscript{22}

Sartre attempts to avoid "forcing the signification of certain events" by enriching our understanding of mediation between structural reality and the everyday reality of events and people in historical situations.

But from a structuralist perspective, Poulantzas sees another form of over-simplification in the "historical-humanist" approach of Sartre. He claims that such interpretations (including Lukács and Korsch as well) reduce dialectical materialism to historical materialism by making history an originating and basic category, rather than a concept to be constructed.\textsuperscript{23} Althusser has a similar objection to Sartre, as explained in Glucksmann:

Whereas the Hegelian 'expressive' totality is characterized by one simple, central contradiction between essence and phenomena which is taken over in what Althusser calls 'historicist-humanist' versions of Marxism, as one central contradiction between the forces and relations of production, or between labour and capital, with all other contradictions emanating from this one, in the 'structural' totality there is the possibility of a multiplicity of contradictions which may be related to each other in a number of complex ways.\textsuperscript{24}

The Althusserian concept of totality hinges on the concept of structure in dominance. In any totality, the elements or structures are
asymmetrically related but autonomous, and one of them is dominant. This
dominant structure or element is not dominant for all time. It varies
according to the uneven development of contradictions between various
elements, and to the "over-determination" of contradictions. This latter
concept means that each element or contradiction is caused several times
over and has more than one raison d'etre. "Vulgar Marxist" notions of
the structure of the State and Ideology as mere expressions of a deter-
mining economic structure are inadequate. Although the economic struc-
ture is seen as determinant "in the last instance" (an instance which,
according to Althusser, does not necessarily occur), the dominant role
in a given social formation may be taken by politics, ideology, or by
kinship in primitive societies. Each structure has a relative autonomy
of its own, and must be analyzed as such.

Althusser is anti-historicist in that he does not see modes of
production evolving through stages from one to the next in an evolution-
ary schema. As explained by Glucksmann, he replaces

the idea of the gradual unfolding of innate properties by that
of a genealogy of the elements of a social formation. Each
element of the combination has its own history. For example
the transformation between feudalism and capitalism depended
on the emergence of two elements: the free worker and capital.
These had different histories and their relationship can only
be studied retrospectively from the point of view of the
capitalist system where they are combined. So, rather than
focusing on the gradual unfolding from one system to another
or on origins, Althusserian history concentrates on a gene-
alogy of the different elements, and in this way history
represents the discontinuous succession of modes of production.

Althusser's concept of the genealogy of different structural
elements will form the basis of historical explanation in this thesis.
The concept addresses the important dimension of history and dialectical
transformation which Sartre feels is essential. But unlike Sartre, Althusser does not focus on one central contradiction. Several structures and elements within these structures can be traced genealogically, and relationships of dominance indicated at any given time. Thus the genealogy combines both historical (dialectical) and structural significance.

This discussion of the tension between history, dialectic and structure has not only led to the choice of genealogy as the form of structural/historical explanation for this thesis. It has also touched on several epistemological points which need to be made more explicit before I go on to the structural approach to the topic of this thesis. I have said that epistemology concerns the production of knowledge and the elaboration of concepts and categories (somewhat in the manner of developing appropriate tools in material production) to produce that knowledge. But these concepts are produced in a social situation, and are dialectically elaborated and enriched through man's interaction with the material and social world. It is therefore important to subject existing concepts and categories to criticism in the process of creating new knowledge, and to understand the historical/social context in which these concepts arose.

A related epistemological position is that concepts or categories acquire different meanings in different historical periods or forms of social development. More specifically, in Marxist theory categories used to describe societies dominated by a capitalist mode of production have a different content from those describing societies under a feudal mode of production. In the *Grundrisse* Marx explains,
Bourgeois society is the most developed and the most complex organization of production. The categories which express its relations, the comprehension of its structure, thereby also allows insight into the structure and the relations of production of all the vanished social formations out of whose ruins and elements it built itself up. . . . The bourgeois economy thus supplies the key to the ancient. . . . But not at all in the manner of those economists who smudge over all historical differences and see bourgeois relations in all forms of society. One can understand tribute, tithe, etc., if one is acquainted with ground rent. But one must not identify them. Further, since bourgeois society is itself only a contradictory form of development, relations deriving from earlier forms will often be found within it only in an entirely stunted form, or even travestied. For example, communal property. Although it is true, therefore, that the categories of bourgeois economy possess a truth for all other forms of society, this is to be taken only with a grain of salt. They can contain them in a developed, or stunted, or caricatured form etc., but always with an essential difference.27

Thus Marx argues that categories used in historical analysis must relate clearly to the mode of production they are intended to describe.

Thirdly, and directly bearing on the quote by Marx above, the object of historical analysis is neither to explain the present in terms of the past, nor the past in terms of the present, but to seek an understanding of the historical and dialectical development of structure. For purposes of this thesis, the considerable emphasis that will be placed on tracing the genealogy of certain structural elements does not mean that my focus is historical. It is simply a means to develop greater understanding of the transformation of those elements and the significance of their present interrelationships.

The last epistemological point concerns the autonomy of structures, touched on in the discussion of Althusser's structuralism. That social structures are relatively autonomous means that they can be described as such, or in Piaget's terms, in terms of their own self-regulation. This
relieves one neither of the burden of describing the interaction between structures, nor of appreciating the totality of which structures are a part. In fact, structural transformation may arise from contradictions between elements within the structure or as a result of contradictions external to the structure. In the latter case, it is essential to locate and describe the structure out of which these external contradictions arose. The most appropriate approach to a particular subject would seem to be a clarification of the structural totality and its movement, and an elaboration of relevant (that is, to the subject of inquiry) substructures and their transformations through the Althusserian method of tracing the genealogies of structural elements. The following section outlines how this approach will be used in this study to examine the topic of the isolation of children.

1.4 A STRUCTURALIST APPROACH TO THE ISOLATION OF CHILDREN

I have stated that this chapter is presented in terms of process—the evolution of a methodology (see p. 5). The starting point of that evolution was a statement of the author's conviction that "children are isolated socially and physically from the adult world in our rapidly urbanizing society" (see p. 7). I subsequently examined certain ontological and epistemological questions and arrived at a sense of structuralist methodology. The present section posits specific structures through which one can construct a description of the isolation of children. In this process, the above statement is itself restructured to take the form indicated in Section 1.0 as the thesis objective: "to describe how and why children tend to be isolated physically and socially from
adult life in urbanized areas of societies in which the capitalist mode of production is dominant" (see p. 5).

I.4.1 The Choice of a Structuralist Totality

I have already indicated that I wish to describe the isolation of children at the level of society rather than at the level of the individual child (see p. 12). If one examines the statement "children are isolated socially and physically from the adult world in our rapidly urbanizing society," one is logically drawn to the terms "adult world" and "rapidly urbanizing society" as possible starting points for a description of a social totality. For reasons explained in Sections I.4.2 and I.4.3, I have viewed the child's social relation to the adult world through the lens of family structure and the child's more physical relation to a "rapidly urbanizing (adult) society" through urban structure. It would be quite possible to view either family or urban structure as wholes (totalities) in themselves. If this approach were used, the isolation of children would be characterized in terms of certain substructures of families "in general" (that is, as a universal structure) or urbanism "in general."

Rather than pursue this avenue of analysis, I have elected to analyze family and urban structure as substructures of the totality of the capitalist mode of production. There are two reasons for this decision. In the first place, the empirical data used in this thesis are drawn almost exclusively from literature about the developed Western capitalist nations. This was obviously a necessity in terms of the fieldwork, which deals with six Vancouver families (See Appendix 1). It was
also necessary in terms of children and urban structure, because the relatively recent interest in the social ecology of children has focused on children in modern capitalist societies. Similarly, the study of urbanism in the Western literature has been conducted primarily in relation to North America and Western European nations and, since the 1960s, the developing nations. The literature on the history of childhood—an essential component for a thesis which emphasizes structural transformation—primarily draws on North American and Western European examples. While it is true that studies of contemporary families deal not only with Third World and advanced Western nations, but also countries with communist or socialist governments, this one exception to the generally restricted availability of studies of children in non-capitalist nations was not sufficient to base a thesis on children in families "in general" or urbanism "in general." The choice of the capitalist mode of production as a totality allows one to give greater specificity (and materiality) to urbanism and family structure, and thus make them more congruent with the empirical literature available.

The second reason for choosing the capitalist mode of production (CMP) as the totality is that it has been the subject of a relatively coherent body of analytic structuralist inquiry. As will be shown in Section V.2, most attempts to characterize urbanism or urbanization have been either empirical in nature, or have dealt with 'emergent wholes' in the style of global structuralism. More recent descriptions of urbanism and urbanization which reflect an analytic structuralist approach have related urban structure explicitly to the CMP. Given this situation, I had the choice of developing a new structuralist
analysis based on a concept of universal urban structure (and universal social ecology of children in urban areas), or analyzing more fully the totality CMP as it relates to urban and family structure, and accepting the consequent narrowing of the scope of the thesis. Because of the paucity of empirical data on non-capitalist countries, as well as the availability of structuralist analysis of the CMP which relates to recent analyses of urban structure, I have chosen the latter option.

Before proceeding with the analysis of the CMP in Chapter II, it is important here to clarify how one should view the place of this analysis in relation to the thesis as a whole. This question can initially be approached by stating what the analysis is not. Firstly, it is not an attempt to establish the CMP as an "explanatory variable," and the isolation of children as a dependent variable. This would represent an empirical rather than structuralist approach. Such an approach would require examination of other modes of production for comparative purposes, and would assume that modes of production are easily characterized as single entities. But as will be seen in Chapter II, mode of production is not a concrete thing, or quality, or other form of empirical construct. It is an abstract theoretical construct elaborated for purposes of structuralist inquiry, and cannot be set up as an empirical variable. It cannot "cause" the isolation of children. As a "system of transformations" defined by the relations between certain elements, the CMP is, if anything, a product of these transformations rather than a producer or cause of anything. Hence it is not claimed that the CMP causes the isolation of children, or that in other modes of production children are more or less isolated. (In any event, this thesis does not attempt to
quantify the isolation of children, but rather to characterize it.)

By extension, there is no attempt in this thesis to characterize, either by inference or direct comparison with the CMP, the isolation of children in a socialist mode of production. Certainly the fact that many Soviet, East European and Chinese cities were constructed in social formations in which a capitalist or even feudal mode of production was dominant would lead us to expect broad similarities in the way the built form of the city relates to the isolation of children. On the other hand, even a superficial examination of contemporary ideological structures in China suggests a deliberate integration of schooling with productive activity in factories for young children, a characteristic which as will be shown, is not present in the CMP. But to attempt to assess these comments from a scientific perspective would require a detailed analysis of the structure of the socialist mode of production. To take a parallel example, Castells suggests that a research program to examine the commonly held assumption that urban cultures are similar in 'capitalist' and 'socialist' countries would require the following objectives:

1. to determine whether, in fact, the real and not only the formal content of these behaviour patterns is the same; 2. to see what is the concrete articulation of the different modes of production in Soviet society, for, indisputably, the capitalist mode of production is present there, even if it is no longer dominant; 3. to establish the contours of the new post-capitalist mode of production, for, although the scientific theory of the capitalist mode of production has been partially elaborated (in Capital), there is no equivalent for the socialist mode of production; 4. to elaborate a theory of the links between the concrete articulation of the various modes of production in Soviet society and the systems of behaviour.

Clearly this type of research is beyond the scope of this thesis. At the same time, these examples reinforce my claim that mode of production—
and the CMP itself—should not be seen as a variable, but as a system of transformations. In the process of describing these transformations, one defines (and limits) the field of inquiry.

I have thus far described how one should not view the analysis of the CMP, and have also shaded it in negative terms as a delimitation of the field of inquiry. But if one does not intend to claim that the CMP "causes" the isolation of children, how can one best characterize its relationship to the isolation of children? The answer requires a description not of one direct relationship, but of several mediated relationships. The CMP will be characterized in Chapter II in terms of the relationship between certain elements at various levels (economic, political-juridical and ideological), and the tendencies within the CMP to which they give rise. These tendencies within the CMP will not be related to children and their isolation, but to family and urban structure.

Even there, the relationship is not direct. Family and urban structure are not accumulative building blocks of the CMP, but—to refer again to Piaget's term (see p.11)—"self-regulating" substructures. There are, after all, countless substructures of the CMP which one could analyze for different purposes. These two, for reasons explained in the following sections, are appropriate for this thesis. Thus one should not expect to find a lock-step relationship between tendencies within the CMP and these two substructures. Rather, the tendencies of the CMP which will be described give greater specificity to the substructures of family and urban structure. (For example, the dependence substructure of family structure will in part be characterized by a particular form of dependence
which is reinforced by tendencies generated in the economic and ideological structures of the CMP; the economic substructure of urban structure is characterized in part by the process of capital accumulation described in the analysis of the economic structure of the CMP.)

The analysis of the CMP in Chapter II may thus seem remote to the question of the isolation of children. It will describe enough of the CMP to give it substance as a totality, to indicate (but not describe in detail) its major transformations, and to establish connecting strands to processes within family and urban structure.

It is within the analyses of transformations in family and urban structure (which are in turn informed by processes of the CMP) that one can characterize the isolation of children. Not all transformations that I shall describe can be characterized in these terms. Some of them—such as the transformation of the productive element in urban structure—are described simply to give integrity to the structure as a whole. It is in this sense that the relationship between family or urban structure and the isolation of children is mediated. In other instances, the transformation of particular substructural elements (for example, schooling, decline of apprenticeship and the socialization of reproduction) can be characterized directly as aspects of the isolation of children.

I.4.2 The Choice of Family Structure

In deciding how to frame the child's social relation to the adult world in structural terms, I considered two approaches. The first was simply to describe the structure of "children's condition" within the CMP, and to differentiate it into separate substructures. For example, one
could posit the following substructures which incorporate children's activities: the family, the school system and the peer system. A comparable choice was made by Mitchell in her decision to analyze women not in terms of the family (as was done by Marx and Engels), but in terms of the "complex unity" woman's condition.\textsuperscript{39} She then differentiated woman's condition into several substructures.

While I felt this approach was feasible for describing children in general terms, I was not convinced that the separate substructures which I posited—that is, family, school and peers—in fact cohered in any "complex unity," or in Althusser's terms, in a relation of structural dominance (see p. 20). For this reason I decided upon a second approach, which was to view children's condition through the lens of family structure. There is a structural thread which logically ties children to the family, and that is their biological dependence on adult caregivers. Children of necessity are brought into a dependent relation with adults from the moment of birth (or conception!). This physical dependence acquires a social overlay as soon as a child is born into a culture; it then becomes difficult to define how long dependence lasts. Nonetheless, the structure of dependence which grows out of biological dependence is describable, and is the strongest link tying the analysis of children into that of family structure. (There is no such comparable biological link requiring that woman's condition be structurally subordinated to family structure, for women can choose to reproduce and nurse children, but children cannot choose to be independent.)

One might claim that children need not be dependent on family, that both historically and in contemporary society there are other forms of
caregiving. This is undeniable. However, I am not talking of a child's dependence on a particular form of family, but of the child-caregiver relationship within the totality of family structure. This relationship occurs in and through several substructures. The interaction of these substructures is such as to include many forms of what would popularly be called "families" in day-to-day living, or even patterns which might not even be called a "family" tomorrow.

I.4.3 The Choice of Urban Structure

It would seem obvious that urban structure should be the vehicle for describing the physical and social isolation of children from adult life in urbanized areas. However obvious this decision may be, it nevertheless involves two problems of definition. The first concerns the difference between urban structure and the structure of cities. The second is the distinction between urban structure and rural structure. These two issues are touched on here only with the purpose of explaining why the term urban structure is used. Elaboration of the actual concept of urban structure occurs in the discussion of urban theories in Section V.2.

The process of definition is frequently arbitrary, or, to be more charitable, related to specific operations. Even if one concentrates solely on the issue of population, the definition of the apparently understandable term "town" offers problems:

Wherein, for example, lies the distinction between town and village, especially when a majority of the employment in towns of even ten and twenty thousand souls is found in farming. In reviewing the laborious efforts of scholars to define the term
"city," Friedmann and Wulff comment:

the city is a social microcosm and consequently a multi-dimensional phenomenon displaying a variety of physical, spatial, cultural, institutional, economic, demographic, and social characteristics. Like the blind man examining the elephant, different urban historians would seize upon a single feature of urbanity and proclaim it as the true and only one.

It would seem that there is no easy way out of this impasse. Definitions are useful only in a context, and one or the other definition may be serviceable for the limited purposes at hand.42

In terms of this thesis, the purpose at hand is to describe a structure that is (like family structure) a coherent unity of substructures. It will also be the bearer of specific relationships as part of the larger totality the CMP. It must also be of sufficient breadth to characterize the physical and social relationships of children to adult life. Given these purposes, it is clear that more is involved than simply physical or spatial concepts. For this reason, I have chosen not to use the term "structure of cities," as the word "cities" all too often suggests a delimitation of space or population (notwithstanding Friedmann and Wulff's above reference to multi-dimensional phenomena which occur within them). The terms "urbanization process" and "urban structure" are less limiting. The process of urban structuring can exist in areas which would not be labelled cities or even towns. Again drawing on Friedmann and Wulff, one meaning of urbanization refers to: "urban modes of production, living, and thinking originating in these centres and spreading from these to outlying towns and rural populations."43

This last statement also helps resolve the issue of rural versus urban structure. If one were dealing with the structure of cities, and defined them in terms of the empirical notions of space or population,
it would then be incumbent upon the investigator to define rural in terms of smaller units of space or population. However, by adopting the term urban structure, I am referring to processes and relationships between structural elements, and these may or may not extend into empirically defined rural areas. In terms of this thesis, it is the existence of urban structure (as described in Chapter V) which assumes importance, rather than the definition of an opposed entity "rural structure."

I.4.4 The Concept of Isolation

In the previous sections I reformulated the notions child and city into the framework of family and urban structure. The term "isolation" also requires reformulation, not as a separate structure, but as a structural effect. As a structural effect, it can only take on meaning as the structures themselves are elaborated. Thus in Chapters IV and V the discussion of isolation will emerge as a discussion of structural processes such as the socialization of reproduction. This is not to say that I will abandon the notion of isolation, but will try to show how it lacks explanatory power in its abstract form and needs more concrete characterizations.

I.5 STRUCTURALIST INQUIRY AND FIELDWORK

The question here is best stated as follows: How does one use or conduct empirical research for structuralist purposes? One wants to avoid Sartre's rebuke (see p. 19) of Marxists for whom concepts are "posited for themselves as an already totalized knowledge." How does one get from "real" people, "real" events and "real" things to "real"
structures?

The key problem is that research conducted by direct observation is usually implicitly, if not explicitly, fashioned by empirical philosophy. The categories used for direct observation, or for the results of investigation are those which can be empirically verified, often by some statistical or otherwise quantitative process. Thus "facts" are produced by a process which has quite different ends than for structuralist formulation. The problems of hypothesis formulation, sample selection, and statistical significance become paramount. Causes and effects become problems of statistical inference, a far cry from structural interaction, dominance and over-determination.

The emphasis in dealing with directly observable events, things and people shifts in a structuralist framework from statistical rigour to analytical rigour. This is not to say that structuralists are unconcerned with statistics, or that empiricists are oblivious to analysis, but that each approach has its own emphasis. This emphasis relates to verification procedures in each methodology. Empiricists seek verification through falsification or non-falsification of an hypothesis. Structuralists seek verification through the explanatory power of the structural concepts and totality.

The obvious effect of this difference in emphasis for a structuralist dealing with empirical research is that the categories and facts used in research must be rigorously subjected to question, possibly reworked into new categories, or even rejected. This is a process I have already explained and which will be used in Chapters IV and V in particular. But what of the fieldwork for this thesis? Since I am in the
position of generating my own categories of examination, where do I begin? The answer is that I am not beginning. This thesis is part of an ongoing process of knowledge production and dialectical elaboration of categories originated by others in specific social situations.

One can usefully make a diversion here to consider Ernest Mandel's description of the methodology of dialectical materialism which can be formulated in six steps:

1. Comprehensive appropriation of the empirical material, and mastery of this material (superficial appearances) in all its historically relevant detail.

2. Analytical division of this material into its constituent abstract elements (progression from the concrete to the abstract).

3. Exploration of the decisive general connections between these elements, which explain the abstract laws of motion of the material, in other words its essence.

4. Discovery of the decisive intermediate links which effect the mediation between the essence and the superficial appearances of the material (progression from the abstract to the concrete, or the reproduction of the concrete in thought as a combination of multiple determinations).

5. Practical empirical verification of the analysis (2, 3, 4) in the developing movement of concrete history.

6. Discovery of new and empirically relevant data, and of new connections—often even of new abstract elementary determinations—through the application of the results of knowledge, and practice based on it, in the infinite complexity of reality.

This process emphasizes the importance of analytical rigour in Steps 2 through 4. Steps 1 and 6 relate to the discovery and examination (appropriation) of empirical material. When Step 6 leads back into a new step, the examiner's perception of what is "empirically relevant" is more refined than in the old Step 1. New categories of analysis ("new
abstract elementary determinations") have been developed.

One can view the process of "empirical appropriation" for this thesis in terms of Mandel's six steps. Fieldwork (and all prior theoretical and empirical literature studies) takes place in Step 1. Steps 2 and 4—essentially the analysis of structure—are implicit aspects of writing the thesis. However, one can jump to Step 6 in the limited sense that structural analysis leads one to new categories. Thus if fieldwork for this thesis were to begin anew, different categories of questions and new procedures would be used. I shall deal with this matter more fully in the conclusion, but here my object is to establish how the fieldwork for this thesis should be viewed.

If one views the fieldwork as "construction in progress"—in the manner of Mandel's step 1—it is important to describe the foundation for that construction in July, 1979 when the fieldwork began. My reading prior to that date was in several areas, each dealing with a particular objective. The first concerned structuralism, and had the objective of understanding general descriptions of this approach (for example, Piaget's Structuralism, Glucksmann's "The Structuralism of Lévi-Strauss and Althusser") and specific applications (for example, any of a number of Piaget's works, Harvey's Social Justice in the City). The second and related area was Marxist literature. In general terms I wanted to explore different trends in Marxist interpretation and its historical and contemporary opposition to empirical approaches. This exploration led me through major portions of Grundrisse and the three volumes of Capital, writings in critical theory and more structuralist orientations, as well as commentators on some of these approaches.
In both my structuralist and Marxist reading I had hoped to locate the idea of the child in relation to urbanism and society in structuralist terms. At the time of my fieldwork I had not accomplished this task, even though I felt I had a reasonable grasp of structuralist methodologies. Piaget, although using a structuralist approach, was not concerned with the child's relation to society, much less urbanism. The Marxist literature, with its focus on economic, political and ideological structures, or essences and appearances, had little room for the notion of childhood. Therefore I also read widely in empirically based literature in an attempt to map out potential child-society-urbanism-isolation connections which could ultimately be reformulated in structuralist terms. Specifically, I read selections of historical and anthropological literature on the child and family, developmental psychology on stages of child development, research on media (primarily television) and children; theory and empirical research on work, leisure and play; urban sociology literature on community and neighbourhood, and finally the field of child-environment interaction (apart from clinical settings).

The fieldwork interviews and procedures were informed by all of this literature, but not in the sense that I had worked out final categories of investigation that reflected analytic structuralist theory. The theory was still being worked out; the fieldwork, as noted, represented "construction in progress" and of necessity was inspired by empirical sources. Specifically, the procedures for interviewing children were drawn largely from Roger Hart's *Children's Experience of Place* and Robin Moore's unpublished work *Childhood's Domain: Learning to Live with an Urbanizing Landscape*. Each of these writers was writing
from a perspective different from my own. Hart described how children differentiate the environment into places and how they feel about it.\textsuperscript{52} Moore examined children's responses to their surroundings under different conditions of urbanization in the San Francisco Bay area.\textsuperscript{53} I was concerned more with the particular theme of isolation and children's relationship to urban structure as opposed to the form (natural or built) of an urban environment. I decided, however, to use Hart's and Moore's empirical techniques to map out children's activity in relation to what was directly observable (the built form of their neighbourhoods), supplement these observations with questions in the parent interviews relating to urban processes as they filter through the family, and construct a more complete picture of child-urban relationships from this composite.

Although many of the questions on the range of children's activities relied predominantly on Hart's work, the parent interviews were original in two respects. In the first place they focused on the major theme of the thesis— isolation and its obverse (inclusion or interaction). I attempted to probe the nature and extent of interaction between children and adults or adult things in activities which took place inside or outside the family. These activities were explored in relation to various nexus which seemed relevant from my theoretical and empirical readings: the media, learning sources (for example, family, school, peers), neighbourhood and/or community and work-leisure-play. My object was not to establish any of these nexus as causative "factors" in the isolation of children as some writers have done. I did feel that they might ultimately be dealt with in structuralist terms and brought into relationship with each other, a process which would occur during the
writing of this thesis.

The parent interviews were also original in that they represented a decision to focus on the family as a primary source of information at the empirical level, and as a structure for analytic elaboration in the thesis itself. Since the original conception of the thesis focused on children rather than on the family per se, there could certainly have been other ways of proceeding. The most immediate one would have been to observe a larger number of children in a variety of interactive settings (for example, school, parks, street corners, commercial areas). My feeling was that, given time constraints and the inherent limitations of observation by only one person, the only type of formulation which could come out of such observations would have been an empirical one. The family seemed a more logical starting point. In empirical terms, it is a hub of activity through which one can observe the child relating to adults, peers and the physical environment not only in space but in time. In structural terms, the family is a transformational system which includes the child.

In summary, the process of fieldwork can be described as follows: I fashioned interviewing and observation procedures by drawing on empirical research, concepts and themes. This was done with the expectation of reworking these concepts in a structuralist analysis. This process was begun even in fieldwork by my emphasis on the child-in-relation-to-the-family rather than on the child-in-him/herself. I also anticipated that what was said or done at any moment of an interview could be reinterpreted and have enriched significance when brought into relation with a larger totality, in the process of structural analysis.
There remains the problem of how to incorporate the fieldwork in the writing of the thesis. I return to Sartre's criticism of "vulgar Marxists" who select materials for study solely for their presumed capacity to illustrate the laws of historical materialism. He calls this placing of phenomena within theory the regressive moment of analysis, but acknowledges it as a necessary one. (Topics do have to be selected according to some theoretical preference.) This is essentially what occurs in the next chapter. But there is a second, progressive moment of analysis which is equally important. It starts as the theoretical analysis is required to deal with concrete phenomena, and consists of ("progressively") tracing the causal and cultural connections ("mediations") between human experience and hidden or postulated social processes. To deal adequately with this phase of Sartre's strategy (which is basically a clarification of Step 4 of Mandel's framework) would require "a continuous elaboration and re-working of empirically traced connections between processes belonging to the 'levels' of biography, family and neighbourhood, community, economy and nation state."

The chapter sequence which follows Chapter II is an attempt to trace processes at these various levels. Chapter III deals with the biographical level, and the "project" (defined in that chapter) which seems to drive the parents to do what they do in relation to their children. There is no attempt (in any of the chapters) to tabulate data according to the questions in the interviews as in a quantitative study. The other purpose of Chapter III is to give a basic description of each family so that observations based on fieldwork in Chapters IV and V will be seen in relation to the context and limitations of each family.
Chapter III is principally concerned with information from the fieldwork. In Chapters IV and V, this information is supplemented with other empirical data. These chapters will see more interplay between empirical observations and structural analysis. Having passed from the biographical (Chap. III) to the family (Chap. IV) and the neighbourhood, community and economy (as urban structure in Chap. V), I shall in the conclusion attempt to summarize and provide an overview of the ways in which children are isolated from adult life in urbanized areas of capitalist societies.

1.6 SUMMARY

I have evolved a structuralist methodology specific to the topic "the physical and social isolation of children from adult life in urban areas of societies in which the capitalist mode of production is dominant." This methodology grew out of a brief analysis of the limitations of empiricism, a description of structuralism generally and in the social sciences, a discussion of the tension between historical dialectics and structure, and a consideration of the specific application of structuralist ideas to the thesis topic.

In general terms, the topic will be developed through a description first of the capitalist mode of production (CMP), and then family and urban structure. Several methodological concerns will be pursued within this general framework:

(1) The structural elements will be generated through a criticism of existing theoretical concepts of the family and urbanism.
(2) The tension between historical and structural interpretation will
be resolved by tracing the genealogy of structural elements in family and urban structure.

(3) Structural relationships will be drawn between elements of urban and family structure and the totality the capitalist mode of production.

(4) Analysis will be both regressive, that is, describing the totality within which structures, their elements and concrete phenomena exist, and progressive, that is, tracing the causal and cultural connections (mediations) between human experiences (to be described in Chapter III) and the larger social processes of the whole.
NOTES, CHAPTER I

1 This is, with apologies, the title of a book on methodology by Jean-Paul Sartre (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967). References are made to it later in this chapter and in Chapter III.
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II.0 PRELIMINARY NOTE

This chapter contains an explanation of the concept mode of production, an outline of the primary structures of the capitalist mode of production (CMP), and a description of certain basic movements of the CMP. My purpose is not to explain these terms, structures and movements as objects of inquiry in themselves. Rather, they will be developed only enough to specify the totality I am discussing, and to establish connecting points for structural relationships I will explore in my analysis of family and urban structure in Chapters IV and V.

As noted in Section I.4.1, this discussion may seem remote from anything to do with children. The CMP is a context for the examination of urban and family structure, rather than for children directly. While this approach may require forbearance by a reader whose primary interest is children, it is a necessary indulgence of those (including myself) who wish to combine this interest with a methodological concern for how structures are in turn structured.

II.1 THE CONCEPT OF MODE OF PRODUCTION

Mode of production is a theoretical concept. According to Poulantz-zas, it "constitutes an abstract-formal object which does not exist in the strong sense of reality. Capitalist, feudal and slave modes of
production, which equally lack existence in the strong sense, also constitute abstract-formal objects.¹ The phrases "abstract-formal object" and "does not exist in the strong sense" can better be understood by clarifying a second term, social formation. A social formation is by contrast a real-concrete object, "a social whole, in the widest sense, at a given moment in its historical existence: e.g. France under Louis Bonaparte, England during the Industrial Revolution."² One can talk of a social formation dominated by a particular mode of production. Thus post World War II Canada is a social formation dominated by a capitalist mode of production. Usually a social formation exists as a particular combination, a specific overlapping of several 'pure' modes of production. . . . Bismarck's Germany is characterized by a specific combination of capitalist, feudal and patriarchal modes of production whose combination alone exists in the strong sense of the term.³

The term society—if used in a specific, historic sense, for example post World War II Canadian society—is sufficient as a replacement for the term social formation. (However, one would have to analyze the society in terms of its particular combinations of pure modes of production.)

This study is an attempt to describe the isolation of children as an effect of family and urban structure in societies in which the CMP is dominant. The fieldwork is conducted in a real social formation—Canada in the summer of 1979. The object of this empirical work is not, however, to clarify the nature of childhood isolation in this social formation. Nor will references to empirical research in present-day United States or the United Kingdom attempt to elucidate the problem in those social formations. Insofar as each of these social formations is
dominated by the CMP, they furnish at least part of the basis for examining the issue within the context of the abstract totality, the capitalist mode of production.

I have defined mode of production as an abstract-formal object as opposed to the real-concrete object, the social formation. Another defining aspect of the concept mode of production is that it describes a social totality, rather than simply the economic structure of that totality. More specifically, this totality or global structure consists of three substructures (generally referred to as "regional" structures in Marxist theory): the economic structure, the juridico-political structure (laws, the state), and the ideological structure (ideas, customs, religion, morals).

The totality is not just a "piling on" of structures (see p. 20). The relationship between substructures is itself structured. In the global structure, one of the regional structures dominates the others, insofar as it plays the fundamental role in the reproduction of the mode of production. Dominance also consists "in setting limits to the independence of other levels, and defining the looseness of the degree of fit between the elements of the structure." Although in the CMP the dominant structure is the economic, in the feudal mode of production it is the ideological (principally the structure of Catholicism).

I also touched on the concept of determination in the previous chapter (see p. 20). In every mode of production, it is the economic structure which is determinant "in the last instance." This Althusserian term implies, in the words of one group of interpreters, "that there are other instances with effective determinations: the economic is not the
first, nor the only instance." The same authors interpret Althusser more fully as follows:

By this expression, Althusser again refers to the fact that, for him, the economic level is never the sole determinant, and consequently that the real causal efficacy of the other levels must be taken seriously. There is never a single original cause of a state of affairs, or "conjuncture." Certainly, the relative autonomy of other levels is only gauged in terms of what is or is not compatible with the principal mode of production: but such a proposition entails the possibility of an indirect causal relation so that "His Majesty the economy" does not and cannot appear "in person." The political and ideological levels do not transparently reveal the presence of the economic lurking behind them.

In summary, mode of production is an abstract-formal concept referring to a social totality as a structure in dominance, in which the economic level is determinant in the last instance. I will now turn to a more specific examination of the CMP.

II.2 THE CAPITALIST MODE OF PRODUCTION

The following discussion will show how a particular combination of elements characterizes not only the CMP as a whole, but each of its levels. I shall start by defining the combination at the economic level of the CMP, and go on to explain how it is manifested at the political and ideological levels. It should be stressed at the outset that although this combination is defined in terms of the relations of production at the economic level, it is articulated at the other two levels in quite different terms and takes on an autonomous character in relation to the economic.
II.2.1 The Economic Structure

All modes of production contain three invariant elements at the level of the economic. These are:

1. The labourer (direct producer who supplies labour-power).
2. The means of production. This term includes both the object of labour (raw or primary materials) and the means of labour (tools, instruments, machinery).
3. The non-labourer (who appropriates to himself the surplus labour).

These elements are termed "invariant" in that they exist in all modes of production. What distinguishes one mode of production from another is the specific combination of these elements, which is variable. This combination consists of a double relation of these elements:

1. A relation of real appropriation (sometimes called possession). This refers to the relation of the labourer to the means of production.
2. A relation of property. This refers to the relation in which the non-labourer intervenes as owner either of the means of production or of labour-power or of both, and so of the product. This relation is considered to define relations of production in the strict sense (that is, most immediately).

In class societies the relation of property establishes a separation of the labourer from the means of production, which is the property of the non-labourer who, as owner, appropriates to himself the surplus labour. On the other hand, the relation of real appropriation in class societies does not act in an invariable way. As Poulantzas explains,
this relation

can set up either a union of the labourer with the means of production (this is the case with 'precapitalist' modes of production) or a separation of the labourer from these means: this is the case with the CMP, in which a separation occurs at the stage of heavy industry and which Marx designates by the expression 'separation of the direct producer from his natural conditions of labour'.

Thus in the combination characteristic of the CMP, the two relations are "homologous":

The separation in the relation of property coincides with the separation in the relation of real appropriation. While that of 'pre-capitalist' modes of production consists of non-homology of the two relations: separation in the relation of property, union in the relation of real appropriation.

In the CMP the worker possesses no means of production, either in the immediate sense of tools or machinery, or in the larger sense of a shop or land. He is thus driven to sell his labour-power to the owners of the means of production in order to survive. By contrast, in the feudal mode of production the labourer has immediate possession of his means of production (most obviously tools, but also land during the period of the tenant's tenure).

What are the implications of this basic combination of elements which characterize the economic level of the CMP? In answering this question I shall restrict myself to implications which are most germane to the development of the notions of family and urban structure in Chapters IV and V. These are outlined in the next four sections.

\textit{II.2.1.A Large scale accumulation of capital becomes possible}

Prior to the generalized separation of workers from their means of production (which historically took the form of agricultural land closures, breaking up of the guilds, etc.), there had been an accumulation
of money capital by the merchant class in Europe. This development spanned several centuries, and resulted mainly from overseas and overland trade. Monarchs and nobles were also able to collect various forms of taxes and duties for use of or trespass on land. These forms of accumulation were limited, in that they were not part of a sustained investment in productive activity. Rather, they were simply surplus value siphoned off from the exchange of commodities. It was not until money capital was invested in production (specifically in tools, machinery, shops and wages of dispossessed labourers) that surplus value could be constantly produced and reinvested in further production.

The basis of surplus value in capitalist production is that the capitalist pays the labour a "wage" which appears to be payment for a "full day's work," but in fact is only payment for necessary labour, that is, that labour necessary for the subsistence of the labourer and dependent family. This necessary labour may comprise only a fraction of the total day's labour; the remaining labour constitutes surplus labour, and ultimately, surplus value for the capitalist. The basis of this surplus value is hidden both from the labourer, who thinks only in terms of his day's wage, and from the capitalist, who thinks in terms of the costs of his factors of production (overhead, materials and labour) and the price he can expect to obtain on the market. The difference between the production costs and market price is "profit" he has "earned."

Because he is dependent on the price he can obtain for his goods on the competitive market, the capitalist must continually lower costs of production in order to undercut his competitors. Although historically this has sometimes involved lowering workers' wages, lengthening
their hours, or intensifying their working conditions (for example, by increased pace of work), the primary means the capitalist has used to secure his position has been to invest in some form of machinery to increase worker productivity. If a worker produces more in a shorter length of time by using a machine, his necessary labour takes a shorter portion of the work day, resulting in greater surplus value for the capitalist.

This process of production, accumulation and reinvestment is repeated because both workers and capitalist are locked into it: the capitalist in order to survive on the market, and the labourer in order to survive at all, as he possesses no means of production. Thus the power to accumulate capital and simultaneously enlarge the productive forces is dependent on the particular relations of production under the CMP, wherein the worker is separated from his means of production and the capitalist monopolizes them.

But the driving force or logic of capitalist accumulation cannot be understood solely with reference to the process of production. It is necessary to follow the complete movement of capital. For this purpose it is easiest to visualize capital as a circuit (see Figure 1, page following).

There are two spheres of activity in this circuit: production and circulation. The sphere of production lies between C and C'. C represents the commodity inputs of labour power (LP) and means of production (MP) which in their combination (that is, once purchased) become productive capital in the process of production (P). This process results in the production of commodities (C') which contain increased value, or
surplus value in a latent form. This surplus value is derived from the surplus labour of the worker, as outlined above.

The surplus value contained in the form of commodity capital must pass through the sphere of circulation (from C' to C) and be realized in the form of money capital (M, and m as realized surplus value) if it is to be of use to the industrial capitalist who wishes to keep the production process rolling. Having harnessed productive forces untapped in previous modes of production, capital's main barrier to ongoing accumulation becomes the time it must spend in the sphere of circulation prior to its realization and re-entry into the sphere of production. Thus capital constantly seeks new geographic markets, new branches of industry,
and a larger consuming public (for example, via the media and advertising) for its products. It also attempts to abolish physical distance and time spent in circulation (for example, through improved communication, transportation, urbanization) so that it can more quickly re-enter the sphere of production and create renewed surplus value.

This circuit, ever renewed and multiplied, gives rise to numerous successive forms of the CMP, which, in the words of Poulantzas, cover "profoundly different economic realities." As capital and the resulting infrastructure expand, these forms pass from simple market production (actually pre-capitalist) through private capitalist production, social capitalist production, monopoly capitalism and state monopoly capitalism. This transformation of the form of the CMP, as well as the movement of capital described above, involves profound transformations in both family and urban structures. In terms of family structure, the most notable impact on children is their isolation from productive activity, as will be described in Section IV.2.1. With their sense of self-realization restricted to the consumption phase of the economic cycle, children's self-realization as individuals in a larger society is sublimated as consumption of corporate products. At the same time, play comes increasingly to be designated exclusively as the activity of children rather than of the population at large. These two themes are dealt with in detail in Section IV.2.4.

The expansion of capital and its infrastructure is taken up in considerable detail in terms of urban structure in Section V.2.1. The processes which will be described there will deal primarily with how urban structure itself is structured through the development of an
integrated space economy; the section will not outline direct structural
effects on children. However, in Sections V.2.2 and V.2.3 I will
describe the isolation of children through residential segregation,
housing form and the restrictive effects of increased vehicular circu-
lation. All of these effects flow indirectly from the expansion and
integration of the space economy.

II.2.1.B Ever-increasing socialization of the productive forces

Integrally connected with the development of capital is the ongoing
socialization of the productive forces. Individual production, in which
the artisan produces an item from start to finish, is superseded by
industrial production, in which many workers take part in various stages
of the overall process of production. But this socialization of the
productive forces extends beyond the factory floor. It entails two
related factors, the increasingly social origin of the means of produc-
tion and the increasingly social destination of the product. The first
term refers to the fact that these means of production came from an ever
greater number of branches of economic production:

Thus, primitive agriculture . . . is self-sufficient, that is
the number of means of production of non-agricultural origin
which it uses is very limited. But agriculture progressively
requires for its own production means of production whose
origin is more and more diverse: more complex tools, disinfect-
tants, electrical energy, electrical equipment, etc. The same
happens in each branch of industry, whether they are extractive
or, even more so if they are manufacturing industries.13

The second phrase, the ever more social destination of the product,
refers to the fact that the products of a production process are gener-
ally destined for a growing number of users. This means that each
branch of production works directly or indirectly for a growing number
of other branches. This is simply the other side of the division of labour referred to above. Harnecker also points out that the increasingly social destination of the product is manifested in the dimensions of the community which is supplied by a unit of the product:

With the progress of the productive forces these dimensions are generally (although not necessarily) growing. Thus we pass successively from the local, to the micro-regional, to the regional, then national, then international level.1

The most significant implication of this development is the necessity for state involvement to plan the increasingly complex economy.15 State involvement in planning of the economy also has direct impact on the evolution of urban structure, which will be explored in Section V.3.2. Of most significance to children is the gradual separation, through planning and legal intervention, of residential areas from industrial and commercial sectors.

II.2.1.C The socialization of reproduction

Just as there is an ongoing socialization of the productive forces in the CMP, there is a corresponding movement of socialization of reproduction. From an economic viewpoint, reproduction refers to the process whereby the labourer is repeatedly brought to sell his labour-power to the capitalist, setting the production process in motion again and again:

The capitalist process of production ... seen as a total, connected process, i.e. a process of reproduction, produces not only commodities, not only surplus-value, but it also produces and reproduces the capital-relation itself; on the one hand the capitalist, on the other the wage-labourer.16

Thus, as already noted, the separation of the worker from the means of production compels the worker to repeatedly present himself to the capitalist as a wage-labourer, simply in order to survive. But reproduction
of the wage-labourer is more than simple economic compulsion to appear at the factory gate. He must be physically, mentally and ideologically reproduced. Furthermore, future generations of labourers must be reproduced, so the concept of the reproduction of the labourer specifically includes children. Physical reproduction occurs in and through the family. Formerly, other aspects of the worker's reproduction, such as the acquisition of skills, occurred in the family as well. It is in relation to these aspects of reproduction that a gradual process of socialization has taken place, inasmuch as the state has intervened in the education of the worker (that is, the worker as a child), and increasingly fulfills other child-raising functions formerly accomplished within the family (for example, day care, family health and recreation).

There is thus a socialization of the functions of reproduction which is in some respect analogous to the socialization of the forces of production. Just as the worker loses control over the entirety of the labour process when it is socialized, the worker's family loses control of parts of the process of reproduction over which it formerly had power. Furthermore, in the same way as the origin of industrial means of production becomes increasingly diverse, the means of reproduction of children include not only the family, but also teachers, equipment, buildings, books, media, social workers and many other sources. Similarly, the increasingly social destination of the product in the production process is paralleled by the multiplicity of destinations for which workers-as-children are being reproduced in the ongoing division and specialization of labour.
I have described here the basis of the socialization of reproduction as it pertains to the economic level of the CMP. This movement involves the political and ideological levels, insofar as it is at the same time a development of the state. The socialization of reproduction is emphasized in Section IV.2.3, for it profoundly affects not only family structure but also the relation of children to the adult world in general. The advent of schooling, the decline of apprenticeship and the replacement of family functions by other institutions—all aspects of the socialization of reproduction—all tend to isolate the child from adult life in society as a whole. Furthermore, the socialization of reproduction is reflected spatially in schools and other institutions which reinforce neighbourhood segregation. This pattern, which is described in Section V.4, tends to isolate the child physically from wider contact with adult life and institutions.

II.2.1.D Alienation

A direct result of the particular combination of elements in the CMP is the alienation of the worker. In being separated from the means of production, the worker is no longer in control of the entire process of production as is a craftsman or an agricultural worker producing for his own subsistence. He is thus alienated from the product of his work, which appears to him "as a combination of alien material, alien instrument and alien labour—as alien property." But alienation from the product of one's labour is not the only form of alienation in the CMP. As explained by Mandel in his introduction to Marx's first volume of Capital:
With the industrial revolution and the emergence of the modern factory, this process of the submission of labour to capital in the course of the process of production is rooted, not only in the hierarchical forms of labour organization, but in the very nature of the production process itself. Inasmuch as production becomes mechanized, it becomes reorganized around machinery. The work rhythm and work content of living labour are subordinated to the mechanical needs of machinery itself. Alienation of labour is no longer only alienation of the products of labour, but alienation of the forms and contents of the work itself.\(^\text{18}\)

Alienation also affects the capitalist. If he is a supervisor or director of the labour process, his activity "acquires a specific, many-sided content." However,

the labour process itself is no more than the instrument of the process. . . . The self-valorization of capital—the creation of surplus-value—is therefore the determining, dominating and overriding purpose of the capitalist; it is the absolute motive and content of his activity. And in fact, it is no more than the rationalized motive and aim of the hoarder—a highly impoverished and abstract content which makes it plain that the capitalist is just as enslaved by the relationships of capitalism as is his opposite pole, the worker, albeit in a quite different manner.\(^\text{19}\)

Ultimately, alienation takes the form of alienation from life itself, wherein the products of man's labour appear neither as expressions of man's self nor as relations between men, but as things which appear to have a life of their own, and at worst, which appear to enslave men. Self-expression or self-actualization in this case takes the form of the acquisition of material possessions.

Alienation is thus a structural effect of the relations of production. But for children, it goes beyond alienation within productive relations, because, as seen in Section IV.2.1.A, they are alienated from the productive process. Another form of alienation relating to the marketplace is the tendency of children—encouraged by corporate adver-
tising—to seek self-realization in the form of consumption of corporate products. This process is described in Section IV.2.4.

II.2.2 The Juridico-Political Structure

In the discussion of the economic level, I have stressed how the relations of production are such as to divide the agents of production into two distinct groups: the capitalist, as owner of the means of production, and the labourer, who has been separated from the means of production. The same elements and relations constitute the basis of the juridico-political structure. Just as the wage form disguises the real relations between capitalist and worker, the institutions of the capitalist state obscure the class relations on which the state is based.

Poulantzas describes the fundamental distinguishing feature of the capitalist state as seeming to be the fact that it contains no determination of subjects as agents of production. In other words, the constitution of the state makes reference to individuals, citizens or people, and not to agents of production (capitalist, worker). Furthermore, political class domination is not mentioned in its institutions, which are organized around the principles of liberty and equality of individuals. (This is substantially different from previous modes of production, where, for example, legitimacy was founded on divine will and the monarchical principle.) Capitalist principles of liberty and equality are evident in various institutions of the state such as parliamentary representation, political liberties, universal suffrage, and popular sovereignty.
How can there be a connection between these institutions, which clearly are oblivious to the existence of class relations, and the actual relations of production described earlier, which are the basis of the CMP? Poulantzas states:

The juridico-political superstructure of the capitalist state is related to this structure of the relations of production. This becomes clear as soon as we refer to capitalist law. The separation of the direct producer from the means of production is reflected there by the institutionalized fixing of agents of production as juridical subjects, i.e. political individuals-persons. But this does not mean that people, popularly represented as "free individuals," are in fact free, untrammelled by their relation to class and production. Poulantzas continues:

The fact that this appearance of the 'individual' at the level of the juridical reality is due to the separation of the direct producer from his means of production does not mean that this separation engenders 'individuals-agents of production' within those same relations of production. On the contrary, our task will be to explain how this separation, which engenders the concentration of capital and the socialization of the labour process within the economic level, jointly sets up agents of production at the juridico-political level, as political and juridical 'individuals-subjects', deprived of their economic determination and, consequently, of their class membership.

To accomplish this task, Poulantzas traces the development of the capitalist state from its elemental form in the absolutist European states of the 14th to 17th centuries through the liberal non-interventionist states of Britain and France in the late 19th century to the various forms of the modern interventionist capitalist state in Britain, the United States and continental Europe. It is unnecessary to detail this development for present purposes, but two aspects can be noted.

The first concerns the emergence of the absolutist European states of the 14th to 17th centuries. This development is important because
these states gave rise to several characteristics of the modern capitalist state, which can be contrasted with those of the feudal state. In the feudal mode of production there is a lack of autonomy between the political and economic levels, insofar as moral/religious compulsion is essential for the conduct of production in that mode. But in the development of the absolutist state, feudal ties are replaced by "strictly political" ties. The "political" is separated from the economic and reconstituted, not as a mixed moral/religious/economic relationship between the lord and the peasant, but as a political relationship between the "state" and the "people." The implication of this is that the economic is then also free to develop untrammelled by the former feudal ties. A basis emerges for an autonomy of the political and economic.

But even if one understands the emergence of an autonomous political level in reaction to the "mixedness" of the political and economic in the feudal mode of production, how can one explain the perpetuation of the particular institution of "free individuals" vis-a-vis a state embodying "the general interest"? After all, it has been shown that individuals as workers are not free; they are separated from the means of production, and are therefore compelled to work for owners of those means of production. Why, then, do they appear as "free individuals" in our state institutions? This is the second aspect of the development of the capitalist state which requires examination.

The explanation of this apparent contradiction lies not in the examination of production relations, but in relations of exchange. In other words, returning to the diagram of the circuit of capital (Figure 1, p. 57), one is concerned with the sphere of circulation, and what happens
when commodities are exchanged for money. In regard to the exchangers in such a relationship, Marx notes:

As far as the formal character is concerned, there is absolutely no distinction between them. . . . Each of the subjects is exchanger; i.e. each has the same social relation towards the other that the other has towards him. As subjects of exchange, their relation is therefore that of equality.24

Not only do the exchangers appear equal, they appear free:

there enters, in addition to the quality of equality, that of freedom. Although individual A feels a need for the commodity of individual B, he does not appropriate it by force, nor vice versa, but rather they recognize one another reciprocally as proprietors, as persons whose will penetrates their commodities. Accordingly, the juridical moment of the Person enters here, as well as that of freedom, in so far as it is contained in the former. No one seizes hold of another's property by force. Each divests himself of his property voluntarily.25

Thus our juridical concepts of free individuals are derived by focusing solely on the sphere of exchange:

Therefore, when the economic form, exchange, posits the all-sided equality of its subjects, then the content, the individual as well as the objective material which drives towards the exchange, is freedom. Equality and freedom are thus not only respected in exchange based on exchange values but, also, the exchange of exchange values is the productive, real basis of all equality and freedom. As pure ideas they are merely the idealized expressions of this basis; as developed in juridical, political, social relations, they are merely this basis to a higher power.26

The juridical ideas of equality and freedom, which are based on this fixation with exchange, are also enshrined as political concepts. But an adequate representation of the state can only be derived by examining both exchange and production relations of capital. The general interest which the state attempts to enforce becomes something else, as noted by Marx: "The general interest is precisely the generality of self-seeking interests."27 The state thus performs not only the technical function of organizing and administering the general interests of an
increasingly complex society (as noted in the discussion of the socialization of production), but a specifically political function of representing the interests of the owners of the means of production ("the generality of self-seeking interests").

On the other hand, the state is not a mere reflection of economic interests. The institutions of the state based on freedom and equality are real in the simple sense that they exist and can develop autonomously. This is true even if they are based on an erroneous conception of the total socio-economic relations of the CMP, and even though their objective function is to serve the interests of capital. As Poulantzas argues:

The capitalist state is therefore characterized by a two-sided feature: on the one hand, its autonomy vis-a-vis the economic involves the possibility of a social policy (according to the concrete relation of forces), i.e. of economic sacrifices to the profit of certain dominated classes; on the other hand, this very same autonomy of institutionalized political power sometimes makes it possible to cut into the dominant classes' economic power without ever threatening their political power. It is in this context that we should locate, for example, the whole problem of the so-called 'Welfare State', a term which in fact merely disguises the form of the 'social policy' of a capitalist state at the stage of state monopoly capitalism.28

This discussion of the capitalist state has two major implications for this thesis. The first is that the primary existence and experience of the family in the CMP as a family (as opposed to the parents "as workers") lies in the sphere of circulation of exchange commodities, rather than in production. Relations in this sphere appear as ones of freedom and equality; persons appear as individuals, rather than as agents of production in a defined relationship. As has been shown; the institutions of the state are also based on this perception. The role of the family thus comes quite naturally to complement the role of the state, that is, fostering the development of "individuals." In Section
IV.2.3, I will explore some of the forms this notion of individuality takes in the CMP, its relation to the direct interference of the state in the family structure, and its general consequences for children.

The second implication of this discussion concerns urban structure, specifically the relation between urban planning and economic forces shaping the city. Given the relative autonomy of the political from the economic, there is a potential for state social policy which does not appear immediately coincident with the short term aspirations of capital. Much of the emphasis on creating livable cities and safe communities has come from community activists and planners who deplored the impact of industrial growth on family and neighbourhood life. Although their efforts have assisted the development of safer, cleaner communities, they have also meant the isolation of children in residential enclaves. This political effect reinforces the economic effect of the socialization of reproduction, and is discussed in Section V.2.2.

II.2.3 The Ideological Structure

I have shown how the elements and relations basic to the economic level and the juridico-political level of the CMP are the same, but appear in quite different forms which disguise real relations (that is, as wage form at the economic level and free individuals at the juridico-political level). I have also traced how the particular juridical form of agents of production as free individuals arises out of a focus on exchange relations. This latter interpretation has its counterpart at the level of ideology in the characterization of agents as individuals-subjects.
Ideology, according to Althusser, is not simply a (false) representation of reality. It is the maintenance of an imaginary relationship of individuals to real conditions of existence. What this means is that ideology allows persons to feel that they are free individuals, rather than as agents of production. Since in their daily rituals of rising, eating, leisure and consumption, individuals do not have to recognize their relation to the production process, they can see their relationship to reality as one of uniqueness and freedom. This false representation of their relation to reality is nurtured by "ideological apparatuses."

Althusser calls these institutional complexes Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs), which he distinguishes from Repressive State Apparatuses (RSAs). The latter include the government, the administration, the army, the police, the courts, the prisons, etc., which function predominantly by repression (physical or non-physical, such as administrative repression). The former, the ISAs, function predominantly by ideology, and in the CMP include such institutions as the religious ISA, the educational ISA, the family ISA, the legal ISA, the political ISA (including different parties), the trade union ISA, the communications ISA (press, radio and television, etc.), and the cultural ISA (literature, the arts, sports, etc.). These ISAs, although functioning primarily by ideology, also include elements of repression:

Thus Schools and Churches use suitable methods of punishment, expulsion, selection, etc., to 'discipline' not only their shepherds, but also their flocks. The same is true of the cultural IS Apparatus (censorship, among other things). Althusser claims that in the feudal mode of production,
there was one dominant Ideological State Apparatus, the Church, which concentrated within it not only religious functions, but also educational ones, and a large proportion of the function of communications and 'culture'. It is no accident that all ideological struggle, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, starting with the first shocks of the Reformation, was concentrated in an anti-clerical and anti-religious struggle.33

He goes on to say that in the mature CMP the school, or educational ISA has replaced the church as the dominant ISA. Or, more correctly, the school-family combination has replaced the church-family combination.34

The fact that the school and family act as the dominant ISAs in the CMP (although Althusser acknowledges that the family has other non-ideological functions) reinforces tendencies described at the political level. In the section on political structure, I referred to the representation of persons as individual-subjects vis-a-vis the state. To this political representation is now added a dominant ideology mediated through those institutions most directly concerned with the lives of children. The thrust of the ideological function—be it through the school and family or other ISAs—is to make individuals feel they are unique, free subjects, and thereby assist the reproduction of the CMP as a whole. As McLennan comments:

In this sense the assurance for the reproduction of the relations of production is a process which occurs "in the consciousness, i.e. in the attitudes of the individual-subjects."35

But as will be seen in Section IV.4.2, this ideology gives rise to major contradictions in the socialization experiences of children. On the one hand, children are encouraged to see themselves as independent individuals; on the other hand, their objective experience is one of considerable dependence on adults. In Sections V.2.2, V.2.3 and V.3 the physical
limitations placed on children by urban structure are shown to reinforce this dependence on adults, while at the same time isolating them still further from adult life.

II.3 SUMMARY

I have analyzed the basic combination of elements and relations which characterize the CMP, and described certain movements or tendencies which arise out of the inherent contradictions in these relations, at the economic, juridico-political and ideological levels. The movements or tendencies which have implications for family and urban structure are as follows:

(1) At the economic level:
   (a) the ongoing process of capital accumulation;
   (b) the socialization of productive forces;
   (c) the socialization of reproduction;
   (d) alienation of workers and capitalists in various forms.

(2) At the juridico-political level:
   (a) the ideological notion of the free individual vis-a-vis the state;
   (b) the relative autonomy of the juridico-political structure.

(3) At the ideological level:
   (a) the school and family as dominant ISAs;
   (b) the ideological notion of the individual as subject.

I have indicated in a preliminary way how these tendencies can be related to the isolation of children through the mediation of family and urban structure. The characterization of the isolation of children will be made in far greater detail in Chapters IV and V.
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CHAPTER III

FAMILY PROFILES

III.0 THE USE OF PROGRESSIVE-REGRESSIVE METHODOLOGY

In Chapter I, I discussed Sartre's concept of the regressive and progressive moments of analysis (see p. 40). Chapter II of this analysis is regressive in that it posits a broad theoretical structure—a concept of totality—which forms a context for the discussion of the isolation of children. The present chapter is the beginning of the progressive moment of analysis in that it deals with individuals—that is children and parents in six real families—and describes a biographical ("lived") level of their existence.

A caveat is important here, in that Sartre's purpose in using progressive-regressive analysis was to explain the meaning of the work and lives of particular persons in social formations. For example, he discusses Robespierre and Flaubert in relation to the France of their respective times. My discussion is centred on the relation of children to the capitalist mode of production. For this reason the continuation of the progressive moment of analysis in Chapters IV and V will relate the lived experiences of the six families not to the Canadian social formation but to family and urban structures of the capitalist mode of production.
When discussing the lives and actions of people such as Flaubert and Robespierre, Sartre makes use of the term "project." He defines this term as follows:

The most rudimentary behavior must be determined both in relation to the real and present factors which condition it and in relation to a certain object, still to come, which it is trying to bring into being. That is what we call the project.

Starting with the project, we define a double simultaneous relationship. In relation to the given, the praxis is negativity; but what is always involved is the negation of a negation. In relation to the object aimed at, praxis is positivity, but this positivity opens onto the "non-existent," to what has not yet been. A flight and a leap ahead, at once a refusal and a realization, the project retains and unveils the surpassed reality which is refused by the very moment which surpassed it.}

The behaviour of each of the children described in the following profiles is constrained (at an immediate level) by family history, local environment and innate capabilities ("the relation to the real and present factors which condition it"). At the same time the children are in the process of becoming, of striving, of needing to attain something material or attitudinal ("the project"). The praxis or behaviour related to the project can negate or attempt to negate the constraining factors (although in dialectical fashion it "retains" aspects of them as well as it strives positively to create (as if in total freedom) its object.

The profiles are conceived in terms of project, striving, negation and surpassing. Much of the sense of project is derived from project "inherited" from the parents. This is of course a tenuous inheritance, because in some cases it is precisely the framework provided by the parents that is negated by the children. (At another level it is negated by larger structural forces, some of which are described in Chapters IV
and V.) By stressing the parents' childhood, present relationships and central values regarding the children, I am not ignoring the child and his or her developing sense of project. (Especially with the older children, elements of their projects are quite readily revealed through drawings, actions and discussion.) I am trying to emphasize that the children are not autonomous individuals, divested of the intensity of family history and present relationships, nor are they necessarily conscious of any sense of project. (Much of the contemporary literature on children in urban environments ignores family history and thus makes abstractions out of the children studied.)

While the profiles are conceived in terms of project, they are presented simply in terms of biography. This style of presentation is an attempt to capture the immediacy of how the subjects perceived or acted out their lives. The language and tone differs markedly from that of Chapters I and II. Little use is made of formal terminology. Although some of the families seem to have easily defined essences and contradictions, others do not. For those who do not, the profiles do not include strong conclusions. In discussing the biographical level of his subjects, Sartre says:

At this level, we study the early childhood as a way of living general conditions without clearly understanding or reflecting on them; consequently, we may find the meaning of the lived experience in the intellectual petite bourgeoise, formed under the Empire, and in its way of living the evolution of French Society.5

There will not be the same tight fit between biographical subjects and wider structural determinants as in Sartre, because I am not trying to develop an understanding of explicit subjects. (Sartre, as I have
pointed out, was attempting to explain the meaning of Flaubert, Robespierre and others. I am not trying to clarify the "meaning" of Boy 7 in the Smith family in relation to the Canadian social formation.) Nevertheless, a number of the lived experiences of children and adults described in these profiles will become themes for later discussion. In Chapters IV and V, I will progressively trace the connections (mediations) between these human experiences and certain social-economic processes as part of an analysis of family and urban structure.

III.2 PROFILE: THE NAIPUL FAMILY

Mrs. Naipaul was born in 1943 in Leicester, England and can trace her urban "working class" origins in construction, coal mining and textile factory work back to the mid-1800s. At age eleven she entered grammar school, subsequently attended university, and then became a teacher. Grammar school was an opportunity denied her father and others in his family for lack of wealth. Mrs. Naipaul was accepted because a few years previously the government (Labour) had made entrance to grammar school dependent on achievement rather than wealth. The significance of her education is not lost on Mrs. Naipaul. She talks with conviction not only about the limited horizons of many workers in her family and the coal mining community of Coalville (12 miles outside of Leicester), but also of the class structure which deprives these people of opportunity. Her education opened her own spirit of inquiry, allowed her to meet other people, work and travel, and want to do certain things with her children. Her interracial marriage, and a stint of teaching in a "public" school (in reality a Protestant school) in Northern Ireland have convinced
her that not only class, but race and religion are means of dividing people and limiting the opportunities of certain groups.

Mr. Naipaul was born of well-to-do parents in British Guyana. His maternal grandfather was from Scotland; his paternal side was ultimately of East Indian origin, but had lived in Guyana at least since his grandparents' generation. His father was assistant chief secretary in the Georgetown police department; his mother owned a chain of drug stores which were run by his grandmother. Mr. Naipaul led a relatively sheltered and privileged existence in a large house on the outskirts of Georgetown, enjoying fishing, hunting, swimming and cricket. When Mr. Naipaul was in his early teens his father died and his mother's fortunes declined. The family moved to Antigua and Mr. Naipaul's academic education was curtailed. He received training in commercial refrigeration which he subsequently pursued in Ireland and England before coming to Canada.

After marrying in Northern Ireland in 1967 and working in Belfast, Leicester and London, Mr. and Mrs. Naipaul emigrated to Canada in 1969 in order to escape what they saw as Ireland and England's political instability and racial problems. They had only £75 on leaving London. They worked for six weeks in Winnipeg and spent their remaining money to continue by rail to Vancouver.

In 1974, having in the meantime moved five times within the city, given birth to two of their three children and gone through the strains of establishing their own appliance repair business, they settled in their present house, four blocks east of Main Street. It was a deliberate decision to put down roots, to have a yard (not just a house) and space, partly for the children, partly for gardening. The four-bedroom house,
sitting at the front of a standard sized lot, is constantly in a state of renovation. It is a project which started tearfully in the first weeks of occupancy when Mr. and Mrs. Naipaul discovered the house was infested with roaches and leaned seriously on its foundations. It carries more positively into visions of a future attic bedroom for the boys and a "proper" sitting room for adults.

According to Mrs. Naipaul, fulfilment of these types of aspirations has entailed constant strain and struggle. Much of this has centred on the relation between the family and the "shop," which can fairly be described as the central contradiction in their lives. The shop is the small appliance repair and service business which they established in 1973, first out of their home and then, in 1974, as a separate location about five blocks away. Prior to 1973, Mr. Naipaul had worked as a repairman for several large appliance firms, was secure in his job, and was able to enjoy holidays and a relatively free family life with his wife and (at that time) only child. The prospect of establishing their own firm, however, was a goal to which both Mr. and Mrs. Naipaul had looked forward.

Realization of this ambition brought them problems they had not foreseen, and from which they cannot easily extract themselves because of financial indebtedness. Prior to opening the shop they moved to a house with an extra room in order to acquire a business phone, and then moved again when this proved too expensive, and no customers phoned. The financial strain of trying to maintain this business forced Mr. Naipaul to take an extra job in Lumby, B.C. for several months in 1973. Mrs. Naipaul commuted by ferry to a part-time teaching job in Nanaimo, leaving
their child with a teenage babysitter each day. The experience was a shattering one for Mrs. Naipaul and she has not tried to teach again (although she intends to when the youngest child is about twelve). With the opening of the shop, new strains developed, even though business picked up. They consisted of constant night work, Saturdays occupied, problems with training and keeping reliable employees, and even difficulty with paying employees on schedule.

Mrs. Naipaul claims these strains persist, and have direct impact on the family. She says Mr. Naipaul is often too preoccupied or tired to interact with the children, although he keeps Sundays clear and tends to be quite active with them. Mr. and Mrs. Naipaul constantly discuss and sometimes argue about financial matters. Their seven year old boy recently asked Mrs. Naipaul, "Why are you and Daddy always talking about money?" Mrs. Naipaul could only agree that that was the case. She complains, "The way we do things is so much the result of the shop that it overrides everything else we do." The most poignant and tragic event in their marriage was also connected with the shop: the decision to have an abortion after conceiving their fourth child. Mr. Naipaul told her that they could not possibly manage another child because of the demands of the shop. Although Mrs. Naipaul acquiesced in the decision, she claims she received no psychological support at the time, and still feels unresolved guilt and anger towards Mr. Naipaul.

Their three children have startlingly different but equally engaging personalities. Mrs. Naipaul describes Bill as quiet, considerate, and "a good companion." He is not academically inclined and is not persevering when he encounters difficulties. He shows interest and talent in ballet
classes. Mrs. Naipaul says G8 is determined, independent, "gutsy," feels she has rights and will stick up for them. She enjoys reading, unlike her two brothers. B7 is irrepressibly cheerful, carefree, optimistic, infuriating but fun, and loves clowning. (In my estimation, he was almost hyperactive; he was the most entertaining but exhausting of all the children interviewed.)

From my perspective, what seems consistent in all three children is a type of intensity—for better or for worse—which mirrors the intensity of Mrs. Naipaul herself. She is aware of and feels the strains of their financial existence. She feels intensely about her own background as a child who was able to escape—via grammar school—the confines of a working class existence. She wants her children to feel and explore life, enjoy new experiences and not fear things. In addition to love and financial security, Mrs. Naipaul feels that "good parents" should provide excitement and variety. Indeed, she does not consider a home a good one without these qualities.

Their house and yard reflect this concern. The living room (which Mrs. Naipaul calls a sitting room) is the first point of entry into the house. All the walls are covered with the children's vibrant, colourful and imaginative drawings. Also on the wall are two poems ("The last word of a Bluebird" by Robert Frost, and "Leisure" by W.H. Davies) with pictures drawn by B11. Mrs. Naipaul tries to get the children to memorize poetry in the process of writing and drawing. She actively encourages an interest in nature. With excitement she shows me the lizard she has bought for Bll's birthday. She and the children made plaster of Paris moulds of a bear print they found during a hike (which entailed a special
trip back up the mountain). The children show me frogs which they nurtured through the tadpole stage. Mrs. Naipaul has built a fortress-type structure in the back yard for the children to play on, and strung ropes between two fruit trees for 'high-wire' climbing. This variety of stimuli is reflected in many instances in the children's drawings and expeditions, which showed more variety of place use and interest than any of the children in the other families.

On the other hand, Mrs. Naipaul does not try to conceal her fears that her children may not escape rather dull, ordinary lives, or may even fail to survive their teens without mishap. She fears that B7's carefree nature could get him in trouble, even in prison. She would love to see B11 go to university, but is aware that it is unlikely to happen. She forces him to do his reading assignments, tries to give him tasks that will force him to persevere and not give up immediately, and has encouraged his ballet, feeling that a child needs "one all-consuming interest" to get him through his teens. Mrs. Naipaul feels the schools could be more help in this regard. Although she values the school's playing down competition in the children's younger years, she maintains "school doesn't push achieving, and kids can tend to just drift along and never reach a high point and surpass themselves, can never get the thrill, that kick from doing something really good—no joy of achievement." It is as if life has come full circle for Mrs. Naipaul, and she fears that the school—an institution which gave her a measure of freedom—might simply be a dead end for her children.
III.3 PROFILE: THE SMITH FAMILY

Ms. Smith was born in 1947 in Kingston, Ontario. Two years later her family moved to the rail and farming centre of Belleville, Ontario (approximately 15-20,000 population), and Ms. Smith spent her entire childhood and youth there.

Apart from medical and family tensions (subsequently resolved) which made the circumstances of her birth "not terribly happy," she led an apparently secure middle class existence. She lived in a residential neighbourhood with large yards and a nearby wooded area in which she and her friends frequently played. She had an elder brother, and maintained a wide variety of friends.

Her father was a salesman/manager in a succession of small businesses. When Ms. Smith was twelve, her mother joined another woman on a part-time basis running a small restaurant. Both Ms. Smith's parents were also born and raised in rural Ontario. Ms. Smith's maternal grandfather was a foreman in a locomotive factory and managed to prosper even during the Depression; her paternal grandfather was a farmer.

Ms. Smith stresses the large amount of contact she had with her parents. This was especially the case with her mother, whose humanistic outlook she grew to share and is consciously passing on to her own son. She also appreciates the stability her family and permanent residence offered her in her childhood (her family moved only once within Belleville).

The circumstances of her own life as a mother have been quite different. She became a single parent by choice, in that she had no
expectation that B7's biological father would form any relationship beyond conception. At the time it seemed natural to her to have a child, and she didn't wish to "wait forever" to have a lasting union. Her life as a single parent has had periods of emotional tumult and self-doubt (especially in B7's third and fourth year), frequent changes of residence and work, and many personal involvements. In the fall of 1978 Ms. Smith and B7 (who was six at the time) moved from Montreal to Vancouver to live together with a man (Mr. Smith) she had met on an earlier visit in the summer. They are not married, but consider themselves a family with every expectation of remaining together.

Mr. Smith was born in 1944 in Fort William, Ontario, and moved to Windsor at age five or six, where he remained throughout his youth. His parents separated when he was five. His mother supported him and his younger brother and sister by doing industrial labour (for example, in a bottle plant). Although they were financially poor, his mother was hard-working, stoical, and made sure that the children's basic physical needs were met. They moved frequently within Windsor, but generally lived in middle class residential neighbourhoods. Usually they occupied an upper unit of a two-storey dwelling, often in cramped quarters. (He and his brother and sister shared the same bed until about grade six.)

His mother was less capable of providing emotional sustenance or of engaging in activities with her children. They learned primarily from their peers, watched a lot of television, and seldom invited friends home. He occasionally visited his maternal grandparents on their farm near Kitchener. He had no contact with his paternal grandparents after his parents' separation, and is not sure of their backgrounds.
Despite the difficult financial and social circumstances, Mr. Smith feels his childhood was basically happy. He also did well in school, went on to get a B.Sc. in biology, worked several years as a lab technician, and spent a year teaching high school. He also spent four years without paid work, which he calls a period of "self-exploration." Since moving to Vancouver in May of 1978, he has worked as a production manager in a small, "radical" (in a non-political sense) publishing firm.

Not surprisingly, the new family's existence in the year prior to the interview is best characterized as a process of adjustment for all three members. For Ms. Smith the neighbourhoods she inhabited in Montreal and Vancouver are dramatically different. She characterizes the location she had in Outremont as a "people neighbourhood." The shops were small and had warmth—a souvlaki place, children's clothing store, health food store, a repertory cinema, record store, toy store, florist, etc. She moved about comfortably in the area and was known to the shopkeepers. She felt like "part of a larger institution." There was also a small park which she felt was characteristic of Montreal yet hard to find in Vancouver: the size of a city lot, adjacent to housing and serving only a small neighbourhood, providing grass, trees, a pond and swings for children, and also a comfortable retreat where the children's parents can chat. In Vancouver, Ms. Smith's residence is one block from a fast-moving traffic artery, with an automobile dealership the dominant commercial feature. In the other directions the neighbourhood is residential, but there is no park for about six blocks. Ms. Smith has developed few neighbourhood friendships of the type she enjoyed in Montreal, and the adjacent commercial sector bears no charm for her at all.
In addition to his new relationship with Ms. Smith, Mr. Smith has had to come to know B7. It is really only now, a year after taking up residence together, that B7 will come regularly to Mr. Smith with problems or needs. A recent ten-day camping trip to Vancouver Island gave the family a block of time together, and according to Ms. Smith, seemed to solidify the relationship between Mr. Smith and B7. Mr. Smith's expectations of family life are also being heightened. He comments that it only seems strange in retrospect that in his childhood there was little social interaction and activity "as a family." Mr. Smith has also had to adjust his perceptions of place, even though he lived in the area prior to Ms. Smith's arrival. For him, it had simply been a place of residence, a place to "hang his hat." But because neighbourhood is so important both to Ms. Smith and B7, Mr. Smith feels it will probably become more important to him.

B7 has had the greatest number of adjustments: new father, new city and neighbourhood, new (and first year in) school, and new friends. In part he also has had to adjust linguistically, because although his mother speaks only English fluently, his daycare in Montreal was French speaking. He had become fluent in French. In Vancouver, there is only one friend with whom he can speak French. His gradual establishment of trust with Mr. Smith has been noted. His adjustment to school has been more problematical. On several occasions in his first year, Ms. Smith has had to work through situations in which B7 has been disruptive in class, been uncooperative, and resorted to petty stealing. She has found the teachers helpful. Now, in the beginning of his second year, the problems seem to have been resolved; B7 seems more positive about school.
There have also been practical adjustments concerning living space. The family first lived together in Mr. Smith's original one-bedroom unit, which was too cramped. Just prior to the interviews, they moved across the street to a three-bedroom basement suite in an old house. Extensive renovations are now in progress.

From my perspective, these immediate adjustments in many ways over-shadow any longer term sense of project. Another reason for this apparent lack of project is that the family is less oriented to material and social ambitions than any of the other families interviewed. The main values that Ms. Smith tries to convey to B7 have to do with attitudes towards life (ways of dealing with problems), towards a natural sense of the body (they frequent a nude bathing beach in Vancouver), and towards other people (in a non-sexist way; conducting oneself with respect, love, understanding). In the interviews she clearly articulates the subtleties of these values. Personal relationships are important to her. Most of the residential moves she has made have to do with personal relationships. She maintains contact with several of her Montreal friends, a number of whom have visited or moved to Vancouver. She feels that personal relationships—the people around her and the quality of support or disapproval they give—have been the single greatest influence (positive and negative) on her freedom to parent her child as she would like.

These values seem to be reinforced by Mr. Smith. He genuinely enjoys his work in the publishing firm, in part because it is essentially a cooperative venture. He socializes regularly with the other workers. Several of them live in other units in the same large house, or nearby. His interest in his work has little to do with a drive "to get ahead"
(the work is poorly paid); it is rather the intrinsically interesting nature of the job and the quality of the personal relations in the work-
place.

Several of the characteristics noted above reflect an important element of counter-culture on their lives. It is not manifested in self-
conscious dress, mannerisms or adornment of their living space, for in all these respects they are quite "straight." But in many of their attitudes—which also contain a strong admixture of what Ms. Smith calls a "humanistic" philosophy—they reject the goal-orientation of Canadian culture. Ms. Smith says that having a child has made her "more concerned with the future, in a different, more personal, intimate way." Much of that concern, as already noted, lies in the quality of human relationships.

My own relationship with B7 was the most reserved of all the con-
tacts I had with the thirteen children. (This had in part to do with the fact that theirs is a one-child family, and I was therefore present on fewer occasions than with other families. I also went on the excur-
sion with him after only one prior visit with Ms. Smith, so he had less time to become comfortable with me. In my interviews with his parents he was frequently not at home.) On the other hand, his geographic expedition and drawings evince a concern with friends' houses as favour-
ite places which far exceed that of any of the other children. His diary also reflects play with a large number of friends in the course of a week.

III.4 PROFILE: THE ROSS FAMILY

Mrs. Ross was born in Preston, northwest England in 1941, and at the age of six moved with her family to Glasgow. A year later the family
moved to Balloch, a small community (10-15,000 population) twenty-three miles northwest of Glasgow, and she lived there until she was married at age twenty-four. She was an only child, and her main social life was with her extended family. Both her parents' families lived in Glasgow, affording her the opportunity of visits with grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins. Both parents had been born and raised in Glasgow; her maternal grandfather had established a dairy and home bakery store in the city.

Her life was ordered, scheduled and entirely predictable. Her father, an iron and steel foundry manager, was always home for lunch at 12:10 and would leave at 12:45. On Saturdays the family would visit relatives and window-shop in Glasgow. On Sundays they regularly attended church. Their holidays were always on the Isle of Arran in July and August.

Her father sang in the local choir and her mother was active in the church guild. Both parents were strict towards Mrs. Ross in terms of manners and dress—far stricter than she is with her own children. This apparently reflected the desire to "better oneself." In fact, notes Mrs. Ross, all of her cousins have "bettered themselves" from "yeoman stock."

Her parents' house was a three-bedroom duplex completed at the end of World War II. It was quiet, being at the end of a cul-de-sac, and Mrs. Ross had both a front and back yard for play. In the summer she would cycle, go for long walks and play tennis. She was an avid reader, studied piano, and participated in Girl Guides and Sunday school. She considers her childhood a happy but overly strict one, and has good
memories of "just the three of us comfortable and safe at home."

Dr. Ross considers his childhood an "excellent" one. Born in 1941, he was also an only child, and far younger than most of his cousins. On one side of the family he was an only nephew and only grandson, and much of his social life was bound up with his grandmother. His family lived in the third floor of a tenement apartment in South Glasgow. His hobbies included fishing and swimming (he was a trained lifeguard).

His father, a clerk, was fifty when he married and fifty-two when Dr. Ross was born. When Dr. Ross decided to go to medical school, his mother worked to support him. He graduated in 1965.

Dr. and Mrs. Ross were married in 1965 and started their family the next year. Having felt the lack of siblings in their own childhoods, they had intended originally to have six children. After the arrival of the fourth, they decided that more children would put too much strain on them as parents. Prior to 1974 their life involved frequent moves, most related to Dr. Ross's medical career. In 1969 they emigrated to Canada (Parry Sound, Ontario) because they were disillusioned with the practice of medicine in Britain. In 1973 they returned to Britain for a year in order to be near family while Dr. Ross did a residency program in anaesthesia. Dr. Ross worked in London while Mrs. Ross and the four children stayed in her home town of Balloch. They subsequently moved to Vancouver and have lived in the same residence since 1974. (In late 1979, after the fieldwork interviews, the family moved to Nova Scotia for what they considered their "final" move.) During the summer of my fieldwork, they formally became Canadian citizens.
Judging from the above moves and his own testimony, it is fair to say that Dr. Ross's work has frequently overwhelmed family life. In one Vancouver area hospital where he had worked, life was "work and sleep." He was frequently away from 6:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Surgery was often scheduled for weekends, taking up sometimes as much as twenty hours of his time. But Dr. Ross does not consider himself a "workaholic," nor does he respect the many colleagues he sees who are totally "married" to their jobs. He feels most doctors are egotistical, and that few of them even attempt to live a normal family life. His decision to move to Nova Scotia was largely influenced by the fact that his future colleagues there share his feelings and have established more reasonable working relationships.

In fact, one of the most dominant characteristics of the Ross family is that they do a large number of activities as a family. They stress having "family suppers" because Dr. Ross is usually not home for other meals. Compared to the other families, they frequently dine out together, at a variety of restaurants. They make extensive use of parks (for example, Stanley Park and Spanish Banks) on weekends, and plan camping or hostelling activities each summer. They hold family memberships in the planetarium and aquarium. The entire family is active in competitive swimming (with parents officiating) which occupies two or three weekends each month, especially in winter. The latter activity occasionally becomes a "grind" for both parents and children because of its excessive time demands. Mrs. Ross, a trained elementary teacher, has also been active in the PTA and its successor, the School Consultative Committees. Both parents attend and often assist at school sports days,
theatrical productions and craft fairs ("I'm one of those awful mothers who attend everything").

Such family activities are one aspect of a more general stress on activities and performance. All the children are involved in at least a few extra-curricular activities—Cubs, Brownies, Beavers, swimming, bagpipe lessons and community recreation programs. The parents want their children to achieve well in school and get interesting jobs. They reward them for good report cards (by eating out, buying something, etc.). Mrs. Ross likes some of the children's Chinese-Canadian friends because they are "achievers" who have a "positive attitude towards schoolwork." She has not hesitated to contact the children's teachers when academic or behavioural problems have arisen, but generally the children have achieved well academically.

This performance orientation carries over into expectations of the children's attitudes in social interactions. Dr. and Mrs. Ross want their children to behave well, learn the "art of conversation," and be at ease in public. They find that other children often have a negative attitude towards authority, and do not like to see this reflected in their children. They are seen by their children as being more strict than other parents (for example, they won't let GI3 go to a teen disco with her friends).

This concern for performance has less to do with "getting ahead" than with having an interesting and fulfilled life. (This attitude extends to the girls as well as the boys, as Mrs. Ross tries to avoid sexist child-rearing.) Dr. and Mrs. Ross are in fact remarkably free of pretense and show only a negative interest in what they see as the
excessive materialism of Canadian society. Dr. Ross downplays medicine as a career option because he does not like the role of "doctor as hero."
The relative strictness of certain rules is balanced by frankness, openness and good humour in child-parent interactions, and as noted at the outset, a high degree of participation together as a family in numerous activities.

The house they rent reflects some of the qualities just mentioned. The upper floor of a modest duplex, it has only three bedrooms, so the boys (B11 and B7) and the girls (G13 and G8) share their rooms. Perhaps for this reason and because there is no yard, many of the children's activities spill into the kitchen (they like cooking), the dining room (model-building, backgammon games), the living room (games and television), the deck over the carport (games and sunning), and even the stairwell (a repository for toys and other equipment). The home thus has a very informal and child-oriented air. Mrs. Ross noted, "I've been a teacher and lots of things don't bother me—for example, glue and tape all over the place."

All four children seem possessed of a common sense and matter-of-factness that would help them through most difficulties, even in situations they have not encountered before. Although I was not a witness of their academic activities, they strike one as stereotypically "good, industrious, quiet, competent students." Their parents are exceedingly hospitable people, and in a less adult way, so are the children: on each of my visits they would greet me, and with interest show me things they were doing or making. They all responded surprisingly quickly and directly to the interview questions during fieldwork.
Of all the children interviewed, they seemed to me to be the least attached to neighbourhood, and identified the fewest "favourite places" in their drawings or expedition. Few of their "best friends" are drawn from the immediate neighbourhood, coming rather from contacts in school, Cubs, Brownies or Beavers, and swimming. They often see these friends only in these settings.

The location of their house tends to reinforce (or produce?) these tendencies. Although it is immediately across the street from the children's elementary school, it is cut off from most other resources by major traffic arteries on the south, west and north within one-half to three blocks. (Its location was primarily chosen because of easy access to the hospital at which Dr. Ross works.)

The children have overcome these barriers in part by being proficient on their bicycles despite the traffic. They participate very frequently (almost daily in summer) in programs at a recreation and swimming centre about ten blocks away, and west of Main Street (they live on the east side). As previously noted, they are also involved with their parents in a wide range of activities far removed from their neighbourhood. (This was in evidence particularly in their diaries.) They have also been outside of British Columbia in terms of both their residence (Scotland and Ontario) and summer travel. All of these factors seem relevant in what appears to be a weaker attachment to neighbourhood and neighbourhood friends. G13 has an additional reason: she has just made a difficult decision to enrol next year in a secondary school farther distant (and better academically) than the one most of her peers are choosing. The decision is her own, but she is feeling isolated from
certain of her former friends as a result.

The children seem to me to be less emotionally expressive—for better or for worse—than children in several of the other families. In these other cases I quickly get the sense of a character "profile" emerging with distinctiveness from the backdrop of the family. This does not happen with the children of the Ross family, despite (or because of?) the very strong characters of the parents. My own limitations of contact, time and perception may of course play a role. (Mrs. Ross talks of B11 as being "very volatile, living from crisis to crisis." I have not seen this, although I feel a brooding intensity when B11 says he would like to be "an only child.") I can not pretend to appreciate the subtler differences of character which might emerge with frequent contact and interaction. On the other hand, it may be that the children represent the idealized norm of "WASP" culture, and thus do not stand in relief to the culture. They have few of the struggles of the children in the Naipaul family, adjustment problems of B7 in the Smith family, or single-mindedness of G7 in the Jones family (described in the following profile). They are well-embedded in a close family with parents who are carrying forth many of the achievement-oriented, common-sense values inherited from their own childhoods. These values are conveyed with a strictness vastly understated compared to those of the parents' childhood, but with a persistence and constancy that will ensure their transmission.

III.5 PROFILE: THE JONES FAMILY

Mr. Jones was born in Prince Edward Island in the early 1940s. His main residence until age ten was a large house and yard with barn in the
middle of a village of approximately 1,000 population. The family had a variety of animals—rabbits, dogs, cats, pigs, and even a fox. Their house was close to a wooded area, and so Mr. Jones had easy access for berry picking and miles of walks. Most of his activities were outdoors, and included baseball, skating and hockey. Even today Mr. Jones feels that a rural environment is far healthier and freer for children than the urban environment in which he is raising his daughter.

However, his own childhood had another, less idyllic aspect. His father was in the army, away from home, and his mother had little time to be with him or his three brothers and two sisters. He grew up "street wise" in a rural environment. His father brought home boxing gloves for Mr. Jones when he was only four, and he boxed from then on. He was brought up "fighting, stealing things and breaking into cars"; he seems proud of his rough background, for it has helped him "stand up for my rights."

At the age of ten he was sent to live with his aunt in Halifax. Since she had no children of her own, she was able to give Mr. Jones more attention, and he had a more "normal" family setting. He attended a Catholic school which was "very strict and straightened me out." He is proud of the fact that at this early age he had his own charge account and bought his own clothing. He started "dating" and especially liked movies: on Saturdays he could see three movies and two cartoons for only twenty-five cents. He also was given a bicycle for the first time.

When Mr. Jones was thirteen, his father left the army and purchased a grocery store, so Mr. Jones returned home. He remained fairly independent, working in the mornings before school, and in the summers on his
uncle's potato farm. He would also earn his own money by collecting beer bottles, copper and other recyclable "junk." He would regularly visit the railway station, the beginning of a life-long interest in trains. He later worked on them for eleven years, and "if I were single, I would still be there." He feels good about his childhood, despite (because of?) the relative paternal neglect: he's "seen more, been around more and had more dates."

Mrs. Jones also grew up in a rural situation, but was much more sheltered, if not isolated. Born in 1947, she lived her entire childhood and youth near a village of 1,100 population, forty miles west of London, Ontario. Her parents were farmers (corn and other cash crops, a few cattle), although her father also drove logging trucks. Their farm was five miles outside the village, and there were no children Mrs. Jones's age nearby. Her brother and sister were twenty and eighteen years older respectively than Mrs. Jones, so she was essentially an only child. Her major contacts were through her local school, a one-room building a mile and a half from her house, which mixed children from grades one through eight. Her other activities included Sunday school, cycling (after she was twelve), and toboganning and skating in winter. She also enjoyed dolls, and played "a lot of house." She remembers numerous showers, weddings and Tupperware parties as community social occasions.

Her parents were both in their forties when Mrs. Jones was born. They were very strict and abrupt. "Everything had to be done at a certain time, in a certain place, in a certain routine." Compared to the upbringing of Mr. Jones, or to her own daughter, Mrs. Jones feels she was taught to "take a back place to everybody, to be quiet and not too
forward." She does not regret her parents' strictness, as "discipline never hurt anybody," but is not as keen as Mr. Jones about country living. Her own isolation as a child made her want to be near people and shops; she likes living in their present apartment.

Mr. and Mrs. Jones were married in Ontario in 1969. Three months later Mr. Jones was transferred to Vancouver by the Canadian National Railway, for which he was working as a waiter in the dining and lounge cars. From 1969 to 1974 they lived on the main floor of a West End apartment; G7 was born in 1971. They moved to their present location a block east of Main Street in 1974, first to a one-bedroom, second floor suite, and six months later to a two-bedroom unit on the first floor.

In addition to his work on the trains, Mr. Jones has also managed the apartments in which they have lived, as well as another building close by. For a short period he also worked as a waiter in a local race-track lounge. He stopped working on the trains in 1974 because of the time it took away from his family. G7 would cry whenever she saw him put on his white shirt and black tie, because she knew it signalled another lengthy separation. Mrs. Jones was also nervous as she was not used to being alone in "the big city." Mr. Jones worked in the Canadian National station from 1974-75, and since then has spent all of his time managing the two apartments (each containing twenty-three suites). Mrs. Jones also contributes to the management by vacuuming the halls and doing other cleaning chores. Mr. Jones anticipates that he will soon have to get another part-time job to make ends meet. Although apartment management has periodic pressures (end of the month; physical problems with the building at times), Mr. and Mrs. Jones like the work because of its
flexibility, and the time it gives Mr. Jones with G7.

In fact, Mr. Jones repeatedly stresses togetherness as an important aspect of their family life: "She [G7] has always been with us since birth. She's never been babysat. We're not nighthawks or pub-goers; if we go to friends she'll come along because we're back by ten p.m." Rather than go to movies they will make popcorn at home and watch television together.

It was hard for me to assess whether this extra time available to Mr. Jones meant that he interacted with G7 more than the average father. Mr. Jones was recovering from a chest injury during much of the time I saw the family. Although he took part in the interviews, he was less active than when healthy. The week's diary showed only one joint activity between daughter and father (pumping up a bicycle tire), and numerous activities between daughter and mother or friends.

On the other hand, Mr. Jones's character is very dominant in the couple's relationship. His references towards others are frequently belligerent, Maginot-minded and unabashedly racist. Almost all negative comment about people is tied into racist perceptions. He derides a "coon" black kid whom he claims tried to rape G7 the previous year. He resents the East Indian proprietor of a local convenience store, whom he has berated because children who purchase candy bars at the store strew the wrappers on Mr. Jones's lawn. Over the course of several interviews, he returns to the story of a Greek teacher who "grabbed G7's throat" at school. Mr. Jones vows he will "throttle" the teacher if she ever lays another hand on G7. The fact that she is Greek was important because "Greeks have such bad tempers." He then proceeds to describe
the emotional conduct of Greek tenants across the street. (On the other hand, Mr. Jones takes considerable pride in his own temper and resultant dramatic incidents in his past. He has physically threatened G7's school principal.)

When asked what changes they would like to see in their neighbourhood and the city at large (at a different stage in the interview) both Mr. and Mrs. Jones immediately say, "fewer immigrants, more Canadians." Without self-consciousness he states that he does not allow East Indians to live in the apartments he manages (clearly a violation of human rights legislation). Mrs. Jones points out that because of the number of immigrants on the east side of Main Street, their daughter G7 "has" to go outside of her area for friends. She "doesn't get involved" with the immigrant population.

Mr. Jones's condemnation of the social environment extends to the school system itself and the "working class area" he lives in. He feels the principal blindly backs up his teachers, good or bad, and will not act on parents' complaints. Mr. Jones feels capable of teaching G7 everything she brings home from school, and considers himself largely self-taught. He feels that most other parents don't care about their children. "Ninety per cent of the parents are working and are happy to get rid of their kids at school. The teachers also think that's the name of the game." He feels that this "dumping" of children and lack of concern would not occur in a "higher class area." (In fact, Mr. Jones feels there are no "good areas" left in Vancouver, although their present location is preferable to the West End.) Both because of parental neglect and because of the attitude of most teachers and principals,
school undermines parental authority in Mr. Jones's estimation.

Mr. and Mrs. Jones's concept of authority reflects Mr. Jones's street-scrapping and Mrs. Jones's country religion in their own childhoods. He tends to stress "standing up for your rights"; she stresses "learning God's way to act." Both demand obedience. Mrs. Jones claims that if they get angry at G7 and she doesn't obey, they will refer to the commandment, "Obey [sic] thy father and mother," and say, "Didn't you read that?—You're one of God's children." Mr. Jones points to a belt hanging on the back of a kitchen chair, which comes into use if G7 disobeys an order four or five times. Fortunately, it has not been used over the past year. One of the advantages Mrs. Jones sees in her husband's quitting his CNR job is that he is home to "help me be firm" with G7.

G7 is not easily daunted. Mrs. Jones, speaking perhaps more for herself than for Mr. Jones, says, "We tried to bring her up to be mannerly and quiet like a girl and not robust—like she is. She acts like a tomboy. It hasn't really had any effect; she's gone on anyway and developed her own character." Both parents describe her as "outspoken, outgoing and independent," and despite their attempts to raise her "like a girl," they feel that "in this day and age, if you're not outspoken and independent, people will walk all over you."

The author's own contacts with G7 tended to confirm their description of their daughter. She is spunky, sometimes cheeky, and always outgoing. Staff at the local recreation centre volunteer that G7 is prone to using "some of the vilest language" they have heard come from a child, but that she has calmed down somewhat over the past year. (Her
mother admitted that G7 had been "quite wild" in school the year before.)

There is also a gentle side to G7's character. Mr. and Mrs. Jones are proud that for two years G7 has been voted the "best to get along with" in her school class. Mrs. Jones describes her daughter as a kind child, but with a rider: "If people are kind to her, she's kind back. If people are harsh, she strikes back." They stress respect for the elderly and are pleased that G7 relates well with some of the elderly tenants in their building. G7 earnestly explains to me during an expedition that she and her parents are helping me out so that I can pass my exams at school. Of her own volition, she says prayers for a friend who has entered hospital. (G7 has reason to be empathic: just before my interviews she broke her arm and spent two days in hospital; the experience terrified her.)

G7 is a busy child. She is involved in Brownies, skating classes, Baptist Church Sunday school, and especially in the summer, virtually lives at the local community centre (three blocks away). Of all the families, this is the only one that judges community organizations as being a more major source of their child's learning experiences than the family itself. (Generally Mr. and Mrs. Jones are very positive towards the community centre, in interesting contrast to their attitudes towards the schools.) In several respects G7 appears to me as a stereotypical youth product of consumer corporate society. She is impressed by and wants the "latest fashions" like blue jeans, vest-sweaters and clogs. She is a child of the fast food era: McDonalds is one of her "favourite places" on the expedition. One or both of her parents take her there or to an A&W (Denny's was also popular) at least once a week. She watches
more television than do the children in the other families (except B7 in the Smith family), roughly 22-25 hours per week. Mr. Jones says that G7 usually falls asleep watching television and is carried to bed at night. There is little of the importance attached to books which is found in the Smith and Ross families: her parents read very little and G7 just "doesn't seem to be interested." While her father listens to talk shows and country-western music, G7 likes rock music, CKLG and Grease.

While in these respects G7 appears "trendy," in her geographic expeditions one feature is remarkably different from the other children and seems to suggest a reclusive aspect of her character. Six of her twelve "favourite places" are "forts." In most cases they are adaptations of bushes, trees or other forms of landscaping adjacent to buildings or fences. These bushes become the structural supports for something "sort of like a home." G7 brings a radio, towels, cards, glasses of water and pictures to complete the "interiors." She almost always plays in them alone, and visits several of the forts on the same day.

A fort is a very common "favourite place" for all the children studied, but in no other case is it such a dominant motif as for G7. It seems to have a correspondingly greater psychological significance for her. I am not trained in this type of interpretation, but given the aggressively individualistic, rural-oriented and isolatory attitude her father frequently espouses, I cannot help feeling that here is a little girl establishing fortresses between herself and a world she needs time to assess. Whether the fortress will get higher, will crumble, or will perhaps direct its defences at Mr. Jones will be a major drama to be played out in G7's coming years.
III.6 PROFILE: THE MIKLOS FAMILY

Mrs. Miklos was born the second of four children in 1937 in a village in Somerset, England. Both of her grandfathers were Anglican priests, and her father was a vicar. Soon after Mrs. Miklos was born, her father joined the navy as a chaplain, because his income as a vicar was insufficient to support the family. From this point on he was seldom at home, and Mrs. Miklos was essentially raised by her mother. Her mother always kept the father alive and influential in the minds of the children: "Whenever he would pop in, we would always think God had landed!"

One outcome of this absence was that Mrs. Miklos was brought up to be independent, a value also nurtured by her mother. This was reinforced by constant moves and adaptations to new surroundings. From age four to eleven she moved almost once a year—from Somerset to County Durham, to Devon, to Scotland (Isle of Bute), to Sussex and back to Devon. Adjustments were not always easy. In Scotland, one of the few times she could have lived together with her father, she was instead sent to a boarding school near Glasgow. ("I didn't question it at the time, but it gives me a lump in my throat to think of it now.") She was "bullied and tormented" in the school, not just as a newcomer, but as an English girl. ("If Scotland won a particular war over the English in our history class, everybody would turn around and stick their tongues out at me.")

Even where schooling was not so adverse, Mrs. Miklos was isolated socially and physically in what were usually village settings. In Devon (which she considered her "home"), the "gentry" lived in large houses outside their village, and the common folk in the centre of the village.
Her family lived "squarely between," and although she would like to have played with the village children, her parents would not permit it. This was also true in Scotland, where such contact was ruled out because "she might pick up the accent." In Sussex and Devon she made a few close friendships, primarily from the naval community and school.

In Sussex and Devon she would go for long horseback rides on the moors. Occasionally she was thrown and had to return on foot. Despite this danger and the long rides, her mother let her go anywhere on the horse. Later Mrs. Miklos taught herself to swim, alone, in streams on the Devon moors. She feels that the present generation of children is over-protected compared to her own. Her mother encouraged her to bicycle and stay in youth hostels at the age of thirteen. She visited friends in Helsinki when seventeen. At twenty she left her family to come to Canada.

The church and a sense of class remain important touchstones for Mrs. Miklos. Despite her present preference for urban living, she has a nostalgia for the "village life of England," which for her centred around the church, to which "one could always turn." Although she avoids putting the same prohibitions against inter-class contact on her children that were enforced upon her, she feels it is important that her children have a clear self-concept. "We have an obligation to act in a certain way because we aren't rubbish. We owe it to our ancestors to act in a decent sort of way. When born in a certain place [in society] we owe a duty to the less strong."

Mr. Miklos was also born the second of four children in 1937. He spent his childhood and youth on the Greek island of Siros, seventy-five miles southeast of Athens. Mountainous and only seven miles in length,
Siros has a population of 30,000. Of these, 10-15,000 people lived in the town of Hermopolis, a regional capital for a number of islands. It was on the "Catholic Hill" (a neighbouring one was "Greek Orthodox Hill") just outside the harbour of Hermopolis that Mr. Miklos grew up.

Mr. Miklos' earlier memories relate to the hardships of the Second World War. His father left the island as a soldier at the beginning of the conflict, but returned to aid the British, often risking his life to hide British spies. Mr. Miklos remembers the hunger, food rationing and frequent bombing on the island. His family was often dependent on his grandparents, who had a farm in the north of the island, both for shelter and food.

Even after the war, the family was always poor. His father was fairly successful as a carpenter and furniture maker, but tended to gamble away much of his wealth at the local "cafenion." The problem became serious by the time Mr. Miklos was thirteen, for he remembers accusing his father of not looking after his business.

Mr. Miklos' childhood was simple and disciplined. He attended a Catholic elementary school for a year, and a French religious school in Hermopolis for another four years. Church and religion was a constant part of his life—"till it was coming out of our ears." He also attended Scouts at ages nine and ten, and later in his teens. This, as well as trips with his relatives, allowed him occasionally to visit neighbouring islands, but generally he remained ignorant of the world at large until his later teens. He notes that all of his toys were improvised: a football made of rags stuffed in a sock, apricot pits as marbles, or marbles made of clay. He remembers polishing his shoes with soot.
There were few opportunities for employment to help him rise above his circumstances, unless he left the island. His father helped him to apprentice as an electrician at the age of thirteen, and after two years of the program, he could go no further unless he went to Athens. After several years in that city, he became an electrician for a freight line, and spent most of the years 1955-65 at sea. He did not like Athens, and still does not like cities. He considers himself a "loner" and feels his life experience is more adaptable to country than city living. But as with many Greek youth, for him the city and the shipping industry were passports to a more worldly and financially secure existence.

Mr. and Mrs. Miklos were married in a New Westminster church in 1965. They lived for ten months in the house Mrs. Miklos occupied when single, and then raised a $1500 downpayment for their present house a few blocks away. They have lived there for fourteen years. It is a comfortable location, set several blocks from major traffic arteries on all sides, far enough west of Main Street to be "respectable" (as a friend of Mrs. Miklos jokingly remarked), and surrounded by other long term residents with whom Mr. and Mrs. Miklos have friendly, chatty relationships.

Their house is not ostentatious, but reflects their values of hard work and achievement. It is a spacious three-storey structure with bedrooms on the third floor, living room, dining room, kitchen and playroom and porch on the second, and basement and office space on the first. The house has been renovated several times, the most recent additions being the playroom, porch and dining room. Mr. Miklos has ongoing building "projects" around the house, although nothing major has been planned
since the porch was completed.

Apart from these projects, most of Mr. Miklos' energies are consumed by his work. After ten years as an electrician on freighters, he worked for nine years as an electrician and then supervisor at a steel fabrication plant. In 1974 he established his own small business as an electrician and electrical contractor, which on larger jobs involves several employees. Summers are always busy, demanding weekend work and occasionally a longer day (till 7:00 p.m.). In the winter he tends to work only two-thirds of the time.

Mr. Miklos is happiest when working. Although he is aware that about 50 per cent of small firms fail in one way or another ("I'm relying on construction; if it fails, then I do too."); he knows his work is good and is proud of his success. Of even more importance is that he can work with dignity. On the one hand, this means "I can take the responsibility of a job and come out with a clean face"; on the other, it means that "others are always paid before me." Mr. Miklos says, "If I ever did have to close my business, I would still be proud. I have achieved something, and haven't hurt anybody." Mrs. Miklos is also proud of her husband's work and integrity on the job. She also points out the popularity of a night school course in electricity that he has recently begun to teach.

His attitude towards work can become obsessive. He is a "worrier by nature," and his mind is constantly on the job: "I work manually all day, and when I come home I have to think about what materials to use, how much it costs, etc. I am here, but my mind isn't." During the winter slack time, "I often spend my extra time worrying." Frequently
this manifest itself in television as a diversion; he watches more than
his children or wife. In the winter he falls asleep before the set more
often than in the summer, even though he works less—"I'm not sure
whether I'm tired or bored."

There is a strong current of patriarchal pride in his attitude:
"I value my family too much, and if I don't provide for them, nobody
else can. That's my job." This pride is allied with a rigidity in his
conduct towards the children: "When I come home I'm often thinking about
the job and don't spend time with the kids. I'm aware of their doings
but don't say anything unless it is negative. This goes back to the
Greek philosophy of emphasizing wrong so the kids know it is wrong. If
I don't say it's wrong, then it's right." His assumption of a cultural
role as critic-from-a-distance permeates his relations with the children.
Although he has found his children more interesting and amusing in recent
years, he has a low tolerance for enthusiasms, quarrels and other emotions
of childhood. The result, as he acknowledges, is that "this is a family
where we don't do too much together."

Mrs. Miklos is irritated and at times dismayed by these attitudes.
She confirms that they fit a Greek cultural pattern related to the desire
to avoid family disgrace. She feels that Mr. Miklos tries to mould
rather than understand his children. Her own role has frequently been
to run interference between Mr. Miklos and the children. She feels a
good parent should "help the child become what he wants to become." Her
own experience as a child involved early independence, so she believes
that a child will respond if given the opportunity to be responsible.
She thinks the school system teaches children to be too submissive to
authority and remembers her own role in her later school years as self-appointed class clown.

She struggles with her own convictions. On the one hand she worries about being too laissez-faire. "Sometimes I think I've gone too far in the opposite direction from the Greeks who are always standing there over them—at every point. Perhaps I should have been over them more, but I'm not sure." On the other hand, she fears that she is too much the "heavy," too critical: "I remember [B12] touching me so much when he was young and I didn't want to be a big person always saying NO, NO, NO! I regret screaming at them as much as I have—I have a terrible temper. I have even had sore throats from screaming so much."

The temper is balanced by her ready sense of humour—often cynical, always full of amusing turns of phrase, and frequently directed at herself or her situation. This latter aspect reflects a willingness to portray herself and family relationships with their blemishes. This directness was shared by Mr. Miklos. Both seem confident enough of their underlying dignity as providers and concerned parents that they can also look at themselves with a degree of criticism.

Both B12 and G10 are voluble, active, confident and lively-humoured children. Mrs. Miklos is proud that she's "helped them to be brave, to try something new." Both children would probably agree. B12 assures me that he is "quite a rascal"; G10 emphasizes that she is a "character" (her mother's term is "eccentric"). G10's current passions are acting and fantasy play. She recounts numerous skits she acts out with two girlfriends, ranging from a Parisien cafe rendezvous to confrontations with Hitler to space fictions. She took drama lessons in the summer.
According to her mother, G10 works hard at close friendships (one of which was with a woman in her fifties, the only significant relationship with an adult of any of the thirteen children interviewed), but also enjoys solitary activities such as clarinet playing and reading. She participates as well in a girls' softball league.

B12 devotes hours to building military models (aircraft, ships), and even helps out by doing inventory at his favourite hobby store. He has just begun cadets. He has a few close friends, but seems to me to have more of a place and activity orientation than the people orientation of his sister. In this sense, both are developing fairly standard sexual role stereotypes. (Mr. Miklos states, "I would push B12 as much as possible towards [courting] girls so that I take pleasure that he is a man. If he plays with girls he will become a sissy."

The ultimate fear of a Greek father is that his son would be a homosexual.

Although more enthusiastic than macho, B12 confides that he has several girlfriends. He is also active in competitive soccer and swimming, and likes camping, skiing, fishing, bike riding and skateboarding.

B12's fantasy drawing and stated interests reveal a passion for scientific gadgetry and "all the latest trends" (see Figure 11, p. 259). At times this latter interest is distressing to both parents, who consider themselves frugal and non-materialistic. Such a claim is probably difficult to understand for children who have a large house and have on three occasions been to Greece and England, and thus traversed more of the world than many of their schoolmates will in a lifetime. B12's consumer passions—for better or for worse—are a logical continuation of his father's rise from poverty to middle class material comfort.
Generally the children seem to me to have charted their way through the conflicting tides of their parents' child-rearing philosophies. As Mrs. Miklos puts it, "My husband and I aren't an easy mix and they stand up to it well." They are not intimidated by either parent's yelling, nor, by extension, of yelling from teachers or B12's cadet instructor. Mr. Miklos claims with some satisfaction: "Considering we have three cultures here [Greek, British and Canadian], we're not doing too bad."

III.7 PROFILE: THE SCHNEIDER FAMILY

Mrs. Schneider's childhood was strongly coloured by World War II. Born in Hamburg in 1941, she has memories of flames, burning houses and screaming people when the city was bombed in 1943. She and her mother soon moved to her maternal grandparents' cottage on the outskirts of the city, where they stayed for twelve years. Her grandparents were as much "parents" as was her own mother. Her father returned in 1947 from a prisoner-of-war camp; Mrs. Schneider felt he was almost an intruder, and never developed a close relationship with him.

She lived in extreme poverty, although relative to other German children during and after the war, her circumstances were not unusual. She was constantly hungry until about 1948, when food supplies improved. She had no toys and few clothes. She used newspaper for her school assignments. Her grandparents' cottage had three rooms—one for her grandparents, another for her parents and herself, and a third for all their other functions. Their woodburner stove was often inadequate; she spent most of the winter of 1945 in bed because it was so cold and she
had become sick. The noodle soup from the soup lines had to be diluted to provide for the whole family. Her grandmother sacrificed constantly in order that Mrs. Schneider survive; as a result, she suffered from extreme malnutrition herself.

Despite these circumstances, Mrs. Schneider feels her childhood was a "basically happy" one. The cottage was next to a large meadow and farm, there were no cars or traffic, and in most respects she led a rural existence. She had about five children with whom she played. All her activities were outdoors, even in the winter, as she had so little space indoors. Although she disliked her father (he was deprived and frequently beaten as a child; a generation later he would spank Mrs. Schneider for the slightest reason), she adored her mother and grandparents. She also had contact with other relatives who would visit the cottage on weekends, when she was often the "centre of attention." Although she had a sister and brother who were eight and ten years younger respectively, she did not develop a relationship with them until they were in their teens.

Mr. Schneider's childhood had many parallel elements. Born in Dortmund (population approximately 500,000) in 1934, his memories of the war are even clearer. Until 1943 he lived on the third floor of a four storey apartment building in a fairly quiet area of the city. Bombing started in 1941-42, and they spent each night in bomb shelters. In 1943 a bomb destroyed their apartment block, and they evacuated to Soest, a railway centre thirty miles east of Dortmund, where his mother had been born. Soon after this move, his father convinced a farmer outside Soest to take in the family. In late 1944, Soest was virtually destroyed by Allied bombing. Mr. Schneider remembers the horror of the whole farm-
house shaking. All the adults had gone outside to watch the bombing and he had been left alone inside. One of the adults remembered him, and collected the terrified child. Together they then witnessed the destruction of a city.

Mr. Schneider stayed on the farm only until 1946. Despite the bombing, he has particularly good memories of the farm. He enjoyed the fruit trees, sheep, cattle, horses and pigs, and the ploughing of the fields. He helped dig up potatoes and sugar beets, and collected firewood. He was never hungry. He would roam in the surrounding countryside and had fieldglasses for birdwatching. He played with the farmer's son and went to and from school with him. The household routine was regular, starting at 4:00 a.m. with milking the cows. Sundays they would go to church. Dinners involved ten to twelve people, including the farmer, his wife, sister and child, several prisoners of war, Mr. Schneider and his older sister. All the people were friendly and communicative.

This contrasted with his own family's existence. His mother was excessively strict, and deprived the children (including his older sister and younger brother) of food if they were not home at 6:00 p.m. He was forced to bed at 7:00 p.m. and developed a habit of shaking his head out of boredom just to get to sleep. His mother committed suicide in 1944 by drowning herself in the Rhine River. Apparently she had a tumour, presumably cancerous. Mr. Schneider's father was a salesman for a publishing firm, and was away five nights of the week. On the weekends he would return home. Thus his absence during the war hardly seemed abnormal to Mr. Schneider. Prior to 1943 and after the war, Mr. Schneider's father hired a governess to look after the children. The father's sister also
took an influential role in raising the family in Soest after the war.

Although Mr. Schneider feels "content" with his childhood, he regrets that he was unable to get more than the barest education. This contrasted with his own father, who was the son of a well-to-do surgeon, and enjoyed a good education and cultured environment. Mr. Schneider's education stopped in 1948 when he was fourteen. He then apprenticed for three years as a salesman, but his father moved away. For several years Mr. Schneider was a factory worker, and in 1956-57 was a coal miner. From 1957-59 he took a photography course in Munich, and since then has been in some phase of photographic work.

Mr. and Mrs. Schneider were married in Munich in 1966. In 1967, two weeks after the birth of B12, Mr. Schneider left for a job on an Alberta game farm. His wife and B12 joined him six months later. The isolation Mrs. Schneider felt in their remote house twenty miles outside of Edmonton, and the harshness of the Prairie winter made their introduction to Canada an unhappy one. They moved to British Columbia the following year. After living in several apartments, during which time G10 was born, in late 1970 they bought their present home on a quiet street west of Main.

It was only gradually that Mrs. Schneider felt reconciled to Canada. For her first five years here she was homesick and unhappy. She feels this was particularly hard on B12. She was very emotional with him, and spanked and yelled at him excessively. Mr. Schneider also had to make adjustments. The move to the game farm had represented a life-long interest in animals, and he had hoped to wed this interest with a career in wildlife photography. Even now he is deeply involved in nature
photography as a hobby; he frequently uses his holidays to go alone to remote locations to study and photograph wildlife in natural settings. He would like to go on longer expeditions, but the exigencies of family life have made this impossible. He has also had to take a steady job rather than freelancing, in order to support the family. Since 1969 he has worked as a medical photographer in a Vancouver hospital for both patient records and academic purposes. Although he uses his photographic skills, he now finds his work repetitive and routinized. It is not what he would like to be doing.

Despite the tumultuous beginning for Mrs. Schneider and the constant pull of wildlife photography for her husband, they have developed and constantly deepened strong convictions about child-rearing. They had always wanted to have more than two children, but after B12 and G10 were born, Mrs. Schneider was not sure whether she could cope with more. Gradually she adjusted to life in Canada, their financial situation stabilized, and they found their new home. She then felt more secure. In 1975, G4 was born, followed by B1 in 1978. "to provide a sort of balance." She has been much more confident and clear about her values with these children: she has never hit or spanked them, is more relaxed and open, and less tolerant of other children who might bully G4. She had breastfed B12 and G10 for four and ten months respectively, but breastfed G4 for three and a half years, and intends to breast feed B1 for a similar period. Feeding habits also changed in the family in 1974 when Mr. and Mrs. Schneider began eating organic produce and abjured McDonalds and junk food. The change has been less enthusiastically accepted by B12 and G10.
In 1978, Mr. and Mrs. Schneider both attended a parenting course based on the humanist philosophy of Dreikurs, which they found useful. Mrs. Schneider feels she used to be too much of a judge and overprotective of her children, and now tries to treat them more equitably. On several occasions in 1979 the entire family held "family meetings" to discuss their collective needs and problems and to explore solutions. Although not entirely successful, the meetings accomplished a redistribution of household tasks, and allowed the family a formal way of "reflecting their feelings" to supplement their informal, everyday interactions.

While Mrs. Schneider feels more confident than she did in her early parenting, her present style of parenting is extraordinarily demanding of herself. (She was often exhausted at the time of the interviews which in her case could only be managed after 8:30 p.m. when the younger children were in bed.) She is very intense in her commitment to emotional support to and interaction with B12 and G10. The length of breastfeeding for G4 and now B1 has clearly been a physical drain. These are choices she has made freely, and she accepts the burdens. Her sense of struggle and intensity is most comparable to that of Mrs. Naipaul. Mrs. Naipaul's struggle, however, seems to be an attempt to always catch up with events or stave off problems, while Mrs. Schneider has the exhilaration of charting a new path, the rightness of which she is convinced.

Mrs. Schneider is supported by her husband in this course. She is the only woman in all six families to identify her husband as "one of the things in her life that has made it easiest to be the type of person I wanted to be." Both Mr. and Mrs. Schneider are gentle, soft-spoken
people. A sense of the spiritual is important in their lives, and many of their closest adult relationships are connected with the church. One senses a strong continuity with the traditional German "die Kinder, die Kirche und die Kueche" role for the woman, in that Mrs. Schneider sets the atmosphere—and in significant ways the philosophy—around the home. However, her husband's role is not authoritarian and patriarchal as in the traditional model. He does all the major shopping (Mrs. Schneider does not drive), cleans the rooms, does dish washing and some laundry, and is supportive of both his wife and the children. At night Mrs. Schneider sleeps with B1 on the main floor, while Mr. Schneider has a bed beside G4 upstairs so G4 does not feel rejected by the attention B1 receives. (Mrs. Schneider says she would feel happiest if the entire family could have one enormous bed to which they could all retire on those "special nights" when they have had long talks together. She would also love to have a huge family-sized bathtub.)

The house is artfully and aesthetically decorated, without being "hands off" to the children. It is evidence that they believe that art, colour and atmosphere are important components of a closely-knit home. Mr. and Mrs. Schneider say they have tried to "open up" the house by giving all rooms multiple purposes. For example, the dining room is designed to accommodate special dinners, listening to music, reading and playing games. The entrance hall and stairwell to the upper floor are at once a play area for the younger children, an "exercise room" in the mornings, and a viewing room for the family's many slide-shows. Awareness of the environment extends to the outdoors. Mrs. Schneider feels that many of the family's closest times are when they work collectively in their garden. Nature is important to the entire family, and many of
their weekends are planned around nature walks, visits to bird sanctu-
aries, and picnics in various parks. The children's sensitivities to
nature are well-developed. G10, unlike other children interviewed,
identifies smells of the forest as being important to her. Family dis-
cussions, television programs which they watch together, and their slide
shows are frequently concerned with ecological awareness.

Both B12 and G10 strike one as intense, serious children. Both are
artistic (and have won prizes at community art competitions), read con-
stantly and love music of a popular nature (both compose music; B12 plays
the saxophone). Both have travelled alone to Europe (G10 at age seven
for six weeks; B12 at age twelve for eight weeks) to stay with grand-
parents, develop their language and deepen their cultural awareness. In
addition, their German grandmother visited the family for nine months in
1975 and six months in 1978. They both attend German language classes
every Saturday morning (although B12 resents the workload). In these
respects their cultural identity is strong and frequently reinforced.
Both children like school and do well. According to their mother, the
friendships they derive there are important for both children. G10 tends
to have a few extremely close friends and works hard at these relation-
ships in a fairly egalitarian way. B12 has more and briefer friendships,
but they are always very intense, and he is usually the dominant force.

This difference in friendship patterns struck me as one aspect of
a fairly clear sexual patterning of the children. While both children
are bright, conscientious and interpretive, B12 seems to develop adap-
tive, outward looking skills, whereas G10 works at inner personal
resources. Mrs. Schneider says that B12 develops passionate interests
in various subjects from magic to kite making, and pursues them serially. Skateboarding is his main activity in the summer of the fieldwork. He keeps badgering his mother for a new and better skateboard, and finally "makes a deal" on his own to purchase one. His mother reports that a few years ago he systematically bicycled over areas of the city far beyond his neighbourhood. He became very intrigued and impressed by the riches of some of the upper class districts. He is extraordinarily confident and very demanding. As Mrs. Schneider notes: "Since he knows judo, is a fast runner, is smart and can argue, and feels he can outsmart any teenage bully, he feels he can handle any situation." In this sense, he is quite egoistic and, his mother feels, unrealistic.

By comparison, Mrs. Schneider can think of no "negatives" with which to describe GI0. She is "thoughtful, kind, sincere, gentle but determined, and reliable." (GI0 chafes somewhat over this "reliability." She expresses resentment to me about her mother's over-protectiveness of her, and also feels her mother takes G4's side in too many cases.) Although B12 has intense spiritual discussions with Mrs. Schneider, he does not go to church. GI0 attends a Baptist church regularly, and tells me that there "I feel like I'm in God's house and feel like I belong." She exchanges presents and favours with her close girlfriends. (She points out some of the better places to find Christmas presents in the local shopping centre during our expedition.) She and her friends spend a lot of time in each other's houses and gardens. Her mother appreciates the intensity of GI0's relationships, and feels they are "in a way, a first step towards love in marriage...[The children] learn that you have to do something to make a relationship happen."
Somewhat as in the Smith family, there is a commitment to make relationships and communication a central point in their lives. Although encouraged most strongly by Mrs. Schneider, this orientation is nonetheless acted upon by the entire family. There is an intensity in the children's definition of themselves which surpasses that of B7 in the Smith family. This may be because the children are older, and because they are conscious of their Germanic cultural inheritance. Their intensity is echoed in the attitudes of Mr. and Mrs. Schneider—he in his commitment to wildlife photography and ecological issues, she to her style of parenting. As explained above, the parents have experienced frustrations as well as deep satisfaction from pursuit of these goals. In an analogous way, the intensity of the children suggests that their futures will involve the pain and joy of intellectual and emotional struggle flowing from a strong adherence to ideals.
NOTES, CHAPTER III


2 Ibid., pp. 91-92.

3 Data collection and interviews were not specifically designed to elicit information concerning the family and/or child's project. As explained in Section 1.5, the interviews consisted of specific questions concerning child-parent interactions, as well as various forms of inquiry about the children's use of urban space. However, the biographical sections of the parent interviews, as well as the sections concerning values, work history, and the children's "case" histories provided ample information around which to build profiles. Upon reviewing the data, I felt that Sartre's concept of project was the most useful conceptual tool, (1) to develop the particular uniqueness of each family and (2) to create a relation to structural concepts developed in Chapters IV and V.

4 In all cases, the mother was the major respondent in the parent interviews. The father answered the sections concerning his own childhood (except for the Ross family), and on his own work history (all cases), and in the Ross and Jones families the father was active in approximately one-third of the interviews. The result is that the sense of project is largely filtered through the attitudes and recollections of the mother. This is certainly a limitation. (Much more needs to be done on the father's role in parenting.) On the other hand, it is not inappropriate considering the major role played by the women in child-rearing in these families.

5 Sartre, *Search for a Method*, p. 143.

6 See the explanation of the family names and symbols in note 7.

7 The name of each family is fictitious. Children are designated by sex and age, rather than names, as the age factor is important in assessing the significance of their experiences, statements or drawings in Chapters IV and V. Thus, B7 means boy aged seven; G10 means girl aged ten.

8 Terms and opinions such as these are always those of the person being profiled, except where I have explicitly stated it to be my own, or where the context makes it clear that it is my own.

9 I have used the present tense to report situations, comments or observations made at the time of the interviews (which took place in
the summer and fall of 1979.) The past tense is used to indicate events prior to the interviews, as reported by the families. It is also used on occasion when I wish to reflect my own opinion.

10 In real life, Mr. Smith and Ms. Smith do not have the same name. It is used here for both of them for ease of reporting.

11 The description of Dr. Ross's childhood is incomplete because it was related by Mrs. Ross. The family made a decision to move to Nova Scotia while they were there on holiday, in the middle of the author's fieldwork. Dr. Ross stayed in Nova Scotia and Mrs. Ross and the children joined him several months later. He was thus unavailable for his "biographical" interview scheduled for after their holiday, even though he had been present in most of the other parent interviews.

12 The entire family voiced a preference for larger living quarters, and hoped to find such when they moved to Nova Scotia. Such a house might become more "formal" as well: the adults would like to have separate dining and living room space to be able to "set the table in the afternoon for company," a more spacious entryway and a separate recreation room for the children. All of the children expressed a preference for their own bedroom.

13 G7 also has an eight month old baby brother, so is no longer an only child.

14 Quite unintentionally, I discovered that Mr. Jones's protestations about pub-going and alcohol generally (from which he claimed to abstain) probably represented present resolve rather than past fact, for a former colleague of his said he drank heavily a few years prior to the interviews.

15 It should be emphasized that at all times Mr. and Mrs. Jones were hospitable to the author.

16 Mr. Miklos seemed to differentiate between courting girls (a manly activity) and playing with them (an effeminate activity).

17 Neither of whom is formally a part of this study.

18 See Appendix 3, Part two, Section V, question B-5.
CHAPTER IV

FAMILY STRUCTURE

IV.0 ANALYSIS OF FAMILY STRUCTURE

Several methodological points were stressed in earlier chapters, and must be pursued in a structural analysis of the family. In the discussion of epistemology in Chapter I, I maintained that knowledge is produced by the elaboration of concepts. New concepts are produced dialectically, not just by negating earlier concepts, but by building on the elements of earlier concepts which have substance, clarifying and enriching them. Accordingly, Section IV.1 deals critically with historical and current concepts of the family. In this process I begin to clarify the elements of a structural conception of the family. Three substructures are defined: production/consumption, dependence, and socialization.

The methodology outlined in Chapter I also requires that these substructures be autonomous (or, in Piaget's words, "self-regulated") but interacting and subject to transformation. Understanding transformation requires tracing the "genealogy" of the individual elements (substructures) and clarifying their interaction with the whole and with each other. This means that the structural processes of the whole, identified in Chapter II, must be related to the three elements of family structure. These "methodological imperatives" are all addressed in Section IV.2.
In Chapter III, I began the "progressive" moment of analysis which dealt with the lives of particular individuals. In Section IV.2 this phase of the analysis is carried forward to the examination of family structure, which mediates between the abstract whole (the CMP) and the concrete. This will be achieved by interweaving references to the lived experiences of the six families with the analysis of each of the elements of family structure.

These references serve several functions. The most fundamental is to clarify the mediations between the concrete (lived experiences of these families) and the hidden structures. Secondly, as experiences or events, these references will themselves be subject to reinterpretation by being viewed through the lens of the substructures. The third point is the converse of the second. The experiences to which I refer can become lenses through which to view the structure; the structure then becomes subject to some form of qualification or even reinterpretation.

IV.1 THEORIES OF THE FAMILY

My immediate objectives are to analyze major theories of the family and to clarify the place of children in these theories. The analysis is a means to an end: I wish to develop a conception of family structure and to identify its substructures. This examination will touch on four bodies of theory: evolutionary theories, functional sociology, psycho-analysis and its descendants, and cultural anthropology.
IV.1.1 Evolutionary Theories

Ariès claims that it was between the 15th and 18th centuries that the concept of the family gradually emerged in Europe. This concept was allowed to emerge only as others were suppressed:

The modern way of life is the result of the divorce between elements which had formerly been united: friendship, religion, profession. It is also the result of the suppression of some of them, such as friendship and religion, and of the development of another element to which the Middle Ages attributed only secondary importance: the family.

The maturing of the concept of family in the 18th century was to be followed by the theoretical study of the family in the 19th century.

The dominant approach in this period, and into the early 20th century was evolutionary theory. The primary debate was between matriarchal and patriarchal theorists. In his 1861 work Das Mutterrecht, Bachofen sought to establish the primacy of "mother right" as a moral and historical fact. He claimed that it originated in the natural and biological association of mother and child. "Matriarchy"—a later development—was the domain of the mother over family and state. Gradually the matriarchal family led to individual marriage and the matrilineal transmission of property and names, and ultimately to civil rule by women. This rule in turn was overthrown by the "divine father principle."

In the same year—1861—a patriarchal theory was advanced in Maine's Ancient Law. Using comparative jurisprudence (the Scriptures and Roman law), he sought to establish that all human groups were originally organized on the patriarchal model. Both theorists found supporters and extenders of their theories. Westermarck defended patriar-
chal theory by showing that males could be dominant in both family and political affairs in societies with matrilineal descent. Morgan (whom Engels credits with influencing his own *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*), supported matriarchal theory with an evolutionary schema based on study of primitive societies. Matriarchal theory appealed to feminists because of the vision of a lost heyday which might be regained. Similarly, socialists believed that if patriarchal society was a relatively recent phenomenon in the evolutionary schema, it was not sacred and could be replaced by a more egalitarian (that is, socialist) society.

Evolutionary theory displayed several negative features. It remained essentially ideological, serving feminist or mythical-ideal concepts of women. One should not be surprised to find that research in support of the great debate often relied on dubious sources (a fact in part acknowledged by the authors). And if one is attempting to establish the place of children in family structure, these accounts, developed for a different purpose, are of little help.

There were also positive contributions of evolutionary theory. It attempted to give a firm footing to the idea of history in sociological explanation, a strand largely ignored by later functional sociologists. It introduced the idea of cultural comparison, which was a first step in freeing theoretical analysis of the family from mystical or prescriptive ideologies. In all works there was also an attempt to relate the institution of the family to structural bases such as law, or in Engels, to the economy. All these strands were ones on which later theorists would build.
Evolutionary theory was largely replaced by functional sociology after World War I for several reasons. The war itself dealt a major blow to the optimistic sense of progress and the "march of civilization" that had constituted the social hand-maiden to evolutionary theory. A particular aspect of this general weakening of optimism was a growing theoretical focus on the apparent disintegration of family life under the impact of urbanization. Compared with these more immediate concerns, the debate between matriarchists and patriarchists seemed rather sterile.

Functional sociology retreated from historical and evolutionary analysis and instead focussed on the roles or functions fulfilled by each unit of the living organism called society. Society itself was in turn seen as the totality of social roles, the combined interaction of personalities. In the sociology of the family, attention was focussed on the various functions of the family, such as economic, educational, religious, protective and recreational. The Chicago school of urban sociologists—including among others Burgess, Park and Wirth—was a decisive influence on American sociology for two decades prior to the 1940s. These writers centred on the affective role of the family. A related theme concerned the breakdown of traditional life under the impact of urbanism (typically expressed as a continuum from traditional or folk society to modern or urban society). This breakdown supposedly necessitated the transfer of many of the functions formerly performed by families to other social agencies.

Lasch analyzes a key contradiction in the Chicago school's theory
of family functions. On the one hand, the folk-urban antithesis suggested that human relations in modern society gradually became impersonal and rational, defined in terms of self-interest and money. On the other hand, when they came to the study of the family, the Chicago theorists focussed only on the family's "affective" function and the indispensable emotional services it performed. As Lasch points out:

> It was as if the family alone, of all the institutions in modern society, had managed to escape the drift toward individualism, "egotism," and moral chaos, which even the sociology of urbanization acknowledged as a powerful tendency in modern life.\(^{12}\)

Such an approach to the family was ideological, and ultimately prescriptive. Furthermore, this approach had little to say about children or socialization:

> So much had been made of the erosion of the family's educative functions by the school that socialization could hardly have looked like a solid basis on which to ground an argument for the continuing importance of the family.\(^{13}\)

In any event, a family which acted only as an emotional haven from the marketplace could hardly be an adequate preparation for children to survive (as adults) in that same marketplace.

There was also a positive element of the functionalist approach as exemplified in the Chicago school. It provided an important point of departure for analysis of the modern family in positing the folk-urban continuum, even though it did not analyze the historical and material process through which one form of society evolved into the other. Such an examination would trace not only the material processes at the level of society, but would also clarify the transformation of the economic substructure of family structure. It is this substructure which will be
dealt with in Section IV.2.1.

IV.1.3 Psychoanalytic Theories

Like functional sociology, psychoanalytic theory of the family arose out of the dissolution of 19th century optimism about "civilized man." However, unlike functional sociology, the psychoanalytic examination of forces threatening "civilization" centred on the internal, unconscious life of man rather than the external, consciously perceived impacts of society (such as urbanism). In the process, the child, socialization and emotional life became key elements of a new theory of the family. Freudian theory described how children of both sexes "tend to convert passive impressions into an active desire to master and possess the object that aroused those impressions."¹⁴ This tendency is part of the wider process of the child's attempt to master the external world.¹⁵ The psychoanalytic theory of the growth of the child describes a process of conflict; it accords poorly with the functional sociological view of the family which stresses sympathy and equilibrium. In fact, as Lasch points out, Freud was articulating certain basic contradictions in the process by which children assimilated culture:

the contradiction between the bourgeois myth of the autonomous individual and the evidence of unconscious determinism uncovered by the analysis of dreams and neurosis; the contradiction between "civilized sexual morality" and the rampant, insatiable sexuality underlying it; above all, the conflict between nature and culture.¹⁶

The primary contribution of Freud to a structuralist conception of the family is the concept of nature (the unconscious, sexuality) and its interaction with culture in the process of socialization. However, Freud lacked a theory of how the family itself is socially determined. Psycho-
analysis cannot distinguish what is universal in a family from what is specific to the family of a particular mode of production or social formation. This requires a fuller historical and material analysis, as hinted at—but not fulfilled—in evolutionary and functional sociological approaches to the family. 17

For present purposes, I will follow Freud in acknowledging socialization as a key substructure of the family. However, I cannot hope to approach the topic by exploring sexuality and the unconscious, since my primary level of inquiry is not the individual. 18 Nor, for reasons explained in the following section, do I wish to follow Mead who, by examining family sentiments, felt she could refute Freud's theories. Instead, the analysis of the socialization substructure will deal with key elements which structure the opportunities of children to assimilate culture within the capitalist mode of production.

IV.1.4 Cultural Theories of Family Life

Much of American cultural anthropology of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s was humanistic protest against racism. 19 The comparative study of cultural patterns helped to hasten the demise of evolutionary theories, which often had racist overtones. It also tended to reject anything that smacked of "biological determinism," including Freud's insistence on the primacy of libidinal drives. Thus many of the cultural theories of the family developed in opposition, or at least reaction, to Freudian theory.

Cultural anthropologists like Malinowski and Mead analyzed household organization, variations in child rearing practices, sexual practices and domestic life in different cultures. Since these aspects of
social life took place at a conscious level, they could hardly be seen as refutations of Freud, who examined unconscious mental life. In terms of this thesis, however, the work of Mead is useful in addressing juvenile delinquency, the "storminess" of adolescence, and other aspects of the so-called generation gap. She claims that the decline of parental (particularly paternal) authority and the rise of peer influences were primarily due to rapid social and technological change, which renders the values of the older generation irrelevant to the new generation. While pointing to some of the key themes in the isolation of children and youth, Mead does little to develop an explicit material analysis of technological change.

Anthropological research also examined the interface between the cultural and biological bases of the family. I have already mentioned cultural anthropology's (misguided) attempt to refute Freud's theory of libidinal drives through research on patterns of family organization and sentiment. At a more basic level is the question of the physical dependence of the infant on adult caregivers. Mead writes:

Even so simple an enumeration of ways of meeting a child's needs makes us conscious of how much children have been bound to the ways of their forebears through love and dependence and trust. It also makes us conscious of how little flexibility there is in the child's dependence on adults as compared to the great flexibility that can be developed in the adult's succoring care. Without adult care, the child will never learn to speak. ... The child is wholly dependent, and it is on this dependency that human culture has been built as, generation after generation for hundreds of thousands of years, adults have imposed on children, through their care for them, their vision of what life should be.

In a more analytical vein, Ainsworth has attempted to apply attachment theory in cross-cultural contexts. Although intended as a theory of
infant development rather than of the family, attachment theory and anthropological discussions of infant dependence point to a structure of dependence which includes both physical (biological) and cultural dimensions. This is the third substructure which we shall develop in our analysis of family structure in Section IV.

IV.2 SUBSTRUCTURES OF FAMILY STRUCTURES

IV.2.1 The Economic Substructure: Production

One's first impression might be that the family and the economy are separate realms. In fact this understanding is specific to capitalist society, where the economic function of the family has been obscured. By contrast, in primitive and precapitalist societies the economic function is readily apparent:

In the most 'primitive' societies—those in which production is least developed socially—the material necessity of the family, its role in sustaining life, was overwhelming. Even putting aside the dependence of children, adults in primitive society had no option but to rely upon the co-operative work of the household and particularly on the sexual division of labour, which by restricting tasks to one sex or the other insured their reciprocal dependence.23

In pre-capitalist society . . . there were forms of economic activity that were not based upon family units—such as the building of public works, and labour in state-owned mines or industries. But they do not compare in extent or importance to peasant agriculture, labour based upon some form of the family, or upon the village, an extension of one or several families.24

Drawing on evidence from iconography and painting, Ariès describes the integration of children in the work of their elders during the precapitalist period (specifically 15th century Europe) through the system of apprenticeship.
Everyday life constantly brought together children and adults in trade and craft, as in the case of the little apprentice mixing the painter's colours. Stradan's engravings of trades and crafts show us children in the workshops with older companions. The same was true of the army. We know cases of soldiers of fourteen; but the little page holding the Duc de Lesdiguières' gauntlet, and those carrying Adolf de Wignacourt's helmet in the Caravaggio in the Louvre, or General del Vastone's in the great Titian in the Prado, are not very old either: their heads do not come up to their master's shoulders. In short, wherever people worked, and also wherever they amused themselves, even in taverns of ill repute, children were mingled with adults.25

Ariès' depiction appears to centre mostly on urban life and on wealthy families. Despite the economic role of the family, the apprenticing child would not necessarily be mingling with his own family. In fact, as Ariès notes:

In these circumstances, the child soon escaped from his own family, even if he later returned to it when he had grown up. Thus the family at that time was unable to nourish a profound existential attitude between parents and children.26

The resulting perception of the family was far more as an economic unit than it is today.

This did not mean that the parents did not love their children, but they cared about them less for themselves, for the affection they felt for them, than for the contribution those children could make to the common task.27

In the case of very poor families, the reality of the family "corresponded to nothing more than the material installation of the couple in the midst of a bigger environment—the village, the farm, the 'courtyard' or the 'house' of the lord and master where these poor people spent more time than in their own homes (and sometimes they did not even have a home of their own but rather led a vagabond life)."28

In a discussion primarily centring on women, but also applicable to children, Zaretsky notes that the perception of the family as an
economic unit continued well into the capitalist era:

As in pre-capitalist society, throughout most of capitalist history the family has been the basic unit of "economic" production—not the "wage-earning" father but the household as a whole. While there was an intense division of labour within the family, based upon age, sex and family position, there was scarcely a division between the family and world of commodity production, at least not until the nineteenth century. . . . [Women's] sense of themselves as "outside" the larger society was fundamentally limited by the fact that society was overwhelmingly composed of family units based upon widely dispersed, individually owned productive property.

In Chapter II, I discussed the processes of capital accumulation (see p. 54 ff) and socialization of production (see p. 59 ff) which were integral to the development of modern capitalism. These tendencies gradually removed labour from the efforts of individual families or villages and centralized it in large scale corporate units—a process well advanced by the end of the 19th century. Labour itself was split between two forms previously united—the socialized form of commodity production and the private form of domestic labour within the house. This also created a split between the family's "personal" life and life within the social division of labour.

So long as the family was a productive unit based upon private property, its members understood their domestic life and 'personal' relations to be rooted in their mutual labour. Since the rise of industry, however, proletarianization separated most people (or families) from the ownership of productive property. As a result 'work' and 'life' were separated; proletarianization split off the outer world of alienated labour from an inner world of personal feeling. Just as capitalist development gave rise to the idea of the family as a separate realm from the economy, so it created a 'separate' sphere of personal life, seemingly divorced from the mode of production.

(This development helps clarify why functional sociology of the early 20th century lost sight of the economic sense of the family and concentrated on its affective function.)
The withdrawal of children from the world of productive labour also relates to the process of capital accumulation. Children were not excluded from labour markets simply because of the decline of the family, craft or village economy. In fact, children were highly desired as unskilled labour in 18th and 19th century industry in both Britain and the United States.31 Paradoxically, however, unemployment of children as well as many adults was eventually brought about by the growth of industry itself:

To compete successfully, industrialists invested in machine technology; hence, the same number of commodities could be produced with fewer hands. Wherever the expansion of capital was unrestricted, living labour was replaced by machines, and capital accumulation incessantly generated a redundant population of workers.32

In the 20th century, children and adolescents were still employed, although they were being concentrated in the secondary labour market. Since the 1930's, however, their labour has become less profitable and youth have been gradually but not completely eliminated from the economy, first in basic industries and last in agriculture.33

Thus, just as economic production has ceased to be a natural part of family life which would include children, so children in modern capitalist society have also been isolated from the larger economic life of industrial commodity production. The adult worker is alienated from the means of production; the child is alienated from production itself. This alienation can be carried even further: as production processes become increasingly abstract, the parent is at a loss even to explain his or her work to the child.

Mrs. Miklos works part-time as a secretary in a law firm specializing in patents. She finds it embarrassing even to have her children to visit the office. There is nothing for them to do, and it is too hard for them to understand the nature of her work.34
Keeping work and family life separate is sometimes a deliberate policy. Dr. Ross comments:

"I try to keep my work separate from my family life and don't talk about it too much. I don't want to encourage them [the children] to become nurses or doctors; I don't want to program kids to do one thing, or to see the 'doctor as hero', as on so many TV shows."

On the other hand, capitalist economic development creates new spheres of work in which children can participate or at least observe their parents' productive activity. Mr. and Mrs. Jones are apartment managers. They value their daughter's understanding of and occasional participation in their work, and the social contacts she develops with a variety of tenants. Small business people also have more opportunity to permit their children exposure to their work. Mr. and Mrs. Naipaul enjoy having their children drop by their appliance shop, only a few blocks away from their home. Mrs. Naipaul feels that B10 gives up too easily with school and other tasks. The shop gives him the opportunity to tinker with appliance parts and persevere until he can take things apart and reassemble them. All three children put the shop high on their list of favourite places, although they see it primarily as an enjoyable place to play.

For the other families, work is less naturally integrated into the lives of the children. However, except for Dr. Ross, all families express positive sentiments about the value of the children at least visiting their place of work. For example, Mrs. Schneider, whose husband is a medical photographer, says:

"We like to teach the kids as much as we can and to have them know what we are doing, what their father is occupied with during the day. It helps teach them values, relationships to people . . . the care of sick people, and what it involves."
Mr. Miklos owns an electrical business. Mrs. Miklos says the children may visit one of the construction sites at which he is working, two or three times a year:

"My husband likes to be seen doing his work—he's good at it. . . . He never seems to mind being tracked down; he always stops what he's doing and attends to the kids. It's good that they see their father in action. [At home] he is a rather 'mythical' figure who occasionally appears and is tired and wants to read newspapers. One's own business tends to absorb one's energies more. It is good for kids to see why their father is tired, what his world is about."

Mrs. Smith also talks positively of B6 visiting his father's workplace. She does not like a rigid division between work and home life; she also feels that it is only in the past year that B6 has been able to appreciate the relationship between work and money.

Clearly these comments reflect attempts to overcome or compensate for the isolation of children from productive activity. The fact that parents must consciously make connections between home life and work life—consumption and production—is an indication of how thoroughly they have in fact been separated. Stuart Ewen comments that preceding industrial development in the United States,

the relationships, interdependencies and work of family members had been intimately linked to the question of production. Despite its innate oppressiveness and hierarchy, the patriarchal family was not a vague ideology spread throughout the society as a "tradition." It was a form of social existence largely determined by the struggle for survival in a predominantly agricultural society faced with chronic scarcity. . . . The family was a unity, patterned around the tasks of production and consumption needs—spheres that were not discrete.36

However, the rise of the wage system in the 19th century as a dominant mode of survival meant that a "living" was to be bought and that the social function of work was now mediated by an exchange process:
selling labor and buying goods. The connection between work and survival still existed, but it was socialized so as to pull the rug of necessity out from under the family as an organization of survival.  

The spheres of production and consumption have now become discrete for children (and for most adults). Children have largely been isolated from the former sphere. I have yet to explore the consumption phase of the economic structure of the family, and the way in which it relates to the isolation of children. However, because that phase will take on added meaning once I have discussed the ideology of the individual in the socialization substructure, I shall postpone its examination to the end of this chapter (see Section IV.4.4.).

IV.2.2 The Dependence Substructure

As indicated in the quotation from Mead's Culture and Commitment (see p. 134), the biological dependence of the child is the *sine qua non* for the continuity and transmission of culture (that is, for the socialization of the child). Biological dependence and socialization are so interconnected that it is easy to make dependence a given in any discussion of socialization. The structure of dependence is distinct, however, from that of socialization, and needs elaboration.

One should immediately acknowledge that human dependence can never be purely biological (as for example the biological dependence of plant life on its physical environment). As Leidermann points out:

The human environment is inescapably social. From the moment of birth, human infants are dependent on others for biological survival.  

In examining the substructure of dependence, I am exploring how the dependent relationship between the child and adult caregiver is
structured, in order to ensure the physical (and inevitably the emotional/intellectual) survival of the child. 39 Such an inquiry naturally focuses on the earlier years of childhood, simply because they are the years of greatest physical dependency. In recognizing the social nature of dependency structuring, however, I shall also explore the ways in which societies deal with age limitations for various activities, and thus define the "exit points" of childhood dependency.

Cross-cultural research suggests some structural bases of dependence which underlie all societies. One should not be surprised to find that the most basic element appears to be protection of the child. In an article on attachment theory, 40 Ainsworth poses the question, "What is the function of attachment behaviour and, indeed, of attachment itself?" Speculating on the development of man in early hunting and gathering periods, Ainsworth suggests that the attachment bond provided assurance that the infant would not stray too far from the mother on expeditions or when the mother was otherwise occupied. She states:

> It is obviously of survival value both that a child investigate the environment actively and learn thereby, and that exploratory fervour be tempered by a proximity-maintaining mechanism that ensures safe exploration. 41

She goes on to say:

> Although attachment behavior is adapted to the original environment in which the behavior was evolved, and although man’s present-day environments differ markedly from that original environment in many instances, it is a fundamental principle of attachment theory that the genetically-based species groundplan still disposes infants to behave in ways appropriate to that original environment. Although in a present-day Western home an infant may be fairly safe from harm or danger even when left alone, he is still predisposed to protest or follow when his mother departs, and he still seeks to be close to the mother when alarmed. Indeed, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that the human infant’s behavior is adapted to a
mother who is continuously nearby and who is responsive to his signals. In other words, the infant's attachment behavior is adapted to reciprocal maternal behaviors.42

Thus one constant element of the dependence structure appears to be a biological mechanism geared to sheer physical survival of the infant—even where the contemporary utility of that mechanism seems more obscure.

Analysis of child-rearing patterns among primitive cultures points to several elements of dependence structure that are cultural adaptations for the physical survival of infants. Levine summarizes his own and other accounts of infant care among a wide range of primitive peoples.

1. The infant is on or near a caretaker's body at all time, day and night.
2. Crying is quickly attended to and becomes rare relative to Western infants.
3. Feeding is a very frequent response to crying.
4. There is, by Western standards, little organized concern about the infant's behavioral development and relatively little treatment of him as an emotionally responsive individual (as in eye contact, smile elicitation, or chatting).43

Levine argues that what is usually taken by Western populations as merely an "indulgent" pattern is really an adaptive response in populations where there are high infant mortality rates. For example, the close-carrying is an adaptation (over countless generations) to such child dangers as fire and animals; quick response to crying is a method of determining if in fact the child is experiencing physical distress; quick feeding and late weaning are similarly assurance that the child's physical needs are satisfied. The maternal responses are embodied in cultural traditions; the parent will frequently not perceive the original environmental adaptation out of which the tradition grew. Levine summarizes:
My theory is that a high infant mortality rate and severely limited resources for responding to disease have shaped a folk pattern of preventive medicine in infancy that reflects parental concern for the physical survival and health of the child and is relatively efficacious in attaining that goal, given the low level of medical technology.44

While other socio-cultural factors have been identified as contributing to these patterns, it is not unreasonable to accept the protective function proposed by Levine.

The infant's biologically-based attachment behaviour together with cultural patterns of nursing, carrying and attending to infants create one pole of the dependence structure, one that addresses the physical survival of the infant. Because of the relevance of these elements in early childhood, they could be called entry points of the structure. At the other pole of dependence structure are the exit points. These concern the ages or events which define when the child is considered less dependent on adults, or when the child is considered to be an adult.

How is this other pole defined in primitive societies? The most common demarcation of the exit from childhood dependence is the so-called puberty institution. One would assume that these puberty rites are a biological celebration, but Benedict points out that they are in fact social:

The most casual survey of the ways in which different societies have handled adolescence makes one fact inescapable: even in those cultures which have made most of the trait, the age upon which they focus their attention varies over a great range of years. At the outset, therefore, it is clear that the so-called puberty institutions are a misnomer if we continue to think of biological puberty. The puberty they recognize is social, and the ceremonies are a recognition in some fashion or other of the child's new status of adulthood. This investiture with new occupations and obligations is in consequence as various and as culturally conditioned as the occupations and obligations themselves. If the sole honourable
duty of manhood is conceived to be deeds of war, the investi-
ture of the warrior is later and of a different sort from that
in a society where adulthood gives chiefly the privilege of
dancing in a representation of masked gods.45

Thus termination of childhood dependence is the result of a socio-
cultural perception of the essence of adulthood—be it attainment of
warriorhood, the exclusion of women, magical training, or the achieve-
ment of "feminine" pulchritude.46

With the two major elements of the structure of dependence now
defined, it is possible to follow the genealogy of each in more recent
history. An account by Badinter of infant care in France in the 17th
and 18th centuries indicates that the dependency needs of infants were
ignored by almost all classes. For example:

In Paris in 1780, out of 21,000 children born (in a popula-
tion of 800,000 to 900,000), fewer than 1,000 were nursed by
their mothers, while another 1,000 were nursed by live-in wet
nurses. All the others—that would be 19,000—were sent away
to wet nurses. Out of these 19,000, only 2,000 to 3,000,
whose parents had comfortable incomes, were placed in the
nearby suburbs of Paris. The other, less fortunate ones were
packed off to distant locations.47

This pattern was repeated, with slight variations, in large and small
centres throughout France in the 18th century. The practice extended to
all classes, except the poverty-stricken who could not afford nurses and
who frequently abandoned their infants to hospitals in order to nurse the
children of more wealthy parents, and the rural peasantry who preferred
to keep their infant children at home. The nobility or upper-middle
classes were often able to secure live-in wet-nurses or ones in suburbs
of the centres in which they resided.48 For the common people, wet-nurses
were obtained more casually by asking acquaintances, neighbours or
passers-by, or by using the services of an agent (une récommanderesse)
who set up shop in the market or major town squares. Numerous accounts cited by Badinter suggest that the subsequent "care" of the infants—who were generally not returned to the family until age four—was frequently atrocious: many (between 5 and 15%) died during the trip to the country wet-nurse, while others died of total neglect or ignorant care (malnourishment, lack of sanitation, illness, lack of changing for days on end, over-swaddling). 49 Badinter, Ariès, François Lebrun, 50 and others consider these and other practices indirect methods of infanticide. 51

Indeed, Badinter claims that the infant mortality rate in France as a whole was 27.5 percent from 1740 to 1749 and 26.5 percent from 1780-89, although these figures varied from region to region:

In Lyon, during the eighteenth century, one child in two died—during good years. On the average, two-thirds of the children of Lyon did not live to see their twentieth year. 52

In general terms, Badinter claims that the mortality rate doubled for children not nursed by their mothers and increased from six to ten times if the child was abandoned. 53 Badinter refers to the work of Mercier to show that these practices were not restricted to France:

Having studied works on mortality and medicine, Mercier states that "in England not only upper-class women but all those who could afford it refused to nurse their children, even if it meant doing without in other areas. . . . In Germany there was the same neglect; given a shortages of nurses, they turned to artificial feeding." In contrast, in Holland and the Scandinavian countries hired nurses were rarely used. 54

Badinter's accounts are also reinforced by a number of similar works on how infants were treated prior to the 19th century. 55 Ariès notes that in medieval society the idea of childhood did not exist; there was no awareness "of childhood, that particular nature which distinguishes the child from the adult, even the young adult. . . . The infant who was too
fragile as yet to take part in the life of adults 'did not count'."\textsuperscript{56}

Like Badinter, Arlene and Jerome Skolnick refer to prevailing mortality rates for one explanation of why children "did not count":

The reason the infant "did not count" was the given statistical probability that he would soon be dead: before 1750, the odds in London were three to one against a child living until the age of five. During these centuries parents could not indulge in the tender feelings towards infants that we take for granted.\textsuperscript{57}

As suggested in the discussion of primitive societies, however, it is precisely because of high mortality rates that children are closely held and suckled. The key to this apparent contradiction is that in hunting and gathering and primitive agricultural societies, children were often the key to survival of parents insofar as they could perform agricultural labour or tend animals, and eventually support the parents in their old age. Badinter's evidence suggests that in many European countries of the 17th and 18th centuries, especially in urban centres, children represented a threat to the survival of many middle and lower working class families. Among the more well-to-do classes, it was ideology—the low value placed on domestic life at the time\textsuperscript{58} which worked against recognition of the dependent needs of infants. Upper class women preferred to pursue the arts rather than care for the young. In summary, compared to primitive societies, modes of early child care in precapitalist France did not recognize the dependence of the child, and did isolate it from the support of the family, particularly of the mother.

This pattern of early child care began to change in France in the late 18th century. The structure of early childhood dependence was altered by economic and ideological forces. Badinter notes the advent
of demography as a science in the 17th and 18th centuries, and with it a concern over the perceived decline in France's population in those centuries. In the late 18th century the concern with ways of increasing France's population, and therefore its economic power and prestige, became a preoccupation of philosophers, political economists and finance ministers. At the end of the 18th century the debate centred on ways of preserving the health of infants and young children, and with this shift came a new perspective on the dependency needs of children.59

In more general terms, Zaretsky outlines how, as the economic transformation of capitalism led from production within the family to production in factories,

the family came to be either scorned as a background institution or nostalgically romanticized. In either case it was contrasted to 'society', the system of social production and administration.60

Jean-Jacques Rousseau was an early exponent of this contrast, and identified the family with "nature." The basis of society—which for Rousseau meant commerce and urban life—was a narrow economic rationality; the basis of family life was the emotions and compassion. Children were seen as different from adults—primitive, irrational and dependent. He advocated breast-feeding and protection of children from the vagaries of society—including schools and urban/industrial life generally.61

In the 20th century the concept of early childhood dependency has strengthened, but along less mystical lines than those offered by Rousseau. Developmental psychology has strongly influenced child care concepts. Piaget, through careful observation of his own and other children, generated numerous works outlining the transformations of a
child's intellectual structure from infancy through youth. Thus dependency has come to be understood in terms of biological and social maturation; the child is less likely to be seen as a "miniature adult." The child's conceptual framework is seen to go through at least four major transformations before reaching that of a "normal" adult. Equally influential has been Freud's work on infantile sexuality. Mitchell calls Freud's works the discovery of the decisive specific weight of infancy in the course of an individual life—a psychic time disproportionately greater than the chronological time. . . . The result is that today we know far more than ever before how delicate and precarious a process the passage from birth to childhood is for everyone. The fate of the adult personality can be largely decided in the initial months of life. The preconditions for the later stability and integration demand an extraordinary degree of care and intelligence on the part of the adult who is socializing the child, as well as a persistence through time of the same person.

Attitudes towards early child care, conditioned by 20th century psychology, have restructured the former indifference to childhood evidenced in 16th and 17th century France. One could say that there has been a progressive assertion of the child's needs for dependence, and a gradual lessening of the tendency to isolate the child from personal warmth, communication and support.

Other aspects of modern capitalist development create exactly the opposite tendencies. Birthing has largely been removed from the family context, and medical intervention has become the norm. Iatrogenic customs—that is, customs which are convenient to both doctors and hospitals—set patterns for infant care giving which are carried into the early years of the child's life. In a comparison of American post-natal care practices with those of Zinacanteco (Mayan Indian) parents in Mexico,
Brazelton helps clarify several effects of these medical practices. Religious, cultural and environmental factors condition Zinacanteco parents to feed the child even prior to demand, to downplay independent exploratory behaviour, and to have the child wean itself in the fifth year. By contrast, iatrogenic influences in the United States tend to regularize feedings at long intervals, allow the child to cry prior to gratification, separate the child in nurseries after birth, demand independent exploratory behaviour, and encourage early weaning.

These types of isolation or distancing between parent and child naturally seem "small scale"; however, considering the "decisive specific weight of infancy on the course of an individual life" to which Mitchell alludes, one wonders if they may be more significant to the psyche of the individual than his or her isolation from productive activity in later years. Certainly they are part of a fundamental contradiction in early child care in modern capitalist society. On the one hand, the biological and psychological dependency of the child is recognized as never before in history; on the other hand, many of the immediate post-natal practices thrust the infant towards independence more decisively than in previous times or than in existing peasant cultures.

Exploring the post-natal experiences of the families through field-work was difficult because of the number of years that had elapsed since the children's births. Breastfeeding practices were, however, remembered with clarity. These patterns varied and were not even consistent within the same family. Mrs. Naipaul breastfed her first child for three months, her second for two weeks (she had family staying and could not simultaneously breastfeed and cater to her family's needs), and her third for
Ms. Smith breastfed for fourteen months, at which point she reluctantly stopped because of an abscess. Mrs. Ross breastfed her two oldest children for six months and four months respectively, stopped breastfeeding her third almost immediately when the child developed pyloric stenosis (a form of stomach knotting) and did not attempt to breastfeed her fourth. Mrs. Jones "just didn't like" the idea of breastfeeding, so bottlefed. Mrs. Miklos breastfed her boy for seven months, but the daughter for only six weeks because the boy "got jealous." Mrs. Schneider breastfed her son for four months, when he ceased to show interest (the hospital had bottlefed the son just after birth), and the daughter for six months (again a problem with the son's jealousy). Mrs. Schneider also has two younger children (who were not part of the fieldwork proper). The girl (now four and a half) was breastfed for three and a half years; the son (now six months) is still being breastfed, and Mrs. Schneider intends to keep it up for three or more years, depending on what the child seems to want. Except for Mrs. Jones, all the women feel breastfeeding is beneficial, and all express regret (and several guilt) about weaning at a relatively early stage. The examples on one hand confirm the general pattern of early weaning and awareness of choices about ways of feeding. On the other hand, they suggest—at least in the case of Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Schneider—a re-evaluation of existing breastfeeding patterns.

I have followed the genealogy of the child care (or entry point) pole of the structure of dependence. What then of the exit points from this structure? Discussing the terminology of the ages of life prior to the 17th century in France, Ariès notes:
The long duration of childhood as it appeared in the common idiom was due to the indifference with which strictly biological phenomena were regarded at the time: nobody would have thought of seeing the end of childhood in puberty. The idea of childhood was bound up with the idea of dependence: the words 'sons', 'varlets' and 'boys' were also words in the vocabulary of feudal subordination. One could leave childhood only by leaving the state of dependence, or at least the lower degrees of dependence.  

Dependence was structured by concepts of feudal class. Among the lower classes this dependence was thus lengthy. Among the upper classes it would last only as long as the child was physically undeveloped—usually until about age five—at which point he entered the mainstream of society. Anticipating Rousseau's concepts of the child by over a century, philosophers and pedagogues of the Port Royal school expanded the notion of childhood to include all pupils of the 'little schools'; a parallel development took place in England at the same time. Dependence was thus increasingly structured by a cultural institution which isolated children from the mainstream of society. I shall follow this development more closely in the next section.

In the 19th century the notion of childhood dependence was further defined in the struggle for a normal working day. Childhood thus became a legal definition. Comments by Marx on just one phase of this struggle demonstrate how arbitrary (but not unnecessary) these limits were:

But capital was by no means soothed; it now began a noisy and long-lasting agitation. This turned on the age-limit of the category of human beings who, under the name 'children', were restricted to 8 hours of work and were subject to a certain amount of compulsory education. According to the anthropology of the capitalists, the age of childhood ended at 10, or, at the outside, 11. The nearer the deadline approached for the full implementation of the Factory Act, the fatal year 1836, the wilder became the rage of the mob of manufacturers. They managed in fact to intimidate the government to such an extent that in 1835 it proposed to lower the age of childhood from 13
to 12. But now the 'pressure from without' became more
threatening. The House of Commons lost its nerve. It refused
to throw children of 13 under the Juggernaut wheels of capital
for more than 8 hours a day, and the Act of 1833 came into
full operation. It remained unaltered till June 1844.69

I have already described how the very process of capital accumula-
tion itself also propelled children out of the labour market (see
pp. 137-138). In fact, the Schwendigers argue that it is marginalization
of youth as a result of capitalist priorities (capital accumulation and
the rate of profit) rather than the decline of the family economy that
has produced the "prolongation of the dependent status of youth."71 But
several processes were at work historically: the decline of the family
economy preceded the struggle for the normal working day, and this
struggle preceded the marginalization of youth through labour market
segmentation, a process continuing to the present day. Adolescents have
become able-bodied but dependent persons in modern society because they
cannot maintain themselves in gainful employment in a labour market which
makes available only the most unstable and poorly paid work. Thus on
several counts the period of dependence has been extended in modern
capitalist society in interaction with the structure of production.

This economic reinforcement of dependence conflicts with the ideo-
logical notions of independence which are generated in both the political-
juridical and ideological structures of the CMP (see pp. 66-70). On the
one hand, youth are forced into prolonged economic dependence on their
families, and isolated from the mainstream of society's functioning; on
the other, they are encouraged to see themselves as free individuals,
actively engaging with the social and physical world. As discussed
earlier in relation to Brazelton's research, this encouragement starts
from the moment of birth, and is mediated both by iatrogenic customs and popular versions of developmental psychology. (Paradoxically, developmental psychology has assisted parental recognition of the slow, dependent growth of the child’s intellectual development, and at the same time been used to promote maximum growth, independence and exploratory behaviour.)

Developmental psychologists recognize a process of biological-intellectual maturation which occurs in most children around age twelve or thirteen, and which helps the child achieve "normal" adult intellectual processes. From a biological standpoint, this is a logical "exit point" from a structure of dependence. In modern capitalist society, as has been shown, the structure of dependence does not dissolve at all at this point. In fact, in addition to the economic structuring already discussed, and the effect of schools which will be explored in the next section, it is maintained artificially in political ways. One example is the emerging juridical pattern of giving legal representation to children and adolescents in family law cases. This helps mitigate the adolescent’s dependency, but more significantly highlights the fact of economic and social dependence of a young person whose thought processes are nevertheless recognized as being sufficiently adult to be heard in court. In summary, the structure of dependence in modern capitalist society is the seat of deep-rooted contradictions. In infancy, children are generally protected and supported, but also thrust into independent exploratory behaviour; in an artificially prolonged childhood called adolescence, young persons are encouraged to see themselves as free individuals but at the same time must face their
substantial dependence on parental and societal support and isolation from the mainstream of society.

IV.2.3 The Socialization Substructure

I have provided a definition of socialization as the mediation of the intellectual and emotional development of the child and a particular cultural (that is, ideological) heritage. This definition suggests that the child is biologically programmed to "develop" (assuming it is protected through some means of dependence structure). How it develops is primarily determined by reproduction of the dominant culture through various mediating institutions or processes. On the basis of the structural analysis developed thus far, one can pose a more particular question: how does modern capitalist society socialize children who are isolated from economic production and dependent on family support, when a prime ideological tenet of that society is that these same children be seen as free individuals? To answer this question, I shall examine two elements of the structure of socialization: the socialization of reproduction (including the emergence of schooling) and the ideology of the individual as subject.

I have already defined in broad terms the meaning of socialization of reproduction in the capitalist mode of production (see pp. 60-62). There are three aspects of this element which are germane to the understanding of how children are socialized in contemporary capitalist society. The first is the advent of schooling as the dominant mode of learning (or, as Althusser would say, as a dominant ideological state apparatus) (see pp. 70-71). The second is the decline of the structure
of apprenticeship. The third is the gradual encroachment of other social institutions on the socializing role of the family. I shall begin the description of the socialization of reproduction by tracing the genealogy of schooling as a primary form of socialization.

IV.2.3.A The advent of schooling

This process is popularly conceived as having occurred in the 19th and 20th centuries. In fact, as Ariès shows in his study of French schooling in *Centuries of Childhood*, the emergence of formal schooling in the capitalist and precapitalist period has a much longer history. This history helps clarify the extent of the isolation of contemporary children not only in schools as opposed to society at large, but in rigidly stratified classes as opposed to a freer mingling of ages.

Medieval schools (that is, until about the 12th century) in France were essentially for ecclesiastical recruiting; they were Latin institutions attached to cathedrals. There was no primary education as one understands it today (either technical or concerning general culture). This knowledge was acquired at home or in apprenticeship to a trade. Thus the earliest beginning age of students was about ten years. The mixture of ages and levels of experience was, however, very marked. Students entered the schools at different ages, and classes were given to all ages simultaneously. Subjects were not graded according to difficulty; one merely repeated the classes over a number of years (classes stressed oral repetition) until the subject was absorbed. Unlike modern schools which isolate the child from the adult world, the child in the medieval school immediately entered the world of adults.
With the establishment of colleges of liberal arts from the 13th through 16th centuries, several changes took place. Subject matter was broadened beyond that of the Latin institutions and ecclesiastical training. Subject order became important: grammar, for instance, was seen as a subject which should be taught before philosophy (regardless of the age of the pupil). The student population gradually shifted to day pupils, but there was still an intermingling of pupils of all ages. The college institutions also became more formal. Ariès contrasts the Jesuit regulations of the late 16th century to earlier college regulations:

This is the way the change took place from regulations laying down the basic principles of a code of behaviour and a way of life to regulations dictating the manner in which every part of the day was to be occupied, from a collegiate administration to an authoritarian system, from a community of masters and pupils to the strict government of pupils by masters.\(^7\)

Ariès compares the evolution of authoritarian regulations "to the general movement of society, which was carrying it towards the political forms of absolutism that were taking shape in the fifteenth century, in the time of Louis XI, Commynes and Machiavelli."\(^7\) This moral authoritarianism marked the beginning of the segregation of younger pupils from their older colleagues.

The first stage of this transformation began with the separation of classes of pupils according to student capacity and the difficulty of subject matter, not according to student age:

While the class had established itself in the sixteenth century as the structural unit of the college, as a basic element of differentiation between a pupil's years of study, the connection between age and class still remained very vague or loose.\(^8\)

Gradually between the 16th and 19th centuries, excessively precocious
(young) and tardy (old) students were eliminated from the loosely mixed classes. The final isolation of children into age-segregated classes occurred through two phenomena in the 17th and 18th centuries. Ariès describes the phenomena as follows:

first, in the seventeenth century, the demographic specialization of the ages from five-to-seven to ten-to-eleven, both in the little schools and in the lower classes of the colleges; then, in the eighteenth century, the specialization of two types of education, one for the lower classes, the other for the middle classes and the aristocracy. On the one hand the children were separated from their elders, on the other hand the rich were separated from the poor. There exists, in my opinion, a connection between these two phenomena. They were the manifestations of a general tendency towards distinguishing and separating: a tendency which was not unconnected with the Cartesian revolution of clear ideas.81

Although the genealogy I have traced here is derived solely from French history, it is adequate to show that the age-segregated school classes that constitute the "package" inherited in most Western societies in the 19th and 20th centuries is a composite of several processes. This package includes the separation of learning from daily activity,82 the separation of children from adults, the separation of all children into age-discrete units (that is, separation of younger children from older children), the establishment of authoritarian regulations, the separation of subject classes into different spaces, and the separation of rich and poor.83 It is only by extracting these processes from the unanalyzed entity "school" that one can appreciate the extent to which this institution isolates children from the adult world and society generally. Furthermore, the duration of this isolation is constantly being expanded. High school is no longer considered adequate preparation for skilled jobs in modern capitalist society; students are required to continue
their studies in universities, colleges or technical institutes. At the other end of the student age spectrum, kindergarten is now run by the state, and increasingly seen as a necessary "preparation" for school. Similarly, preschools are becoming a "necessity" as an earlier form of preparation for kindergarten and school. For example, Mrs. Miklos notes that there is a strong preschool parents group in her area that feels preschools, like kindergartens, should become part of the school system and be free of charge. She also talks of a mother on the community centre board who wants "enriched babysitting" for children ages one and two, to accompany certain adult programs—perhaps the precursor of yet another extension of schooling.

In general, the parents interviewed during fieldwork do not perceive schools as isolating children. In fact, it is ironic that one of the attractions of school is that it helps the child "move into life in the outside world. [B7] has the chance to interact with other kids in his class and with the whole school" (Mrs. Smith). Mrs. Naipaul also feels school enables her children to move into a broader society: "on a social level one isn't able to teach kids things like race in a larger society, because only in school are there sufficiently large groupings of kids to simulate society." Mrs. Miklos also feels that schools are useful because they teach children that not everybody has "pink skin." She adds that schools are a big step towards independence in that they teach children "how to get along without Mummy"—another variant on moving into a wider society. Ironically, she also complains that "schools tend to teach kids to submit to authority, whereas I'm trying to teach them to be independent." The contradiction in her two
comments is resolved if we acknowledge that schools are accepted as the "given" intermediary between infancy and adulthood, between parents and the larger culture in contemporary societies. Thus it cannot be conceived that children could learn about race in society at large other than through schools, or that they can become "independent from Mummy" other than through schools. So even if schools establish authoritarian patterns, they still are seen as representing a form of independence from "suffocating parents"; no other intermediaries in this process seem readily at hand.

This point helps partially to answer the contradictory question posed at the beginning of this section, that is, how capitalist society socializes children who are isolated from economic production and dependent on family support, when a prime ideological tenet is that these same children be seen as free individuals. School, even if it is authoritarian in structure, is seen as a major step in a child's independence, or move to the "outside world," because it is the contemporary institution which significantly alters the relationship between child and parents. Any parents with children will recognize society's assumption that a child is "growing up" when he or she approaches school age; the question, "When are you starting school?" begins several years before the event.

The extent of this altered relationship between parents and children after the onset of schooling is dramatic: the school suddenly has the "power." This is reflected on one level when parents disagree with the values of the school. In most cases in the fieldwork interviews these differences existed but were considered relatively minor by the
parents except for the situation described in the profile of the Jones family, where Mr. Jones was in constant conflict with teachers and the principal. On a deeper level, there is the difficulty parents have of finding out, much less having impact on "what is happening to our kids."

Mrs. Miklos states:

"I find it very difficult to come to grips with the education system here—so much of education seems to be 'fooling around'. [B12's] report card last year was very poor, so I resolved to check on him once a week. I also volunteered to assist with teaching once a week so I could check on him. I still find myself intimidated in dealing with teachers, despite the fact that I know they are nothing special."

This level of parental involvement is in fact extraordinarily high; Mrs. Miklos acknowledges that her own mother saw teachers only once each year. As a former teacher, Mrs. Ross is less intimidated and has less difficulty understanding what is happening in the schools. She also had a high degree of contact through the mechanism of the School Consultative Committee, of which she was chairperson for two years prior to the interviews. The committee was a successor to the Parent-Teachers Association, which four or five years previously had been disbanded because, according to Mrs. Ross, it was "becoming too bossy, intruding into the school system." She considers the change a political method of keeping parent "participation" within certain boundaries. Mrs. Ross also points to socio-cultural reasons why "East End" parents participate little in the schools. She claims that there are many single parents who simply have no time for such participation; many parents have language difficulties; and many parents are of backgrounds that would lead them to feel it is being disrespectful or mistrustful of teachers to "interfere" in academic matters. Mr. Jones also feels that because of the high number
of single parent families and situations where both parents are working, parents just "dump" their children in school. He claims that in the local School Consultative Committee "only three people ever did the talking," so he "gave up" on the meetings. Thus even in these instances where parents are able to participate in the structure of their children's schooling, there are overwhelming barriers to such participation. The term "overwhelming" is justified if one reflects on the power parents have over the learning and socializing opportunities of their children prior to school admission. After school admission, parents have only slightly more access to the school system than their children have to the world outside the school.

IV.2.3.B The decline of apprenticeship

I have traced how the learning and much of the socialization function of the family was removed from the family and transferred to schools. This development should also be seen in conjunction with the decline of apprenticeship as a significant structure of children's learning and socialization. Ariès describes this decline:

Until the end of the Middle Ages, and in many cases afterwards too, in order to obtain initiation in a trade of any sort whatever—whether that of courtier, soldier, administrator, merchant or workman—a boy did not amass the knowledge necessary to ply that trade before entering it, but threw himself into it; he then acquired the necessary knowledge through everyday practice, from living and working with adults who were already fully trained. . . .

When academic instruction was extended to laymen, apprenticeship ceased to be a noble function and was gradually driven back towards the mechanical trades—the manual occupations—to the point where, in our own day, the development of technical and professional training, slow and tardy thought it has been, is reducing it still further to a relic or stage of practical instruction. But this replacement of apprenticeship by academic instruction, in the upper and middle classes of
society, was not at first universal. Children began by spending two or three years at school, in the little classes, the big classes still being reserved for Latin careers such as the Church or law. This stay at school did not dispense a boy from serving his apprenticeship between about twelve and fifteen in the writing professions which were the qualification for work in law. Little by little, the school cycle lengthened at the expense of the period of apprenticeship.

One of these traditions of apprenticeship, especially in noble families, was to send male children to stay with other families, particularly abroad to learn other languages, geography and mathematics, as well as cultural skills such as dancing, riding and music. In the second half of the 16th century this form of apprenticeship began to be replaced by academies.

In the Middle Ages in France a child was customarily sent to live in another house, where he had to learn the manners (or trade) of the head of the family. In the mid-17th century this form of apprenticeship was taken over by the "little schools"—forerunners of the modern primary schools. Thus in addition to singing and rudiments of reading and spelling, domestic and family apprenticeship became the source of the primary curriculum. With the extension of schooling to girls in the 18th and early 19th centuries, domestic apprenticeship ceased to exist.

With the advent of universal compulsory schooling in the 19th and 20th centuries, trade apprenticeship was eliminated as a form of socialization for working class children. Technical apprenticeships continue to exist today, of course, but as a training period for young adults which follows school learning.

Mention has already been made of the positive attitude of most of the fieldwork families to exposing their children to their parents'
workplace (see pp. 139-40). Such exposure is held to have learning value, but in no case is there expectation—or possibility—of a more structured family "apprenticeship." In the case of the Miklos and Schneider families, travel also has learning value, perhaps heightened by the fact that the parents are of European origin. Mrs. Miklos feels it important for the children to learn about their "roots" in their trips to England and Greece, especially since their grandparents are not resident in Canada. She also feels that both maternal and paternal grandparents lead an exemplary non-materialistic lifestyle which provides a useful antidote to materialistic tendencies in their own family.

Mrs. Schneider is emphatic that travel has taught her children more than any other form of learning. She feels that in addition to establishing a firm relationship with their grandparents in Germany, the children have improved their language skills, learned about another culture and other life experiences, and gained an excellent sense of space and time. Mrs. Schneider's enthusiasm for travel—shared by her children—is a particular aspect of a more general emphasis on learning by direct experience rather than from books or study. Although the children do very well academically, Mrs. Schneider feels that there is almost more value in meeting people in community centres, getting engaged in activities or visiting "exhibitions" (for example the zoo, aquarium, or children's art exhibitions). Given this wider emphasis, it is possible to look at the children's travel experiences as diluted and less structured forms of the "stay abroad" tradition of apprenticeship of early noble families.
IV.2.3.C Encroachment of other social institutions on the family's socialization role

The third aspect of the socialization of reproduction develops at the interface between the family and several other key socializing institutions. Lasch refers to this aspect as the "proletarianization of parenthood."\(^94\) Just as the socialization of production deprived craft workers of the knowledge by which they had retained practical control of production even after the introduction of the factory system, the socialization of reproduction made parents "unable to provide for their own needs without the supervision of trained experts."\(^95\) In many respects, Lasch claims, the history of modern society is the assertion of social control over activities once left to individuals or their families. During the first stage of the industrial revolution, capitalists took production out of the household and collectivized it, under their own supervision, in the factory. They then proceeded to appropriate the workers' skills and technical knowledge, by means of "scientific management," and to bring these skills together under managerial direction. Finally they extended their control over the worker's private life as well, as doctors, psychiatrists, teachers, child guidance experts, officers of the juvenile courts, and other specialists began to supervise child-rearing, formerly the business of the family.\(^96\)

The effects of socialization of production followed by the socialization of reproduction, are contradictory:

On the one hand, these changes have laid the material basis for a new form of society, in which collective needs rather than private profit determine the form and content of production. On the other hand, they have made people more and more dependent on the managerial and professional classes—on the great business corporations and the state—and have thus eroded the capacity for self-help and social invention. At the very moment when capitalism has not only outlived its usefulness but created the conditions for its own supersession, the will and capacity to replace it have atrophied.\(^97\)

Lasch claims that the reason for this incapacity is the successful
intrusion of capitalist control over the worker's family. There is no resistance on the part of the family to the economic and political order:

The family . . . socializes the young into the easygoing, low-keyed encounters that predominate in the outside world as well. . . . The work ethic, nurtured in the nuclear family, gives way to an ethic of survival and immediate gratification.98

A fuller historical perspective of Lasch's concept of the socialization of reproduction will help clarify its relevance to the theme of the isolation of children. Lasch claims that by the end of the 18th century the main features of what he calls the bourgeois family system were firmly established in Western Europe and the United States. Marriage took place at a later age (many people remained unmarried) and was arranged by the participants rather than parents and elders. Young people courted with a minimum of interference (replacing adult supervision with a code of self-restraint). This overthrow of arranged marriage took place within

a new conception of the family as a refuge from the highly competitive and often brutal world of commerce and industry. Husband and wife, according to this ideology, were to find solace and spiritual renewal in each other's company. The woman in particular would serve, in a well-worn nineteenth century phrase, as an "angel of consolation."99

Several contradictions were inherent in this family system. Self-inhibitions acquired during courtship led to more sexual tensions and maladjustment in marriage. Secondly, the woman's mission as "angel of consolation" also extended to her children who, as we have seen were no longer considered miniature adults, but dependent, innocent creatures. As a result,
Child rearing became more demanding... and emotional ties between parents and children grew more intense at the same time that ties to relatives outside the immediate family weakened.100

Thirdly, the bourgeois family simultaneously degraded and exalted women:

On the one hand, it deprived them of many of their traditional employments, as the household ceased to be a center of production and devoted itself to child rearing instead. On the other hand, the new demands of child rearing, at a time when so much attention was being given to the special needs of the child, made it necessary to educate women for their domestic duties... The new domesticity implied a thoroughgoing reform and extension of women's education... Thus bourgeois domesticity gave rise to its antithesis, feminism.101

By the end of the 19th century, these contradictions had begun to surface in the form of concern about the rising divorce rate, the falling birth rate among the "better sort of people," the changing position of women, and the so-called revolution in morals.102

There were four major responses to the deterioration of the bourgeois family, all of which tended to socialize reproduction, and bring the family firmly under the control of institutional forms of socialization. These were the home economics movement, the rationalization of sexuality and emotional relationships, compulsory education, and the advent of welfare services. Firstly, the conservative (but popular) response to feminism was to constitute motherhood and housewifery as careers which required special training in "homemaking" or "home economics." Laslett claims that two ideas in the home economics movement of the early 19th century were seen as particularly important:

(1) the belief that family roles were not instinctual or natural, but were to be learned; and (2) that skills must be taught and learned, not in the home, but in the schools, from specially trained personnel. The emphasis was on the need for scientific management, efficiency, and economy within the home and on the role of the school in producing these desired ends.103
She concludes that the goal of scientific home management and the use of educational institutions to achieve that end emphasized traditional views of women's place in the home and reinforced the sanctity and privacy of the individual family. Not only was there the old will, reinforced by a scientific ideology, but there was also the way, provided by the new structural characteristics of the family. . . . The privacy which the New England colonists had valued so highly more than two centuries earlier was finally attainable.104

Lasch's conclusion is quite the opposite:

By rationalizing the household and child care, some of the opponents of feminism probably hoped also to make the family a more effective competitor with the outside agencies that were taking over its functions. Ironically, the rationalization of housework rendered the housewife more dependent than ever on the help of outside experts.105

The reason for this difference of opinion is that Laslett concentrates primarily on the locale and immediate framework of family life. She claims that because home economics reinforces the woman's ability to maintain family life within the house (as opposed to parks or front steps) and away from the observation of non-family members such as servants, apprentices or boarders, it reinforces the "sanctity and privacy" of the individual family. This perspective ignores the fact that the woman's dependence on external "experts" is a structural invasion of privacy which pulls the family into the widening orb of market influences; aspects of reproduction which had hitherto remained in the private domain have become socialized.106

The second area in which reproduction was socialized was in the form of a response to the feminist demands for a more liberated sexuality. Like the demand for education, this demand was domesticated (rather than allowed to threaten monogamy) and rationalized:
When marriage experts said that marriage represented the art of personal "interaction," they meant that marriage, like everything else, rested on proper technique: the technique of stage-managing quarrels, the technique of mutual agreement on how much adultery the marriage could tolerate, the technique of what to do in bed and how to do it. . . . Marriage experts saw "illusion," fantasy, inner life as threats to stability and equilibrium. They proposed to save marriage at the expense of private life, which they simultaneously expected marriage to foster. Their program eroded the distinction between private life and the marketplace, turning all forms of play, even sex, into work. Thus "achievement" of orgasm, according to medical and psychiatric opinion, required not only proper technique but effort, determination, and emotional control.107

The art of stage-managing and rationalizing adult relationships was the precursor to "cooling out" the intensity of parent-child relationships. One of the main thrusts in counteracting the perceived selfishness and destructiveness of these relationships was compulsory education. This approach also had the advantage of homogenizing disparate family traditions:

The family preserved separatist religious traditions, alien languages and dialects, local lore, and other traditions that retarded the growth of the political community and the national state. Accordingly, reformers sought to remove children from the influence of their families, which they also blamed for exploiting child labour, and to place the young under the benign influence of state and school.108

The fourth aspect of the socialization of reproduction was the development of social welfare services. Like compulsory education, social services—children's aid societies, juvenile courts, family visits by social workers—were seen as a response to the deterioration of the bourgeois family and its inability to meet the intellectual, physical and emotional needs of children. The "helping professions" did more than just "help" parents. Their powers included the legal right to stand in loco parentis.109 The extension of social welfare services was often
rationalized as a way of avoiding use of this ultimate legal power; it was seen as the substitution of prevention for custody and punishment. Lasch maintains that,

The diffusion of the new ideology of social welfare had the effect of a self-fulfilling prophecy. By persuading the housewife, and finally even her husband as well, to rely on outside technology and the advice of outside experts, the apparatus of mass tuition—the successor to the church in a secularized society—undermined the family's capacity to provide for itself and thereby justified the continuing expansion of health, education, and welfare services.

The final irony in this process of appropriation was the development of parent effectiveness training:

Having monopolized the knowledge necessary to socialize the young, the agencies of socialized reproduction then parcelled it out piecemeal in the form of "parent education." . . . Having first declared parents incompetent to raise their offspring without professional help, social pathologists "gave back" the knowledge they had appropriated—gave it back in a mystifying fashion that rendered parents more helpless than ever, more abject in their dependence on expert opinion.

The above analysis of how the process of reproduction—formerly the domain of the family—has been socialized in such institutions as home economics, sexual technique manuals, schools, social welfare agencies and parent training courses, adds a new dimension to an understanding of the isolation of children. What on a day-to-day level may appear as a widening of a child's experiences through contact with other children (in schools, kindergartens, preschools, day care and recreation programs) can better be understood as an isolation of children in more restrictive (in terms of age range and homogenization of culture) socialization modes through the socialization of reproduction. With the loss of economic functions through the socialization of production, the family lost a natural (work) setting for a child's learning and exposure
to the world. With the encouragement of the agencies of socialized reproduction, the family, having also lost the capacity and confidence to socialize children in an ideological sense, delivers children to the socializing agencies of modern capitalist society.

A "weakening of parental confidence" over several generations is on the one hand impossible to establish empirically; on the other hand, it is possible to describe the experiences of some parents as they engage themselves in the different structural conditions that Lasch has outlined. For example, all the mothers except Ms. Smith and Mrs. Ross have taken parenting courses. Ms. Smith had taken no courses, but avidly reads parenting books such as *Between Parent and Child* and *Everything Every Child Would Like Their Parent to Know*. As mentioned in the family profile, she is quite interpretive about the role of the parent and values she feels are important. Mrs. Ross has taught at both elementary and preschool levels and feels she has incorporated many parenting ideas in that way. She feels that it is useful to read women's magazines and to get "tips" from friends, just to "reinforce my own attitudes." Both Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Naipaul have taken a parenting course based on the theories of Dreikurs. Both object to the philosophy of the course that children should learn from the consequences of their own actions. Mrs. Jones rejects the course outright; Mrs. Naipaul disagrees with it but enjoyed the contact and discussion with other parents. Mrs. Miklos has taken three courses, one at the community centre, another at the local school, and still another through the local health unit. All three courses stressed the theories of Dreikurs and also Parent Effectiveness Training. Mrs. Miklos enjoyed talking with other parents in the courses
who did not find child raising all "peaches and cream." Both Mr. and Mrs. Schneider attended a Dreikurs-based program at the local school, to which they responded very positively. It helped consolidate the transition in parenting philosophy described in their family profile.

Except for the Schneider family, in none of the cases have these courses played a decisive role for the parents in terms of changing their parenting philosophies. Books and magazines, which Lasch would consider other agencies of socialized reproduction, have played an important role. Furthermore, if one considers the family profiles, there is a rough continuity from the previous generation's style of parenting, especially in the Naipaul, Smith, Ross and Jones families. It seems that this intergenerational continuity—remarkable in that there are no grandparents living locally in any of the families—has provided the baseline for response to parenting courses. Only Mrs. Miklos articulated a lack of confidence in her parenting role, perhaps understandable in terms of the conflicting philosophies noted in the family profile. Mrs. Naipaul seems confident of her role, but less confident of her children's future, again understandable in terms of the situation outlined in the family profile. Mrs. Schneider clearly went through a "crisis of confidence" earlier in her child raising, but now holds strong and consistent convictions.

The idea that children are eagerly "delivered" to socializing institutions by their parents also requires interpretation. Certainly none of the parents in this study question the basic institution of schools. As discussed earlier, they all recognize schools as a decisive breakwater in their socialization roles with their children (see pp. 161-
In fact, Mrs. Ross feels that from ages three to five, preschool supplants the influence of parents; this relationship exists until the child reaches age seven, when school ceases to be a novelty. Mrs. Jones, on the other hand, feels that community organizations—including Sunday school, the community centre, Pioneer Girls, skating and swimming lessons—have more influence on G7 than does the family. Mrs. Miklos says there is a sharp polarization of opinions concerning parental involvement in Little League baseball: many adults feel that parents should be banned from involvement (presumably because of the competitive pressures they exert on the children), while many coaches feel parents are using them as free babysitters. Mrs. Ross claims that in general, parents are more involved in their children's "institutional" activities than in the previous generation: "Before, Girl Guides was run by the Guides. Now there are parents involved in Guides, schools and everything." It is her belief that because most families are no longer embedded in an extended family and the children "can't run over to their auntie," it is necessary for parents to give more time to their children's activities. Another perspective is Mrs. Naipaul's concerns in enrolling B10 in ballet classes. As is evident in the family profile, ballet represents less a desire to deliver up her child to any activity, than an almost desperate attempt to find the activity which will absorb B10 sufficiently that he will not fall into more negative patterns of peer culture.

In summary, although most of the parents acknowledge (and generally accept) the impact of these socializing institutions, they seem to be aware of a need to interpret the institutions and determine the role
both of themselves and their children within them. Their basis of interpretation frequently stems from their own childhood experiences and the values imparted by their own parents. The fact that a majority of the parents are of non-Canadian origin adds an additional filter to their interpretation of institutions. Although the parents seem to be using external institutions for the socialization of their children to a greater extent than either their parents or grandparents might have done, they also tend to be more involved as parents in these institutions than was the case in previous generations. At the same time, the parents interviewed frequently point to non-involvement by other parents in the lives of their children. None of these comments fundamentally contradicts Lasch's claim that agencies of socialized reproduction have largely supplanted the socializing role of parents, but they do suggest that strands of involvement and interpretation are maintained by parents.

IV.2.3.D The ideology of the individual as subject

In introducing the issue of socialization, I posed the question: "How does modern capitalist society socialize children who are isolated from economic production and dependent on family support, when a prime ideological tenet of that society is that these same children be seen as free individuals?" (see p. 155). In the intervening section I have explored the first part of this question by discussing three aspects of the socialization of reproduction which characterize the isolation of children in the structure of socialization. In this section, and in the following section on the structure of consumption, I shall turn to the second part of the question. At this point in the analysis, it would be
reasonable to assume that a dependence on family for economic support, and separation from any meaningful role in economic production, would make it impossible for children to sustain any sense of being free individuals. By examining the ideology of the individual as subject in historical terms—tracing its genealogy—I shall show that such an ideology does not appear to be in conflict with the child’s economic dependence in contemporary capitalist societies. In fact, as will become clearer when I discuss the structure of consumption, it is an essential element in maintaining the separation of children from economic production and self-support.

The individual has not always been seen as the most basic unit of society. In *Ancient Law*, Maine states that archaic law

> is full, in all its provinces, of the clearest indications that society in primitive times was not what it is assumed to be at present, a collection of *individuals*. In fact, and in the view of the men who composed it, it was an aggregation of *families*. The contrast may be most forcibly expressed by saying that the *unit* of an ancient society was the Family, of a modern society the individual.  

The term "family" in this case referred to some form of extended family. In fact, legal responsibility for wrongs could extend from one generation to another within a family line. Among other things, this conception of responsibility—which was not related to the action of the individual—allowed slavery to be justified morally as an inherited status. Maine claims that from a legal perspective, the movement of "progressive societies" has been distinguished

> by the gradual dissolution of family dependency, and the growth of individual obligation in its place. The Individual is steadily substituted for the Family, as the unit of which civil laws take account.
More contemporary analyses have provided a clearer picture of this transition. Zaretsky notes that in feudal society (roughly pre-14th century in Europe) the manor was the lowest social unit the head of which was an active citizen, able to buy and sell in the marketplace. As feudalism disintegrated (from the 14th to 16th centuries), peasant families extracted themselves from feudal ties to become either tenants or landowners. At the same time, a new conception of a basic unit of society began to emerge, which Zaretsky calls "possessive individualism":

As market relations developed, the identification of the individual with a fixed social position began to give way to a commitment to the 'individual' (i.e., the individual family) who would rise or fall on the basis of independent efforts. The family came to be seen as a competitive economic unit apart from, and later even opposed to, the rest of society.

It is important to reinforce the point that at this stage, "individual" meant the individual family:

The early bourgeoisie understood the family to be the basic unit of the social order—'a little church, a little state'—and the lowest rung in the ladder of social authority. They conceived of society as composed not of individuals but of families, each an indissoluble cell. If they spoke of 'individual rights', it was because of the sovereignty of paternal power.

During this period, awareness of internal psychological life was deepening due to the new social and religious functions of the family. Zaretsky notes that Christianity had always encouraged a degree of self-consciousness in the form of the conscience. He also points to other indications of an emerging self-consciousness in the 17th century: diaries, silvered mirrors, autobiographies, chairs (rather than benches), self-portraits and the spread of private lodgings. Although aristocratic marriages were still arranged, among the early bourgeoisie young people when grown
could marry according to their own desires (while listening to their parents' counsel). 120

The possessive individualism of the early bourgeoisie was also inextricably identified with private productive property. As noted in my discussion of the economic structure, however, by the 19th century the factory system had eliminated many of the productive functions of the family. There was a corresponding shift in the ideology of individualism:

On one side appeared 'society'—the capitalist economy, the state, the fixed social core that has no space in it for the individual; on the other, the personal identity, no longer defined by its place in the social division of labour. On one side the objective social world appeared, perceived at first as 'machinery' or 'industry', then throughout the nineteenth century as 'society' and into the twentieth as 'big business', 'city hall', and then as 'technology' or 'life', as the domination of the proletariat by the capitalist class became more difficult to perceive. In opposition to this harsh world that no individual could hope to affect, the modern world of subjectivity was created.

This sense of an isolated individual ranged against a society he or she cannot affect, distinguishes social life in developed capitalist society.121

Ironically, the drive for personal fulfilment became the prevailing form of individualism in a society in which production was organized around alienated labour. 122 Deprived of individual identity through work or ownership of property, proletarianized workers pursued this sense of individualism through the family, the only "space" they appeared to "own."

In the transitional period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the family did in fact convey the appearance of a "haven" from an alienating work world and mechanized society, a haven where personal fulfilment and creativity—including resistance to capitalism—were possible. As already suggested in my discussion of the socialization of reproduction, however, this potential for self-realization, much less creative resistance to
capitalism, has largely been diverted through the structure of capitalist consumption which was laid in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It is by examining this structure that one can more fully understand the present form of the ideology of the individual as subject and its implications for children.

IV.2.4 The Economic Substructure: Consumption

I left the discussion of the economic substructure (see Section IV.2.1) at the point where the spheres of production and consumption become discrete. As noted in that section, several forces tended to isolate children from the productive sphere. In Section IV.2.3, I outlined the gradual definition of childhood and adolescence as distinct ages of mankind. It was also noted that by the late 19th and early 20th centuries individualism in the form of a search for personal identity and fulfilment had become a major ideology. In this section I carry all three analyses a step further to show how the period of childhood and adolescence has been transformed into a period of consumption, how youth has become a cultural symbol of considerable value to business, and how consumption has become the dominant form of the individualistic search for fulfilment. Together, these strands characterize yet another aspect of the isolation of children, and form one element of this phase of the economic substructure: children as consumers (or childhood as the period of consumption). Following this examination I shall look at a second element of the consumption phase of the economic substructure: children as players (or childhood as the period of play).
IV.2.4.A Youth as a period of consumption: youth as a symbol

As production and consumption became more and more discrete as spheres of activity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the collective nature of the family underwent a major transformation. Ewen, drawing on an analysis by Lynd, describes this transformation as one in which all members of the family are gradually brought into a direct, individualized relationship with business:

Taking issue with the notion of the family as a consuming unit, Robert Lynd concluded that "consuming unit was a misnomer in that it implied a modicum of collectivity." Instead, Lynd argued, the involvement of the family bond within the wage-consumption process had equated it with the basic premise of "free labour." As each wage earner confronted work as an individual selling his labour, the consumerized family had undergone a "devolution" through buying, into an "increasingly loosely articulated group that we call the family." Traditionally the family had found a social bond, a collectivity in its production and self-definition of activity. But within the mass industrial context, it was the "productive and merchandising agencies" which increasingly acted in concert, while "the consumer faces his problems alone." The conditions of the family member, despite the continuation of a family ethos, exacted a personal, individualized relationship to the burgeoning authority of business enterprise.123

Thus at one and the same time, two processes of the isolation of children are extended. The first began with their isolation from production. This is extended in the sense that not only is their life experience now played out in the sphere of consumption, but it occurs essentially as an individual process. The child is addressed and confronted directly by the authority of business enterprise. Children and youth become separated from adult society as a useful target for corporate advertising. Referring to developments in the United States in the 1920s, Ewen remarks:
Once a financial credit, modern childhood was a debit on the family—increasingly involving it in the consumption of goods and services connected to child-rearing. To many in the twenties, the association of children with the increase in external influence was clear. Working-class families of *Middletown* spoke of how children carried into the home the messages of growing industrial authority and the industrialized moralities of home economics, movies, Y's, and education in general. As children brought home such messages, and argued for their expanded realm of consumption within the distribution of family wages, parents felt these forces "drawing the child away from the home." It is not surprising that many working families in *Middletown* expressed the feeling that consumption of goods and services by children had provided a conduit between the family as an arena of social relations and external agencies seen to be "an 'enemy' of the home and society."\(^{124}\)

Here one notes an obvious connection between the role of children as consumers and the concept of the socialization of reproduction which was discussed in Section IV.2.3. Just as children had to become defined as separate from adults to facilitate the advent of schooling, so too did they have to be separated from the family as a collective unit into individual consumers to become appropriate targets for corporate advertising. In essence, childhood and adolescence in early 20th century America became transformed into a period of consumption.

Beyond this transformation, youth became separated from the rest of society in a second, and perhaps more insidious way. What Ewen and Lynd called the "devolution" of the family from a collectivity to a "loosely articulated group" signalled the development of the new framework for individualism in the 20th century. In the previous section, I described how possessive individualism of the early bourgeoisie still referred to the family as the individual unit held together by patriarchal authority. When this unit began to dissolve, it was replaced by each family member—including children—as an isolated or individual
This dissolution was reinforced by the emerging ideology of the individual search for personal identity and self-fulfilment. But, as has just been shown, this notion of self-fulfilment was directed towards fulfilment as a consumer. Thus the potential benefits of self-realization or self-fulfilment in youth's new status as individuals are lost in the equation of fulfilment and individuality with consumption.

Separated from adult society, youth became what Ewen calls "a broad cultural symbol of renewal, or honesty, and of criticism against injustice." The reason for this sudden ascendency of youth lay in the realities of production in the early 20th century. The skills required to tend industrial machines were radically different from those required in agricultural or craft work:

Where artisan and agricultural labors had required a period of long training, leading toward a life-time resource to draw upon, the rapidity of the machine had made the worker an adjunct to its rhythms. The "swiftness and endurance" required of a machine-tender had displaced the "training and skill" of "the apprentice-master-craftsman system" within the few years that had seen the wide-scale implementation of industrial line work. Most young people spoke of how they would "stumble on" or "fall into" jobs that were to "become literally their life's work." Their strength, and not their skill, was what was appealing to employers.

Youth thus became an idiom for the transformation in production, and the elevation of the youth value within the culture had provided an ideological weapon against the traditional realms of indigenous authority as it had been exercised in the family and community in the periods before mass production. Youth ultimately became a language of control; instead of being used in the critical and rebellious sense that we associate with it today, it was, in the words of Floyd Dell, but a modernized interpretation of "the old patriarchal wish to exploit the younger generation's . . . life for economic purposes."
Advertising was one of the main sources of the language of control and the isolation of youth:

As youth appeared the means to industrial survival, its promulgation as something to be achieved by consumption provided a bridge between people's need for satisfaction and the increased corporate priorities of mass distribution and worker endurance.  

Ewen analyzes advertisements in this period, running from Quaker Oats which promote youthful intelligence to Sun-Maid Raisins which kept people young at fifty to various soaps and creams which preserved "school girl" complexions. All made youthfulness a desirable and saleable commodity. Its pursuit meant the foresaking of patriarchal authority and the acceptance of malleability, endurance and individualism as positive values.

Children were increasingly raised with their (and their parents') attention focussed on the sphere of consumption, and with themselves as the "stars" of the ads. Lasch, in his criticism of the Chicago school of sociology (see pp. 130-131) claims that "the modern child increasingly judged his parents according to their ability to provide goods and services, and ... the parents in turn attempted to justify their authority in a way that merely strengthened appeals to enlightened self-interest." These trends were heightened in the 1950s. Ewen cites several factors: the mass marketing of television, the shift of work and commercial activity into the avenues of bureaucracy, service and communication (which further minimized the notion of family self-sufficiency with the loss of any immediate productive base) and automobilization (new forms of wish-fulfilment and "get-away space" for teenagers).
If one considers only the first of these factors, one finds a vast literature on television and children, focused on such diverse topics as amount of television viewing, violence, perception of reality versus fantasy in programs, trust versus distrust in commercials, and activity patterns in viewing. From this diverse literature, one can make several points relevant to the isolation of children and of childhood as a period of consumption. Firstly, most children regularly watch television (in varying amounts) before entering the first grade, although viewing frequency seems to decrease in the high school years. Secondly, "television for young persons is an experience largely devoid of direct parental influence." This assertion focused on the degree of control exercised and of concern expressed by parents, but strongly suggests that a large amount of viewing by children takes place in isolation from adults. The writer, citing numerous sources, in a review of the American literature, continues:

Parents typically do not attempt to control quantity or character of viewing, although there are certainly restrictions in some families. Even in a sample of nursery school children, 40 percent said they made their own program selections. However, parents often express concern, and the fact that parental efforts to ban certain programs and to stipulate the viewing of others increases when children approach adolescence suggests unarticulated alarm over television's competition as a socializing agent. Furthermore, the family can hardly be said to be irrelevant because viewing and various attitudes and classes of behavior relevant to television have been found to be correlated with various family attributes other than race and income.

Thirdly, the broad structural intent of the financers of television is to promote consumption of products or, more delicately put, to "develop consumer skills." Finally, "television affects young persons' attitudes and information, especially on topics when the environment does
not supply firsthand experience or other sources of information."\textsuperscript{137}

Following from the third point, much of this information is oriented towards consumption.

These general points do not diminish the fact that many children become relatively sophisticated in distinguishing truth from fiction both in program content and advertising, or that the impact of television is absorbed in various ways depending on the immediate (family) and wider (social) environment. On the other hand, this sophistication itself bespeaks an almost total immersion in consumer culture. In fact, Ewen points out that the student movement of the 1960s was a broadening of resistance to capitalism born out of familiarity with consumer culture (rather than exclusion from it). Young people (and women) who since the 1950s had grown up in a consumer culture had begun to understand how the commercialization of culture, the attempt "to reproduce corporate priorities in the wide social realm," had degraded life: "[a]midst a promise of unlimited possibilities, women and children confronted limited and predigested realities."\textsuperscript{138}

Ewen suggests that despite such resistance and the beginnings of a "politics of daily life," corporate capitalism in the 20th century has been successful in its ability "to define and contend with the conditions of the social realm."\textsuperscript{139} He poses both the dilemma of 20th century man and the hope for resistance:

Social change cannot come about in a context where objects are invested with human subjective capacities. It cannot come about where commodities contain the limits of social betterment. It requires that people never concede the issue of who shall define and control the social realm.\textsuperscript{140}

For children the problem is especially acute: they are excluded from the
economic realm, and despite the appearance of being at stage centre in many aspects of the social realm, this centrality is primarily as a consumer of corporate-defined priorities.

Fieldwork experiences:

All parents in the fieldwork interviews perceive consumption pressures as a problem, but react in different ways. Ms. Smith often finds herself responding to pressures from B7. He tends to ask for games he sees advertised in TV commercials (a car racetrack; Star Wars figures). Frequently his requests are framed by the question, "When is Christmas?" She resents television ads aimed at children: "They create the illusion that if you have all these material goods, you'll be happy." (B7 watches more television than the other children interviewed—about thirty-two hours per week during the summer of the interviews. Ms. Smith is shocked when she tallies up the viewing hours for the weekly diary. Shortly thereafter the television set mysteriously "goes on the blink" at particular viewing times—proof that social research can never be objective, because it introduces new elements to the object of its research!)

Mr. Jones proudly claims that he and his wife have "spoiled" G7—"We've bought her everything she wants, and we don't really consider it a mistake." Mrs. Jones, who is less enthusiastic in this regard, feels that one of the hardest things for her as a parent is that G7 gets "mixed up with bad kids in school—and starts wanting things they have." G7 is clothes-conscious and likes "in things"—blue jeans, vests and especially clogs.
Like Ms. Smith, Mrs. Ross resents television advertising aimed at children:

"I particularly dislike the tie-in of food and fun. Somewhere in Western society we have this concept that food, fun and play are tied in together. Unless you eat at McDonald's you won't have fun."

This interesting perception is closely related to Ewen's observations cited earlier (see pp. 181-182) on the promotion of youth as a symbol, and the youth-giving qualities of certain food products. Mrs. Ross takes some pride that all her children can react critically and specifically (for example, concerning size, cost, quality) to most advertisements. They have attained a level of consumer sophistication, similar to the type noted in general terms in the discussion above. Like Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Ross feels that her children's peers influence her children's consumer desires:

"Most of their friends are fixated on money, which is bad. According to them [her children], everybody in the whole world has more money to spend than we do. Our kids will talk of a bike as being 'only eighty-five dollars'. They don't have a real sense of the value of money; they only see the immediate money other kids have. And I think the reason other kids have more money on hand is because their parents don't do things with them or take them places."

Although Mrs. Ross feels that many of her children's peers are more independent than her own children (and feels that it is useful at times that her children learn independence skills from them), the point that she is making is that money (and thus the ability to consume) is a payoff for parental non-involvement with their children. As noted in the family profiles, the Ross family is a very close family, and undertakes more activities as a family than the other families interviewed.
Mrs. Schneider also identifies peers as a source of consumer pressure:

"When they come into other families and see things they have, they always seem to want them, or else want to do things they do. It creates a lot of pressure."  

She gives examples such as watching television, buying a racing car set, getting a mini-bike, going to Disneyland. During two of the interviews with this family, B12 demonstrates how persistent he can be in pursuing a consumer interest. His main passion during the summer of the interviews is skateboarding, which consumes several hours of his time each day. He has a good skateboard, but discovers a "good deal" on a better one. He relentlessly explains the details of its technical superiority to his mother, who patiently tries to explain the fact that she cannot justify further expenditures, and that he will have to be content with the first one. B12 then evolves a scheme whereby he will return a model car recently bought but not "much" used to a department store, use the refund money on top of the trade-in value of his old skateboard, and buy the new one. The deal is consumated, not without protest and misgivings on the part of Mrs. Schneider.

Like most of the other parents, Mrs. Miklos vigorously objects to television advertising as a source of consumer pressure: "My kids don't know any nursery rhymes, but they know all the commercials." Even when television is good, she feels it can have detrimental effects:

"On television you're always seeing the 'best' of everything. When you see Fonteyn and Nureyev on the tube, you don't feel like going out to see your neighbour at her little recital, or paying five dollars for a local ballet performance."

Mrs. Miklos also speaks of the trade-off between working more and having
more money for spending. She is carefully weighing whether she wants to return to work on a more regular basis, and seems aware that her decision could simply create more consumer desires at the expense of genuine involvement with her children: "I don't agree with working if it's just for a big car or ego trip and to hell with the kids." She feels that the family's frequent trips to Greece and Britain are antidotes to a materialistic view of life. Both sets of grandparents are extremely frugal and, she feels, set a good example to the children of alternate ways of living one's life.

IV.2.4.B Childhood as a period of play

I have identified childhood as a period of consumption as one element of the economic (consumption phase) substructure. The other element can be referred to as childhood as a period of play. This element has emerged as part of the consumption phase of the consumer cycle in different ways in capitalist societies. Referring to pre-17th century France, Ariès states that there was no specialization of adult or child games and pastimes after infancy. After age three or four, children played the same games as adults, either with other children or with adults. Children also took part in seasonal festivities which regularly brought together the whole community. The mixing of adults and children occurred within the context of a rather relaxed attitude towards work and play generally:

In the society of old, work did not take up so much time during the day and did not have so much importance in the public mind: it did not have the existential value which we have given it for something like a hundred years. One can scarcely say that it had the same meaning. On the other hand, games and amusements extended far beyond the furtive
moments we allow them: they formed one of the principal means employed by a society to draw its collective bonds closer, to feel united. This was true of nearly all games and pastimes, but the social role was more obvious in the great seasonal and traditional festivals.\textsuperscript{143}

A gradual restriction of games and play occurred over the next two centuries, however, until they were largely the domain of children. This development was somewhat analogous to the evolution of the concept of the child and of schooling described earlier: under the influence of moralists (earlier the medieval church, later humanist pedagogues and figures of the Enlightenment) games either became formalized (part of curriculum in educational institutions), simply died out or were banned (jousting and various forms of gambling) or were reserved for the lower classes and children of all classes.\textsuperscript{144} Also as noted by Stone,

As work moved to the center of social arrangements, play became increasingly relegated to childhood, and pari passu children were established as identifiable social beings.\textsuperscript{145}

In England, play was not simply relegated to childhood during the 17th and 18th centuries; under the religious justification of Protestantism and its glorification of the work ethic, play was generally suppressed.\textsuperscript{146} In the United States the suppression was not as complete, and many regional differences existed in the extent of adult and child play. The development of the idea of childhood as a period of play occurred later in these countries:

It required a social movement against the excesses of capitalism, in the Protestant countries, to release children from the bonds of work and confer the privileges of play. The movement had its inception in the reformist and revolutionary thought of the mid-nineteenth century and persisted until the twentieth.\textsuperscript{147}

In any event, the result in both Catholic and Protestant societies has been similar: the isolation of childhood as a period of play, separate
from the activities of adults.

Once play became isolated as the characteristic activity of children rather than an accepted form of cultural and community expression of all age groups, it became, ironically, subject to increasing manipulation by market forces. Aronowitz notes:

Children no longer draw on their unmediated experience of family and other aspects of social life to derive the forms and substance of play. Child's play is no longer exclusively self-reflexive and self-generated. Television-watching has become a major form of child activity that is undertaken both with other children and alone. Inevitably the relations between children are mediated by the values and perceptions suggested by television, and the very activity of watching itself. Elements of mass culture are incorporated into the modes of child's play, which becomes more imitative of mediated patterns of adult interaction and social relations in general. The creative aspect is significantly diminished.

The toy industry plays a role similar to television as a mediator of a child's experiences in play. In a discussion of the role of imitative play as a form of mastery, Sutton-Smith comments:

The modern world forces imitative play. Actually our modern world is so complex and so dangerous that we have made children imitate us less and play more. We have forced them away from mastery of the actual environment (imitative mastery) and have given them mastery of toys and play with toys instead (imitative play). The billions of dollars that we spend on toys and models, which are miniatures of the world, is unheard of in human history. . . . But by pushing for so much use of toys we are doing something special to human nature. Instead of having competent little aborigines who are masters of their physical and social worlds, who can survive fairly well even when quite young, we have children who have acquired many many alphabets of toys and play but are completely dependent on their elders for survival for many years to come.

Just as schooling becomes the form in which children are isolated from society at large in terms of learning activities, toys become an increasingly common form by which children's direct mastery of the environment is frustrated. Play occurs both indoors and outdoors. In
both cases urban structure is an important mediating influence. I shall
turn to an analysis of that relationship in the next chapter.

Fieldwork experiences:

Three types of toys seem to have a strong attraction for most of
the children. LEGO, plastic building blocks with an infinite number of
figures and models that can be built, are mentioned in all families
except the Jones and the Schneiders. Star Wars figures or other types
of models are mentioned by the Naipaul, Smith, Ross and Miklos families.
In this regard it is worth mentioning an experience of B7 in the Smith
family. He took a tape recorder to the movie "Star Wars" and taped the
whole performance. After replaying it numerous times with a friend, the
two children began making tapes of their own creation. For children,
media productions are frequently not just a consumer item to be viewed
passively. They are the "stuff" of the real world, primary materials to
be utilized in children's fantasies. Similarly, Battlestar Galactica is
fodder for enormous (and creative) fantasies for the Naipaul children.
In general, it seems to be the case that toys that are manipulable for
the children's fantasies are more valued than those which are simply
replicas of real things. As a qualification of my earlier statements,
it can be said that in such cases, toys seem to be less barriers to the
real world than opportunities for children to create their own. Separa-
tion of adult and child worlds, of course, is still maintained.

Bicycles are the third class of "toy" valued by children in all families,
although slightly more for boys than for girls. The importance of
bicycles for giving children access to a wider world will be discussed
in the next chapter.
The parents have varying motivations for the types of toys they choose for their children. Mrs. Jones mentions that the value of several of the toys is that they keep G7 "busy." She also tries to use toys to direct G7 (unsuccessfully) to more feminine interests. Mrs. Naipaul uses toys in some cases to direct her children (unsuccessfully) away from role stereotypes. Mrs. Schneider gave a number of toys to her children that she had not had the opportunity to have as a child. Dr. and Mrs. Ross stress toys with "child guidance" value, as opposed to "plastic junk." Similarly, Ms. Smith values B7's play with natural items whenever possible—pots and pans at a younger age; hammer, wood and nails at a later stage; and frequent play with proper drawing equipment. The Ross, Miklos and Schneider parents also mention that the female children tend to be more interested in friends, while the boys tend to be more interested in things. This is not the case for the female children in the Naipaul and Jones families. In general it would seem that toys used by children are a reflection of the mass production priorities of corporate interests, but their selection and use are mediated in varying degrees by parental values.

Just as there are varied parental motivations in the provision of toys, there is also a variety of rationalizations as to whether and how frequently parents will interact with their children in a "playing" or just "being together" way. For the fathers, these rationalizations usually are based on the nature of their work. In the Naipaul and Miklos families, the fathers' work life has a direct and negative effect on the time they spend either playing or just being with the children. As shown in the family profiles, both have family businesses which
either keep them at work for long periods of time, or cause them considerable worry. Both fathers tend to watch a lot of television when they come home, and have little energy for interaction with their children.

Mr. Naipaul puts his position clearly:

"I can't see changing the system of work for the sake of the kids. They have to get attention from me when I'm available. Mrs. Naipaul fills in that gap."

Mr. Miklos has developed a rationale for not planning many activities with the family, which shows a direct connection with his worklife:

"I like to have the kids and [Mrs. Miklos] around here. I like to be part of things with them, and yet I don't like to go here and there. I don't like to be programmed and tied down with times [for doing things]. I put my effort into being efficient at work. It's not so much a reaction to being programmed at work as an attitude to life itself. I would prefer work not to be programmed either."

As noted in the family profiles, Dr. Ross had at one point had an overwhelming work schedule which had all but obliterated his family life. However, many of his efforts since that period—including a recent move to Nova Scotia—have been directed towards securing a schedule which allows more reasonable time with the family. Mr. Schneider has had to come to terms with the fact that pursuing wildlife photography—his first love—would be inimical to family life. Although his present job as a medical photographer is not as satisfying to him, it leaves him adequate time to enjoy the family:

"I enjoy the children more and more. It is a real pleasure to see them grow up. I could not see them day to day if I were doing animal photography. The way I am—liking to observe, not saying a lot—makes me good at wildlife and at watching kids."

Similarly, Mr. Jones dropped his job as a railway waiter when it became apparent it was causing his wife and G7 a lot of distress. With his job
as an apartment manager he has more energy at night when G7 is at home. Although both Mr. Miklos and Mr. Naipaul claim they have more energy on the weekends (and Mr. Naipaul usually takes the children out on Sundays), it is clear that there is a greater involvement with the children as a family in the other families. In this sense, the nature of work appears to produce or shape the nature of leisure or recreation.

IV.3 SUMMARY

In this chapter on family structure I have posited three substructures, each composed of various elements. Each of these elements has been developed as a "genealogy." Connections have been made to the overall structure of the capitalist mode of production outlined in Chapter II, and to the reinforcing or mitigating effects of other substructures and elements of family structure. In fact, as I have progressed from one substructure to the next, there has been a deliberate attempt to carry unresolved questions forward into the next discussion, and to generate and resolve larger, more complex, more total questions. Finally, each element has been discussed in terms of the experiences of the six fieldwork families. Usually these experiences have fortified the main argument, frequently they have qualified it, occasionally challenged it, and always particularized (concretized) it.

It was shown in the economic substructure (production phase) that children have gradually been isolated from the process of production as it has been removed from the family and agricultural settings. In the discussion of the structure of dependence it was shown that a contradiction exists between the widespread recognition of biological and
psychological dependence of the infant, and various post-natal practices which thrust the child toward independence and isolation from nurturant care. At the "exit point" of the structure of dependence, it was found that childhood is artificially prolonged as "adolescence" through economic and legal dependence on parents, while at the same time children are encouraged to see themselves as free individuals who are part of a larger society. Discussion of the substructure of socialization centred on the socialization of reproduction and the ideology of the individual as subject. Analysis of the first element revealed the extent of isolation of children from a larger society implicit in the advent of schooling, the decline of apprenticeship structures and the encroachment of other social institutions on the family's socialization functions. On the other hand, the ideology of the individual as subject has been a sort of carrot that has encouraged children not to feel isolated from mainstream society, but rather to see themselves as free, participative individuals.

In the analysis of the production (consumption phase) substructure, this sense of being free individuals is shown to be transformed into the freedom to be consumers of corporate mass products. In addition, play, formerly an element integrating children with adults in non-productive activity, has now become an isolated sphere for children, carried out in part according to the priorities of corporate-directed consumption.

Thus isolation of children under the capitalist mode of production has been given a series of more concrete characterizations:

- separation of children from production;
- a contradiction between the recognition of dependence and a stress on independence in infancy;
— enforced dependence in adolescence;
— institutionalization of learning isolated from the adult world;
— self-realization as individuals in fuller society sublimated as consumption of corporate products;
— play designated as child's activity.

While these characterizations are relatively more concrete in terms of family structure, they remain abstract in terms of the physical space in which they are played out. It remains to be seen what effects the physical structuring of modern capitalist societies has on the various characterizations of children listed above. This will form the substance of the next chapter on urban structure.
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CHAPTER V

URBAN STRUCTURE

V.0 ANALYSIS OF URBAN STRUCTURE

The approach used in analyzing urban structure is similar to that used for family structure. Specifically, I shall critically examine historical and current concepts of urban structure. This process will also clarify the substructures of urban structure. I shall then trace the "genealogy" of the major elements in each substructure, clarifying their interaction with each other, with elements of family structure (from Chapter IV) and with the structural processes of the whole (from Chapter II). Finally, the experiences of the six families profiled in Chapter III will be incorporated in the discussion in the same way as in the preceding chapter (see p. 127).

V.1 THEORIES OF URBANISM AND URBAN STRUCTURE

My first task in this section is to develop a concept of urban structure from an analysis of urban theories. Secondly, I wish to determine how (if at all) children are treated in such theories. As shown in the previous chapter (see Section IV.1), it was quite possible for theorists of the family to discuss their subject without reference to children. It can safely be said that the child features even less centrally in urban theory than it does in family theory. Nevertheless, analysis of the existing literature on "children in the city" provides
a basis for integrating the theme of the isolation of children within a systematic examination of urban structure. To reach that point of departure, I shall examine three broad groupings of urban theory: the early German theorists, the urban ecology/urban sociology schools, and the more recent macro-theorists of urbanization processes.

V.1.1 The Early German Sociologists

Urbanism and urbanization, unlike the family, were not specific theoretical foci of pre-20th century philosophers or political economists, despite the fact that cities are among the oldest artifacts of civilized life. Sennett explains:

The reason for this is that up to the time of the Industrial Revolution, the city was taken by most social thinkers to be the image of society itself, and not some special, unique form of social life. . . . Thus, until quite recently, the field of urban studies had no real meaning of its own; the city was taken to be the mirror of a broader reality, more appropriate as a focus of thought.¹

Even in the 19th century, when the first major brunt of industrialization and urban transformations was being felt, intellectuals assumed that all those urban traits could be related in one way or another to society as a huge market place in which individuals or groups struggled with each other for gain. . . . This system, generating the social conditions of cities, was thought to be perfectly clear as an idea, and useful new knowledge would be gained, supposedly, in discovering the good and evil of the system in practice.²

Marx, for example, approached the concept of the city in an historical perspective (primarily in a discussion of town and country as a manifestation of the division of material and mental labour) in his early *German Ideology*,³ and Engels dealt with it marginally in *The Housing Question*.⁴ Otherwise, their primary objective was to analyze capitalism
as a whole. The German sociologist Tönnies was implicitly but not explicitly concerned with urbanism in his book *Community and Association* published in 1887. He described the transition from small and close-knit groupings (Gemeinschaften, or communities)—essentially a prototype for later descriptions of "rural" society—to large, bureaucratic, impersonal and anonymous aggregations (Gesellschaften, or associations)—the prototype for later descriptions of "urban" society.

Sennett describes the German sociologist Weber's 1905 work *The City* as the first "modern effort in urban studies." Weber, unlike Tönnies, saw positive potential in the city, "and sought to describe not how cities could lead to a sense of isolation and lostness in men, but rather under what conditions cities could be positive and creative influences on men's common lives." He saw the cities of his day as primitive and underdeveloped institutions, and evolved the concept of an "ideal-typical" condition of the city—that is, specific urban forms which bred rich, diverse styles of life. His younger colleague Simmel also proposed an "ideal-typical" form, based however on psychosocial rather than structural elements. In his essay, "The Metropolis and Mental Life," he claimed that the multiplicity of stimuli in large urban settings required individuals to break life into separate components and to defend themselves by not reacting emotionally to people around them. In this process the individual was able to experience a certain freedom. Spengler, as part of his larger work *The Decline of the West* (Volume II), also focussed on the imbalancing effect of the city, but unlike Weber or Simmel, saw the ultimate decay of civilization in the breaking of ties of solidarity between people, necessitated by urbanism.
The theoretical underpinning of all three theorists is the view that a given ecological context (the city) produces a specific system of social relations (urban culture). Sennett sees this as a positive contribution in that it attacked "the sway of the mechanical idea of a market economy generating urban social conditions." He maintains that these writers felt this idea was too simple, and reduced away the complexity of experience that occurred in a city. Significantly, none of these new thinkers challenged the rightness or wrongness of the market idea as such, but rather sought to show that the economic life of the city was shaped in part by, or had at least a symbiotic relation to, noneconomic conditions peculiar only to urban areas. In this way, these classic urban theorists established themselves by enlarging the genera, the creative forces, that men understood to have produced the specific conditions of city culture.

Castells, while acknowledging "that there are cultural specificities in the different social milieux," feels it is just as obvious that the cleavage no longer passes through the town/country distinction, and the explanation of each mode of life requires that one should articulate it in a social structure taken as a whole, instead of keeping to the purely empirical correlation between a cultural content and its spatial seat. For our object is quite simply the analysis of the process of the social production of the systems of representation and communication or, to put it another way, of the ideological superstructure.

Castells would therefore have us trace the production of these "cultural specificities" not to the city (a spatial notion) but to the capitalist mode of production (CMP). To the extent that the CMP entails not only the economic but also political-juridical and ideological structures, there is some measure of agreement between Sennett and Castells. However, Castells would not agree that the cultural specificities evident in urban areas are produced by the "urban area," but are part of the social production of the ideological structure, mediated by elements of
urban structure (which is produced by the CMP as a whole). As will be shown, Castell's critique is applicable to most of the theories of urban sociology, urban ecology and urban geography to the present day. An additional criticism is that Weber, Simmel and Spengler saw city culture as a unitary phenomenon, that is pertaining to the city as a whole (with an implicit or explicit "rural culture" as the opposite pole), rather than seeing the city as composed of numerous cultures. This latter deficiency was largely resolved in the work of the Chicago school of urban sociologists and their successors.

V.1.2 Chicago School and After: Urban Sociology and Urban Ecology

As just indicated, the first members of the Chicago school of urban sociologists did not treat the city as a whole, but rather "asked questions about the internal character of the city, about how the different parts of the city functioned in relation to each other, about the different kinds of experience to be had within the same city at the same point in time." Over and above Park's connection with the German tradition as a student of Simmel, Chicago itself was conducive to the furtherance of a more detailed study of the internal workings of the city:

From the perspective of Chicago, which had grown from a frontier settlement to a huge industrial metropolis in less than a century, completely rebuilding itself after the fire of 1871, rapid urbanization loomed as the central fact of modern society. The city, it appeared, was "the natural habitat of civilized man." Accordingly, the city should be studied as a total environment that gave rise to a distinctive way of life. Park's 1916 article, "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behaviour in the Urban Environment," was a blueprint—or in his terms "a program"—for the study of that distinctive way of life, its
physical organization, its occupations, its culture. His essay poses numerous questions requiring detailed study, such as the effects of population growth, the function of neighbourhoods, the "urban" occupational structure, mobility, communications, family and racial issues, and the creation of "moral" regions. 14

Since 1916, there have been two continuing areas of research in urban literature that can be said to be related to Park's essay. The first is a continuation of the theoretical theme of the essence of "urban culture." Two notable examples were Wirth and Redfield. In "Urbanism as a Way of Life" (published in 1938), 15 Wirth points out relations between three essential characteristics of urban areas—dimension, density and heterogeneity—and resultant cultural forms. In "The Folk Society" (1947), Redfield develops ideal types of primitive or folk societies which contrast to, or form a continuum with, modern urbanized society. 16

The second is a plethora of empirical studies and theories in the field of urban ecology. Thomlinson 17 identifies twelve such theories in four categories: spatial (star, concentric zone, sector, and density gradient); natural (polynuclear and surface feature); social (process, sentiment, social area, and cluster analysis); and economic (ecological distance and land economics). These theories have been widely discussed in the literature, 18 so will not be specifically analyzed here. Much of the debate has been on the difficulty of application of the theories to diverse urban contexts. Other criticisms have been over the deterministic nature of the theories, insofar as they stress physical, economic or social values to the exclusion of others. 19 Thomlinson concludes
that present thinking on ecological structuring is "middling in the rigor of research and depth of sociological sophistication it has so far attracted."20

Nevertheless, such studies have generated an enormous amount of empirical data which can form the basis of further theoretical development. Sociological studies on urban kinship, community and neighbourhoods were particularly prominent in the 1960s: for example, the series of works of Willmott and Young on kinship and community in London,21 Gans's The Urban Villagers22 (a study of an Italian community in Boston's West End) and Keller's The Urban Neighborhood23 (a more theoretical work). Perhaps it was inevitable that such studies of kinship and family in urban neighbourhoods should lead eventually to the study of the social ecology of childhood. This field of research blossomed in the 1970s. Although it can be said to follow logically from the studies just cited—the neighbourhood is the most immediate environment of the child—it drew on other disciplines as well. Environmental psychologists, building on the developmental psychology of Piaget and others, examined children's spatial cognition and cognitive representation. Initially this research took the form of laboratory and small scale studies; eventually it explored children's cognition of their immediate environment.24 Part of this emphasis was on the child's home environment (also a concern of social psychologists who felt the inadequacy of much laboratory-derived information),25 and part on the outdoor environment.26 The latter studies use a wide variety of methodologies, ranging from behaviour mapping and simulation procedures to child-guided field trips and formal interviews, several of which approaches have been used in the fieldwork
for this thesis (see discussion, pp. 37-39). Most comprehensive both in terms of methodology and in mapping out children's relationships with a relatively complete (that is, a village) ecological setting was Hart's *Children's Experience of Place.*

Despite the excellent progress that has been made in the past decade in studying the child's relationship to a variety of urban environments, there are three serious deficiencies in these studies. The first has already been discussed in relation to the overall critique of the early German sociologists, and by extension to the field of urban ecology generally. That is, the phenomenon described as "urban environment" is taken as given. There is little, if any, discussion of how that environment has in turn been structured by larger processes. This issue is taken up again in the next section. The second is the lack of an historical perspective. Not only is the child's environment taken as a given in space; it is taken as a given in time. Thus the literature is of little value in discussing structural transformation. For purposes of this thesis, recourse has been had to various historical sources such as Ariès' *Centuries of Childhood,* which only incidentally touch on the relationship of the child to the built environment at different points in time. Thirdly, most of the studies on the social ecology of childhood assume that the child's relationship to the environment can be taken as given. Little if any analysis is made of family or class-related processes that might structure or mediate that relationship. This failing is simply the reverse of that displayed by family theorists in the 1930s who reduced theory of the family to theory of marriage, ignoring the crucial areas of reproduction and the socialization of children (see
discussion, pp. 130-131). In 1981, \(^{28}\) Hart acknowledged the need for a greater understanding of the people who immediately control the child's environment, and the occupational structure and other social factors mediating the patterns of children's spatial activity. The approach used for this thesis reflects Hart's concerns in this respect, for I have developed an analysis not only of family structure, but of the structure and major processes of the CMP prior to examination of urban structure.

V.1.3 Marxist Approaches to Urbanization

The focus of urbanization studies broadened considerably in the 1970s, a result perhaps influenced by such events as African decolonization in the 1960s, the Vietnam War, increased American investment and intervention in the Third World, and other major world developments. In a major review of urbanization studies in 1976, Friedmann and Wulff comment:

Macro-studies of urbanization are characterized by their approach to the subject via the concept of a spatial system that consists of both a 'core' and a 'periphery'. Although the systems studied are almost always national, attention has recently shifted to the question of foreign domination and its influence on national spatial patterns and their evolution.\(^{29}\)

Micro-studies (similar to the type I have classified as urban ecology) were extended to Third World cities in the 1970s. Commenting on both the macro and micro approaches, the authors state:

Unfortunately no concepts have yet been found to link, within a single and coherent framework, observations at the micro-with those at macro-levels of urbanization. The only theory which claims to have done so is philosophical Marxism. Its holistic method—corresponding to a motivation drawn from
revolutionary practice—is particularly well suited for a
critical understanding of historical processes; it has yet
to prove itself, however, as a method for application to
specific policy designs.30

One of the first detailed attempts at a Marxist historical inter-
pretation of urbanism is Harvey's "Urbanism and the City: An Interpretive
Essay."31 His essay is based on the proposition that "cities are built
forms created out of the mobilization, extraction and geographic concen-
tration of significant quantities of socially designated surplus product."32
Harvey's description of how this surplus is mobilized in different Euro-
pean countries at particular points in history gives specificity to the
process of production as a source of urban transformation. In "Class-
Monopoly Rent, Finance Capital and the Urban Revolution,"33 Harvey con-
centrates on the consumption element through the production of residen-
tial differentiation in urban areas. Taken together, these two essays
provide a useful basis for the description of production and consumption
in the economic substructure of urban structure.

Castells' The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach goes further than
Harvey's essays in that Castells formulates a concept of urban structure
as a spatial articulation of several34 modes of production. For Castells
this means:

To analyse space as an expression of the social structure
amounts, therefore, to studying its shaping by elements of
the economic system, the political system and the ideological
system, and by their combinations and the social practices
that derive from them.35

Castells outlines the principal elements of each of these three systems.

For the economic system,

production (=spatial expression of the means of production),
consumption (=spatial expression of labour power) and a
derived element, exchange, which results from the spatialization of the transferences between production and consumption, within production and within consumption.\(^{36}\)

For the politico-institutional system, the major elements are the relations of domination-regulation and integration-repression. The spatial expression of these elements is

on the one hand, the segmentation of space (for example, communes, urban areas, etc.); on the other, it is action on the economic organization of space, through the regulation-domination that the institutions exert on the elements of the economic system, including their spatial translation (process of administration).\(^{37}\)

Lastly, the ideological system

organizes space by marking it with a network of signs, whose signifiers are made up of spatial forms and whose signifieds are ideological contents, the efficacity of which must be construed from their effects on the social structure as a whole.\(^{38}\)

Clearly, these formulations are directly related to the discussion of the capitalist mode of production in Chapter II.

The approaches of Harvey and Castells go some way to resolving the problems of earlier theorists who accepted urbanism and urbanization as a given, or who failed to trace identifiable urban processes and forms to more basic structural referents. It is for this reason that Castells' conception of urban structure and its elements is adopted for this paper. Castells obviously does not attempt a conceptualization of the child, and several of the elements he discusses have only indirect impact on the lives of children in urban areas. Thus in the following pages I have attempted to incorporate the theme of children in urban environments into Castells' structural framework. This has meant translating, for example, the structural ideas of consumption into houses and neighbourhood, and
exchange into streets, cars, childhood range and other terms borrowed from the ecological literature. This translation process runs the risk of losing the intent of structural description, and lapsing into a mere categorization of elements of children's environment. I have tried to preserve the structuralist intent by tracing the genealogy and transformations of the structural elements, as was done in the previous chapter on family structure. Castells does not undertake this task, and so I have had recourse to Harvey (concerning production and consumption) and other writers for this purpose.

V.2 THE ECONOMIC SUBSTRUCTURE

V.2.1 Production

The articulation of the production element in urban structure has only an indirect effect on children. Nevertheless, it is essential that it be described in order to grasp the relation of production to other elements more directly affecting children, and to comprehend the driving force of the overall transformation of urban structure.39

As stated in the previous section, Harvey conceives of cities as built forms created out of the mobilization, extraction and geographic concentration of significant quantities of the socially designated surplus product.40 He defines urbanism as "a patterning of individual activity which, when aggregated, forms a mode of economic and social integration capable of mobilizing, extracting and concentrating significant quantities of the socially designated surplus product."41
Using these propositions, Harvey analyzes urban centres and regional space economies from medieval Europe to the present day. This overview clarifies both the transformation of urban structure and the essence of urban structure dominated by a CMP. Harvey first examines the feudal economy dominant in northern Europe up to the end of the 15th century which consisted basically of a checkerboard of local self-contained and rurally based economies in which redistribution occurred within either the manorial system or the somewhat larger feudal fiefdoms.

The surplus for the support of the various elements in the rank society was extracted as tithe, work-days and slave labour while privilege was attached to land-ownership (held through laws of heredity) and to position within the church hierarchy. Military power and ideological control were the twin controls which served to maintain society. The urban centres that did exist were, for the most part, fortresses or religious centres; sometimes church and fortress could combine to form a centre of considerable significance. But much of the surplus extracted was not concentrated geographically in an urban form—it remained dispersed throughout the manorial system.42

It is important to point out that the small scale nature of production and redistribution in a manorial system depended on families as productive units. To this extent, it also allowed for the participation of children in production.

Long distance trade was another quite distinct geographical circulation of the surplus in this period, which remained set apart from local redistributive activity. This trade for profit was viewed as immoral and dehumanizing in feudal ideology; at the same time, feudal society extracted revenue (in the form of taxes and tolls) from this activity, and thus itself profited. The solution to this contradiction was to restrict long distance trade to the towns, where it could be controlled and monitored.
This regulation relied initially upon articles of incorporation which gave the city a legal structure and conferred rights and duties on its inhabitants which were markedly different from those which regulated the feudal economy. The city thus assumed the form of a territorial corporation.43

As I have shown in the previous chapter (see pp. 162-163), apprenticeship was a form of productive activity which allowed children a large measure of participation in adult life. The restriction of long distance trade can be seen as one (spatial) attempt to preserve the guild system and the apprenticeship structure. Its demise would remove one avenue of participation by children in adult productive life.

Merchant capital (see pp. 54-55) relies on differentials in economic development so that items can be bought at low prices and sold at high prices. The fact that the feudal order was highly decentralized with numerous parochial economies made such differentials quite common. Merchant capitalists did not seek to control production and labour. Rather they sought to preserve monopolistic advantages vis-a-vis other cities (through the legal powers conferred upon them by the feudal order). This prevented spatial integration in production, a transformation which would occur with the advent of industrial capital. In southern Europe (specifically Italy) the Catholic church was more supportive of merchant activity. Banking institutions and technical advances (for example, double entry bookkeeping) facilitated trade, but it was still only in the early 16th century "that the lineaments of a self-regulating, regionally integrated economy began to appear and this economy was still not integrated with urban industrial production or long distance trade."44

In what way did the various forms of circulation of surplus product become evident in the built form of the medieval and merchant capital
city? It is worth quoting Harvey at length:

The built form of the medieval and merchant capitalist city reflected the kind of social order of the times and was quite different from the social order of the new industrial city. In the early medieval period, the triple themes of fortress, religious institution and market place were everywhere evident. In the later period when merchant activity grew to dominate, the larger cities evolved an ecological structure exhibiting considerable residential segregation as well as segregation of activities. These patterns were not so much a result of functional segregation of work forces, as they were territorial and symbolic representations of relative position in the prestige scaling of the medieval order. Even the distinctive artisan quarters in the larger cities reflected considerations of prestige as much as they did economic necessities imposed through an increasingly elaborate division of labour. Some activities, particularly those involving the movement of heavy materials, were located with efficient location in mind. Wealth, however, was an indicator of prestige and prestige locations were, for the most part, close to the symbolic centre of the medieval redistributive city. Land values reflected the competition for prestige locations.45

In Section V.2.2, I shall discuss in greater detail the nature and extent of residential segregation in the merchant capitalist city, and what it might have meant in terms of children's access to and experience of urban life.

The transformation from merchant capital to industrial capital involved two elements:

1. the creation of a regional, national and eventually a supra-national space economy within which resources, people and product could be mobilized through the operation of price-fixing markets;
2. the penetration of market exchange into all facets of production as opposed to its penetration into distribution under merchant capitalism.46

Much of the first process was accomplished under merchant capitalism (for example, in the Netherlands by the late 16th century) operating from urban centres. The second process, ironically, first occurred in rural
areas. This was because manufacturing in the urban centres continued—as in medieval times—to be regulated by guilds according to precepts of prestige, status and moral worth, rather than by the wage system. Thus industrial activity—as in the case of the English woolen industry—was frequently forced to seek out locations in rural areas away from urban influence and regulation. The way in which surplus value was extracted from the labour process by the capitalist in capitalist production (see pp. 54-55) was reflected in a new form of urbanism:

Class stratification now became the most significant feature, instead of the rather older kinds of differentiation which were based partly on stratification (under the legal conditions governing property rights and rights to production in general) and partly on the traditional criteria of the rank society.47

Once the self-regulating market exchange economy had penetrated into production, capitalist forms were freed from their urban confines and gradually integrated the whole economy—nationally and then internationally. (Hence the difficulty after the mid-20th century of talking about urban versus rural spatial forms.) In this overall movement in which new productive centres were established and a larger space economy created, the guild system on one hand and the family based productive system gradually crumbled. Thus the development of an international space economy signalled the end of two important avenues for the participation of children in productive activity.

With increasing socialization of the productive forces (see discussion, pp. 59-60) throughout this integrated economy,

all kinds of new ways were opened up in which the surplus, now universally designated in its exchange value form, could be created and appropriated. As a consequence the total product as well as the quantity of surplus value in circula-
tion increased enormously, as did the urban centres and the populations they contained. 48

The globally integrated space economy is hierarchically ordered with local centres dominating hinterlands, with, in a pyramid fashion, ultimate subordination (and major flow of surpluses) to the central metropolitan areas of North America and Western Europe. These metropolitan centres become "transaction maximizing systems" in which surplus value is extracted at every transaction point (primary, secondary, tertiary, and quaternary). 49

Metropolitan dominance is precarious in that much of the actual production of socially necessary goods and services takes place in non-metropolitan and overseas areas. If total reliance were placed on an international self-regulating market, neither labour power nor metropolitan hegemony could be ensured. Harvey points to two countervailing forces to a totally self-regulating market: various forms of monopoly control and a rapid rate of technological innovation. These two elements are related:

The metropolis provides a field for the application of technological innovations as well as a locale for the operations of large corporations. At the same time the metropolis is organized to reflect the growing power of monopolistic forms of organization in certain spheres of activity. 50

While urban centres have always been the locus of monopoly power, 51 the contemporary form of monopoly is very different in that in a self-regulating market economy surplus value has to be put back into circulation to create more surplus value. The rapidity with which surplus value is now circulated is such that wealth is measured as a rate of flow rather than as an absolute quantity of stored product. Wealth is no longer a tangible thing but constitutes a statement of rate of current flow (capitalized over a future time period) supported by paper rights over future flows or debts and obligations out-
standing from past flows. The metropolis as a transaction maximizing system reflects this in many ways, the most evident of which is the growing physical instability of the structures it contains as the economy requires a more rapid circulation of surplus value in order to maintain the rate of profit.52

Two major examples of corporate solutions to the need for rapid circulation of surplus value are the automobile industry (which, to support its expansion requires an enormous infrastructure; see Section V.2.3) and the housing industry (involving large financial institutions and numerous intermediaries in the construction industry; see Section V.2.2). For both of these industries planned obsolescence is an essential means of ensuring continued circulation of surplus value. In more general terms, Harvey notes that

Contemporary metropolitanism apparently functions in part as a field for the necessary disposal of surplus product and as a manipulable source of effective demand. Surplus product has frequently been lavished on the built form of the city in the past (in the form of monumental architecture and the like). But it is now necessary for urbanism to generate expanding consumption if the capitalist economy is to be maintained. Much of the expansion of GNP in capitalist societies is in fact bound up in the whole suburbanization process.53

In several respects the maintenance of a "transaction maximizing system" and the rapid circulation of surplus value will be shown to have an indirect effect on children's access to the larger urban environment. In the next section I will discuss how the residential structure of cities—and its tendency to isolate children—is shaped by financial institutions seeking to extract surplus value. In the same section I show that apartments and highrises aid the realization of surplus value on the one hand, but restrict the access of children to the outdoor environment. Automobilization will be shown in Section V.2.3 to restrict
the movement of children beyond the immediate neighbourhood, and in Section V.4 to affect the nature of urban symbolism and its intrinsic interest for children. One should also note Harvey's comment that it is now necessary for urbanism to generate expanding consumption. Although two aspects of this consumption are dealt with in the next section, in more general terms one can say that the type of consumption patterns and problems discussed in relation to family structure (see Section IV.2.4) can be seen as being indicated by urban structure.

V.2.2. Consumption

The consumption element of the economic substructure refers to the spatial expression of labour power (see p. 219). At the empirical level, this refers chiefly to the creation of neighbourhoods and housing (that is, the physical "vessels" essential for the reproduction of labour power). It is within these two categories that I shall discuss the consumption element. Although at the theoretical level consumption is clearly an element of the economic substructure, at the empirical level housing and neighbourhoods are economic, political and ideological all at once. My discussion will tend to flow back and forth between theoretical and empirical realities.

V.2.2.A Neighbourhoods

The term "neighbourhood" is used here principally because it is the empirical term used to discuss the close-to-home physical environment of children in much of the ecological literature. For much of my discussion broader theoretical terms such as "residential segregation" will be
used to delineate some of the economic processes at work historically and presently in the spatial expression of labour-power. Although it is acknowledged that terms such as residential area and a child's "neighbourhood" are very different conceptually and physically, the economic processes involved in their creation as described here are broad enough to contain both. This is sufficient for purposes of this discussion, the basic intent of which is to outline how these economic processes have isolated the child from contact with a larger environment.

In his analysis of preindustrial cities, Sjoberg points out that there was a general class pattern of residential location, with the elites dominating central locations and the poorer classes fanning out towards the periphery. This pattern allowed the elites access (primarily by foot or animal-drawn vehicles) to the headquarters of administrative, religious and educational organizations (religious and administrative structures were usually in the centre, with marketplaces close by). It was also common to have ethnic or occupational subdivisions within preindustrial cities. Sjoberg links the localization of particular crafts and merchant activities in segregated streets or quarters to rudimentary transportation and communication media, as well as to the guild system which encouraged propinquity of members of an occupation. On the other hand, there was little land use specialization:

the residential units of artisans and merchants often serve simultaneously as their places of work, the living quarters being behind or just above the shop. The ecological situation wherein a person may reside, produce, store and sell his wares within the confines of the same structure has been a feature of preindustrial-urban life from the earliest cities in Mesopotamia down to the present day.
At a minimum, therefore, the child in the preindustrial city would be exposed to productive activities within the location of his residence, and to commercial and productive activity in his own and nearby streets. Given the fact that most intra-urban movement would be by foot (see also Section V.2.3), and that access to the larger market would entail traversing the residential area of the elite, it was likely that the larger class and commercial world of the city would be open to the child.

According to Ariès,

the old unique social body embraced the greatest possible variety of ages and classes. For these classes were all the more clearly distinguished and graded for being close together in space. Moral distances took the place of physical distances. The strictness of external signs of respect and of differences in dress counterbalanced the familiarity of communal life. . . .

People lived in a state of contrast; high birth or great wealth rubbed shoulders with poverty, vice with virtue, scandal with devotion. Despite its shrill contrasts, this medley of colours caused no surprise. A man or woman of quality felt no embarrassment at visiting in rich clothes the poor wretches in the prisons, the hospitals or the streets, nearly naked beneath their rags. The juxtaposition of these extremes no more embarrassed the rich than it humiliated the poor.56

Thus, as noted in the previous section, precisely those elements which had to be overcome in the establishment of the wider capitalist space economy—the guild system, a feudal rank society, and production by artisans within their own establishment—were elements which also allowed the child freedom to observe and participate in the activities of the wider society.

This pattern was to change with the advent of industrialization. Production under the factory system required large numbers of labourers deprived of control of the means of production.57 The vast majority of workers in industrial urban areas worked in factories. Place of work
and place of residence were thus separated. At the same time residential differentiation between labourer and capitalist took a new form. Referring to mid-19th century England, John Tarn notes:

Following the industrial development came the housing. In the early industrial society, people were obliged to live near to their work because of the conditions of labour, there was not time for the worker to ask environmental questions and his employer did not yet consider them to be a problem. For the first time in history, because of the nature of many factory processes, working-class ghettos were created. But the owners and managers fled from what they clearly recognized as unpleasant surroundings and set up new suburbs, up-wind from the sources of their wealth and employment. The sector of the community which had choice about how it lived, made that choice quite decisively. The labourer took what the market forces offered him by way of a home; new or converted it was likely to be overcrowded and basic in the extreme. He had no choice. 58

"No choice" did not remain an absolute condition. The provision of adequate housing soon became a focus of class struggle. The concentration of the working class and the unemployed in space—that is, within walking distance of industrial locations—was soon perceived by the bourgeoisie as a danger. This was evident in the revolutions in 1848 across Europe, the Paris Commune of 1871, the urban violence which accompanied the great railroad strikes of 1877 in the United States, and the Haymarket incident in Chicago. 59 The bourgeois strategy in many of these instances was one of dispersal:

Cheap suburban land, housing and cheap transportation were all a part of this solution entailing, as a consequence, a certain form and volume of investment in the built environment on the part of the bourgeoisie. To the degree that this policy was necessary, it had an important impact on the shape of both British and American cities. 60

This solution, combined with the policy of individual home ownership for more affluent workers, was also used as a response to social unrest in the 1930s (implemented more fully after World War II) and the urban
riots in the United States in the 1960s.\footnote{61} Equally important, it had the added advantage of opening up the housing sector as a means for rapid accumulation through commodity production.

This last point relates to the theme of the circulation of surplus value discussed in the previous section. I referred to 20th century metropolitan centres as "transaction maximizing systems" in which surplus value could be extracted at every transaction point (see p. 226). Finance capital—as opposed to industrial capital—is uniquely capable of realizing surplus value at all points, with significant impact on the form of urban, and specifically residential areas:

Since the industrialist is adept at immediate production but has little control over the totality of production, finance capital (operating through industrial, financial and governmental institutions) has emerged as the hegemonic force in advanced capitalist societies. Urbanism has consequently been transformed from an expression of the production needs of the industrialist to an expression of the controlled power of finance capital, backed by the power of the State, over the totality of the production process. Herein lies the significance of urbanization as a mode of consumption and as a producer of new social wants and needs. Concomitantly, the urban realm becomes the locus for the controlled reproduction of the social relations of capitalism.\footnote{62}

Using Baltimore as a case study, Harvey explores the role of finance capital in promoting this "controlled reproduction of the social relations of capitalism." Specifically, he examines the various financial sources (both private and government sponsored) utilized by aspiring homeowners (and landlords), and finds that there is a geographic structure to the potential residential locations financed by these sources. (For example, white ethnic areas were financed by small, community-based savings and loan institutions; areas of high turnover were financed by a combination of mortgage brokers and Federal Housing Administration
insurance, etc.) Harvey states:

This geographical structure of sub-markets in Baltimore forms a decision environment in the context of which individual households make housing choices. These choices are likely, by and large, to conform to the structure and to reinforce it. Harvey concludes that through several mediating actors and processes, financial institutions—with state assistance (see also discussion, pp. 59-60)—are a fundamental force in shaping the residential structure of the city. He does not claim that race, ethnicity, social status and prestige, or lifestyle aspirations are irrelevant to understanding residential differentiation: "Ironically, all of these features increase the potential for realizing class-monopoly rent because they help to maintain the island-like structure, to create the absolute space of the parochially-minded community." But Harvey argues the deeper process is that structured by financial institutions.

Although residential differentiation in 20th century urban centres is significantly determined by these economic forces, political and ideological forces have played important roles as well. I have noted Sjoberg's comments that areal divisions along class, ethnic and occupational lines existed in preindustrial cities. Formal planning of cities in terms of basic amenities as well as architectural splendour has existed since Roman times and before. More formal politico-legal interventions occurred in England and the colonies in the Georgian era (that is, the 18th century) as England began to come to terms with overcrowding caused by the advent of industrialization. Corporations and some merchant politicians endorsed the introduction of parks, squares, housing estates and gardens to improve the environment. Construction
was legally controlled by building laws such as the 1774 Building Act, which required conformity to certain codes concerning area, material, heights and situation. In addition,

Georgian plans resolved both freight and pedestrian movements with coherent street systems. Their architects designated special use areas: they introduced parks and open space and public use, they used a neighbourhood concept but expanded it beyond parish identification when they laid out a variety of housing, markets, inns, taverns, prisons, churches, almshouses and stables.

In the late 1800s Germany, modelling legislation on the English Building Acts, classified different building heights for different areas, as well as widths, landscaping and use of streets. Density and accommodation were also controlled through zoning.

A significant influence on British, American and German residential planning has been the "Garden City" theories of Ebenezer Howard first proposed in 1898. His aim was to develop wholesome housing in self-sufficient little towns encircled by belts of agriculture. This was seen as an alternative to the undesirable urban qualities of London and other large urban centres. Embedded in the Garden City concept is the idea of a neighbourhood unit of particular size and with certain amenities to create a "full measure of social life":

Most of the towns have adopted the principle of neighbourhoods varying in population from 5,000 to 10,000, usually with at least one junior school, a group of shops and service workshops, and a public house and some facilities for meetings.

Not only were Howard's ideas implemented in Britain (in Letchworth and Welwyn before World War I and in more than a score of centres around Britain after World War II), but they were adapted to the United States in the 1920s through the work of Lewis Mumford, Clarence Stein, Henry
Wright and Catherine Bower. These "decentrists" applied Howard's ideas to city planning, primarily—and perhaps inappropriately, since Howard's vision was seen as an alternative to cities—in the form of housing schemes in large city suburbs. Although these developments, especially in their original inspiration, were attempts to provide a more wholesome social life for their inhabitants, they also made for a large measure of social and physical homogenization. As Jencks notes:

If the English architect could point with pride towards the fact that his country was the first to initiate such Garden Cities and New Towns, he was also forced to admit that it was the first to make mistakes in this area: they were obviously lacking in the life and density of the old cities—and worse—their social uniformity made the epithet 'social ghetto' inevitable.

The activity of planners has helped to separate residential from other areas and has provided basic amenities to these districts. Ideology has also played a role in this process, through the concept of community. As Harvey notes, the concept of "community improvement"—like suburbanization—has been a political-ideological response to class unrest around the issue of housing. As early as 1812, the Reverend Thomas Chalmers advanced the "principle of community" as an antidote to class war:

The principle entailed a commitment to community improvement and a commitment to those institutions, such as the church and civil government, capable of forging community spirit. From Chalmers through Octavia Hill and Jane Addams, through the urban reformers such as Joseph Chamberlain in Britain, the 'moral reformers' in France and the 'progressives' in the United States at the end of the nineteenth century, through to model cities programmes and citizen participation, we have a continuous thread of bourgeois response to the problems of civil strife and social unrest.

Castells points out that "community improvement," and by extension "local democracy" tend to
reinforce the consequences of segregation, by practising a policy of amenities in terms of the interests of the dominant fraction of each administrative unit. In effect, since local resources depend on the economic level of the population, local autonomy perpetuates the inequality: the higher this level, the less public intervention in matters concerning public amenities is necessary. Therefore, the 'privileged' local communities will tend to close their frontiers, leaving to the responsibility of the federal state the subsidies necessary for the overwhelming needs of the underprivileged communities.74

From this brief overview it is evident that economic, political and ideological processes have shaped present-day neighbourhoods in a markedly different way from that described by Sjoberg in preindustrial cities. Residential neighbourhoods do not support mixed land use. They are truly "residential islands" with a few planned or unplanned amenities and are frequently homogenized by class. For the child, these neighbourhoods become the containers of his or her existence.75 Examination of the patterns of the six families in the fieldwork helps clarify how their neighbourhoods and the parents' social attitudes tend to contain the activities of the children. It also points in some cases to ways in which the containing effect is overcome.

The area in which the residences of the six families are located is nineteen blocks long and eight blocks wide. It straddles Main Street, a commercial "ribbon" street generally considered to mark the division between the East and West sides of Vancouver. The West Side can be described in broad terms as a middle to upper class area; the East Side as middle to lower class. There is general statistical support for these popular conceptions, although Main Street is perhaps more of a psychological division than a rigid socio-economic wall. The "incursions" of lower income families or of lower housing values can reach several blocks
to the west of Main Street at various points along its north/south axis. Of the six families in the study, the Smith, Miklos and Schneider families lived on the West Side, and the Naipaul, Ross and Jones families on the East Side. The Smith family is in a somewhat anomalous situation. Although they live farther to the west than any of the families, they are in an area of low income and housing value.

Looking first at the East Side families, the Naipauls are farthest east (three and a half blocks) from Main Street. All of the parents' major social contacts are east of Main, as is their immediate neighbourhood orientation. The profile of the family indicated the poignancy of Mrs. Naipaul's struggle to ensure that her children are not "trapped" by a class or ethnic background. This is reflected in the several excursions the children take with their parents in the week of their "geographic diary" (for example, to Sechelt, a summer cottage area, with their father; to a recreation centre west of Main Street with their siblings and/or mother; to a major West End park with their mother and siblings; to a pet shop west of Main with their mother). Both G8 and B7's activities alone or with each other are usually within a few blocks of their house, although they go to a recreation centre one block west of Main Street with B11. B11 generally stays east of Main except for the recreation centre and a ballet lesson which requires a long bus trip west of Main; he also runs an errand along a major traffic artery to the east. Thus, except for excursions with their parents—particularly the mother—the children are generally to be found within a few blocks' radius of their house on the East Side.
The profile of the Ross family characterized the children as being less neighbourhood-oriented than those of the other families. This pattern is similar to that of their parents, who have no real social contacts in their immediate neighbourhood. Their friends live in the suburbs around Vancouver. The parents were also portrayed as being highly involved with their children. This is reflected in their week's diaries. The diaries show that all four children go at least four times with their parents outside of their immediate neighbourhood to some event or recreation. In addition, the children spend part of almost every weekday at the recreation centre west of Main Street. Bill also goes downtown (well out of the neighbourhood) on an errand or music lesson on three occasions. As with the Naipuals, it is easy for the younger children to go to the recreation centre as long as one of the two older siblings accompanies them.

The profile of the Jones family shows Mr. Jones seemingly "embattled" in his neighbourhood, primarily because of his racial attitudes, but also because he considers the East Side too "working class." He has no social contacts in the immediate area of his residence, although his few major social contacts in Vancouver are all on the East Side. Mrs. Jones also claims that G7 has to go "out of her area" (which is only a half block east of Main Street) for friends. In fact, two of the three friends noted in G7's diary are west of Main. Every day she goes to the recreation centre west of Main. On the other hand, all three of her shopping trips with her mother are on Main Street itself, and a trip to a park and to Sunday school are both on the East Side. Although she goes several places on foot with her mother and an adult friend (primarily
shopping), in no case did she go more than six blocks away from her apartment. Mrs. Jones does not drive a car.

Turning to the West Side families, in the profile of the Smiths it was noted that Ms. Smith feels isolated from the immediate neighbourhood compared to the sense of community she experienced in Montreal. However, unlike many of the other families, she has developed social contacts with several families within the immediate neighbourhood. Her major "outside" friend lives on the West Side of the city. Like Mrs. Jones, Ms. Smith does not have a car. B7's diary reflects roughly the same range that is apparent for G7 in the Jones family. On three of the seven days of his diary he does not venture farther than a half block from his house. On two occasions he goes to a grocery store five blocks away, over a major traffic artery: one occasion is with an older friend; a second time he goes alone. On another day he goes for an outing to Burnaby (a municipality adjoining Vancouver on the east) with an age-mate and her parent. Once he goes to a Dairy Queen on Main Street with both parents. On two occasions he goes shopping or to an appointment with his mother. One of these trips is a block east of Main. All activities save two are west of Main.

Mrs. Miklos is very aware of the east/west boundary. She expresses fears of shoplifters, kids "hanging around," gangs of kids who would "rough up" younger children, and a more general concern that B12 or G10 would not be able to get assistance if they were in trouble east of Main. Her preference would be to live even farther to the west, but acknowledges it is "just pure snobbery." All of her social contacts are on the West Side of the city. B12 takes long bicycle rides (sometimes twenty
blocks) which dip one or two blocks east of Main on two occasions in his diary week, but are otherwise completely on the West Side. GI0 goes shopping with a friend on Main Street on one occasion, and to a library one block east of Main on another. Otherwise, B12 and GI0's activities and friends are exclusively west of Main Street. GI0 tends to stay closer to home. B12's wider forays are primarily a result of his penchant for cycling.

The Schneider family is also strongly oriented towards the West Side of the city. Even though their house is only one block west of Main, the parents have no social contacts east of Main. Mrs. Schneider has two friends eight to ten blocks north of their house, but still west of Main Street. The rest of their acquaintances are also on the West Side. The children's orientations are equally strong. GI0 has no contacts east of Main during the week's diary, while at the same time she walks to church seven blocks south, and rides to a shopping centre fourteen blocks southwest. On two occasions, B12 rides some thirty blocks to the East Side to an "excellent" skateboard park. Otherwise all of his activities are west of Main. Like the Miklos children, most of B12 and GI0's activities are with other friends of the same sex or alone. This contrasts with the Naipaul and Ross children.

This brief analysis of the children's orientation towards a roughly drawn class boundary suggests that such boundaries do tend to "contain" children. They appear to be reinforced strongly by the orientations of the parents, specifically whether and where parents have local social contacts, and their attitude towards life on their and the other side of the boundary. Children who venture reasonable distances (even over major
traffic arteries) in one direction, will not do so as readily across Main Street. This is particularly true of the younger children. At least for the children of these six families, neighbourhood does not mean simply the point at which one's house is located, but a socio-economic framework which isolates the child from experiences beyond certain boundaries. The areas within which the children exist are relatively homogeneous in terms of class, have strips of commercial activity along their borders, and have recreation locations within the borders. It should be stressed that while these areas certainly seem homogeneous to the adult viewer, especially if compared to areas traversed by children in preindustrial cities, they are not necessarily experienced in the same way by children. In Section V.4 (Urban Symbolism), I shall explore how these areas are used by children.

V.2.2.B Housing

In this section I shall trace the development of different housing forms and internal arrangements, and suggest the relationship of these forms to the isolation of children. Housing form can be interpreted from several perspectives. In the first place, it can be seen simply as a reflection of different ideologies. For example, in the previous section I discussed urban renewal ("community improvement"), new towns and the suburbanization movement as aspects of an ideology of wholesomeness, and to a certain degree, of a rediscovery of peaceful country life. Another ideology is of housing as private ownership, privacy and individualism. This ideology is closely related to a second perspective on housing form, in which it is seen as a commodity or exchange value. But housing only
emerges as exchange value from a consumer's standpoint when it is created as an exchange value from a production standpoint. Under the capitalist mode of production, housing as exchange value is a major form of investment for accumulated capital and the continued circulation of surplus value (as shown in the previous section). In an analysis of capitalist cycles of over-accumulation, Harvey notes this tendency to view housing (and other aspects of the urban built environment) as exchange value in 18th century Britain:

The eighteenth century in Britain was characterized, for example, by a capital surplus much of which went into the built environment because it had nowhere else to go. Investment in the built environment took place primarily for financial rather than use-value reasons—investors were looking for a steady and secure rate of return on their capital. Investment in property (much of it for conspicuous consumption by the bourgeoisie), in turnpikes, canals and rents (agricultural improvement) as well as in state obligations were about the only options open to rentiers.77

The most direct relationship between housing as exchange value and the isolation of children is in the construction of highrise dwellings. This relationship is discussed at the end of this section.

A third framework for discussing housing form is housing as use value. As use value—that is, as shelter and to varying degrees as the locus of social activities—housing is an essential element in the reproduction of labour power in all modes of production. It is by tracing the genealogy of housing as use value that one can most clearly see the relationship between housing form and the isolation of children.

Ariès looks at two forms of housing in Western Europe in the 15th to 17th centuries. The primary use value of the "small house"—of peasants or urban poor—was for minimal shelter for an immediate family
and perhaps animals:

there were tiny houses containing only married couples and probably just a few of their children, the youngest. In the towns, these were houses such as are still to be found here and there in the old districts, houses with only one or two windows on each floor. . . . Often the two windows lighted only one room. Thus there were only one or two rooms in these urban lodgings. In the country, the little houses had no more than that, and when there were two rooms, one of them was reserved for the animals. They were obviously shelters for sleeping and sometimes (not always) eating. These little houses fulfilled no social function. They could not even serve as homes for families.78

This lack of social function reinforces the importance of the social function of the street for all ages in this period (see also Section V.2.3). At the same time, Ariès describes the houses of the rich—the big houses—which served a use value in terms of shelter, professional life, and sociability for a large number of people. These houses contained as many as twenty-five people, including the family proper, servants, employees, clerics, clerks, shopkeepers and apprentices. The big house fulfilled a public function:

In that society without a cafe or a 'public house', it was the only place where friends, clients, relatives and protégés could meet and talk. To the servants, clerics and clerks who lived there permanently, one must add the constant flow of visitors. The latter apparently gave little thought to the hour and were never shown the door, for the seventeenth-century pedagogues considered that the frequency and the time of these visits made a regular time-table, especially for meals, quite impossible.79

These visits were professional as well as friendly or social,

but little or no distinction was made between these categories. A lawyer's clients were also his friends and both were his debtors. There were no professional premises, either for the judge or the merchant or the banker or the business man. Everything was done in the same rooms where he lived with his family.80
Internal arrangements in the big house reflected this "piling on" of social functions. Unlike modern houses, rooms were not specialized and were all connected to each other (thus requiring passage through one room to get to the next). Only the kitchen had a special function, and even the cooking was done in the hearth of the biggest room. People lived and ate in general purpose rooms: "the 'dining-table' did not exist, and at mealtimes people set up folding trestle-tables, covering them with a cloth." Beds, like the eating table, were collapsible. Servants would simply put them up when company was expected. Even the transformation of the collapsible bed into a permanent piece of furniture did not signal the advent of a specialized bedroom:

the room containing the bed was not a bedroom because of that. It remained a public place. Consequently the bed had to be fitted with curtains which could be opened or drawn at will, so as to defend its occupants' privacy. For one rarely slept alone, but either with one's husband or wife or else with other people of one's own sex. Clearly the form of the big house was one that, for better or for worse, maximized the child's exposure to all those who passed through the house.

In the 18th century these internal spatial arrangements changed, as the "zone" of private life began to expand. Moral inhibitions increased and the concept of domesticity and "family life" took on new force. Corridors were introduced to houses. As a result, rooms became independent and people were no longer obliged to go through them all to pass from one to another. Beds were confined to bedrooms. Servants remained in out-of-the-way quarters unless summoned. It ceased to be socially acceptable to have acquaintances "drop in" without warning. Fewer servants were required to attend to the needs of the family's more
restricted social life.\textsuperscript{85} The decline of the apprenticeship system toward the end of the 18th century also meant that there were fewer non-kin children present in the master's house. In transitional situations the factory system actually enlarged the number of apprentices, also leading to their departure from big houses:

His [the apprentice's] home had formerly been at his master's. He had lived and worked familiarly with him, receiving his board and clothing in return for his services. Now, with the growth of industry, the master could no longer house all of his apprentices. He had to let them find their own shelter, and commute their former benefits into cash allowance.\textsuperscript{86}

Technological advances in the 20th century have contributed further to changes in internal housing space and ultimately to the isolation of children from adult family members under the same roof. Reflecting on his Norwegian childhood at the turn of the century, Parr notes:

In cold and temperate climates, winter became a time of greater family togetherness, with bedrooms serving only as places to sleep after a quick dash under the blankets, but not as studies or playrooms. . . . The chores of tending the wicks, cleaning sooty glass chimneys, and filling the reservoirs kept to a minimum the number of lamps actually lit at any given time, and the entire operation of kerosene illumination was too risky and complicated to be entrusted to young children on their own in their separate chambers.\textsuperscript{87}

Parr felt that because of the necessity of having at least two and sometimes three generations gathered in one warm and well-lit room, children and adults quickly learned to respect each other's privacy and personal peculiarities. Children also learned to discipline each other. Parr speculates:

The ephemeral animosities of daily life were more likely to develop between siblings than between generations. Could it be pure accident that the generation gap does not seem to have been invented until after the invention of the electric light?\textsuperscript{88}

With the arrival of electricity, lights were placed in all rooms and
could easily be handled by small children. As a result, "bedchambers became studies and playrooms, as well, and the family dispersed itself and its activities throughout the house at all hours, except mealtimes, and in all seasons, as rapidly as improved heating facilities allowed." In a rather amusing account, Wylie describes the reverse process in a French village when he and his family had to adapt to a house heated by fireplace:

Little by little, our family life, which at home was distributed throughout the entire house and which we had tried to distribute throughout the Peyrane house, withdrew from all other rooms and was concentrated in the salle. . . . I had to learn to work while the children were playing. The children had to learn to play more quietly. I had to learn to pick up my paper from the table so that it might be used as a dining-room table. . . . Without realizing it we had adapted ourselves to a necessary condition of life in Peyrane where families learn to live together in one room.90

The economic, social and technological trends towards dispersal within houses are now frequently heightened by deliberate design for the isolation of children in the guise of creating attractive spaces:

Were we to trust only popular magazines in the field of design and home arrangement, we might assume that specialized (and expensive) children's furniture and toys are the most important items, whereby all (or most) ills could be cured and desires satisfied. Illustrations of neatly laid out, colorful rooms seem to imply that were we to decorate brightly and possess all these objects, our children would spend most of their time in their room, happy, tidy, and busily creative in their non-adult compound. Despite these popular images with their strong product orientation and bias (understandably so in a consumer society), the fallacy of these ideas is apparent to all who have experienced children, their continuous search for adventure and new stimuli, their intense preoccupation with discovery, their need to be where adults or the action are. Their room is not their universe although it is an important part of it.91

Of course spatial design does not absolutely determine either children's use of space or their interactions with adults. Discussions
with the fieldwork families elicit more detailed understanding of adult-child interactions and the use of internal space. For example, most families perceive value in various degrees of crowdedness or "being on top of each other." Dr. and Mrs. Ross feel the children learn about sharing, and the younger children have immediate role models in their older siblings. A year prior to the interview, Mrs. Naipaul deliberately enforced a shared room between B11 and B7 because B11 was getting too possessive. According to Mrs. Jones, G7 desperately wants to share her room with her newborn brother. Mrs. Ross, whose family is living in the most crowded situation of all the families, finds that much more activity (for example, drawing, modelling and games) takes place in their living room/dining room, creating greater family involvement than would normally be the case. This is evident in the drawing of the dining room as the favourite indoor place for B11 (Fig. 2) and the backgammon board (always in the dining or living room) drawn by G8 (Fig. 3). The family regularly plays backgammon together, and the author was presented with a carefully constructed cardboard replica of the game during one of the interviews. (Jacks are played in the bedroom.) As noted in the family profile, Mr. and Mrs. Schneider deliberately encourage multiple uses for rooms which might bring the family together in joint activities.

On the other hand, most of the families would opt for more space and room specialization if it were possible. Not only do Dr. and Mrs. Ross want more bedrooms, they would prefer a separation of living from dining room in order to have "more formal" dinners at times, as well as a larger entry room to receive visitors across the threshold. Mrs. Naipaul dearly wants a "proper" (English-type) sitting room rather than
FIGURE 2: Drawing of indoor favourite place (Bil in Ross family).
the cheerfully jumbled playroom cum television cum living room that they have. Mr. Miklos would like the living room accorded a respect closer to that given the Greek "saloni"—a special room with the best furniture, reserved for entertaining guests or the local priest, and usually locked at other times. Notwithstanding, he enjoys the comfort (and television) of their present living room (and has had little contact with priests since his arrival in Vancouver).

Privacy is also important to all the families. Mrs. Miklos says, "I encourage the children's own space because I like mine." This comment echoes that of all the families, although neither Ms. Smith nor Mrs. Schneider set up rigid boundaries for their own rooms or privacy. Mrs. Schneider, despite her desire for the family to be together and sleep together when possible, also would like all the children to have the
opportunity for individual rooms to retreat to. In general, the rule for the other families is "no access to the parents' room unless permission is asked." Similarly, all parents expect to knock on their children's doors if they are closed, and they desire reciprocal behaviour. Most of the children seem to close their doors if playing with friends in their bedrooms. The Ross children express a desire to have their own rooms. This is particularly true of G13—the only child who took pictures of her own room as a "favourite place." B11 goes so far as to state to me a wish that he were an "only child." (Ironically, Mrs. Ross notes that the two girls have an imaginary boundary down the middle of their room to create their own space; the boys seem less concerned, and even sleep interchangeably in the other's bed.) The Miklos children spend a lot of time in solitary activity in their own room, as evidenced in their weekly diary and corroborated by their mother's comment. B12 posts a "NO ENTRANCE" sign on his closed door. In her drawing of her favourite places (Fig. 4), G10 labels the kitchen "Mum's territory," her brother's room "his territory" and the living room "Dad's territory," and leaves each of those rooms devoid of detail. Her room, the dining room and the playroom have depictions of things she likes. The drawing by B12 in the Schneider family identifies his room as a source of privacy, expresses a feeling of rejection about the basement (where his father has his study locked when not in use) and a sense of togetherness with family in the living room (Fig. 5). In general, it seems that the children retreat to their rooms more as they get older.

The outdoors also seem to fulfil privacy needs of the children. The Naipaul, Ross, Miklos and Schneider parents mention that their
FIGURE 4: Drawing of indoor favourite place (G10 in Miklos family).
FIGURE 5: Drawing of indoor favourite place (B12 in Schneider family).
children frequently use bike-riding simply as a way of being alone. In a study of children's use of local environments in the San Francisco Bay area, Moore speculates as to why children like the outdoors as a "retreat" from the indoors."

The indoor-outdoor contrast category, plus the categories of access and choice, play, and social relationships, together represent the generalized attraction of the outdoors as a domain of freedom and choice of experience. Outdoors is where children can run their own lives, "do things," "look at people," "meet other kids," "feel free," "play"... in other words interact with the world in a necessary and special fashion.92

Given the earlier discussion of historical changes in house form and activity, it may be speculated that an outdoor preference among children is related to the gradual spatial isolation of children indoors, as well as the decline in the sociability function of the house. Thus outdoor preferences are not an "absolute" attraction to nature, but a dialectic between the decline of certain possibilities indoors and their continuing availability outdoors. In this respect, it is interesting to examine the children's drawings of their "ideal" or "fantasy" houses. A desire for mobility (or access?) and excitement is reflected in many of the drawings, particularly among the boys (see Figs. 6, 7, 8). The rocket-shaped "lipstick house" has a similar sense about it in the drawing of G10 in the Miklos family (Fig. 9). By contrast, G10 in the Schneider family wants nothing more than an elegant mansion (Fig. 10), reflecting the sexual stereotyping mentioned in that family profile. B12 in the Miklos family also retreats to his room, aided by the latest in electronic gadgetry (Fig. 11). His schoolroom avoids the necessity of the trip to school. The computer asks the questions for him and the control panel
FIGURE 6: Fantasy drawing of ideal house (B7 in Ross family).
FIGURE 7: Fantasy drawing of ideal house (Bill in Ross family).
FIGURE 8: Fantasy drawing of ideal house (B12 in Schneider family).
FIGURE 9: Fantasy drawing of ideal house (G10 in Miklos family).
FIGURE 10: Fantasy drawings of ideal house (G10 in Schneider family).
FIGURE 11: Fantasy drawing of ideal house (B12 in Miklos family).
provides the answers. Similar labour saving devices are evident in the other rooms.

The relations between indoors and outdoors takes on a different dimension in apartment buildings. In examining this dimension, I am returning to the concept of housing form as it relates to exchange value (see pp. 241-242). Highrise housing, like suburban housing, is a product of finance capital's attempt to realize surplus value through substantial investment in the built environment. While beneficial from the standpoint of capital, this element of urban structure reinforces the dependence of young children. Highrise living puts several constraints on children's access to outdoor play, and therefore to a child's mastery of the environment. Although Pollowy identifies a few studies in which parents in highrises express little concern about their children's access to the outdoors, the studies she reviews indicate several detrimental features of apartments:

(1) Higher proportions of children under eleven play outdoors in a lowrise setting than in mixed or mediumrise settings.

(2) The most important contributing factor for playing outside for children under eleven (frequency and duration) is ready and easy access (usually from ground or second floor dwellings).

(3) In typical highrise apartment buildings, lower floor residents (ground to third) tend to be more satisfied than upper floor residents with respect to child supervision (thus freeing the child to venture outdoors).

(4) With all floors alike, young children often find it difficult to locate their own apartment level.
(5) Young children are often afraid of elevators, and often cannot reach the control buttons.

(6) Adults often do not like stairwells and are less inclined to go out with children requiring supervision.

Bungen examines mental maps (similar to the favourite places maps for this study) of "highrise" and "lowrise" children, and concludes that there are noticeable spatial restrictions in the home range pathways of highrise children. In highrise apartments children also lose the value of the threshold, the interface between inside and outside. Dovey's observations concerning older people and threshold locations are equally applicable to younger people:

The human preference for edge space with outlook in front and cover behind shows the value of the inside/outside interface. The doorway, porch, and veranda are such places. In aged persons' housing, inhabitants tend to crowd the entry areas in order to participate in the comings and goings of a world they no longer have adequate access to.

In apartments, such traffic does not occur immediately outside the child's door, as this form of contact with the world outside occurs only at the main entrance to the building.

Michelson mentions studies which negate claims of detrimental effects (for example, less interaction with friends, more television watching) from these and other features, but he does acknowledge that the features exist and have been reliably reported. Hart, while generally critical of the effects of highrises on children's spontaneous access to the outdoors, points to some highrises where play space on second or third storey plazas acts as an effective outdoor environment, while providing a buffer from negative social influences from the street.
Such observations forbid categorical statements on the effects of apartment dwelling, but in general it can be said that highrise apartment units tend to isolate younger children from contact with the immediate outdoor environment more than do lowrise (two or three storey) units. To the extent that this isolation reinforces the dependence of young children, it heightens the contradictions identified in the previous chapter (see p. 150); that is, infants and young children are thrust into exploratory behaviour, yet at the same time highrise living restricts that same behaviour.

V.2.3 Exchange

I have said that exchange in urban structure results from the "spatialization of the transferences between production and consumption, within production and within consumption." For example, transferences within production might be transportation of unfinished goods for processing or manufacturing. Transferences between production and consumption could be transport of commodities for commercial sale. In both cases, as mentioned in Chapter II, the object of capital is to abolish physical distance and time spent in circulation (see p. 58). Transferences within consumption might be trips to school, to supermarkets or to various appointments. It is the latter two types of transferences (within consumption and between production and consumption) that would account for the largest impact of exchange on the lives of children. The location of exchange activities in these types of transferences that has direct impact on children is the street (as opposed, for example, to railroads, airplanes and electronic modes of exchange). If one traces
the genealogy of streets and the nature of traffic they bear, it is evident that their impact on children has changed over time.

Examining calendar scenes of 15th century Europe, Ariès notes that,

This medieval street, like the Arab street today, was not opposed to the intimacy of private life; it was an extension of that private life, the familiar setting of work and social relations. The artists, in their comparatively tardy attempts at depicting private life, would begin by capturing it in the street, before pursuing it into the house. It may well be that this private life took place as much in the street as in the house, if not more. 100

Ariès stresses that children were part of this active street life. In part it was because the houses of the poor were very small (see also pp. 242-43): "there was no space for children inside houses. They quite naturally slipped into the street, into the public space." 101 The children of the rich were more able to spend time inside the "big house" described in the previous section, but at the same time, they also partook of the street. In the 18th century, the rich began to abandon the street to the poor. This can be explained in part because of the general moralization of society discussed in the previous chapter: the children of the rich were sent off to schools to prevent their corruption. On the other hand, the street—despite its vitality—increasingly became the locus of delinquency, as the effects of increased urban migration and the beginnings of industrialization were felt. These effects were also felt in North American cities in the 19th century where, as evident from this excerpt from the Report of the Committee on the Subject of Pauperism and a House of Industry in the Town of Boston in 1821, children were to be found everywhere,
begging in the streets, or haunting our wharves, market places, sometimes under pretence of employment, at others for the purpose of watching [for] occasions to pilfer small articles, and thus beginning a system of petty stealing; which terminates often in gaol; often in the penitentiary; and not seldom, at the gallows.102

Even the more innocent street activities of children were frowned on in some cases. In late 18th century England, where legislated inclosures of open areas had already deprived much of the population of place space, "play was further suppressed by legislation in English towns which, for example, forbade children from playing with tops in the streets or running races on the roads."103

Public squares are essentially an extension of the street. One can observe a similar transformation in their accessibility to children over the time period just discussed for streets. Squares of medieval towns were small, surrounded by concentrated housing, full of street trade and teeming with people. In the late 17th and 18th centuries, public squares in French, Italian and English cities were restricted both in appearance and function. The large public squares of the late 17th century (for example, Piazza Obliqua in front of St. Peter's in Rome, Place Vendôme and Place de la Concorde in Paris) were designed for purposes quite different from their medieval counterparts:

The great urban places were not to concentrate all activities of the surrounding streets; the street was not to be a gateway to the life of the square. Rather than a focus as all the architecture at Versailles is a focus, the square was to be a monument to itself, with restricted activities taking place in its midst, activities mostly of passage or transport. Above all, these squares were not designed with a lingering, congregating crowd in mind. Hardouin-Mansard struggled therefore to eliminate stalls, bands of acrobats, and other forms of street trade from the squares, sought as well to keep the cafes on them contained behind their doors and the posthouses out of the squares altogether.104
Smaller squares in London were less imposing, but similar in that street vendors, acrobats, flower sellers and the like were not permitted. The squares were instead filled with shrubs and trees. Parks of this type became the successor to the street for the rich:

The smart set visited them on foot, on horseback, in their carriages, but families came too, children with their nurses, sometimes children alone, escaping for a moment from the supervision of adults who, besides, did not worry too much about their pranks in this well controlled space.

Despite legal and social controls put on the activities of children both in the street and in public squares, children's exposure to adult activities and "spaces" continued into the present century. As Ariès notes:

The face of the street has also been necessarily affected by this tendency to empty it and to condition what remains. One could have believed that the global sociability of the street was going to disappear. This, however, did not happen for another century, and it is quite remarkable that the privatization of family life, the industrialization and urbanization of the XIXth century did not succeed in smothering the spontaneous forms of urban sociability, even when, in certain cases, this sociability found different expressions. It is only in the middle of the XXth century, long after industrialization, that its collapse took place, and with it that of the city.

The title of Jacobs' book The Death and Life of Great American Cities suggests that a collapse of urban sociability has indeed occurred. Her attempt to identify aspects of vitality in cities led her to re-examine many of the current planning postulates about what makes for wholesome and good cities. She concludes that the evisceration of street life in many American cities has led to insecurity, crime and delinquency in the streets:

The first thing to understand is that the public peace—the sidewalk and street peace—of cities is not kept primarily
by the police, necessary as police are. It is kept primarily by an intricate, almost unconscious, network of voluntary controls and standards among the people themselves, and enforced by the people themselves.109

Jacobs claims that many housing and commercial developments "turn their backs" on the street in an effort to avoid noise and develop some private security. But such streets do not then have enough natural surveillance to ensure their safety. She argues that such surveillance requires many stores and other public spaces sprinkled along the sidewalks of a district. Storekeepers and small businessmen tend to watch streets out of self-interest. Their businesses encourage sufficient traffic to attract onlookers as well as pedestrians criss-crossing streets to use various establishments. 110

Jacobs also points to the restrictive nature of most contemporary sidewalks in the loss of urban vitality and safety, particularly for children. She asserts that although most city architectural designers and planners are men,

they design and plan to exclude men as part of normal daytime life wherever people live. In planning residential life, they aim at filling the presumed daily needs of impossibly vacuous housewives and preschool tots. They plan, in short, strictly for matriarchal societies.

The ideal of a matriarchy inevitably accompanies all planning in which residences are isolated from other parts of life. It accompanies all planning for children in which their incidental play is set apart in its own preserves.111

If sidewalks were made much larger and were part of lively, peopled and commercially diversified streets, they could accommodate a lot of incidental play (such as roller skating, marbles, skipping and tricycling) that would be integrated with adult society. At the same time, "matriarchal planning" would be negated:
Working places and commerce must be mingled right in with residences if men . . . are to be around city children in daily life—men who are part of normal daily life, as opposed to men who put in an occasional playground appearance while they substitute for women or imitate the occupations of women.\textsuperscript{112}

David Zerner completes the picture of how streets can be suitable loci of play for children by clarifying essential relationships between a vital street and a nurturing residence:

A street that is a hearth of play is one in which the volume and speed of through traffic is greatly reduced. It is a street whose buildings are no more than three stories high, permitting visual, acoustical, and immediate physical access to the life below. It is a street in which children and parents know through experience that they are reasonably safe and that their activities in the street will not be periodically ruptured by the passage of cars. The street that lives is one that has a complex contour created by the edge of dwellings as they meet the sidewalk. It is one in which, on the plane of the sidewalk, there is a variety of places of varying depths and dimensions where children situate themselves and locate spots for their activities. It is a street that has a variegated vertical topography as well as a complex contour in plan. It is literally terraced on all levels and like the terracing of hillsides or the sloping banks of a natural stream it permits children to locate themselves on perches, platforms, and thresholds above the street. On these perches children are in contact and relation with the activities on the street, yet at varying degrees of remove. Finally, the street that is a rich and vital context for young children is an intimate space; this quality of intimacy is made, in part, by the narrowness of both sidewalk and streetbed itself. It also is enhanced by the closure of one of the entrances to the street. A sense of density or compression increases the feeling that the street itself is a dwelling.\textsuperscript{113}

The removal of children from the streets and the loss of the street's capacity to nurture children's physical contact with the urban life of adults are but two aspects of how children are isolated by the exchange element of urban economic structure. The mobility of children is also seriously restricted by the automobile. This might appear surprising at first glance, for a widely held view in urban planning is that
the automobile and other modes of transportation have increased mobility and accessibility. Webber argues that this also means less necessity for spatial proximity as a precondition for community:

Although other conditions are associated with the community—including "sense of belonging," a body of shared values, a system of social organization, and interdependency—spatial proximity continues to be considered a necessary condition.

But it is now becoming apparent that it is the accessibility rather than the propinquity aspect of "place" that is the necessary condition. As accessibility becomes further freed from propinquity, cohabitation of a territorial place—whether it be a neighbourhood, a suburb, a metropolis, a region, or a nation—is becoming less important to the maintenance of social communities.114

Parr eloquently points out that this type of observation ignores the mobility of children:

References to man's increased mobility run like a bad refrain through all the literature on urban planning. Sixty years ago the mobility of a child in first grade was not very different from that of its parents, and its autonomous daily orbit was virtually identical with that of its elders. Today the mobility of the adult is greatly increased, but one never sees any mention of the corollary fact that the child's mobility has simultaneously been greatly reduced, largely as a result of the hazards introduced by the new means of adult locomotion.115

Obviously children cannot drive motor vehicles. They are thus dependent on adults if mobility is to have any meaning in their lives. In relation to the diverse potentials of an urban environment, the child's independent mobility—his or her capacity to have direct access, much less direct physical action on the environment—has been curtailed. Stea and Blaut cite studies which demonstrate that motor experience and sensorimotor interaction are important to the development of a child's perception.116 They suggest that "passive systems" (for example, cars or buses) may lead to an impoverished imagery of the environment compared
to "active" systems such as walking or cycling. Lee makes similar suggestions in a study which showed that children who ride buses to school form two "schemata" (a home schema and a school schema) with only a weak link between the two.

The inability of children to be mobile on their own in a larger environment also has detrimental effects on the maintenance of friendship (or community), despite Webber's contention that friendship is possible over larger distances with increased mobility. For example, the Naipaul family live in a neighbourhood which has a high turnover of families. Even though many of the families have moved to other locations in the Greater Vancouver area, it is impossible for G8 to maintain many friendships which she has started. As a result, Mrs. Naipaul feels that G8 has fewer friends than most girls.

Restricted to more immediate environments by their inability to use conventional modes of transportation on their own, children are further isolated by traffic itself. Sandels reported an extensive study of young Swedish children's ability to cope with traffic. The study found, for example, that practical application of knowledge about right and left was unsatisfactory even in eight and nine year olds; that six year olds were not able to see moving vehicles out of the corners of their eyes as quickly as adults can; that six year olds knew practically nothing about road signs and that even ten year olds had considerable gaps in their knowledge; and that misconceptions about the most common traffic issues were common throughout ages five to ten. All parents in the current fieldwork seem intuitively to appreciate these limitations, as their greatest single fear limiting their children's range is traffic
and safety. Heavy traffic streets are frequently mentioned as range boundaries, especially for the younger children in the Naipaul, Smith and Ross families. On the other hand, only the Smiths and the Jones are concerned that their children (both age seven) might get lost. All the other children are considered competent urban navigators by their parents. For example, Mrs. Schneider remarks: "Bl2 assures me he can go anywhere in Vancouver and get back. I believe him, because he's alert, suspicious, can question people to get what he wants, has a good sense of direction and a good memory." Despite this confidence in her son's intrinsic competence, Mrs. Schneider is still nervous because she feels Vancouver's drivers are not used to cyclists, nor are the streets built for cycling. This perspective is echoed by Mrs. Naipaul and Mrs. Miklos. These same parents feel more secure if their children are on foot. Ironically, a mode of transport which can widen children's range—and is appreciated by parents and children for this capacity—is still constrained by urban traffic. The children studied have expanded their range as they grow older, and have been helped in this by their bicycles, but given the confidence Mrs. Schneider has in her son's abilities, it is probable that without traffic fears, children's range would be much extended. Clearly the exchange element of urban structure as expressed in the changing character of the street tends artificially to reinforce children's dependence and to limit their ability to master a wider environment.
THE INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION OF SPACE

Castells notes that when speaking of "institutional space,"

one is not referring to the spatial seat of the state apparatus (for example, the location of the various administrations), but to the social processes which, on the basis of the politico-juridical apparatus, structure space. The spatial distribution of the apparatuses is merely one concrete expression among others of these processes.\textsuperscript{122}

In the chapter on family structure, I discussed the historical process of the socialization of reproduction, specifically the advent of schooling, the decline of apprenticeship and the encroachment of other social institutions on the family's socialization role. In this section, I shall show how the advent of schooling and the encroachment of other social institutions—primarily organized recreation—is reflected spatially.\textsuperscript{123}

Early in the history of schooling, the small number of colleges made it impossible to locate schools in local neighbourhoods. This situation began to change, however, as early as the 17th century in France:

the separation which was rendered inevitable by the small number of colleges would not be tolerated for long by the parents. Nothing could be more significant than the effort made by the parents, helped by the city magistrates, to found more and more schools in order to bring them closer to the pupils' homes. In the early seventeenth century . . . a dense network of schools of various sizes was created. . . . The multiplication of schools satisfied both the desire for a theoretical education to replace the old practical forms of apprenticeship and the desire of parents to keep their children near home as long as possible.\textsuperscript{124}

In France, the boarding school system went into a decline in the second half of the 19th century in favour of day schools. Although the boarding school system still thrives within the 20th century British upper class,
the public school system is solidly established on the basis of proximity
to residential neighbourhoods. In fact, the relationship is now more
frequently reversed: neighbourhood is defined in terms of its orientation
to schools. For example, speaking of the English new towns, Osborn
writes:

Most of the towns have adopted the principle of neighbourhoods
varying in population from 5,000 to 10,000, usually with at
least one junior school, a group of shops and service work-shops, and a public house and some facilities for meetings.125

Abercrombie's *County of London Plan* for 1943 contemplates "the conserv-
vation or creation of communities which would be divided into small
neighbourhood units of between 6,000 and 10,000 persons related to the
elementary school and the area it serves."126 Perry's formulation of
the neighbourhood unit in the *Regional Plan of New York* in 1929 is almost
identical:

The formula for a city neighbourhood, then, must be such that
when embodied in an actual development all its residents will
be taken care of as respects the following points; they will
all be within convenient access to an elementary school, ade-
quate common play spaces, and retail shopping districts.127

These formulations, common in both the theory and the practice of 20th
century planning, are a clear spatial reflection of the socialization
of reproduction. While the effects in terms of socialization have been
identified in the previous chapter, the spatial effects reinforce the
isolation of the child in a residential neighbourhood. As Parr notes:

The child's daily orbit has been even more sharply curtailed
than its mobility. It seems the ideal of all urban designers
is to place the schools as near the homes as possible and with
the simplest route between them, at the same time as urban
growth is pushing residential precincts and school districts
farther and farther away from the centers of history and of
current affairs. A child's exposure to the life of the city
two to four times daily has become a thing of the past.128
Paradoxically, if one accepts the constriction of the neighbourhood to a school-proximate space, school can actually be seen as a force which expands a child's range. For example, Hart notes an expansion of a child's "free range" (that is, range without soliciting parental permission) between grades two and three, when extra-curricular school activities and new school-found playmates put pressure on parents to relax the range restrictions. Similarly, Moore notes:

In late childhood and adolescence, habitual "turf" remains significant but becomes fragmented as destinations more distant from home (e.g. friends' houses, soda bars, sports facilities, high school) are substituted for nearby middle childhood places.

In the Naipaul family, the location of the elementary school on the other side of a major traffic artery is a source of consternation to Mrs. Naipaul. The children are not generally allowed across the street during the summer holidays, and Mrs. Naipaul often requires that B7 wait until G8 has finished school two hours later (the school operates in shifts) so that they can come home together. As a result, B7 has made some friendships with children who live closer to the school. Despite this (and Moore and Hart's) example of school as a range-increasing force, schools generally reinforce the location of a child's major life experiences within a small area removed from many other aspects of urban activity.

Pollowy claims that, "generally, planned child spaces are to children's activities what schools are to learning." Thus, just as schools have replaced the varied contexts and spatial locations of a child's learning processes, so parks and related forms of planned recreation have replaced more eclectic, spontaneous and spatially wide-ranging
activities with state or community supervised programs in prescribed locations. Part of this process has been indicated in the section on exchange in relation to the demise of the street as a locus of children's play. Cavallo draws a connection between the type of playgrounds that emerged in early 20th century American cities with a philosophy of that period which espoused the value of organized team sports. The child study movement, a reformist development of the late 19th century, was becoming increasingly alarmed about the urban youth's leisure time activities and the freedom from constraint that the city supposedly granted him. From their perspective urban-industrial society compromised the authority of traditional socializing institutions: neither the family, nor the church, nor even the school as then constituted could control and direct the child's instincts in an urban setting.  

In this the movement shared the concerns of other agencies of the socialization of reproduction examined in the previous chapter. Their solution paralleled the solutions of other reformers who tried to make people's activities and attitudes more consonant with the modern economic system:

Play advocates perceived designed and supervised play-forms as fostering moral ideals, and social interactions based on those ideals, that paralleled the interdependence of modern economic and political life. The morality of the playground was to reflect the most salient fact of modern economic life: that competitive individualism was incompatible with the need to structure all forms of social interaction.  

Especially after the establishment of the Playground Association of America in 1906, the movement's efforts culminated in the erection of thousands of playgrounds and parks in congested areas of major cities throughout the United States.  

The philosophy of play has considerably enlarged its focus since the turn of the century, and more particularly in the last decade, to encourage a variety of forms such as "creative" playgrounds (emphasizing
novel forms, textures and different heights) and "adventure" playgrounds (which supply materials such as wood, nails, tires and water for construction and experimentation by children under adult supervision).

Nevertheless, the main thrust of play philosophy, insofar as playgrounds are used at all, is still to create "safe" and controlled children's places, usually in a neighbourhood context.

Ironically, the child's access to cultural institutions such as museums is not planned in the same way. Parr notes:

As our cities increase in size their cultural institutions tend to grow larger, or more select in their quality, or both. But these establishments scarcely ever multiply in proportion to the expansion of the community. For the adults the resulting greater distances may be compensated for by their increased mobility, but even this is a very questionable assumption. Highest per capita museum attendance is, for example, not found in the largest cities. But for a child, with his reduced autonomous mobility, the opportunity for frequent and independent visits to cultural treasures and centers of informal education are virtually eliminated by the urban spread. While electronic surrogates have valuable uses of their own, they are in no sense adequate substitutes for self-directed experience of the real thing.

At the same time, Parr claims that libraries, which occupy "an intermediate place between the cultural institutions of entirely optional and informal attendance and the educational system of formally scheduled and required studies" are decentralized in most urban areas. He feels this helps to restore "some of the childhood opportunities that have been lost in megalopolis."

Examination of the activities of this study's fieldwork children in relation to parks, recreation centres and schoolgrounds show two distinct patterns. The Naipaul, Ross and Jones children are very park oriented. This is evident both in their indication of "favourite places"
(over fifty per cent are related to schoolgrounds or parks) and their actual use of facilities recorded in their week's diary (in all three families the children use the parks for an average of five of the seven days in the week, for two to five hours per day). All three families are from the east side of Main Street. The main "draw" of their activities is the pool and programmed activities in the park at the recreation centre one block west of Main. This is especially true for the Ross and Jones children. For the Naipauls, another focus of their interest in parks is a smaller park three blocks from their home and on the east side of Main. It has a supervised wading pool, crafts and box hockey programs. In both the Naipaul and Ross families, the children frequently go swimming with their siblings; G8 in the Jones family will usually go with a friend or her mother. For these three families, parks and recreation programs can be said to have captured much of the children's play activity, while at the same time they tend to enlarge the playing range of the children.

The Smith, Miklos and Schneider children (the West Side children) are much less park oriented. Less than twenty-five per cent of their favourite places are school or park related, and on average only one of seven days in their diaries show park related activities. In fact, neither B7 in the Smith family nor B12 and G10 in the Miklos family use parks at all during the week of their diaries, although the latter two go on two recreation sponsored tours during the week. (B12 and G10 of the Schneider family both use parks for three of the seven days, B12 on two occasions at a distant park for skateboarding, G10 at a local park to attend a craft fair and assist her younger sister at a
toddler's event. Neither usage is comparable to that of the East Side families.) B7 in the Smith family has no ready access to a park. The nearest one is beside the recreation centre seven blocks to the south, and entails crossing a major traffic artery. His major "favourite place" and actual activity focus is his friends' houses, seven of which are within one to two blocks of his house. The major orientation of the Miklos and Schneider children is home based activities, visits with friends, and for the boys, bike riding and skateboarding.

These observations are difficult to assess because of the connection of the families to the recreation centre and the time of year during which the diaries were completed. However, the markedly different patterns of the two sets of families suggest that usage of parks, especially those with supervised recreation programs, may be mediated by class. Certainly use of the playground or creative play facilities is minimal by all children; the real drawing cards are the supervised pool or group recreation activities. Supervised activity, like school, may represent an opportunity for East Side families to ensure that their children are being looked after. For example, Mrs. Jones feels that because of the encouragement of the supervisors, the community centre "teaches [G8] how to get along with other children. As long as she's supervised, it's good. I know she's being looked after." Thus the socialization of reproduction emerges again as a factor, its spatial expression being the children's regular attendance at supervised recreation programs. For B7 in the Smith family this pull tends to be counteracted by age, lack of older siblings to help overcome a major traffic barrier, and a bountiful resource of local friends. The Miklos and Schneider children are
securely on the West Side, and their parents are confident that they will not venture to the east; hence there is less concern that they be directly supervised. In this case the parents have confidence in the socialization capacity of a relatively homogeneous residential area. At a more theoretical level, one could say that the process of residential differentiation seems to have more impact on these children's spatial patterns than does the process of the socialization of reproduction.

V.4 URBAN SYMBOLISM

Urban symbolism refers to the organization of space by the ideological system, which marks it with "a network of signs, whose signifiers are made up of spatial forms and whose signifieds are ideological contents, the efficacy of which must be construed from their effects on the social structure as a whole." I commented earlier that the fortress, religious institutions and a certain degree of residential segregation are signifiers of preindustrial Europe, and the signified is the prestige scaling of the medieval order and power of the church (see p. 224). Buildings of government, railway stations and the headquarters of industrial corporations were frequently grand architectural symbols of the emerging industrial and bureaucratic powers in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Expressways, bank towers, parliament buildings, city halls and shopping centres are some of the signifiers of the dominant institutions of modern capitalist societies. In residential areas fences, walls and gates are, apart from their functional purposes, frequently symbols of private ownership, a demarcation of property.
Manicured lawns and other forms of landscaping may reflect prestige (power in a social hierarchy), concern with neighbourhood image (which in turn relates to house value), and an attempt to recapture a lost sense of "natural order." All of these contemporary forms of urban symbolism tend to isolate children, primarily because of their large scale and "hands off" nature. Often the large scale quality of urban symbolism relates to the fact that the viewer is the driver of an automobile, but as Parr notes: "An environment properly designed for viewing at 30 miles per hour, or more, is one that would be extremely deficient as a stimulus field for the explorations of the young." Mrs. Naipaul, referring to the Eaton's Block in downtown Vancouver, which is almost windowless for the first six storeys except for the two main entrances, exclaims:

Somebody should bomb that building. It's a loss of a whole block that could be of interest. It's like a fence.

This adult impression is comparable to the reaction of many children when faced with large scale, hands-off architectural features: they feel a barrier.

Nicholson advances a "theory of loose parts" which formulates the basis of a child's urban symbolism and at the same time further clarifies the problem adult symbolism poses for children (and many adults such as Mrs. Naipaul):

The theory of loose parts says, quite simply, the following:

In any environment, both the degree of inventiveness and creativity, and the possibility of discovery, are directly proportional to the number and kinds of variables in it.

It does not require much imagination to realize that most environments that do not work (i.e.: do not work in terms of human interaction and involvement in the sense described) such as schools, playgrounds, hospitals, day-care centers, inter-
national airports, art galleries and museums, do not do so because they do not meet the "loose parts" requirement; instead, they are clean, static and impossible to play around with. What has happened is that adults in the form of professional artists, architects, landscape architects, and planners have had all the fun playing with their own materials, concepts and planning-alternatives, and then builders have had all the fun building the environments out of real materials; and thus has all the fun and creativity been stolen: children and adults and the community have been grossly cheated and the educational-cultural system makes sure that they hold the belief that this is right.146

Where in the urban environment do children find enough variables or loose parts to create their own urban symbolism—their own images? Most writers identify what could be called fringe areas—areas not planned by the adult professionals. In the inner city, Zerner identifies (in more poetic fashion) the back lanes and dead end streets:

The irony emerges early in the journey; it is on the "dead ends," the cul-de-sacs and within the narrowest lanes—the marginal streets; the forgotten, hidden streets out of the swirling mainstream of city life—that the life of children is to be found.

The city's streets begin to assume the aspect of a labyrinth, to form fragments of an allegory whose symbolism is so intricate, so contradictory that one has, at best, bare glimmerings of its depth. Blake's London and Jerusalem seem to be transposed upon one another like two fused conflicting negatives of a single object. The projected image that results is a bewildering nebula of stars upon a void, of illuminations and dust. Shall we consult a map? It is Babylon and it is Sumer; it is the Lower East Side, and San Francisco; it is the tarry electric labyrinth of the twentieth-century city; jarring and deathly. The magic circle of play, imagination's own emblem and signet, chalky spiral upon the pavement ground, becomes a sign of affirmation within those tattered and forlorn places. And the play of children upon Gotham's floor becomes an act of transcendence within a Jerusalem profaned.147

In the more suburban setting of the fieldwork, children gravitate towards the lanes as their pathways. Property lines between houses at the back are frequently less rigid than in front,148 traffic less dangerous, and environments less formal and more amenable to manipulation,
fantasy play or simply bike riding and skateboarding by the children (see Fig. 12). (During the expeditions, much of our travel is by back lanes.) Frequently, favourite places are adaptations of larger (adult) environments for purposes quite different from those for which they were designed (see Fig. 13). In this respect the urban scene often "throws up" micro-environments with lots of "loose parts," and takes them away just as quickly. The first picture in Figure 13 used to be wild grass, berries and a pile of sand on an otherwise empty lot. The Naipaul children used it for three years for playing and making "forts" in the sand, picking berries and catching grasshoppers—prior to its disappearance because of the construction of a new house. Bill in the Ross family has a similar place—a construction site—where he can ride his bike over little ramps made of scrap wood. The year prior to the interviews he and some of his friends from his Cub pack adapted a fifteen foot deep water line excavation site on a nearby street to their own purposes at night. Since the hard-packed clay walls were (apparently) safe they would climb in under the retaining boards and pretend they were in "King Tut's Tomb." Ponds, trees and rocks also provide the children with space for direct interaction with the environment and room for fantasy play (Fig. 14). Like the fort in the cherry tree, the "club-house" on the ground is totally adaptable for children's purposes (Fig. 15).

Insofar as the urban symbolism of children is created out of fringe places, it is the antithesis of the institutional organization of space discussed in the previous section. As space, it is also the antithesis of adult urban symbolism. It is usually separated from
adult-created space completely, or else adapts the peripheries of such spaces to its own purposes. But I have stated at several points that spatial forms are only manifestations of socio-economic processes. The spatial forms are signifiers of processes, the signified. Children's activities in fringe spaces are frequently expressions of socialization processes, and in this respect are not necessarily antithetical to the adult ideological system. Thus a back lane (Fig. 12/1) becomes a theatre for a drama on firefighting (young children taking responsibilities in emergencies). A weeping willow tree against a fence (Fig. 13/3) becomes the locale for a girl's mastering the process of "keeping house." A receiving ramp (Fig. 13/4) behind a store is a hideout in a Battlestar Galactica epic featuring young heroes (read: development or the sense of being "individuals"). A series of landscaped areas adjacent to commercial or recreational locations (Fig. 13/7-11) become housekeeping locations for another girl. "Secret" access to a professional ballpark scoreboard (Fig. 13/13) helps a boy develop his own sense of being a "rascal" (read: individual). A cherry tree in a back lane beside a vacant lot (Fig. 14/3) permits children to develop their courage and overcome all enemies (read: assert their individuality). And in a more bureaucratic vein, a boulevard tree (Fig. 14/5) is the "club" for five children who regularly meet and establish their executive positions (on higher or lower branches) in the club's hierarchy. In summary, while the urban symbolism of children is expressed in the creation and adaptation of fringe spaces and in this sense is isolated from adult created space and adult urban symbolism, its social content is frequently in keeping with the adult-defined ideological system.
FIGURE 12: Favourite place photographs: the use of back lanes.

1. G8 in Naipaul family: "Fire Engine" street. A back alley behind a commercial street where G8 and her brothers play a complicated game of "spotting fires" from the garage roof at right. The fire (a piece of red paper) is stuck on the yellow building on the left picture. Using walkie-talkies and water pistols, they put out the fire.
2. G10 in Miklos family: "Echo Hill"—the lane falls away to the west and east from the top of the rise where picture was taken. G10 yells from here to the west (left picture) and gets an echo back from store wall in distance. Also good for skate-boarding.
FIGURE 12: Favourite place photographs: the use of back lanes.

3. B12 in Schneider family: a lane which is a "shortcut" on the way to school—lots of friends go this way.
FIGURE 12: Favourite place photographs: the use of back lanes.

4. B12 in Schneider family: lane for skateboarding and meeting friends.
5. B12 in Schneider family: lane on way back from shopping mall. Quiet, don't need to wait for traffic; good for bikes.
FIGURE 13: Favourite place photographs: adaptations of adult environments.

1. Bill in Naipaul family: formerly an empty lot with sandpile, grass, berries—now a construction site.
2. G8 in Naipaul family: father's place of work (appliance shop)—play on fridges—hide and seek and tag.
FIGURE 13: Favourite place photographs: adaptations of adult environments.

3. G8 in Naipaul family: "hideout" against fence behind weeping willow in supermarket parking lot.
4. G8 in Naipaul family: her brother's "hideout"—a receiving ramp in supermarket parking lot—used in re-enactments of Battlestar Galactica.
FIGURE 13: Favourite place photographs: adaptations of adult environments.

Figure 13: Favourite place photographs: adaptations of adult environments.

7. C8 in Jones family: "fort" in lot of McDonald's restaurant—for "playing house" (behind broom shrubs against the fence).
8. C8 in Jones family: same location as 14/7—for playing follow-the-leader in and around the broom.
FIGURE 13: Favourite place photographs: adaptations of adult environments.

10. G8 in Jones family: same location as 13/9—"fort."
FIGURE 13: Favourite place photographs: adaptations of adult environments.

11. G8 in Jones family: "fort" behind bushy tree against wall of G3's elementary school.
12. G8 in Jones family: "fort" in woodchips of long-jump pit at G3's school. Uses woodchips as "little people."
FIGURE 13: Favourite place photographs: adaptations of adult environments.

13. B12 in Miklos family: "private entrance" to scoreboard at professional ballpark—can turn on lights on scoreboard.
14. B12 in Miklos family: fun to climb up between wall and fire escape at elementary school.
FIGURE 14: Favourite place photographs: the use of nature.

2. G8 in Naipaul family: "the berry patch" on empty lot. For eating berries on the way home from school.
FIGURE 14: Favourite place photographs: the use of nature.

3. B7 in Ross family: "cherry tree" in back lane—used as a spy fort and for eating cherries.
4. B12 in Miklos family: pond in same park as 14/1. Good for catching fish, swimming, skating when frozen.
FIGURE 14: Favourite place photographs: the use of nature.

5. GI0 in Miklos family: "our club tree" where they sit on branches when making decisions. The president sits on the highest branch, then the treasurer, secretary, and so forth.
6. GI0 in Miklos family: scaling cliff in park (same as 14/1 and 14/4) and coming down "tunnel" behind tree.
FIGURE 14: Favourite place photographs: the use of nature.

7. Gl0 in Miklos family: tree to have "picnics" under—a nice place to sit with two friends after going to the store.
FIGURE 15: Favourite place photographs: "the clubhouse."

1. B7 in Naipaul family: "the clubhouse"—exterior. Located on neighbouring lot.
2. B7 in Naipaul family: "the clubhouse"—interior.
In this chapter I have traced the genealogy of three substructures of urban structure: the economic (including production, consumption and exchange), the institutional organization of space, and urban symbolism. The analysis of the production element clarified the transformation from feudal urban centres which could not sustain regional space economies and depended on long-distance mercantile trade, to modern capitalist urban centres or "transaction maximizing systems" which assist the rapid circulation of surplus value within a globally integrated space economy. Both the separation of the economic function of the family and the decline in apprenticeship described in Chapter IV were shown to be related to this transformation in urban structure.

The consumption element was discussed in relation both to residential segregation (neighbourhoods) and housing. Neighbourhoods—the product of economic, political and social forces—were seen to effectively "contain" or isolate children from wider and more varied areal contacts. Social and technological developments have tended to isolate children in specific rooms within the houses, and in the case of apartments, economic forces have created built forms which tend to reduce their accessibility to the outdoor environment. Analysis of the exchange element showed that children have gradually been isolated from the sociability of the street, and suffered a restriction in their general mobility. Furthermore, the perceived and actual dangers of traffic itself have tended to restrict the range of children.

In the institutional organization of space the process of the socialization of reproduction (discussed in Chapter IV) is given spatial
expression. Children's range tends to be contained within neighbourhood limits by the location of schools and community recreational facilities. The analysis of urban symbolism demonstrated significant differences between "adult" and "child" symbolism in terms of space usage, the child places being fringe locations. The content of the activities in these places was nonetheless frequently a reflection of the adult ideological system.

In brief, this chapter has given the term "isolation of children" a series of more concrete characterizations which complement the characterizations in the family structure chapter (see pp. 196-197):

- residential segregation in defined neighbourhoods;
- "dispersal" within the house itself;
- removal of children from the streets;
- decreased mobility of children;
- "containment" by traffic;
- institutional organization of space (principally schools and recreation centres) which reinforces the neighbourhood containment;
- differentiated adult and child urban symbolism.

While these structural characterizations were generally reinforced at the empirical level in examples from the fieldwork, it was also possible to show that the lived experiences of the fieldwork families suggest variations and contradictions in the general patterns.
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In The Fall of Public Man, Richard Sennett comments: "A dialectical inquiry means the argument is complete only when the book has come to an end. You cannot state 'the theory' all at once and then lay it like a map over the historical terrain." This observation is directly applicable to this thesis. Just as Chapter I was entitled "The Evolution of a Methodology," so could Chapters II through V be called "The Evolution of the Argument." The argument, like the methodology, required continual elaborations and could not be stated concisely at the outset. At the end of Chapters IV and V, I summarized the main ways in which the isolation of children through family and urban structure in the capitalist mode of production had been characterized as the argument developed:

- in terms of family structure:
  - separation of children from production;
  - a contradiction between the recognition of dependence and a stress on independence in infancy;
  - enforced dependence in adolescence;
  - institutionalization of learning isolated from the real world;
  - decline of apprenticed learning;
  - institutionalized socialization practices;
  - self-realization as individuals in fuller society sublimated as consumption of corporate products;
  - play designated as child's activity.
in terms of urban structure:

- residential segregation in defined neighbourhoods;
- dispersal within the house itself;
- removal of children from the streets;
- decreased mobility of children;
- containment by traffic;
- institutional organization of space (principally schools and recreation centres) which reinforces neighbourhood containment;
- differentiated adult and child urban symbolism.

These characterizations taken together must be considered the heart of my conclusions, insofar as I set out to clarify the ways in which the isolation of children occurs (see p. 23). Speaking in more structural terms, these characterizations are the mediations I sought between the lived experiences of individuals (and specifically in terms of this thesis, the children of the six fieldwork families) and the larger structural totalities (family structure, urban structure and the capitalist mode of production itself). As such, they reflect both a concreteness (for the most part they are easily related to experiences drawn from the fieldwork) and an abstract quality (they were basic elements of substructures, and could be traced genealogically).

While identifying the mediations between the lived experiences of individuals and larger structural totalities was a primary concern, I also maintained that a description of transformation was essential to an understanding of structure (see p.10). I followed Althusser in claiming that transformation can only be understood by tracing the genealogy of a structure's elements (see pp. 20-21); this was the procedure used for
each of the elements or mediating processes listed above. For example, I found that the major transformation in which production was separated from other economic functions within the family did not really occur until the 19th century in such countries as England and France; children's involvement in production continued even into the 20th century in the United States. On the other hand, the transformation in which children were segregated by age within schools occurred primarily in the 17th and 18th centuries, well before the advent of universal schooling in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The socialization of reproduction is really a 20th century transformation, as is the sublimation of individual self-realization in consumption. The emergence of residential segregation in its present form was a transformation of the past half century, as has been the institutional organization of space described in Chapter V.

These different periods of transformation tend to reinforce Althusser's claims that modes of production do not go through transformations as totalities from one stage to the next in an evolutionary schema (see p. 20), and that structures are relatively autonomous (see pp. 22-23). My examination also gives some support to Althusser's concept of structures in dominance and "over-determination" of contradictions or elements (see p. 20). For example, the decline of apprenticeship, shown in Chapter IV to be related to the advent of schooling as a primary form of socialization (see p. 162)(that is, an effect of the ideological structure), was shown in Chapter V to be fundamentally a result of the circumvention of the restrictions of the old mercantile urban centres by industrial capital (see pp. 224-225)(that is, an effect of the economic
structure).

In a general sense, the description of historical transformations has served to clarify contemporary structural elements and relationships, simply by providing a perspective on these elements. One tends to take for granted what one encounters on a day-to-day basis, and thus draw too directly on empirical reality as a source of structural description. It is difficult to achieve a distancing effect so that one can perceive underlying structures. For example, historical perspective allows one not to take for granted the separation of residence from the locus of production in a discussion of children, nor to assume that increased mobility is a structural effect of new modes of transportation.

Beyond this general advantage of acquiring perspective on structure, I feel the discussion of historical transformations has been most useful in two types of cases. The first is where a contemporary institution is a particularly dominant structural element, thus making it difficult for the viewer to see it as a composite of several processes. For example, in Section IV.2.3.A the description of the advent of schooling showed that there are several isolating effects of schools, each of which took centuries to develop. The second case in which the discussion of historical transformations has been particularly useful is where there is no contemporary structural element evident which is even comparable to one which formerly existed. For example, the contemporary viewer tends not to see the economic substructure of the family as being extant, much less having an influence on children.² The same comment applies to the effects of the economic substructure of urban structure. But historical analysis clearly shows in both cases
structural effects which isolate children.

In identifying major structural elements and mediations, tracing their genealogy to show key transformations and clarifying where possible structural interrelationships, I have accomplished the major methodological goals established in Chapter I. But pursuit of any methodology leads to the discovery of new methodological problems, or at the very least more questions. Since I have referred to the necessity of "analytical rigour" as the structuralist's substitute for statistical rigour in seeking validity for one's claims (see p. 34), it is essential to discuss factors which limited or threatened achievement of such rigour.

The first concerned the choice of the capitalist mode of production as the totality in question. While this choice enabled me to make use of a longer historical perspective than if the totality had been the Canadian social formation, and also avail myself of analysis of many countries in which the CMP was dominant, it created the constant possibility of using examples indiscriminantly, or of "forcing" a point (see p. 19). In one instance, I draw examples from precapitalist France, in the next from industrial England, then early 20th century United States, and then from six contemporary families in the city of Vancouver. While I am convinced that such usage has not been indiscriminate, I did not undertake to justify each example by stating that the country in question was at that point in time a bona fide example of a social formation dominated by a certain mode of production.

Related to this point is the fact that space did not permit more detailed discussion of finer differences between various social formations dominated by the CMP, especially as they relate to the central
theme of the isolation of children. For example, the private school system in England is remarkably different—primarily in extent—from that of Canada or the United States. The built form of many of the Western European inner cities is more amenable to children than in the United States or Canada, in terms of pedestrian and bicycle access and in historical preservation. Iatrogenic customs in Holland, France and the Scandinavian countries tend to be less isolating of the infant than those outlined for the United States (see pp. 149-150). As in the previous point, lack of acknowledgement of these differences can result in forcing the significance of certain points.

A related problem was to determine the exact status of the experiences and attitudes of the fieldwork families as a source of example. Although in Chapter I, I saw the fieldwork as one source of empirical data to be used in tracing connections between human experience and social processes (see p. 40), I did not determine its exact weight in relation to other empirical data, nor to structural analysis itself. In most cases in Chapters IV and V, information from the fieldwork was presented as "contemporary situations." The background profiles in Chapter II were considered adequate as contexts which could indicate the relative significance of the information presented, while at the same time providing a type of dynamic (conceived earlier as a sense of "project"; see pp. 77-79) that contained the possibility of future change. In some cases information from the fieldwork which seemed contrary to the main structural points being advanced was simply presented without suggesting that the structural elements required revision; it seemed more appropriate to talk in terms of "qualifying" or "adding
"insight" to the structural points advanced. To do otherwise would have lent too much authority to a fieldwork process which had few empirical pretensions.  

A broader problem relates to the extent of the analysis. The thesis explicitly dealt with the isolation of children, and thus accepted the category of child as a legitimate level of generalization. Clearly, the category of child could have been given greater specification by dealing with particular forms of isolation experienced by female as opposed to male children. Similarly, the analysis could have dealt with class differences, an approach to which Marxist structuralism would be well suited. While some indications of sex differences and class differences in terms of the isolation of children are given in the body of the thesis, it was felt that such elaboration would simply make the thesis too long. As noted in the discussion in Section I.4.1, there was also no attempt to make comparisons between isolation patterns between societies dominated by the CMP and ones dominated by a socialist mode of production. As explained in that section, the CMP was chosen as a totality to reflect the empirical data and analyses of children which were available, rather than to suggest an exclusive and direct association between the CMP and the isolation of children.

A final concern in terms of analytic rigour has to do with the adequacy of the critique of previous categories or concepts related to the central issue of this thesis. This epistemological issue was raised at several points in Chapter I (see pp. 21-22, 36) and was followed through in Sections IV.1 and V.1 concerning family and urban theories. Not surprisingly, the most successful dialectical critiques are generally
those of works which deal with the same topic as that of the individual
offering the critique. For example, throughout Volume I of Capital,
Marx analyzes the work of previous political economists, building on
their successes, pointing out their errors. Lasch does the same regard-
ing family theory in Haven in a Heartless World. Parts of Harvey's
Social Justice in the City have the same power. The difficulty encoun-
tered in this thesis was that few writers have written on the isolation
of children in urban areas of capitalist society, and none have done so
from a structuralist perspective. It was therefore difficult to engage
previous writers "head-on" in any coherent dialectical critique. Instead,
a general review of various types of literature was undertaken to trace
a historical dialectic of "how we got to" the point of producing this
particular piece of knowledge (that is, this thesis). While this was
perhaps less than what was originally anticipated, it was the only feas-
ible way of dealing with the problem.

In summary, I suggest that the particular nature of a structural
and dialectical inquiry is such that the argument is not concisely
recapitulated. I have outlined the main characterizations of the iso-
ation of children in urban areas of social formations dominated by the
capitalist mode of production, and identified the shifting locus of
transformations within various structures. Finally, following from the
point made in Chapter II that analytical rigour is one of the main con-
cerns in a structural methodology, I have attempted to clarify the areas
in which rigour was problematical.
NOTES, CHAPTER VI


2 As shown in Section IV.1.2, this probably is why American sociology has tended to focus on the affective functions of the family, thus ignoring other structural dimensions.

3 It can, of course, be argued that by not granting a lot of authority to the fieldwork process, one can retreat into a structural analysis which forces empirical information into a predetermined mould. In Sartre's terms, this would constitute an over-reliance on regressive analysis (see p. 40).

4 For example, for sex differences in play and fantasy, see p. 253; for class differences in neighbourhood containment, see pp. 237-241 and regarding schooling, pp. 157-158.
SELECTED OF FAMILIES

I was originally faced with several ways of selecting the families for this study, all of which were limiting from one perspective or another. It was tempting to select a range of families which showed either ecological breadth (that is, were drawn from various points in a rural to urban continuum) or economic diversity (from high to low income, or professional to labourer occupational range). The main purpose, however, was to study the lived experiences of the families in sufficient depth, richness and concreteness that they could serve as a basis from which to trace connections with processes at the level of family and urban structure. I could not have fulfilled this purpose and at the same time have developed a sample size sufficient to cover a large number of socio-economic variables, without running into severe time and energy constraints.

I decided instead to choose six families from the same general area (Mount Pleasant) of Vancouver (see Fig. 16). The vehicle for selection of the families was a community recreation centre. Initial contact was made by the recreation director with families that had used the centre in the previous year. The only "variables" involved were that the children had to be between the ages of six and twelve; an age and sex mix was attempted within that range; and different sized families (from
FIGURE 16: Map of fieldwork study area.
The shaded area is the combined range most normally covered on foot or bicycle by the thirteen children in the study, as indicated by their weekly diaries, expeditions, favourite places maps and the author's interviews with their parents.
one to four children) were desired. The recreation director phoned a list of families which met these criteria and outlined the nature and purpose of the study and the time commitment involved. If the family was receptive, I was given their telephone number and I explained the study in greater depth. I then arranged a personal meeting to answer any questions prior to the final commitment to the study. Most families were surprisingly receptive considering the time commitment involved (about twelve to fifteen hours of interviews with the parents). Only two families declined when the recreation director phoned, and two when I phoned. After this initial contact, neither the recreation director nor his staff were involved in the study in any way.

All of the families interviewed were two-parent families; only Ms. and Mr. Smith were unmarried. The parents in the Naipaul, Ross, Miklos and Schneider families were born and raised outside of Canada. The parents in the Smith and Jones families were Canadian born and raised. None of the children had grandparents who were living in British Columbia. Naturally the lack of single parent families and high number of families of non-Canadian origin created biases, but as noted above, there was little pretense of developing a "representative" sample. The lack of grandparents was more regrettable, because I had originally hoped to interview some grandparents about their childhood experiences.

As can be gathered from the family profiles in Chapter III, of the six families, two had one child, two had two, one had three, and the last had four. (The oldest girl in the Ross family was thirteen. She was interviewed to keep the family "intact." ) The sample comprised seven boys and six girls. There were three children aged seven, two aged eight,
two aged ten, one aged eleven, two aged twelve and one aged thirteen. In this respect the families interviewed contained the balance originally desired.

**INTERVIEW PROCEDURES**

All interviews were undertaken between July and September of 1979. The expeditions (described in this section) and other contacts with the children were undertaken in July and August. Those two months were completely rain-free, so the weekly diaries and activities reveal little about the effects of Vancouver's usually rainy climate for nine months of the year. Four procedures were undertaken with the children:

1. *A week's diary* was compiled in which the children traced their daily activities on a large scale street map of their area. Maps for each child were provided by the author after discussion with the parents of the approximate range of the child. The maps were therefore different for each child, although they were all on the same scale. A different map was used for each day, and activities by bus, foot, bicycle, car and skateboard (which became necessary) were colour coded. For each day, a sheet was also filled out detailing the nature of the activities, where they took place, and who else (friends, siblings, parents) were involved. Where necessary, parents helped record and trace each day's activities.

2. *An expedition* was taken with each child to their "favourite places." This expedition was usually by bike (by choice of the child). It afforded me a first-hand view of the child's spatial preferences, as well as a sense of how he or she navigated the terrain. Favourite places that were too far to be reached (out of a child's habitual range) were
simply recorded and discussed.

At each location the child took a Polaroid photograph of the place (unless he or she for some reason wanted to be in the picture). Usually at each place, but sometimes upon returning from the expedition, the children were asked a series of questions about their use of and reason for preference of the place (see Appendix 2). They were also asked to rank their preference of the places using the photographs.

The use of Polaroid photographs and the fact that they were taken by the children has meant a distinct loss of quality in terms of presentation for this thesis. This problem was more than offset in my opinion by the fact that the children enjoyed the process of picture-taking and the instant results. They were therefore relaxed and interested during the expedition. Furthermore, I was able to discuss the photographs immediately after the expedition, while it was still clear in their memories.

These expeditions usually took a half-day per child, although no formal time limit was mentioned.

3. Drawings were made of favourite indoor and outdoor places, as well as of an "ideal," "fantasy," "best possible," "fun" or "dream" house. The drawings were then discussed with each child for clarification of their contents. No examples of the outdoor favourite places are given in Chapter V, as they were almost identical to the places in the photographs.

4. General questions regarding likes and dislikes of the indoors and outdoors were asked of each child (see Appendix 2). This was usually done at the end of the expedition.
The only procedure with the parents was the use of a personal interview (see questions, Appendix 3). All interviews were open to both parents, although only in the Ross and Jones families was the husband in fact present. In these cases, I noted who was responding to the question. Husbands were interviewed for the questions concerning work and their own family history. In all other cases, except those noted, the woman was the respondent. Children were not involved in the interviews. In several cases they were present in the house, and occasionally found excuses to come into the room where the interview was taking place (on one occasion G10 in the Miklos family tried to "spy" on the interview!)

The total time of the interviews was between twelve and fifteen hours per family, and was spread out over five to seven actual meetings. The format of the interviews was relaxed. Parents who so desired were shown all of the questions in advance so they could reflect on the issues. Although I asked each family all questions in Appendix 3, there were frequent diversions to explore side issues when this seemed appropriate. I wrote their responses in long hand, usually in note form, but often wrote potential quotes in full.

Questions in Part One of the interview related primarily to the children's and parents' use of place, and were therefore substance for the discussion of urban structure. Questions in Part Two related more (but not exclusively) to social issues, and were primarily intended for the discussion of family structure. In addition to various questions throughout the interview, the last section of Part Two ("Parents' Childhood") was more specifically intended for the family profiles.
APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONS ASKED THE CHILDREN

1. Concerning the favourite places visited on the expedition (and farther afield):
   
   A. 1. Tell me about this place.
       2. How do you usually feel when you are here?
       3. What do you like about it here?
       4. Why do you usually come to this place?
       5. Do you come with anyone else to this place? Who?
   
   B. 1. Are there any places apart from your house where you really feel like you belong or feel really comfortable?
       2. Which places do you most like to be in when you are alone?
       3. What are your favourite places outside of (the area of the study)? Tell me about them.
       4. If you won a competition and could live anywhere in the world, where would you live? Can you tell me what this place looks like?

2. Concerning favourite places generally, and likes and dislikes:

   1. What are your favourite places to go after school?
   2. What are your favourite places to go on the weekends?
   3. What is the farthest distance you have travelled without an adult?
   4. Are there any places you are not allowed to go?
   5. Why are you forbidden to go to these places?
   6. What do you like about the outdoors? Indoors?
   7. What do you dislike about the outdoors? Indoors?
   8. What would you like to see added or changed about the outdoors? Indoors? Why?
   9. Are there places you do not feel welcome because you are a child? How do these places or people in these places make you feel unwelcome?
APPENDIX 3

PARENTS' INTERVIEW

PART ONE

1. Parental knowledge of child's activities

   a) Are there any places your child considers his/her own?
      —what does s(he) do there?
      —how does s(he) let other people know s(he) thinks it
         his/her place?
      —does s(he) let other people go there? Who?
   b) Are there other places your child is especially attached to,
      or which are precious to him/her?
   c) Any places s(he) goes to when s(he) wants to be alone?
   d) Are there places your child is frightened or afraid of?
   e) Are there places your child actively dislikes?
   f) Are there places your child feels unwelcome?
   g) What places does your child play at most?

   where  how often  usual activities  who with

   summer
   winter
   night
   day

   Probe re more specific locations: sidewalks, playgrounds, etc.

2. Attitude towards and rules about range

   a) What places do you allow your child to go alone without asking
      permission each time from you? (use outline map)
      —any different on a bicycle? (where appropriate)
b) What places with a child of the same age?
   —any different on a bicycle?
c) What places with older children?

   place who with age

d) Are these rules followed by your child?
e) Why do you limit your child's range?
   Probe: both parents the same?
   changes necessary to extend range?
f) Do you worry about your child getting lost?
   —does this influence range limits?
g) What areas do you believe s/he knows well enough to be able
   to return home by him/herself without getting lost?
h) Are there places in this area which you consider dangerous
   or unsafe for your child? Elsewhere in Vancouver?
i) Of the places in #lg) which do you most like him/her to play
   at? (check)
j) Of the places in #lg) which do you least like him/her to play
   at? (cross)
k) Do you have rules about time of day or night your child can go
   out at all? (e.g., mealtimes, dusk, etc.)

3. INCLUSION/EXCLUSION: activities, attitudes, rules

   A. OUTSIDE of the home

   a) What places does the child frequently visit with you?

      child's your why
      where how how often purpose activity activity together

   Probe: —restaurants, cultural activities, commercial,
   recreational, place of work, social visits
   —do you like this activity? dislike? why?
   —does your child like the activity? dislike? why?
   —change over time in nature of activities since
   birth of child (in general category of place
   rather than particular places)
   —value, if any, for child to accompany adult to
   these places; harm?

   b) What places do you seldom or never take your child?

      where parent's activity why no child

   Probe: places child would like to go but may not
   potential value or harm to child in these places
c) Are there places in Vancouver (or Lower Mainland) which you occasionally visit with your child which you think have special value for him/her?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>place</th>
<th>how frequently</th>
<th>purpose</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Probe: response of child (does child perceive value?)
places you would like to go with child but can't; reason?

d) Does your child ever visit you at your place(s) of work? (or do you take him/her there?)

Probe: frequency
reason for child coming
what does child do?
child like/dislike going there?
do you like/dislike it?
what do you do when child there?
attitude of co-workers (if applicable)?
difficulties/advantages (if any)?
does child telephone to work? do you telephone from work?

e) What places outside of Vancouver has your child visited with you or with others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>place</th>
<th>how many times</th>
<th>purpose</th>
<th>who with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Probe: vacations, child's activities, any change in parent-child interaction in new setting, perceived benefit/harm to child

f) Do you ever take your child to play with other children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ages of other</th>
<th>do you</th>
<th>why/why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

where who with children frequency activity stay not stay

Probe: why take child?

g) Do other parents ever bring children here to play with your child? (or do you collect other children to come here to play?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>where from</th>
<th>who</th>
<th>how often stay activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Probe: why children brought
h) Do you have rules about certain children or adults that your child cannot visit, or rules that limit their visits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>who</th>
<th>nature of rule</th>
<th>why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

_Probe:_ does child obey rules?

B. _INSIDE_ the home

a) When your child plays in the house, in which room(s) does most of her/his activity take place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nature of activity</th>
<th>with major place</th>
<th>with secondary place</th>
<th>with tertiary place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

_Probe:_ change over time? (i.e., child's age)
- night/day, seasonal change?
- specific special activities: e.g., music, painting, reading, T.V., games

b) Are any rooms "off bounds" to the child at particular times or for particular reasons?

_Probe:_ is there a 'best room'? 
- what if child dirty?
- with toys? tricycle, etc.?
- play with friends?
- child permitted access to bathroom if sibling or parents there?
- parents' bedroom? siblings' bedroom (if not shared)
- in apartment: corridor? elevator? lobby?

_Probe also:_
- reasons?
- transgressions punished?
- change over time (child's age)?
- seasonal variation?

c) Are there "things" which are "off bounds" to the child for particular reasons? at particular times?

_Probe:_ stereo set, T.V. plants, flowers
- kitchen implements furniture, medicine cabinet
- stove inside of car
- liquor cabinet —reasons?
- parents' belongings —transgressions punished?
- ornaments, heirlooms —changed access over time (child's age)
d) Do you have rules about noise?

rules          when          why

e) When you have adult friends at your home for a social visit, does your child participate as well?

Probe: frequency of visits, time of day, seasonal variations, type of visit, people involved (neighbours, relatives) nature of child's participation interest of child in occasion? of other adults in child? any measures by parent to include child? does your child participate in similar social visits to other adults' houses? if child "banished" from such visits: what does s(he) do? where does s(he) play? how does s(he) react?

f) Where do you spend most of your time in the house?

nature of          with          with
major place       with adult      with
secondary         activity        children
tertiary

Probe: mainly concerned with relaxation, non-specific time; perhaps probe night/day differences, seasonal variations

g) If you could redesign your house (apt.), which room would you enlarge first? (if any); second?

Probe: why? (concerned with general family use vs. individual activity or small group activity)

h) Are there any other structural alterations you would make to the house (apt.) if you could? why?

e.g., combining rooms, putting up walls, balcony

i) If not already covered in Question #1 for indoors: Do you have rules about privacy for the child?

Probe: do you encourage a child's own space?

   e.g., do you knock before entering child's room? bathroom? what if the child says "don't come in"?
j) Do you use 'isolation' as a means of punishment?

  where
  circumstances  isolated to  why  effect

  Probe: better/worse than other methods?
  other methods used?
  difference between spouses
  philosophy re methods

k) (If siblings and/or parents share room with child)
What do you think are the effects on the child of sharing rooms?
  Probe: good/bad effects: consider age, sex, activities,
  night/day
  are there ways that you try to reinforce the privacy
  of the child/sibling/parent, given that the room is
  shared?
PARENT INTERVIEW

PART TWO

1. Communications

A. Television

1. Do you have a television set?
   —if not, why not; if so, why?
   —if yes, more than one set? why?
   —how long have you had television?

2. Do you have any rules about what, when or how much the child(ren) can watch? Reasons?
   Probe: are children forbidden from watching shows the parents watch?
   why?

3a) How much and what do(es) the child(ren) watch?
b) How much and what do you watch?
   Probe: summer/winter
       mornings, afternoons, evenings
       weekends
       at friends (re children)

4. What do you like about T.V. in relation to your child(ren)?
   Probe: learning tool? good programs? what does it teach them?
       keep kids out of your hair?

5. What do you dislike about T.V. in relation to your child(ren)?
   Probe: violence? role modelling? replacement of other activities? passivity?

6. Interaction around T.V. programs and watching
   a) Of the programs in 3a) and 3b), do you watch many T.V.
      shows together with your children?
      —what types? why together?
b) Do you discuss the contents of T.V. shows with your children?
Probe: examples of discussions?
regularly? seldom?
who initiates discussion?
do you watch with the intention of discussion?
do children come to you because disturbed, frightened or enthusiastic about shows? why?
do children discuss shows with spouse?
do children discuss shows between selves or friends? is discussion usually before, during or after shows?

c) Do you look for good programs for kids to watch?
e.g., in T.V. Guide or reviews.

d) Do(es) your child(ren) do other things while watching T.V. (as a rule)?
e.g., talking, playing, etc.
—activity vary with types of program?

B. Radio

1. What do you listen to on radio? when? (time of day)
—are certain programs better or different from T.V.?
2. What do your child(ren) listen to on radio? When?
3. Do you have rules for your child(ren) about radio listening?
—explain.
4. Do you ever listen to radio together?
Probe: deliberately or coincidentally?
ever discuss programs? e.g.?

C. Telephone

1. Do you have any limitations on your children's use of the telephone?

when to whom why
—how long are their calls on average? (nature of variation?)

2. Do your children know how to use the phone book? Do they ever use it as a resource?
do they ever make calls other than social calls? (e.g., to library, store, etc.)
do they ever make long distance calls?

D. Reading

1. Newspapers: do you have regular subscriptions? to what?
—what do you read in the papers? spouse? children?
ever discuss articles together? e.g.?
—child(ren) have individual subscriptions? or purchase separately?
2. Magazines: same questions

3. Books:
   a) what and how much do child(ren) read, apart from school-work?
   b) where do they get books?
      —school, bookstore, library
   c) what sorts of things do you read? spouse?
   d) do you ever go to the library together with your child(ren)?
      —do children go alone?
      —frequency in either case
      —if not, why not?
   e) do you ever discuss the books they read with them?
      —who initiates? e.g.?
   f) do children discuss books between selves?

4. Comics:
   a) what and how much read by child(ren)?
   b) do you read them? what? how much?
   c) do you discuss contents with child? discourage? encourage?
      —any restrictions?

E. Records/tapes

   1. Do you have a stereo? record player? cassette recorder?
   2. What do you listen to? Frequency?
   3. What do(es) the child(ren) listen to? Frequency?
   4. Do you like their musical tastes? Why/why not?
   5. Do you have rules about their listening to music?
   6. Do you listen to music together? Discuss music together?

2. Learning situations

A. Family learning/interaction

   1. Do you set aside particular times to be with, play with or talk with your children?
      —when? usual activity?

      a) If times are not "set aside", when are your 'best times' with your children?
      Probe: mealtime? after school? )
      time of day? week? ) why is this a season?
      ) 'best time'?
      who initiates these times? what happens?
      do they involve the family as a whole, or primarily one to one situations (i.e., one child, one parent)
      do you have particular family projects, hobbies or activities that occur then, or are they mainly spontaneous discussions or activities?
2. Do you feel there are certain things you are responsible for teaching your children, or which you would like to teach your children?  
*Probe:* values?  
beliefs?  
knowledge—particular skills, sex information, socialization skills, outdoor skills, health information.  

Is your house or yard in any way designed or modified to help teach skills, assist family communications, or for the child to develop abilities on own?  

3. What resources (if any) do you draw upon to assist you in teaching your child the things mentioned in #2?  
*Probe:* church, relatives, travel, recreation, community centers, neighbours, work associates, social workers, books  

4. Do you ever take courses (e.g., night school), attend lectures (e.g., church or community center) or read books consciously to assist you in being a "good" parent?  
—e.g.?  

5. Do you think it is good or bad—or does it make any difference—to express anger towards or in front of (e.g., quarrelling with spouse) your child(ren)? Do you ever cry in front of your children? Do you explain the reason for your tears or anger?  

6. Do you ever send your child(ren) out of the room when discussing family matters with your spouse?  
—type of situation (e.g., financial)? reason?  

7. Do you share or hide your feelings (especially negative or critical) about other people with your children?  
*Probe:* about adults  
about children's friends  
reason for sharing or hiding  

8. What would you call a:  
good home?  
good parent?  
good child?  

B. School learning  

1. Do you feel there are things schools teach your children which you are not able to teach?  
—e.g.?
2. What does your child learn at school which you think is good (or helpful or positive)?

3. What does your child learn at school which you think is bad (or unhelpful or negative)?

4. Do you ever think the school a) undermines, or b) reinforces your authority, your ability to communicate, or your value system concerning the child? —e.g.?

5. Do you ever discuss your child's progress, or particular events or happenings concerning your child, with his/her teacher?
   Probe: examples? frequency?
   who initiates this contact?
   ever quarrel or disagree with the school re your child?
   —about what? consequences?
   are you involved in PTA or other community-school groups?
   —nature of involvement?

6. Do you ever assist your child with homework or projects, or discuss them with him/her?
   Probe: examples
   who initiates contact? why?
   does child like assistance? resent it?

7. Have you ever taken a particular course in order to assist your child with his/her schoolwork?
   —nature of course

8. Do you ever attend school activities or performances in which your child is involved? Or simply go to school performances with your child?
   Probe: examples? frequency?
   child ask you to come? like it? resent it?

C. Peer learning

1. Are there things that your child's friends teach him/her that you either can't or don't, but which you consider good or positive?
   Probe: examples?
   from children his/her age? younger? older? same sex?
   when, where taught?
2. Does your child learn negative things from other children?  
*Same probe*

3. Which of your child(ren)'s peers are the most valuable to him/her?  
*Probe:* location
    relation if any
    age, sex
    why valuable

4. What, if anything, do you think your child learns from play activities with her/his friends?  
  —Examples?

**D. Learning from other adults**

1. Apart from you and your spouse, what other adults does your child learn from, and in what way?  
   *Probe:* relatives, church people, social worker, recreation people, neighbours
   informal or formal learning

2. Do you encourage your child(ren)'s contact with other adults, especially those in a non-institutional setting (i.e., more casual contacts)?  
  —why/why not?

3. What sort (if any) of caution do you advise your children to take in their contacts with adult strangers?

4. Have you ever sought the assistance of a counsellor, recreation director, neighbour or other such person in dealing with learning needs (non-school) of your child?  
  —Specify; was it useful?

**E. Self-learning**

1. What types of solitary activity does your child engage in?  
   e.g., reading, quiet reflection, walks, exploring environment, 'just sitting around', T.V. watching

   Are there particular times when s(he) engages in this type of activity more than others?  
   —mornings, evenings; after a 'big day', rainy/sunny  
   —frequency of this type of activity

2. Do you think s(he) learns anything when alone like this?  
   —if so, what?  
   —if not, what do you see as the function (if any) of this type of activity?
3. Do you encourage his/her learning by him/herself?
   — why/why not?
   — if so, how?

4. Do you try to enlarge your child's resources for self-learning?
   — in what way?
   — e.g., going to library, getting tapes, etc.

F. General

1. All in all, which of the following do you think are the sources of your child(ren)'s most important learning experiences?
   — the family?
   — the school?
   — his/her friends?
   — him/herself?
   — the media?
   — relatives?
   — other adults?
   — community organizations?
   Probe: why are they the most important experiences?
   are you satisfied with this order of importance?
   — if not, why not?

2. At what stages were you and your spouse most involved and interested in your child's development? (distinguish between interest and involvement)

   0-2 yrs  3-5 yrs  6-9 yrs  10-12 yrs
   spouse
   you

3. City living/neighbourhood/community/mobility (moving)

1. Outline the major places you have lived in since you were married, prior to moving into this house.

   place               how long there       why moved away

2. (If moved after children born) Did any of your moves seem to affect the child(ren)?
   Probe: effect
   how manifested? how adjusted? how long to adjust?
   what did you do about it?
   — conversations, preparations, compensation
   do you expect to move again? where? when? why?
3. On the accompanying map, outline the area you consider to be 'your neighbourhood'
   —with whom do you have social contacts in this neighbourhood? (pinpoint on map)
   —nature of contact? frequency?
   —which, if any, of these contacts are parents of your child-(ren)'s friends? (show on map)
   —did you come to know these adults through your child, or vice versa?

4. Widening your area to include Greater Vancouver, can you pinpoint your major social contacts (friends and/or relatives) on this map? (maximum of ten)
   —frequency of contact per month; nature of contact
   —which of them have children?
   —are these children friends of your children?

5. Is (the area in which the respondents lived) a good community to raise a child in?
   a) why/why not?
   b) what are the major advantages/disadvantages of raising a child here?
   c) would you prefer to be in another community? —why/why not? if so, where?
   d) do you intend to move to another community? —where? when?

6. Why do you live in the city rather than the country? Why in (the area in which the respondents live) (if not already evident)?

7. What are the advantages of city living in terms of raising a child?

8. What are the disadvantages of city living in terms of raising a child?

9. Assuming you have to stay here or are staying here by choice, are there specific things you would like to see changed in this neighbourhood in terms of how they affect
   a) you?
   b) your child(ren)?
   in the city at large for
   a) you?
   b) your child(ren)?
4. Work/leisure and recreation

A. Paid work (both spouses if applicable)

1. a) What is your job?
   b) How long have you been doing it?
   c) Where were your previous jobs? (chronological order)

2. a) Where is your place of work (locate on map)
   b) How far is it to work from your home?
   c) How long does it take to get
      i) to work
      ii) from work
   d) What means of travel to/from work? route?

3. (If applicable) Are you active in your union?
   —position, time spent, nature of activities

4. a) What do you like about your work? dislike?
   Probe: hours, distance, nature of work, boss, co-workers,
   facilities, location (aesthetics), flexibility of
   schedule, union relations (if applicable), office
   or job politics

   b) Are there certain times when your job is more demanding
   than others?
   Probe: time of year or situation
   nature of demands
   —stress, work tempo
   —overtime
   effect on family life?

5. What do you typically do after coming home from work?
   i.e., any sort of routine?
   summer/winter difference?

6. Have you ever felt that your job positively or negatively
   affects your relation with your children?

   effects                   why
   positive
   negative

7. Have you been able to get around or avoid any of these
   negative effects?
   —e.g., time off, flexible schedules, making up time, etc.

8. During the week, at what time of day do you have the most
   energy for relating to your children? the least energy?
   —what about the weekends?
9. What changes in your job would you ideally make that would benefit your family life?
—is there any discussion of these types of points either in your family, by management, co-workers or union?

10. (If husband or wife has worked previously but not now)
   a) When did you stop work? why?
   b) What types of previous work?
   c) Any intention to get back into the labour market? when? why?

B. Housework

1. Do you have a housework schedule?
   i.e., certain activities scheduled for certain days on a more or less regular basis
   —do you schedule certain times for activities with your children? (or see 2.A.1)

2. What sorts of technological conveniences do you have to help in your housework?
   —washer, dryer, dishwasher, freezer, vacuum cleaner, others?
   —are there certain things you are planning to get which would lessen your workload?
   —do you find that these conveniences do in fact save time?
   Do you find that you have actually transferred time to another activity (e.g., if you've recently bought an appliance)?

3. Do you have a car for your homemaking activities?
   —In either case, what effect does it have on what you do
   a) socializing or getting out
   b) shopping
   c) with the children

4. a) Do your children help with household activities?
   Probe: nature of activity
   sex differences? why?
   child like or dislike; why?
   child help with you or alone?

   b) In which of your activities do your children usually accompany you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activity</th>
<th>why accompany</th>
<th>child like/dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. a) Does your spouse share in housework?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nature of activity</th>
<th>why shared</th>
<th>effects (on child, father, mother)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   —who suggested sharing? how long ago?
b) Does your spouse share in childcare activities?

activity        why shared       effects (on all three)

— who suggested sharing? how long ago?

C. Recreation/leisure

1. What are your major outdoor recreational activities/hobbies? (stress activity)

   activity place weekday weekend alone with child

   with other adults organized summer/winter

2. Where are your favourite places to go for recreation in the Lower Mainland? (stress place)

   Use same table

3. What are your major indoor leisure activities?

   activity weekday/weekend alone with child

   with other adults summer/winter

4. What are your major types of leisure activity with your children? (stress with children)

   Use same table as #1 and 2 but add the following:

   activity    order in which       order in which
   activity initiates   you like activities   child likes activities

   who usually   order in which

   order in which

5. Why do you engage in leisure activities? What sort of meaning do they have for you?

   Probe: for own sake? (pleasure alone?)

   attempt to put

   antidote to work?

   a relative

   time with children?

   ranking of

   time with other adults?

   reasons provided

   time to self?

   by parent

   more meaningful than work?

   change to learn new things/skills?
5. About Children

A. Specific history and development

1. Birth Situation
   a) Hospital or home birth? spouse present?
   b) Were there any complications in delivery
      —induced labour; other drugs
      —caesarian
      —conscious?

2. Was your child breast or bottle fed? reason for decision?
   —if breast fed, how long?

3. Illness/medical
   a) Has your child ever had a major non-routine long-term
      illness or a major accident?
      —if so, what was the impact/effect in both the short and
      long term on
      i) the child (e.g., friendships, confidence, character,
         school, activities)
      ii) you
      iii) your spouse

4. Has your child always had his/her own room from birth? Reason?

5. Did your child go to daycare, have a regular babysitter (in
   place of daycare), or go to a pre-school when younger?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>where</th>
<th>reason</th>
<th>effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>daycare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babysitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   —how did you find out about these care situations, and what
   involvement, if any, did you have in them?

6. What grade has your child just finished?

7. Age of child now.

8. Do you think you have brought up your child in a specific
   manner because of his/her sex?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>difference</th>
<th>reason</th>
<th>effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. What were the most important toys or things you've given or made
   for your children, and when did you give them to them?

   | toy or thing | when given | why important |
10. What have been the three most important events in your child's life in making him/her the child he/she is today (for better or worse)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>event</th>
<th>when occurred</th>
<th>effect</th>
<th>why important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. How would you describe your child (as a person) to somebody who didn't know him or her?

12. What quality do you value (appreciate) most in your child?

13. What, if any, major mistakes, do you feel you've made with your child(ren)?

14. What are the things you are most proud of in the way you've raised your child? Why are you proud of this (why is it important to you)?

B. General

1. Why did you have (a) child(ren)?

2. Why did you have the number you've had?
   —any more children intended?

3. How would your life be different without children?
   positive               negative

4. Have you ever seriously regretted having children?

5. What things in your life have
   a) made it easiest
   b) hardest

   to be the type of parent you want to be?

6. If asked for advice, what would you say to your child(ren) about having children?
   —is this different from what you did?

6. Parents' Childhood

In both interviews I have asked all sorts of questions about your present life, your child's life and your relationship with your children. Considering all these questions, what would you say are the major similarities and differences between your childhood/parent situation and your present situation with your child?
Outline briefly:

a) when born, where brought up during first twelve years, 
nature of environment  
b) your parents' work situation  
c) major attitudinal differences and similarities between you 
   now and your parents (especially when they were parenting you)  
d) consider:  
   i. communications technology and interaction  
   ii. learning situations  
   iii. living situations—recreation, play, etc.
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