6

American Childhood as a Social and Cultural Construct

Steven Mintz

Not an unchanging, biologically determined stage of life, childhood is a social and cultural construct that varies by region, class, and historical era. Over the past four centuries, every aspect of childhood, including methods of child rearing; the nature of children's play; the duration of schooling; the participation of young people in work; and the demarcation points between childhood, adolescence, and adulthood have shifted significantly. This history provides an essential perspective on the questions of whether children's well-being has declined in recent years, whether children are growing up faster than in the past, and whether the United States is a particularly child-friendly country.

Today, Americans have a firm, although somewhat contradictory, conception of childhood. On the one hand, childhood is romanticized as a time of carefree innocence, when children should play freely, untouched by the cares of the adult world. But at the same time, many middle-class mothers and fathers engage in intensive parenting designed to stimulate their children's development. They buy them educational toys, involve them in a host of organized enrichment activities, and intensively read and talk to their children, in hopes of cultivating their talents and skills. Schools, too, now place greater emphasis on early academic achievement, and marketers are targeting children with an intensity previously reserved for adult consumers. Some observers fear that our society is taking the playfulness out of childhood.[1]

Childhood is not some unchanging, biologically determined stage of life. The whole concept of childhood is a social and cultural construct that varies by region, class, and historical era.[2] Over the past four centuries, almost all aspects of

childhood—including children's relationships with their parents and peers, their proportion in the population, and their paths toward adulthood—have changed dramatically. Societal views about methods of child rearing, the nature of children's play, the ideal duration of schooling, the participation of young people in work, and the demarcation points between childhood, adolescence, and adulthood have shifted significantly. In this article, I trace the changing concepts of childhood from early colonial America until today. I conclude by comparing the status of today's children with the status of those from the past.

Two centuries ago, the experience of youth was very different from what it is today. Segregation by age was far less prevalent, and chronological age played a smaller role in determining status. Adults were also far less likely to sentimentalize children as special creatures who were more innocent and vulnerable than adults.

Language itself illustrates how perceptions of childhood differed from those today. Two hundred years ago, the words used to describe stages of childhood were far less precise than those we now use. *Infancy* referred not to the first months after birth, but to the whole period when children were dependent on their mother, typically until the age of five or six. The words *childhood* and *youth* could refer to someone as young as five or as old as the early twenties.

In that era, Americans did not have a category for "adolescent" or "teenager." The vagueness of the broader term *youth* reflected how fluidly the stages of life were viewed in that era. Chronological age mattered less than physical strength, size, and maturity. Young people were not automatically granted full adult status upon reaching a certain societally agreed upon age. They became full adults only when they married and set up their own farm or entered a full-time trade or profession. In some cases that might be as early as the mid- or late teens, but usually it did not occur until the late twenties or even the early thirties.[3]

Although there were important regional differences in children's experiences, depending on the prevalence or paucity of slavery and indentured servitude in a given area, most seventeenth-century American colonists regarded children as "adults-in-training." It was recognized that children differed from adults in their mental, moral, and physical capabilities, and the colonists distinguished between childhood, an intermediate stage they called youth, and adulthood. But in colonial America, a parent's duty was to hurry the child toward adult status. Infants, being unable to stand or speak, were thought to lack two essential attributes of full humanity, and infancy was therefore regarded as a state of deficiency to be rushed through as quickly as possible. Parents discouraged infants from crawling, and placed them in "walking stools" to get them on their feet. Rods were affixed along the spines of very young children to encourage adult posture.

The goal was to get children speaking, reading, reasoning, and contributing to their family's economic well-being as quickly as possible. A key element in this process was early involvement in work, either within the parental home or outside as a servant or apprentice. Before the mid-eighteenth century, most adults exhibited surprisingly little interest in their children's very first years of life. Children's play was commonly dismissed as trivial and insignificant. In that era, adults rarely looked back on their childhood with nostalgia or fondness.

During the eighteenth century, a shift in parental attitudes took place. Fewer parents expected children to act as miniature adults, to bow or doff their hats in their parents' presence, or to stand during meals. Instead of addressing parents as "sir" and "madam," children began calling them "papa" and "mama."

By the end of the eighteenth century, furniture specifically designed for children was being widely produced. Painted in pastel colors and decorated with pictures of animals or figures from nursery rhymes, the new furniture reflected a growing popular notion of childhood as a time of innocence and playfulness.

Parents began to regard children not as incomplete adults but as innocent, malleable, and fragile creatures who needed to be sheltered from contamination. Childhood came to be seen not simply as a prelude to adulthood but as a separate stage of life that required special care and institutions to protect it.

By the early nineteenth century, mothers in the rapidly expanding middle class in the Northeastern states were embracing an amalgam of child-rearing ideas. From Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Romantic poets, middle-class parents acquired the idea that childhood was a special stage of life, intimately connected with nature, and purer and morally superior to adulthood. From the philosopher John Locke, they took the notion that children were highly malleable creatures and that a republican form of government required parents to instill a capacity for self-government in their offspring. From evangelical Protestants, the middle class adopted the idea that parents must implant proper moral character in children and insulate them from the corruptions of the adult world.

Behind these developments was a growing belief that childhood should be devoted to education and building character as well as play. Middle-class children were no longer sent out to work at an early age, but parents began to believe that their children's play should foster their moral growth. Because parents in the emerging middle class could not automatically transfer their societal status to their children through bequests of family lands, transmission of craft skills, or selection of a marriage partner, they adopted new strategies to give their children a boost by limiting the number of their offspring through birth control and prolonging the transition to adulthood through intensive maternal nurturing and extended schooling.

Over time, the concept of childhood became divided into much more precise, uniform, and prescriptive stages. Adults began to hold much more rigid views about what was appropriate at each stage. By the mid-nineteenth century, informal patterns of child rearing were being supplanted by more structured forms. Schools began to follow prescribed grade-specific curricula. Adult-sponsored and adult-organized activities began replacing activities that young people organized informally on their own.

The dramatic reduction in the birthrate over the past two centuries also altered the concept of childhood. In the mid-nineteenth century, children made up fully one-half of the population. By 1900 their proportion had declined to one-third of the population. As parents had fewer children and had them over a shorter time span, families became more clearly divided into distinct generations, and parents had the opportunity to lavish more time, attention, and resources on each child.

Yet until the early twentieth century, there was still a high degree of diversity in the experience of childhood, based on social class, gender, and race, and accentuated by the rapid and uneven expansion of industrial capitalism. The children of the urban middle class, prosperous commercial farmers, and southern planters enjoyed increasingly long childhoods and were free from major household or work responsibilities until their late teens or twenties. But the offspring of urban workers, frontier farmers, and blacks, both slave and free, had briefer childhoods and became involved in work inside or outside the home before they reached their teens.

Urban working-class children often contributed to the family economy through scavenging and collecting coal, wood, and other items that could be used at home or sold, or by taking part in the street trades, selling gum, peanuts, newspapers, and the like. In industrial towns, young people under the age of fifteen contributed on average about 20 percent of their family's income. In mining areas, boys as young as ten began working in the pits as breakers, separating coal from slate and wood, and then graduated into full-fledged miners in their mid- or late teens.

On farms, children as young as five might pull weeds or keep birds and cattle away from crops. By the age of eight, many were tending the livestock, and as they grew older they milked cows, churned butter, fed chickens, collected eggs, hauled water, scrubbed laundry, and harvested crops. A blurring of gender duties among children and youth was especially common on frontier farms.

Schooling in the nineteenth century varied as widely as did work routines. In the rural North, the Midwest, and the Far West, most mid- and late-nineteenth-century students attended one-room schools for three to six months a year. But city children spent nine months a year attending age-graded classes, taught by

professional teachers. In rural and urban areas, girls generally received more schooling than boys.[4]

As the nineteenth century drew to an end, middle-class parents were starting to embrace the idea that child rearing should be scientific. Through the Child Study movement, teachers and mothers, under the direction of psychologists, identified a series of stages of child development, culminating in the "discovery"—more accurately the invention—of adolescence, a period marked by emotional and psychological turmoil tied to the biological changes associated with puberty. Within the middle class, acceptance of the concept of scientific parenting was reflected in young people's remaining longer within the parental home and spending longer periods in formal schooling.

The attempt to apply scientific principles to the care of children produced new kinds of child-rearing manuals, now written by doctors and psychologists rather than ministers, as had previously been the case. The most influential manual was Dr. Luther Emmett Holt's *The Care and Feeding of Children*, first published in 1894. In an era when a well-adjusted adult was viewed as a creature of habit and self-control, Holt stressed the importance of imposing regular habits on infants by rigidly scheduling a child's feeding, bathing, sleeping, and bowel movements. He also advised mothers to guard vigilantly against germs and to avoid undue stimulation of infants—for example, by kissing their babies. Holt also advised parents to ignore their baby's crying and to break such habits as thumb sucking.[5]

At about the same time, self-described "child-savers" launched a concerted campaign to universalize the middle-class model of childhood, in which childhood was defined as a period during which young people should be insulated from the stresses and corrupting influences of the adult world and free from adult-like responsibilities. Trying to universalize the modern ideal of a sheltered childhood without regard to a child's class, ethnicity, gender, and race was a highly uneven process and to this day has never encompassed all American children.

But by the early twentieth century, the middle-class conception of "modern childhood" had generally been accepted as the societal norm, although progress was slow and bitterly resisted. Child labor was not finally outlawed until the 1930s, and not until the 1950s did high school attendance become a universal experience.

During the 1920s and 1930s, the field of child psychology exerted a growing influence on middle-class parenting. It provided a new language to describe children's emotional problems. Concepts like sibling rivalry, inferiority complexes, phobias, maladjustment, and Oedipus complexes gained wide acceptance. Child psychology also offered new insights into the effects of different styles of parenting, such as demanding and permissive forms. It categorized the stages and

milestones of children's development and the characteristics of children at particular ages. This was when, for example, the phrase "terrible twos" was coined.

The growing prosperity of the 1920s made the late-nineteenth-century emphasis on rigid self-control and regularity seem outmoded. The new model for a well-adjusted adult was a more easygoing figure who was capable of enjoying leisure. There was a reaction against the mechanistic and behaviorist notion that children's behavior should and could be molded by scientific control. Popular dispensers of advice now advocated a more relaxed approach to child rearing, emphasizing the importance of meeting the emotional needs of babies. The title of a 1936 book by pediatrician C. Anderson Aldrich—*Babies Are Human Beings*—summed up the new attitude.[6]

The stresses and uncertainties of the Great Depression of the 1930s and World War II made parents much more anxious about child rearing. In the postwar era, many psychologists asserted that faulty mothering was the cause of lasting psychological problems in children. Leading psychologists such as Theodore Lidz, Irving Bieber, and Erik Erikson linked schizophrenia, homosexuality, and identity diffusion to mothers who displaced their frustrations and their needs for independence onto their children.

Many psychologists worried that boys, being raised almost exclusively by women, might fail to develop an appropriate sex-role identity. In retrospect, these fears reflected the fact that mothers were playing a much more exclusive role in raising their children than ever before in American history.[7]

By the 1950s, developments were already under way that would bring down the curtain on "modern childhood" and replace it with something we might call "postmodern childhood." Postmodern childhood is a product of radical changes in society that led in the space of just over thirty years to the breakdown of dominant norms regarding the family, gender expectations, age, and even reproduction (see Coontz in Chapter 5 of this volume).

Children today grow up under different circumstances than their immediate predecessors. They are more likely to experience their parents' divorce. They are more likely to have a working mother and to spend significant amounts of time unsupervised by adults. They are more likely to grow up without siblings. They are more likely to hold a job during high school.

Age norms once considered "natural" have been thrown into question. Even the bedrock biological process of sexual maturation has accelerated. Adolescent girls today, for example, enter puberty at an earlier age and are much more likely to have sexual relations during their mid-teens than their peers did a half century ago.[8]

While society still assumes that the young are fundamentally different from adults—that they should spend their first eighteen years in the parental home

and should devote their time to education in age-graded schools—it is also clear that basic aspects of the ideal of a protected childhood, in which the young are kept isolated from adult realities, have broken down.[9] Postmodern children are independent consumers and participate in a separate, semiautonomous youth culture. Adults quite rightly assume that even preadolescents know a great deal about the realities of the adult world.

Since the early 1970s, a variety of factors have contributed to a surge in the scope and intensity of parental anxieties about child rearing. As parents had fewer children, they invested more emotional energy in each child. Greater professional expertise about children, coupled with a proliferation of research and advocacy organizations, media outlets, and government agencies responsible for children's health and safety, made parents more aware of threats to children's well-being. Many middle-class parents responded by trying to protect their children from every imaginable harm by baby-proofing their homes, using car seats, requiring bicycle helmets, and the like—things unknown a generation earlier.

Middle-class parents also worried that their offspring might underperform compared to peers and looked for ways to maximize their children's physical, social, and intellectual development. The goal of postwar parents had been to raise normal children who fit in. Middle-class parents now try to give their child a competitive advantage, a trend spurred by fears of downward mobility and anxiety that parents may not be able to pass on their status and social class to their children (see Coleman in Chapter 24 of this volume).

Today we no longer see early childhood as a stage to be rushed through. Early childhood is viewed as the formative stage for later life. Society believes that children's experiences during the first two or three years of life mold their personality, lay the foundation for future cognitive and psychological development, and leave a lasting imprint on their emotional life. We also assume that children's development proceeds through a series of physical, psychological, social, and cognitive stages. It is accepted that even very young children have a capacity to learn, that play serves valuable developmental functions, and that growing up requires children to separate emotionally and psychologically from their parents.

There are, however, significant class differences in contemporary parenting practices, as sociologist Annette Lareau has shown (see the CCF Brief at the end of Chapter 31 of this volume). Working-class and poor mothers and fathers are much more likely to believe that child development occurs naturally and spontaneously. Unlike their middle-class counterparts, many working-class parents reject the notion that successful child rearing requires parents to actively stimulate their children's development by organizing their leisure activities, chauffeuring them to lessons, or supervising their homework.

Lareau has shown that middle-class parents spend more time in conversation with their children, read to them more often, employ a larger vocabulary, and are more likely to try to reason with their children rather than simply enforce rules. Middle-class parents are also more likely to place their children in adult-supervised enrichment activities, while children in working-class and poor families spend more time in free, unstructured play and are more likely to socialize with extended family.[10]

Although the middle-class ideal of child rearing has become the societal norm, social class remains a primary determinant of children's well-being.[11] In recent years, social conservatives have argued that family structure is a primary source of inequality in children's well-being, while political liberals tend to focus on ethnicity, race, and gender. But the most powerful predictor of children's welfare is, in fact, social and economic class. Economic distress contributes to family instability, inadequate health care, high degrees of mobility, and elevated levels of stress and depression.

As in the nineteenth century, social class significantly differentiates contemporary American childhoods. There is a vast difference between the highly pressured, hyperorganized, fast-track childhoods of affluent children and the very different kind of stressed childhoods experienced by the one-third of all children who live in poverty at some point before the age of eighteen.

In many affluent families, the boundaries between parental work and family life have blurred. Parents often try to cope by tightly organizing their children's lives. But most affluent children are unsupervised by their parents for large portions of the day and have their own television and computer, which gives them unmediated access to information. Many affluent families swing back and forth between parental distance from children caused by work pressures and parental indulgence as fathers and mothers try to compensate for parenting too little.

Meanwhile, one-sixth of all children live in poverty at any given time, including 36 percent of black children and 34 percent of Hispanic children. Children who live in poverty generally experience limited adult supervision, inferior schooling, and a lack of easy access to productive diversions and activities.

How does the status of children today compare with the past? Are children better off or worse off? This question has been of importance to every generation.

One of this country's oldest convictions is a belief in the decline of the younger generation. For more than three centuries, American adults have worried that children are growing ever more disobedient and disrespectful. In 1657, a Puritan minister, Ezekiel Rogers, lamented: "I find the greatest trouble and grief about the rising generation. . . . Much ado I have with my own family . . . the young breed doth much afflict me."[12]

But wistfulness about a golden age of childhood is invariably misleading. There has never been a golden age of childhood, when the overwhelming majority of American children have been well cared for and had idyllic lives. Nostalgia typically represents a yearning not for the past as it really was but rather for a whitewashed fantasy about the past.

In 1820, children constituted about half of the workers in the early factories. As recently as the 1940s, fewer than half of all high school students graduated. More than half a century ago, Alfred Kinsey's studies found rates of sexual abuse similar to those reported today. His interviews indicated that 12 percent of preadolescent girls had been the victims of exhibitionists and that 9 percent of girls had had their genitals fondled.

We also forget that the introduction of every new form of entertainment over the past century has been accompanied by dire warnings about its impact on children. The anxiety over video games and the Internet are only the latest in a long line of supposed threats to children that included television, movies, radio, and comic books.[13]

The danger of nostalgia is that it creates unrealistic expectations, guilt, and anger.[14] If we cling to a fantasy that once upon a time childhood and youth were years of carefree adventure, we have to ignore the fact that for most children in the past, growing up was anything but easy. Disease, death of a parent, family disruption, and early entry into the world of work were integral parts of family life. The notion of a long childhood, devoted to education and free from adult-like responsibilities, is a very recent invention, a product of the past century and a half, and one that only became a reality for a majority of children after World War II.

Another problem with nostalgia about childhood in the past is that it assumes that the family home was traditionally a haven and bastion of stability in an ever-changing world. Throughout American history, however, family stability has been the exception, not the norm. As late as the beginning of the twentieth century, fully one-third of all American children spent at least part of their childhood in a single-parent home, and as recently as 1940, one child in ten did not live with either parent—compared to one in twenty-five today.[15]

There have been genuine gains achieved in children's lives, such as the outlawing of child labor, the expansion of schooling, the growing awareness about the evils of child abuse. But the history of childhood has not been a story of steady, linear progress.

Each generation of children has had to wrestle with the specific social, political, and economic constraints of its own historical period. In our own time, the young have had to struggle with high rates of family instability, a growing disconnection from adults, and the expectation that all children should pursue the

same academic path at the same pace, even as the attainment of full adulthood recedes ever further into the future.

Profound class differences in children's experience persist and have even grown in salience over the past thirty years. Poor children grow up in an "ecology of poverty," characterized by substandard housing, inadequate schooling, deficient health care, unstable living arrangements, and limited access to decent child care. Many poor children are exposed to violence and have parents who suffer from depression stemming from erratic incomes and demanding work hours. In recent years, the gap between poor and working-class and affluent children in rates of attending four-year colleges has widened.[16]

Even for children of the middle class and the stably employed working class, American society is not as child-friendly as we might hope. Literary critic Daniel Kline persuasively suggests that contemporary American society subjects the young to three forms of psychological violence that we tend to ignore. First is the violence of expectations, in which children are pushed beyond their social, physical, and academic capabilities, largely as an expression of their parents' needs. Then there is the violence of labeling normal childish behavior (for example, childhood exuberance or interest in sex) as pathological. Third is the violence of representation, in which children and adolescents are exploited by advertisers, marketers, purveyors of popular culture, and politicians, who exploit parental anxieties as well as young peoples' desire to be stylish, independent, and defiant, and eroticize teenage and preadolescent girls.[17]

I believe there is a fourth form of psychological abuse: seeing children as objects to be shaped and molded for their own good. Contemporary American society is much more controlling of young people in an institutional and ideological sense than its predecessors. And as the baby-boom generation ages, American society has become increasingly adult-oriented, with fewer "free" spaces for the young, a society in which youth are primarily valued as service workers and consumers.

For more than three centuries, despite massive evidence to the contrary, America has considered itself to be an especially child-centered society. Yet in no other advanced country do so many young people grow up in poverty or without health care, nor does any other Western society provide so few resources for child care or restrict paid parental leave so stringently.

This paradox is not new. Since the early nineteenth century, the United States has developed a host of institutions specifically aimed at the young: the common school, the Sunday school, the orphanage, the house of refuge, the reformatory, the children's hospital, the juvenile court, and a wide variety of youth organizations. All were envisioned as caring, developmental, and educational institutions that would serve children's interests. In practice, however, they frequently end up being primarily custodial and disciplinary.

Many of the reforms that were supposed to help children were adopted in part because they served the needs, interests, and convenience of adults. The abolition of child labor removed competition from an overcrowded labor market. Separating children by age-based grades not only made it easier to handle children within schools, it also divided the young into convenient market segments.

The most important lesson that grows out of understanding the history of childhood is the simplest. While many fear that American society has changed too much, the sad fact is that it has changed too little. Americans have failed to adapt social institutions to new realities, to the fact that the young mature more rapidly than they did in the past, that most mothers of preschoolers now participate in the paid workforce, and that a near majority of children will spend substantial parts of their childhood in a single-parent, cohabitating-parent, or stepparent household.

As we navigate a new century of childhood, we need to pose new questions. How can we provide better care for the young, especially the one-sixth who are growing up in poverty? How can we better connect the worlds of adults and the young? How can we give the young more ways to demonstrate their growing competence and maturity? How can we tame a violence-laced, sex-saturated popular culture without undercutting a commitment to freedom and a respect for the free-floating world of fantasy?

Notes

1. Annette Lareau, *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).
2. Colin Heywood, *A History of Childhood: Children and Childhood in the West from Medieval to Modern Times* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2001); Joseph Illick, *American Childhood* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002); James A. Schultz, *The Knowledge of Childhood in the German Middle Ages, 1100–1350* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), p. 11.
3. Howard P. Chudacoff, *How Old Are You? Age Consciousness in American Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989); Joseph F. Kett, *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America* (New York: Basic, 1977).
4. Priscilla Clement, *Growing Pains: Children in the Industrial Age, 1850–1890* (New York: Twayne, 1997); David Nasaw, *Children in the City: At Work and at Play* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1985); Christine Stansell, *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1789–1860* (New York: Knopf, 1986).
5. Ann Hulbert, *Raising America: Experts, Parents, and a Century of Advice about Children* (New York: Knopf, 2003); Julia Grant, *Raising Baby by the Book: The Education of American Mothers* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).

6. Kathleen W. Jones, *Taming the Troublesome Child* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

7. Steven Mintz and Susan Kellogg, *Domestic Revolutions: A Social History of American Family Life* (New York: Free Press, 1988), p. 189.

8. On changes in the onset of sexual maturation, see Marcia E. Herman-Giddens et al., "Secondary Sexual Characteristics and Menses in Young Girls Seen in Office Practice: A Study from the Pediatric Research in Office Settings Network," *Pediatrics* 9, no. 4 (April 1997): 505–12. In 1890, the average age of menarche in the United States was estimated to be 14.8 years; by the 1990s, the average age had fallen to 12.5 (12.1 for African American girls and 12.8 for girls of northern European ancestry). According to the study, which tracked 17,000 girls to find out when they hit different markers of puberty, 15 percent of white girls and 48 percent of African American girls showed signs of breast development or pubic hair by age eight. For conflicting views on whether the age of menarche has fallen, see Lisa Belkin, "The Making of an 8-Year-Old Woman," *New York Times*, December 24, 2000; Gina Kolata, "Doubters Fault Theory Finding Earlier Puberty, " *New York Times*," February 20, 2001; Gina Kolata, "2 Endocrinology Groups Raise Doubt on Earlier Onset of Girls' Puberty," *New York Times*, March 3, 2001.

9. Stephen Robertson, "The Disappearance of Childhood," http://teaching.arts.usyd.edu.au/ history/2044/.

10. Lareau, *Unequal Childhoods* (2003).

11. David I. Macleod, *The Age of the Child: Children in America, 1890–1912* (New York: Twayne, 1998).

12. Rogers quoted in James Axtell, *The School Upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974), p. 28.

13. Hard as it is to believe, in 1951 a leading television critic decried the quality of children's television. Jack Gould, radio and TV critic for the *New York Times* from the late 1940s to 1972, complained that there was "nothing on science, seldom anything on the country's cultural heritage, no introduction to fine books, scant emphasis on the people of other lands, and little concern over hobbies and other things for children to do themselves besides watch television." *Chicago Sun Times*, August 9, 1998, p. 35.

14. Phil Scraton, ed., *"Childhood" in "Crisis"?* (London: University College of London Press, 1997), pp. 161, 164.

15. Richard Weissbourd, *The Vulnerable Child: What Really Hurts America's Children and What We Can Do about It* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1996), p. 48.

16. Ibid.

17. Daniel T. Kline, "Holding Therapy," March 7, 1998, History-Child-Family Listserv (history-child-family@mailbase.ac.uk).