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Abstract
This dissertation explores the reproduction and ideological legitimization of the nation-state in the eyes of successive generations. There are two components to this study. The first is a socio-historical analysis of the formation of nation-state ideology, a formation which seems to necessitate creation of "in-groups" and "out-groups." It is a socio-historical analysis of victimization, of the tendency to justify colonialism, expansionism, imperialism, and brutality to outsiders.

The second component of this study is concerned with how the ideology of the nation-state regarding nationalism, patriotism, and especially classification of enemy groups, is reproduced and legitimized for future generations. For this purpose, I conducted 142 in-depth interviews with children aged 7 through 14. I asked them open-ended questions about kind and unkind behavior on the international, national, and interpersonal level.

An overall, rather expected, finding of this study is that children tend to internalize the status quo. This is done through their embracement of national symbols, attachment to political authority, and glorification of "our" way as the "best" way. It can be said that the ideological hegemony of the dominant group is perpetuated and legitimized through the larger agencies of socialization: the mass media, political slogans and campaigns, schools, religion, and parents. Children are sensitized to groups that differ, a reflection of what is known as the "dominator model," that is, one which evaluates differences in terms of inferior or superior, as opposed to the "partnership model," which evaluates differences in more pluralistic terms. Many of the responses of children indicate that the world would be better off if every group were to run things as we do in the United States--a testament to the effective socialization of these children. Many children believe that our political system and ideology are superior to those of others. On the interpersonal level, children seem to be aware of social stratification in their schools, namely, the system of ranking groups on the basis of such social attributes as class, race, gender, or physical appearance--which some considered wrong, but acknowledged that either they had witnessed or taken part in this classification.
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ABSTRACT

THE NATION-STATE AND ITS IDEOLOGY: A STUDY OF SCHOOL CHILDREN'S VIEWS OF NATIONALISM, POLITICS, AND ENMITY

by

Linda J. Olson
University of New Hampshire, May, 1995

This dissertation explores the reproduction and ideological legitimization of the nation-state in the eyes of successive generations. There are two components to this study. The first is a socio-historical analysis of the formation of nation-state ideology, a formation which seems to necessitate creation of "in-groups" and "out-groups." It is a socio-historical analysis of victimization, of the tendency to justify colonialism, expansionism, imperialism, and brutality to outsiders.

The second component of this study is concerned with how the ideology of the nation-state regarding nationalism, patriotism, and especially classification of enemy groups, is reproduced and legitimized for future generations. For this purpose, I conducted 142 in-depth interviews with children aged 7 through 14. I asked them open-ended questions about kind and unkind behavior on the international, national, and interpersonal level.

An overall, rather expected, finding of this study is that children tend to internalize the status quo. This is
done through their embracement of national symbols, attachment to political authority, and glorification of "our" way as the "best" way. It can be said that the ideological hegemony of the dominant group is perpetuated and legitimized through the larger agencies of socialization: the mass media, political slogans and campaigns, schools, religion, and parents. Children are sensitized to groups that differ, a reflection of what is known as the "dominator model," that is, one which evaluates differences in terms of inferior or superior, as opposed to the "partnership model," which evaluates differences in more pluralistic terms. Many of the responses of children indicate that the world would be better off if every group were to run things as we do in the United States — a testament to the effective socialization of these children. Many children believe that our political system and ideology are superior to those of others. On the interpersonal level, children seem to be aware of social stratification in their schools, namely, the system of ranking groups on the basis of such social attributes as class, race, gender, or physical appearance — which some considered wrong, but acknowledged that either they had witnessed or taken part in this classification.
CHAPTER I

CHILDREN IN THE NATION-STATE

This study is an exploration of the idea of the enemy in the Western world, particularly in the United States, and the political rhetoric and mythology which sustain this idea. Essentially, I will be examining how boundaries are set between "us" and "them," and between friends and enemies. My primary concern is to see how the enemy is perceived through the eyes of children. One of the most harmful aspects of creating enemies is having such creations reinforced in younger generations. It is hoped that this research would clarify how this process is perpetuated so that we may learn to cope with it in the future.

Creating enemies is part and parcel of nationalism, of cultural hegemony of the nation-state, of political indoctrination of its citizens. By hegemony is meant not merely dominance through the forces of coercion in society, e.g., the police and the courts, but also through such consensus building institutions as schools, churches, and the mass media (Bates, 1975:363). In other words, hegemony as conceptualized by Gramsci, is a shared system of values that provides widespread, all-encompassing legitimacy to those who ultimately control the institutions of the nation-state, the ruling elites. What is in the interest of dominant groups,
then, appears as a massive reality, unquestioned and unquestionable, taken-for-granted. My primary concern is, thus, to see how the cultural hegemony of American society is legitimized and validated to children in the United States:

1. Are future citizens indoctrinated into the status quo even though they are presented with information which contradicts these assumptions? In other words, in what manner do children make sense of the competing messages, images, and ideologies in their attempts to internalize the status quo.

2. Is belief in the system is reproduced?

3. Do we embrace our own system through the denigration of those who differ?

4. Is creating enemies is an essential component of cultural indoctrination both within the school and outside it?

In a general sense, this is a study of children’s perceptions about the world in which they live, an exploration of how children internalize and process the information they are presented with on a daily basis. I only hope to get glimpses of the process of political socialization in children, not all of the stages. The central focus of this study is the notion of enmity in the nation-state and how this notion is received by children. My original questions, which I later modified, were very direct about the enemy. While the responses of children were very informative, they were more like lists of groups they either perceived as America’s enemies or groups they themselves did not like. Thus, subsequently, I broadened my inquiry to include more general questions about what children perceived as kind and unkind
behavior on both the interpersonal, national, and international level. While I was still hearing about their perceptions regarding the enemy, I was also finding out about children's perceptions of politics, nationalism, and interpersonal interactions.

My impression is that children's perceptions about the world in which they live -- in terms of politics, nationalism, and enmity -- are greatly influenced by what Ralph Miliband referred to as the larger "agencies of legitimation," or the "agencies of indoctrination," in society, such as, the mass media, schools, religion, and by children's interaction with teachers, parents, and peers (Miliband, 1973: 214-216). Children designate certain groups as superior and others as inferior: those who believe in the overall hegemonic suppositions are considered friends; and those who do not, are enemies. It seems that we tend to appreciate the system we have by denigrating those that differ.

This chapter will begin by stating the problems which will be addressed. Secondly, I present a brief review of the literature regarding how children's perceptions about the world they live in are formed. Thirdly, I will discuss how enemies are created and how boundaries and scapegoats are defined. Finally, I will outline the remaining chapters of the dissertation.


Statement of the Problem

The primary concern of this study is how children set boundaries between "us" and "them" and between "friends" and "enemies." From the interviews I have conducted, it is apparent that this is the first step in the process of determining political perceptions, feelings of nationalism, and interaction on the interpersonal level. I will explore how pervasive cultural designations of enemy groups have permeated the media, political rhetoric, and the education system generally throughout U.S. history. I will also explore children's perceptions of political events that took place at different times to see if their perceptions mirror those of the larger culture. Finally, I will examine our current cultural climate in the post-Cold War era and determine if the interviews with children reveal that they have adult-like perceptions of politics, nationalism, and enmity. My working hypothesis, is that the perceptions of children regarding the notions of the world in which they live are shaped by influential agencies of society, such as schools, parents, the media, and government. Children represent future adults in the United States: understanding where they get their perceptions may enable us as a society to nullify or counter negative or unwanted perceptions, especially those regarding the "enemy."

The central questions for this study are: (1) Which groups in the past did we consider enemies, and why? (2) Why
is there an apparent necessity for an enemy (we seem never to have been without one as a nation)? (3) What factors explain which groups we perceive as enemies? In this regard, where do our perceptions originate, and why? (4) How do agencies of legitimation, those that influence personal identity, such as the government, the media, the educational system, and others, create, sustain, and perpetuate certain hegemonic definitions? In order to answer these questions I will, based on written accounts, conduct a socio-historical analysis of enemy groups in the United States and children's perceptions of these groups prior to, and including, the Cold War, as well as intensive interviews with students. The next section briefly addresses the literature regarding children as citizens and the process of political indoctrination.

Children as Citizens

There has been much written on the political socialization of children into citizens of the nation-state. Both Plato and Aristotle felt education should be used to form a "public." Education, therefore, should be technical, moral, and civic (cited in Green, 1971:136). Plato discusses an intricate system of education which creates a guardian class of women and men who have been educated as leaders who work for the common good (Plato, 1974:Book VII). Much later on, Emile Durkheim proposed that the schools should be a setting to teach future citizens about secular morality (Durkheim,
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promotes loyalty to the larger cultural precepts of nation-state (Khleif, 1971:144-155). In terms of international events, there is a constant re-classification of enemy groups throughout history. Part of the cultural conditioning of children in schools is this very revisionist history (Khleif, 1971:144-155). In the United States, children are taught about the triumphs of America in their history textbooks. Further reinforcement of the dominant ideology in the United States is reinforced in schools with children starting the day with their hands over their hearts and the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. Children are also taught songs which glorify America, for example, This Land is Your Land, America, The National Anthem.

An important question is, does political socialization of students occur in terms of superiority of self and inferiority of others? In other words, in schools, are students presented with information that legitimates the cultural hegemony of dominant groups in the United States, by portraying these groups as superior, internally and externally, to groups that differ? If this is the case, does this designation harm the groups that differ? This point is, of course, part of the larger debate on multiculturalism which will be discussed in detail later on in this dissertation.

I assert that a cultural ideology, one which legitimizes the hegemony of dominant groups, is constructed for the benefit of future generations. This ideology will be partly
described through a soci-historical analysis of victimization in the United States. Using existing data concerning the political socialization of children at various historical periods, I explore how this ideology is received by children, how they accept this ideology and, as a result, accept the status quo. I will begin in the Post-Cold War era: is the cultural hegemony of enemies legitimized to children even after one of our primary enemies is no longer classified as such? Since my assumption in this research is that setting boundaries and designating enemies is done routinely in the process of socialization, in internalizing political doctrine, nationalist feelings, or even interpersonal relations, I will now review the general process of creating enemies and its link with socialization, with bringing up new generations of citizens in the nation-state.

Creating the Enemy

In the recent history of the West, the image of the enemy has been quite pervasive. The enemy has taken many forms. It has been groups with differing political ideologies -- different cultures, norms, and values we regard as alien; at times singled out as the cause of social problems faced by the Western world. Regardless of the form the enemy takes, the process of creating enemies is one of denigration, demonization, and dehumanization. Once this process is complete, we acknowledge only the traits in the enemy which
confirm our stereotypes. Truth is the first detail relinquished when we disregard the humanity of the enemy.

The process of enemy creation is one based upon a mythology of stereotypes, scapegoating, and setting-up boundaries. There are many steps in creating an enemy. First, we perceive some differences between us and them and then exaggerate these differences. An important element in the making of enemies, which will be discussed in much more detail in later chapters, is ranking "differences" within a framework of "superior" or "inferior." Secondly, we impose on the "other" those traits we fear most in ourselves (Keen, 1986:9; Frank and Melville, 1988). The "other" then becomes an objectification of those characteristics we hate most about ourselves. Thirdly, we stereotype the "other" and then only acknowledge the traits that justify the stereotype: the stereotype serves as a quick or decisive summary of the "other." Scapegoating the other also occurs in this step: we blame the other for our own social ills. Finally, we dehumanize the enemy. The humanity of the enemy is lost and he or she is transformed into a devil, a savage, or beast (Keen, 1986:9). After these steps are complete, the mythology of the enemy is established as a cultural precept.

Setting Boundaries:

The process of designating enemies is one of setting boundaries between groups that are "acceptable" and those that are not. How and why these boundaries are set and maintained
is of paramount importance for nourishment and maintenance of political, group, and personal identity. Ultimately, there is no identity without boundaries.

Group identity basically consists of the ready-made "set of endowments and identifications which every individual shares with others" (Isaacs, 1975:31). This includes such items as shared physical traits, a shared history and origin, a shared culture in terms of such things as nationality, religion, language, and value system, and, lastly, a shared set of rituals and ceremonies (Isaacs, 1975:31). Along with these features of the group, members also share the external classification of the group. Essentially this refers to the group's position in the stratified system -- nationally and internationally -- their status, their wealth or poverty, and the group's power or powerlessness in the larger system (Isaacs, 1975:31). The main function of a group is to provide its members with both a sense of belongingness and self esteem (Isaacs, 1975:33). Another aspect of group identity is distinguishing the group from other groups. Unfortunately this clarification of group identity is often done through denigration of others. Other groups are frequently seen as inferior: they smell bad, or they are "dirty," or they have unusual sexual powers or characteristics (Isaacs, 1975:33). It is this process of setting boundaries between groups that distinguishes "us" from "them."

At the same time, there is also a creation of allies or
allegiances based upon need. As Levi-Strauss theorized, we form alliances with groups when they can provide us with something we want or require: he saw this as the genesis of culture (Levi-Strauss, 1969:489). The treatment of immigrant groups after the Civil War is an example of this. Industrial leaders saw the value of immigrants as a cheap source of labor so they encouraged migration even though these groups were certainly classified as "others" (Higham, 1955:17). This perception changed with the economic crisis of the 1890s, which led to persecution of immigrants and anti-immigration legislation (Higham, 1955:68-71).

Fredrik Barth, in his analysis of ethnic-group boundaries, asserts that boundaries between ethnic groups are maintained "despite the flow of personnel across them" (Barth, 1969:9). Previously, it was believed that ethnic distinctions were maintained because each "tribe" was ignorant of its neighbors (Barth, 1969:9). In a society as diverse and complex as the U.S., it becomes clear that ethnic distinctions are maintained even when geographic exclusion or separation of groups is not. In fact, Barth believes that ethnic distinctions are not weakened, but strengthened by interactions with groups that differ:

The identification of another person as a fellow member of an ethnic group implies a sharing of criteria for evaluation and judgement...On the other hand, a dichotomization of others as strangers, as members of another ethnic group, implies a recognition of limitations on shared understandings, differences in criteria for judgement of value and performance and a
restriction of interaction to sectors of assumed common understanding and mutual interest (Barth, 1969:15).

It is through interaction with groups that differ that we further clarify the social reality of our own group: we need others to be ourselves. The differences between us and the other group further validate and reinforce our ethnic boundary. In fact, the only way self-definition occurs is through the designation of the other:

An ingroup cannot be understood apart from an outgroup; both are interlocked into a unity of opposites...one cannot be understood except in terms of the other...(Khleif, 1979:163).

Men are understood through their comparison with women, blacks through their comparison with whites (Khleif, 1979:163).

Khleif asserts that if boundaries define belonging and identity, a blurring of the boundaries is perceived as a threat to group existence (Khleif, 1979:159). For this reason, maintaining the boundary is extremely important. The differences between us and the "other," therefore, are exaggerated and stereotyped in order to better safeguard the boundary. According to Khleif, boundaries are inextricably linked with socialization and social control (Khleif, 1979:159). We are taught from the beginning the distinction between "us" and "them" and these boundaries are maintained through formal and informal social control. These boundaries are not only reinforced by others in the group, but also by those outside the group (Barth, 1969:18). Boundaries, therefore, are validated both by members and nonmembers. Some
examples Barth uses to illustrate this point are that all classes punish the proletariat who puts on airs and both sexes ridicule the man who is effeminate (Barth, 1969:18).

Another way in which boundaries are created and maintained is through language (Khleif, 1979:165). "Labels of primary potency," according to Gordon Allport in The Nature of Prejudice (Allport, 1979), are single words that unilaterally summarize the human being in one epithet concealing other attributes, e.g., prejudice words against enemies. Pejorative words against others, ethnolinguistic and ethnoreligious labels, are a special form of "restricted code," in that they condense communication and force it into an unbridgeable dichotomy, forcing closure in interaction, making meaning richly implicit, integrating the speaker into an in-group network of kin and community (Bernstein, 1965; Khleif, 1979:160).

Derogatory labels for "out-groups," or ethnolinguistic or ethnoreligious labels, is an extreme form of "restricted code." The primary way in which language creates boundaries is through the use of these ethnolinguistic and ethnoreligious labels or stereotypes (Khleif, 1979:159). Khleif analyzed more than three hundred of these labels coined by Americans (WASPs) to put "other" groups in "their place" (Khleif, 1979:166). Similarly, I.L. Allen contends there are close to 1200 derogatory labels, most of them now obsolete, used in American speech to classify groups (Allen, 1990:3). It
becomes clear which groups dominate a given society when one examines the number of ethnomelinguistic labels used to distinguish "inferior" groups:

By far, most disparaging words are aimed at American Blacks, Chicanos, Indians, and Chinese. Color in America, seems to be the supreme boundary (Khleif, 1979:166).

I would add gender as a "supreme boundary" as well, since there are over two hundred derogatory words directed at women alone (Miller and Swift, 1977).

Language, in itself, is also a defining characteristic of an ethnic group (Trudgill, 1988:54). This is true not only for those ethnic groups which have different languages, but also for those which use different varieties of the same language (Trudgill, 1988:60). Dialect distinguishes superiority and inferiority. In the United States, Standard English dialect with a Midwestern or Northern accent is viewed as superior, while Black Vernacular English or a Southern accent is deemed inferior.

The stigmatization of groups, or the setting of boundaries, also occurs on a large scale through the dominant elements of society. Those who fit into our cultural notion of the "norm," namely the white middle and upper classes, are glorified in our history, media, and political rhetoric. Those who differ from the norm, both within the U.S. and outside it, are often portrayed as deviant and inferior. I expect that these perceptions of the "other," of the enemy, would be reflected in the responses children provide.
Dominant elements in society set up boundaries for different "in-groups" and "out groups." An important element in boundary maintenance -- of "us" vs. "them," "insiders" vs. "outsiders," "natives" vs. "foreigners" -- is creating scapegoats.

Creating Scapegoats:

Inherent in enemy mythology is the construction of scapegoats. According to René Girard, there are some commonly held definitions of the word "scapegoat." The Biblical meaning of the word scapegoat is:

...that one of the two goats that was chosen by lot to be sent alive into the wilderness, the sins of the people have been symbolically laid upon it, while the other was appointed to be sacrificed (Girard, 1987:73).

In other words, evil is doubly punished, driven out and killed.

The anthropological meaning is used in connection with rituals that were based on the belief that "guilt" or "suffering" could be transferred from the community to a ritually designated victim: one is not blamed merely for the "sins" of others, but also for tensions, conflicts, and difficulties of all kinds (Girard, 1987:74).

The primary element in scapegoating is delusion (Girard, 1987:78). Those who scapegoat others are unaware of this process. Without this element of delusion, scapegoating would not occur. While the process of scapegoating is easy to see in others, when we do it ourselves, it is seen as justified.
(Girard, 1987:79). It is an interesting phenomenon: as we condemn others for the process of scapegoating, in the next breath we ourselves are guilty of it. In other words, it is easier to blame others for our problems than to look within to find the blame:

No group addicted to scapegoating will knowingly publicize the fact. Its arbitrary scapegoats will be presented, if not as culprits deliberately bent on evil, at least as individuals unwittingly responsible for some disastrous event (Girard, 1987:82).

The process of scapegoating is an important aspect of making enemies. Evidence of this process is apparent in the interviews with children in my study. Many have a tendency to make sweeping generalizations about a group and blame that group for our current national problems.

Scapegoating also serves a unifying purpose. It creates the illusion that it is "us" vs. this evil, outside force:

Even if the scapegoat is really an insider, the threat transforms him into an outsider, and the remaining insiders feel united as they never did before. They form a new and tighter inside...Beyond a certain threshold of intensity -- all other circumstances being favorable -- the hostile polarization against a victim must empty the group of internal hostility, unifying it so tightly that a cultural rejuvenation can really occur (Girard, 1987:90-91).

Creating a scapegoat, like the setting of a boundary, as the "content" within a boundary, further defines for us who we are and reinforces our group solidarity. In his sociological formulations, Emile Durkheim felt that deviance served a functional purpose in that it united non-deviants; so too with
the creation of the scapegoats. We need to be aware of the underlying unity of opposites, of their inexorable link, their dialectical connection. Dichotomy is at the root of human thinking. Positive and negative terms permeate, for example, religious thinking -- as in "heaven and hell," "life and death," "good and evil." The unholy reinforces the holy; what is not defines what is.

**Goals**

The purpose of this dissertation, as stated earlier, is to explore the political socialization of children: do children tend to internalize the status quo, including the designation of enemy groups? I am concerned not only with what children know about the workings of the political realm, but how they process the negative images of the "other" that are presented to them by the larger agencies in society. I am concerned with how children exhibit an attachment to the nation-state. Is this done through glorification of national symbols, legitimization of political authorities, or, more importantly, through an embracement of "our" way as the "best" way?

It is hoped that this study will contribute to our knowledge about the effect of messages propagated by larger agencies of socialization on perceptions of children about groups that differ. The goal of this research is to ascertain not only how these larger societal messages affect children's
perceptions about groups that differ on the international and national level -- larger enemies of the nation-state -- but also how they influence children's relations with groups on the more micro level: with peers, teachers, and adults.

**Format**

The following chapter deals with methodology, including issues that arose in this qualitative study. Chapter III presents theoretical considerations in this research. Of primary concern in this chapter is designing a framework to analyze how the cultural hegemony of dominant groups is reproduced and legitimized for future generations, as well as exploring theoretical issues on the interpersonal level. Chapters IV, V, and VI provide a socio-historical analysis of victimization in the Western world. These chapters define the ideological hegemony which legitimizes the creation of enemies in future generations, that is, the historical justification of social stratification in the Western world. Chapter VII reviews past literature on the political socialization of children. Chapters VIII and IX provide the empirical findings of the intensive interviews of children. Here, I will examine whether the larger ideological hegemony, outlined in chapters IV, V, and VI, of groups that differ -- cultural constructs of the enemy -- are apparent in children's responses. In Chapter X, the final chapter, I summarize the major conclusions, as well as offer some suggestions for further research on political socialization of children.
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CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS: AN INQUIRY INTO CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE WORLD IN WHICH THEY LIVE

As stated in the previous chapter, this study is an exploration of children's perceptions of the world in which they live, and their notions of the "other." The primary issue in this investigation is whether or not the impressions of children about their world and in relation to the "other" mirror larger social constructs. The overarching hypothesis of this study is that children are socialized by the larger agencies of society to accept the status quo as unquestionably as possible. Political socialization of children is, in essence, what Khleif refers to as the "control of consciousness," that is, narrowing the perceptual sphere of the new generation, and of the old one, towards seeing only what is in the interests of those who socio-economically and politically manage the state (1986:219-244). This should also be apparent in their designation of the "other." This chapter outlines the methodological framework for this study.

First, I will describe the sample and setting, as well as my methods of data collection. Secondly, I will discuss the manner in which these data are analyzed. Finally, I will explore matters relevant to conducting fieldwork in the schools, including remarks about my role as a field worker.
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Sample and Method

My primary goal in this research is to explore children's perceptions about the world in which they live. How do they make sense of all of the information they are constantly bombarded with by the media, the government, their parents, and in schools? This study examines how children internalize this information on the super-macro (world system), macro (national), meso (institutional), and micro levels (interpersonal interaction).

In an attempt to link the international scene with local problems, Khleif (1994:6-7) has constructed a fivefold spatial framework, a metaphor of five concentric circles: (a) the outermost circle, the super-macro, is that of the world-system, one permeated with the power of giant transnational corporations (TNC's); (b) the next circle inwardly is the macro, that of the nation-state, where TNC's are headquartered; (c) the third circle, representing the meso level, is that of institutions, e.g. of the "agencies of legitimation," of schools and the mass media among others; (d) the fourth circle is micro, that of the household or small group level, of interpersonal relations that sustain and cushion the person against adversity; and (e) the bull's eye, the innermost circle, is the sub-micro one, that of the person, where intra-psychic conversation is generated, e.g., regarding identity, loyalty, self and others. This study examines how the larger ideological percepts on the super-
macro, macro, and meso levels are legitimated to children on the micro and sub-micro levels. Specifically, what is children's knowledge of the world outside the United States? What do they view as significant issues in the United States? What are their perceptions of various institutions within the United States? How does all of this influence their interaction with teachers, parents, and peers?

In the next section I discuss my method of gaining access to the schools, provide a description of my methods of sample collection, and present a description of each of the school settings where interviews took place.

The Sample and Settings:

It is often difficult to gain access to classrooms to conduct research. Understandably, teachers, administrators, and parents are leery of allowing a stranger to come into the classroom to interview the children. Initially, I attempted to gain access to many different schools primarily in the Northeast. What I was finding was a significant hesitancy among principals and teachers to let me in their classrooms. The most frequent response to my attempts to gain "cold" (having no contacts) access to the schools was that the school did not allow researchers in the classrooms. I realized that this mode of gaining access to students was not going to prove fruitful.

Instead, I decided to focus on those schools where I had at least one teacher contact. It worked well. I contacted
those teachers I knew and explained my research and the difficulty I was having gaining entrance to the schools. These teachers agreed that I had a worthwhile study that would not put the children in jeopardy. They then went to the principals of their schools to get the permission required. For this reason, my sample is a snowball design. I also petitioned, and got the agreement of, my University's research review board to conduct this study and apply the usual safeguards of anonymity and confidentiality.

I interviewed a total of one hundred forty-two children in grades one through eight, at seven different schools, in three different U.S. regions. Interviews were conducted at four grammar schools and three junior high schools in the Northeast, Midwest, and South. The number of children interviewed in each region is listed in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60.56</td>
<td>60.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>80.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "Freq." = Frequency; "Cum." = Cumulative Percentage

Forty of the interviews conducted in the Northeast were done to pretest my questions which I changed somewhat after these interviews. The pretest questions explored children's perceptions mainly on the national level. I have included
these in the overall sample because they were somewhat specialized: while these interviews did not reveal information on the micro (small-group) level, they did explore perceptions on the super macro (international) and macro (nation-state) level. When these interviews are examined in Chapters VII, I will indicate that they are from the pretesting period. I did not want to exclude them entirely because they provide useful information (consistent with other interviews conducted later on) about international and national perceptions.

While I conducted interviews in different regions, and there are some differences in responses between regions, I am not asserting that these differences are generalizable to children in given regions. My sample is really too small to make that assertion, but useful for generating hypotheses. I do contend, however, that there are some qualitative differences in responses based upon socioeconomic characteristics of the school, i.e., whether working class, middle class, upper class, and inner city.

In the Northeast and the South, I conducted interviews at one grammar school and one junior high school. In the Midwest I interviewed at two grammar schools and one junior high. The breakdown of the sample by grade is presented below in Table 2.
Table 2: Sample Distribution by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Grade</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>26.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>39.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Grade</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>59.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>68.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>80.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total     | 142   | 100.00 |

As is evident from Table 2, I had much better luck gaining access to grades three through eight than I did in first and second. There are two reasons for this. First and foremost, I did not have many teacher contacts in these grades. Secondly, there was more reluctance on the part of teacher contacts I did have in those grades, because of the young age of the children, to allow me to interview.

Unfortunately my sample breakdown on the basis of race, indicated in Table 3, is not very diverse. Most of the children of color who were interviewed (with the exception of two Assyrian boys and one Asian girl) were at one of two sites; either the middle school in the Midwest or the grammar school in the South.
Table 3: Sample Distribution by Race of Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>91.55</td>
<td>91.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>95.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>98.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main reason for this unequal division in terms of race was that the majority of schools where interviews were conducted had a predominately white student population. The sample also has more girls in it than boys (although not to such a significant degree), as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4: Sample Distribution by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41.55</td>
<td>41.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58.45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for this, quite simply, is that more girls brought back their permission slips than boys. The next three sections explore the settings of each of the schools by region. There are significant differences in the physical structures of the schools, classroom settings, and the students attending the facility. For these reasons, I will describe these differences, which seem to affect the type of education received and the perceptions children have about the world around them. To maintain the confidentiality of both
the sites and my school contacts, I have used pseudonyms.

The Northeast. Both the junior high school and the grammar school in the Northeast have overwhelmingly white, middle-class student bodies. The junior high, which I refer to as Old Landing Junior High, is located in a small, university town. Many of the students interviewed here indicated that at least one of their parents worked at the university. The school itself is relatively small with a large field for sports activities. The school is a rather plain brick building. The halls are decorated with student art work. The classroom where the interviews were conducted happened at the time to be decorated with posters which celebrated Black History month. Here, I interviewed Irene Peters’ seventh and eighth grade classes. The class sizes vary from seventeen to twenty five students. It is at this location that I pretested my questions.

The grammar school, Annandale, is much larger and was recently remodeled extensively. Upon entering the school, I was struck both by the cleanliness and orderliness of the school as well as the significant amount of student work that was displayed everywhere. The school philosophy is displayed proudly by the main office; it states:
One who learns from one who is learning, drinks from a running stream. 
- Seletz Tribe

Our community shares responsibility for fostering respect for ourselves, others, and our environment: growth in self confidence, and problem solving ability, joy in life-long learning.

We are committed to the following:  
- Everyone can learn.  
- We are sensitive to one another.  
- We learn from each other.  
- The process of learning is as important as the product or end result.  
- We make time to learn through our experience.  
- We make time to listen and respond.  
- We build a safe environment that encourages risk taking.  
- We support each other through encouragement and respect.  
- We benefit form each other’s differences.  
- We make time to assess and re-evaluate our goals.

Besides the philosophy of the school there is also a sign above the doors that lead outside that states: "It is Our Differences that Make Us Special." The classroom of my teacher contact is very large, the middle of the room was filled with desks for the twenty to twenty five students per class (depending upon the class). There are cabinets for supplies along two walls and there was a carpeted area for doing activities like art work and science projects. This setting to me appeared very conducive to encouraging creative learning. My teacher contact, Hannah Anderson, made arrangements for me to interview in several classes, grades one through five.

The South: My contact at the grammar school in the South was Principal Rogers. Here I began the day by speaking with
him. He was very excited about my project and eager to find out the results. I explained to him that the confidentiality of the students had to be maintained, but that I would send him a copy of the general trends of the interviews without presenting any information that would reveal the identity of the students. The school is a large, old, brick-building that had the familiar smell of stale tater tots (fried potato logs -- most schools had a similar smell). There is a state college campus near the elementary school, but the backgrounds of the students were not necessarily reflective of this fact. According to Principal Rogers, the student population is largely made up of poor and working class students and there is some diversity in terms of the race and ethnicity of the children. While this was not an inner-city school, I would classify it as a working class school.

The junior high school, Butterfield, in the South, is a much more modern and bright building than the grammar school. The students here are mostly white and of the middle class. Unlike the schools in the Northeast, the walls here were devoid of student art work, posters, and school philosophies. In fact, the whole building had a certain air of sterility about it. I only had a very limited time at this school so I was unable to see the entire building or the grounds. My teacher contact here was Sally Jones.

The Midwest: It was in the Midwest that I saw the most significant contrasts between schools. I interviewed at three
different sites in the Midwest. The first school was not unlike the two schools in the Northeast. Lincoln Village Elementary is located in a middle class suburban area. Like many of the suburban areas in this region, the neighborhood surrounding the school is made up mostly of single family brick ranch-style houses with small yards. The school itself was set on a large semi-grassy lot with some playground equipment. The classroom of my teacher contact Marcia Larson was a small room decorated with colorful posters and student art work. This class only has nine first grade students with one teacher and two teacher aides. The reason for the high student teacher ratio was that all of these students had been labeled with behavior and learning disabilities. The day began in an adjoining office where the children discussed what day, month, and year it was and how many days were left of the school year. They then all faced the flag with their hands on their hearts and recited the "pledge of allegiance" (this was a ritual at all of the grammar schools attended). I noticed that while all of the students stood proudly facing the flag with their hands on their hearts, many of them were mumbling the words and I heard one student say "invisible" instead of "indivisible." I interviewed five students from this class in the room next door.

The next site in the Midwest, Grassy Knolls Elementary, is located in a very wealthy suburban area. The houses in the surrounding neighborhood were very large if not enormous. The
school itself is in an older brick building. The playground is very large in comparison to the other schools: there is a large grassy field and new wooden playground equipment situated on wood chips. When I arrived at the school, I was greeted by a woman who asked if she could help me. I explained that I was here to interview in Casey Mason’s, my teacher contact, class. She explained that Ms. Mason was not back from lunch yet, nor had the bus arrived with the children. I asked if the children had gone on a field trip -- not understanding why else they would be arriving by bus at noon; she explained that most of the children were bused home for lunch. I was amazed by this, not only because this school had the funding to provide such a service, but also because this meant most of the kids had someone at home to feed them at lunch time. I then asked the woman if she was a teacher at the school. She explained to me that the school had mothers, like herself, volunteer daily to check-in visitors. This procedure was instituted eight years ago when a woman walked into an elementary school in a neighboring community with a gun and opened fire on the students (if I remember correctly one student was killed and several teachers and students were injured). After Casey Mason arrived, she took me into her classroom and had two of her students give me a tour. The class was divided into several different sections. One area had the desks for the sixteen students in the class; another was the science and geography section, where they had made
salt dough reliefs of all the states; another section had a computer in it (the only class so far with a computer); and another was divided for English where students had actually published their own stories and poems in bound books. I include such a lengthy description of this school because it was so much more privileged than the other sites where I had conducted interviews.

The final site was also unique from all other schools and was in stark contrast to the school described above. This school is located in an urban metropolitan area in the Midwest and it is, in every sense of the notion, an inner-city school. At Metropolitan Junior High School, 65% of the students attending are children of color and 80% of the students receive free lunches from the government (meaning they live below the poverty line). My teacher contact, Jon Carlson, has an average of 36 students per class, with grades sixth, seventh, and eighth mixed in a single class. He has one teacher’s aide to help him. He is a biology teacher with essentially none of the supplies necessary to teach. Even if he had the supplies, it would be unlikely that he could teach biology in any real way with so many kids to supervise. Mr. C, as his students refer to him, did try to make do. The room is filled with creative things made from cardboard, plastic soda bottles, and tin foil. Missing from the room are bunsen burners, microscopes, and recent textbooks (the one I looked at was published in 1967). Mr. C told me that when he needs
supplies he usually has to buy them himself and hopes that the school will reimburse him; they rarely do. Like the grammar school in the northeast, Metropolitan Junior High also had a school motto posted all over the school. This motto, however, differed qualitatively from the other:

Metropolitan Junior High
- Be verbally appropriate
- Be physically considerate
- Be on time
- Be prepared for class
- Strive for best achievement

Expects the Best

Obviously, the intent of this motto, instead of inspiring students to learn to love knowledge (as in the other philosophy mentioned), is to encourage conformity and obedience to the rules. The school itself is situated in a low-income neighborhood. Most of the surrounding residences are multi-family houses or apartment buildings. The school grounds are concrete, including the playground which is small and run-down.

It is apparent from my description of the schools themselves that making any meaningful generalizations about the regions themselves would be impossible because of the differences between schools within the same region. Instead I will contrast responses of students at various schools, exploring for qualitative differences.

The next section describes the interviewing process, including the requirements of my University’s human subjects
committee, the various formats used in the interviews, and the questions asked.

The Interviewing Process:

In order to meet the requirements of the human subjects committee (also known as the IRB, or institutional review board) at the University of New Hampshire to conduct these intensive interviews, I obtained written permission from the principal of each school, written permission from the parents of the children participating, verbal permission from the teachers and students, and I set up a liaison with the particular school’s counselors in case any information obtained from the interviews revealed any possible instances of abuse or neglect among the children. The parent and principal permission slips are in Appendices A and B, respectively. The confidentiality of the sites, teachers, and students is maintained. Prior to interviewing any child, I made this point very clear.

I conducted intensive interviews lasting anywhere from 10 minutes to 50 minutes in various school settings. The time varied with the amount of information the child or children provided. Some students answered the questions in the quickest manner possible, while others elaborated extensively. The interview guide is found in Appendix C. I also experimented with different types of interview formats including interviewing individuals, pairs, and small groups. I found that certain interview formats worked well with
certain age groups and not others. The small groups were very effective with the older children (fifth through eighth grade), because they would get into some very interesting discussions with each other about various issues and I would just sit back and take notes. The small groups did not work with the younger children; they had much smaller attention spans which resulted in me spending most of the interview trying to maintain control over the groups while they were carrying on their own discussions with friends, shouting to be heard, and even dancing around the room. Some of the younger children were also more concerned with talking about outlandish issues to impress their friends than answering my questions. One example that comes to mind is the third grade boy who stated the following to the question "Tell me a story about a person or group who is unkind to America" -- "People who have fangs and are young Republicans (Northeast Field Notes #11:145)."

The interviews took place in many different settings within the schools, including a corner in the classroom with the rest of the class going on around us, empty classrooms, the library, a separate office, or even in the hallway outside the classroom. The location of the interviewing process did not seem to have any effect on the responses.

While I wanted to analyze much information about how children make sense of their world, I did not want to lead the students to their answers. For this reason, I chose to ask
the children very general, open-ended questions about kind and unkind behavior. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the root of the word "kind" historically means natural, native, or of good birth (Simpson and Weiner, 1989:438). "Unkind" initially referred to strange, foreign, and devoid of natural goodness (Simpson and Weiner, 1989:92). Both of the words, therefore, have their roots in setting boundaries between "us" and "them." The interview guide is as follows:

1. Tell me a story about a child your age that does something kind for someone.

2. Tell me a story about an adult that does something kind.

3. Tell me a story about a person or group that does something kind for America.

4. Tell me a story about a child your age that does something unkind.

5. Tell me a story about an adult that does something unkind.

6. Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America.

Questions 1, 2, 4, and 5 were taken from a study exploring peer relations conducted by psychologist James Youniss (1980), while questions 3 and 6 I added to examine more super-macro (international) and macro (nation-state) perceptions. Because these questions were general inquiries into kind and unkind behavior, it was really up to the children to discuss those concerns they felt were most pressing; it was up to them to both interpret the questions and make their own conclusions about their answers. I also wanted to explore how the
attitudes of the children translated into behavior. After they described incidents of unkind behavior I asked them either "How would you react if you saw this?" for questions 4 and 5, or "How do you think we as country should respond?" for question 6. Here I was interested in investigating how children would resolve conflict: would they state the problem should be resolved through peaceful means, or would they see resolution through violence? I also did not limit the interviews to my questions. Frequently students would bring up issues they themselves wanted to discuss; I welcomed this. An example of this is an eighth grade boy who ended the interview by discussing why he felt things in the United States had become worse during his lifetime (Midwest Fieldnotes #1:31). The next section outlines the qualitative design of this study.

**Qualitative Analysis of Children in the Nation-State**

This study explores responses made by children with regard to their perceptions of kind and unkind behavior on the super macro, macro, meso, and micro (international, nation-state, institutional, small groups) levels in a qualitative framework. While this study also could have been conducted statistically or deductively, using some type of survey design for example, I chose to explore these issues inductively because I wanted the children to define for themselves the world in which they live. I agree with Shulamith Reinharz in
her assertion that the survey method frequently creates rather than reflects reality (Reinharz, 1979:68). I contend that this a particularly relevant critique of survey methodology when it is used to study children in the school setting. In this setting, children are constantly subjected to evaluation. My feeling is that with a survey design, children in schools are more likely to respond in a manner they feel will be perceived as acceptable by the researcher and their teachers. However, with an open-ended question format, the child is at liberty to define the questions in any manner he or she sees as appropriate. This, of course, does not preclude the child from responding in a manner that he or she perceives as the intended one, but the child has more latitude in expression and the desires of the researcher are not as apparent.

This latitude was not always easy for the children to accept. It was not uncommon for children to stop their responses to ask "Is this what you want?," "Is this what you're looking for?" My response to these inquiries was simply to state "You answer the question any way you want." They would also seek out guidance in their responses. Since the questions ask the children to tell a "story" about kind or unkind behavior, a frequent query was "Real or made up?" Again, I stated "Answer the question any way you." Invariably, after asking this question, the child would preface her or his response by stating "This one's real" or "This one's made up." I allowed the children to present
fictitious responses because these too provided valuable information about their perceptions of the world. If the child did "tell a story," I would ask, "Can you think of an example of this in the real world?" Usually she or he could. It seems that children's definitions of fantasy do not stray far from reality.

A second, more important reason I decided to conduct a qualitative rather than quantitative study is that I am not merely interested in assessing what they know about international, national, and interpersonal events, but how they make sense of all of this. I want them to define for me, with as little prompting as possible, the way they perceive the world.

As will be evident in Chapter VIII, I have coded and quantified some aspects of this research. Specifically, I will present frequencies of the responses dealing with people or groups who are unkind to America. This does provide useful information about which groups children most frequently perceive as being unkind to America (larger enemies of the nation-state). It does not, however, illustrate how strongly children stated their responses, whether they felt this was a social construction which they did not agree with, or if they discussed these groups in an ethnocentric manner. To get at these issues, I will rely on qualitative methodology.

In my analysis of the questions concerning kind and unkind behavior on the macro (nation-state) level, I am
specifically interested in whether the child’s response is more indicative of the "dominator" or "partnership" model. Anthropologist Riane Eisler coined these terms to describe whether a society was characterized by ranking differences as superior or inferior, the "dominator model," or by appreciating differences in pluralistic terms, the "partnership model" (Eisler, 1987:xvii). A more detailed exploration of these two models is presented in Chapter IV. If the child discusses groups or people in more ethnocentric terms, or if she or he insists that the world would be better if other countries were more like the United States, then this is evidence of the dominator model. On the other hand, if the child asserts that divisions between people and groups are largely social constructs (largely arbitrary or unfairly set up) and that being different is good, then this illustrates the partnership model.

I am also concerned with trying to decipher where children’s perceptions originate. Were these perceptions either created or legitimized by the larger agents of socialization (schools, churches, the media) in society? To determine this, I asked the child "Where did you hear about this?" It is not always easy to figure out where children’s perceptions come from because of the interactive nature of the whole socialization process, but sometimes children were very clear about where their perceptions originated or were legitimized.
On this level, I am also interested in finding out how children feel resolution of international and national conflict should take place. Responses to these questions will also be put in a historical context. By this I mean that I will watch out for larger cultural events occurring at the time of the interviews to find out if children discuss these events. My hypothesis is that children's perceptions are influenced by the larger cultural agencies in society, especially the mass media. If this is in fact true, the children should be responding to the questions by discussing the current events at the time of the interview.

For those questions exploring children's perceptions of kind and unkind behavior on the interpersonal level, I am primarily interested in how children set boundaries between "in-groups" and "out-groups" in their daily interactions with one another. To study this, I will use the theoretical categories outlined by James Youniss in his study of peer relations (Youniss, 1980:37-41). Specifically, I will determine whether or not the interaction discussed by the child is characteristic of the following categories: mutuality, understanding of the "other" arrived at either through cooperation or imposition of unilateral authority; standards of worth, determined either through interpersonal consensus or enforced conformity; similarity between self and "other," the ability or inability to find a common ground between self and "other"; interpersonal sensitivity,
appreciation or denigration of differences; and, finally, relational possibilities -- does the child acknowledge the need for relations with others or not? These categories of interpersonal interaction are outlined in more detail in Chapter III. To illustrate how responses on this level of analysis will be regarded, I provide the following example taken from the junior high in the South. This interview was with a pair of white, eighth-grade girls who were discussing a classmate who is very active in, and outspoken about, community activities:

[in response to the question "Tell me a story about a child your age that does something kind"]
Girl 1: Basically our school is broken down on the basis of class. So, someone is kind who doesn’t separate people at all.
Girl 2: We might talk to them [people labeled "nerds"] in the halls -- like this one girl [who other students don’t like] I think she’s trying to be an adult too fast.
Girl 1: Yea, I try to be nice to her because it is probably something in her environment that made her grow up too fast... [after thinking a bit] I have to admit, she does her best to help America -- she is a vegetarian, she doesn’t wear leather, and she recycles.
Girl 2: Yea...she does help America (South, Fieldnotes #2:36-37).

This passage illustrates both interpersonal sensitivity (willingness to be nice to the girl even though she has been labeled as a "nerd") as well as standards of worth (this girl is judged "worthy" by these two girls because of her community involvement). In the final section of this chapter, I discuss my role as researcher. Specifically, I address the issues faced by the field worker in the schools, status definition,
and questions of confidentiality.

Fieldwork in the Schools

There are differences between fieldwork in "exotic" settings and fieldwork in the schools. First, the field worker does not suffer culture shock in the school setting because he or she is aware of the language and culture of the schools (Khleif, 1974:390). While my experience overall was that I was aware of the "culture" of the schools, there were times in the interview process when I needed further clarification from the student. Children would frequently refer to school policies on various issues as if I were aware of them. For example, one child in the South was complaining because her teacher had "turned her color." She assumed I understood this policy. In situations like this, I asked for clarification. In this instance, the policy involved placing a color coded card for each child at the front of the room: each time the child acted up, a different color card, with sanctions attached, varying from not being able to participate in group activities to in-school suspension, was the result. Children would also use terms at times that I was not familiar with. One example is a child who spoke of someone "dissing" her, which I found out means "disrespecting" her. For the most part, however, I was familiar with the expressions used by the children. I also encountered problems with two of the first grade children who did not know what the word "kind"
meant. After discovering this, I prefaced interviews with the younger children by asking if they understood what the word meant.

A second aspect of fieldwork in the schools, is that the field worker cannot be a participant in the schools (Khleif, 1974:391). The field worker is neither student nor teacher. To do research in the schools, the field worker must take the role of the outsider (Khleif, 1974:391). This is an important point to make clear to the students. I found out that many of the children were questioning my motives. They would ask me things like "What is it you're writing?," "Who will read this?," and so forth. It is understandable that they would be concerned with my motives. As I stated before, in school children are used to being evaluated all the time. I believe their concern came from their fear that I, or their teachers, were evaluating their answers. I tried to assuage their fears by explaining that I was writing something like a book, called a dissertation, about their ideas, and that their names would never be used. While this seemed to satisfy most children, some remained concerned. For example, one first grade boy from the Midwest was afraid to let me write down his response. He was speaking in very stereotypical terms about gypsies (this response will be discussed in chapter IX). When I began writing down what he was saying he said, "Don't write this down." He seemed satisfied after I explained to him that I would never use his name, but he did look over my notes a
couple of times. There were some children who were not at all troubled by the issue of confidentiality and insisted that it was okay to use their names (I thanked them but said I would not use their names).

A final issue which I faced in my fieldwork was the necessity to constantly define my status to the children. Who was I? Why was I interested in kids' ideas? What was I going to do with my research? One humorous example is taken from a fourth-grade group in the Northeast:

Boy 2: What grade are you in anyway? [directing the question at the researcher]
LO: I am in graduate school.
Boy 2: Yea, but what grade are you in?
LO:[figure it out] I guess I'm in 21st grade.
[one of the children let's out a huge WHOA! in disbelief] (Northeast, Fieldnotes #8:101).

This discussion went on for quite a while -- the children asked how old I was, one girl insisted I only looked sixteen, how much longer I would be in school, etc. -- until I finally had to continue with the questions. In another exchange in the Midwest, a young child asked if I had had a baby yet (I chose to change the subject). When these questions came up, I tried to answer them as honestly, and as quickly, as possible.

The experience I had in the classrooms was one of learning about the subcultural differences of grammar and junior high school students, assuring students that their identity would remain confidential, and constantly defining both myself and my intentions as a researcher. The research
is always watched, almost never taken for granted.

**Summary**

This chapter outlined the methodological considerations for this study. I have discussed the methods used for constructing my sample and for data collection, the interviewing process, the qualitative research design, and issues faced by the researcher in the school. Chapter III, the next chapter, will consider theories relevant to the study of the cultural construction of children's perceptions about the world in which they live. That chapter defines the ideological hegemony of the nation-state in order to determine if children's perceptions mirror this hegemony. Here, theories of Antonio Gramsci, Jürgen Habermas, and James Youniss will be explored. Chapters IV, V, and VI provide a socio-historical analysis of victimization in the Western world. This analysis provides the framework for exploring children's perceptions of the "other." Chapter VII presents past research on the political socialization of children. This will be used as a point of reference for my empirical endeavor. Chapters VIII and IX present the findings from the intensive interviews with children. The themes presented in these chapters are derived from the responses of the children themselves, that is, those issues repeatedly cited as most important by children are the themes addressed in these chapters.
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CHAPTER III:

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter presents the theoretical framework for this study. The theoretical question of this study is how does a society "reproduce" itself? Are future generations influenced to accept and believe in the status quo? In answering this question, the following corollaries are considered:

1. What is the ideological hegemony of the dominant groups who control the nation-state?

2. How is this ideological hegemony legitimized by the larger political and cultural institutions in such a manner that the "Weltanshauung" or worldview of the dominant groups is accepted by all through consent and not domination?

3. Do children believe in the Weltanshauung of the dominant group as indicated by either their acceptance or rejection of the status quo?

4. Finally, if there is an acceptance of the status quo, does this influence children's interactions on the interpersonal level: with peers, teachers, parents, and other adults?

This study explores the ideological hegemony of dominant groups in society, validation of this hegemony by the larger institutions of socialization (the mass media, the political establishment, the schools), and internalization of this hegemony in future generations. The intent of this chapter is to define this hegemony of dominant groups, to explore the process of legitimizing this hegemony, and to set the theoretical framework for analyzing micro-level (small group)
interactions among children.

Since this study regards children's perceptions of the world in which they live on the super-macro and macro levels, that is, perceptions of nationalism, politics, and enmity within both the international and national contexts; on the meso level --perceptions of various institutions within the nation-state; and on the micro levels, that is, interactions with peers and significant adults, different theories are utilized for each level of analysis. On the super-macro, macro, and meso levels, the theories of Antonio Gramsci and Jürgen Habermas are addressed. Gramsci's theory of hegemony is used to explore ideologies of dominant groups, while Habermas's theory of legitimations is used to explore how this hegemony is validated through various institutions in society. These theories are used in connection with both the socio-historical analysis of enmity -- presented in Chapters IV, V, and VI -- and with the responses of children to national and international events (presented in Chapters VIII and IX). The question here is are the ideologies of the nation-state reproduced in future generations? On the micro level, theoretical considerations discussed by James Youniss pertaining to peer interaction will be employed. For this level, the main question is how are boundaries between "in-groups" and "out-groups" in interpersonal realities designated and maintained? The first section of this chapter looks at the role of culture in the designation of enemies.
Legitimation of the Nation-State

This section presents theoretical constructs which examine how the dominant ideology of the nation-state is reproduced and legitimated in future citizens. Here, I use the works of Antonio Gramsci and Jürgen Habermas because both assert that the Weltanshauung of dominant groups are validated through culture. In this respect, acceptance of the status quo is achieved through consent, internalizing the belief that "our" way of conducting affairs is truly the "best" way; not acceptance through domination, that is, through fear of punishment. It is my contention that children’s support for the status quo is achieved through consent and not domination, and that this support is achieved through the portrayal of "our" way as "best" way by the main agencies of socialization. To illustrate this process, I present a detailed discussion of the theories of Gramsci and Habermas.

Antonio Gramsci and Jürgen Habermas can be classified as critical theorists, in that, they both re-work traditional Marxist theory by incorporating culture. In his study of ideological hegemony, Gramsci incorporates culture into his study of the nation-state by uncovering the role of both political and civil society in reproducing the stratified system (Gramsci, 1994:67). Similarly, Habermas criticized Marx for focusing too heavily on economic determinism (Habermas, 1971:45-48). Habermas felt that Marx reduced communicative action, that is, social or symbolic interaction
to purposive-rational action, that is, work (Habermas, 1971:45-48). Habermas states that communicative action, not purposive-rational action, is the most distinctive and pervasive form of oppression (Habermas, 1971:45-48). Essentially, while Marx stressed the role of work, Habermas stressed the role of communication (specifically "distorted communication," which is discussed later in this chapter) in the reproduction of the stratified system. In fact, both Gramsci and Habermas felt that domination of the individual occurs primarily through culture and not through the economy (Gramsci, 1994:67; Habermas, 1971:45-48).

Both Gramsci and Habermas also share a similar ideological starting-point in their work. They both begin with the assumption that oppression and stratification of groups is wrong. I wish to state this "bias" because it is one I share. In fact, since this is, in part, a study of enmity, I feel it is important to state from the outset that stratification and oppression are my own personal enemies. To me it is important to acknowledge the researcher in the research. This "researcher bias" has, of course, had an influence on my selection of theories and the research in general so I feel it is important to state this at the beginning. I also share the sense of idealism that is apparent in the works of both Gramsci and Habermas. Both believe that by uncovering the sources of oppression, social science can, and should, be used to alleviate the plight of
the oppressed. The theories of hegemony and legitimations are appropriate for a study of enmity because both address the question, how are boundaries between the dominant group (in-group) and subordinate groups (out-groups) maintained and legitimated through the structures of the system?

First, I look at Gramsci's theory of hegemony and I discuss how it is appropriate for this study. Secondly, I explore the role of legitimations in validating ideological hegemony and how the larger agencies of socialization legitimate this hegemony in future generations. Thirdly, I discuss Habermas's solution to this reproduction of stratification, as well as criticisms of Habermas's theory by Georg-Hans Gadamer.

**Hegemony and the Enemy:**

The central hypothesis of this research is that children's acceptance of the status quo -- indicated by their sentiments of nationalism, embracement of the dominant political rhetoric, and in their acceptance of larger cultural designations of "in-groups" and "out-groups" -- are both manufactured and legitimated by several of society's institutions. This legitimation is done as part of "ideological hegemony." Antonio Gramsci defines hegemony as the process of covertly creating people with values which help to perpetuate the dominant status of certain groups in society. Essentially, hegemony perpetuates the status quo.

As stated in Chapter I, hegemony is perpetuated in both
civil society, e.g., schools, media, and religion -- and political society, e.g., government, police, and judicial system (Bates, 1975:363). Gramsci states the following about the formation of hegemony:

My study [of society] also leads to certain definitions of the concept of that State that is usually understood as a political Society (or dictatorship, or coercive apparatus meant to mold the popular mass in accordance with the type of production and economy at a given moment) and not as a balance between the political Society and the civil Society (or the hegemony of a social group over the entire national Society, exercised through the so-called private 'organizations' such as the Church, the unions, the schools, etc.) and it is with the civil society that intellectuals operate (Gramsci, 1994:67).

Here, Gramsci states that while the popular perception is that the formation of the "public" is usually understood as a result of the influence of political society, it is actually a product of the balance between the ideologies perpetuated and legitimized by both political and civil society. Establishing consent is the key issue in the process of hegemony: people unquestionably see the existing system as the best system (cf. Gramsci, 1973; Said, 1978:6-7). Since hegemony is perpetuated through culture, it is perceived as a form of consent, not domination (Said, 1978:6-7). It is the cultural leadership, therefore, which defines hegemony. Those who dominate the servants of power, the intellectuals, are the ones who define hegemony. Hegemony, therefore, is not merely a product of political domination, but more importantly, of covert cultural indoctrination in both the political and civil
spheres.

The only way the influence of hegemony can be overcome is by deciphering the historical foundation of it. According to Gramsci:

The starting point of critical elaboration is the consciousness of what one really is, and is 'knowing thyself' as a product of the historical product to date, which has deposited in you an infinity of traces, without leaving an inventory (Gramsci, 1971:324).

By "historical product," Gramsci is referring to the influence of the social reality of the dominant group. It is this reality that is legitimized through the process of hegemony. Because we have no "inventory" of where this history comes from, we believe it -- usually without question. Our culture is legitimized through intellectuals and various agents in society, taken for granted, so the origins are not considered.

Gramsci insists that we need to scrutinize the roots of our perceptions of self and our own social reality. It is Gramsci's belief that the inventory of this history must be compiled; we must inspect the origins of hegemony and whose interests are served by it (Gramsci, 1971:324).

Hegemony also perpetuates the idea in both political and civil society that the power held by the dominant group is indicative of their ability and those who remain powerless are somehow deficient. This way, hegemony provides the ideological basis for stratification. With regard to enmity, hegemony provides the basis for setting boundaries. Those who agree with the dominant system are acceptable, part of "us,"
while those who do not are classified as "them." The mythology which surrounds the ideology of enemy creation brings a sense of order to our own social reality. The old adage "if you’re not with us, you’re against us" comes to mind. By dismissing the perceptions of those who differ from the dominant group as uncivilized, uneducated, or irrelevant, we further reinforce our own hegemony. This process is perpetuated in future citizens through both a glorification of "our" (dominant group’s) history and traditions by the mass media, political rhetoric, and schools, and through a denigration of "their" way of doing things. The next section will explore Habermas’s addition of culture to traditional Marxism in his notion of "legitimations" and its relevance to validation of the ideological hegemony of dominant groups to children. The final section, of the more macro theoretical concerns, will examine the debate between Habermas and Hans-Georg Gadamer.

Habermas and Legitimations. In his analysis of Habermas, George Ritzer states the following about the domination of individuals through culture:

In fact, the control is so complete that it no longer requires deliberate actions on the part of the leaders. The control pervades all aspects of the cultural world and, more importantly, is *internalized in the actor*...Domination has reached such a complete stage that it no longer appears to be domination at all. Because domination is no longer perceived as personally damaging and alienating, it often seems as if the world is the way it is supposed to be (Ritzer, 1988:252-253, emphasis added).
This quotation also illustrates the process of hegemony. I believe that the process of hegemony and Habermas's notion of legitimations are inextricably linked. It is through legitimations that hegemony is validated and reproduced.

Legitimations are systems of ideas generated by the main agencies in society to support the existence of the system, the status quo. They are designed by the political system and other agencies to "mystify" the public as to what exactly is happening (Habermas, 1975:36-38). In this respect, legitimations can be equated with ideologies. It is necessary for the agencies of society to secure mass approval by reinforcing those ideologies which legitimize the system.

Habermas differs from Gramsci in that he acknowledges the role of the individual:

The unity of the person requires the unity-enhancing perspective of a life-world that guarantees order and has both cognitive and moral-practical significance (Habermas, 1975:118).

The individual, at all costs, wishes to avoid chaos. When order is absent, the illusion of order must be created (Habermas, 1975:119). Habermas feels that historically this illusion of order is seen in the content of myth (Habermas, 1975:119). Initially, science took over the role of creating a sense of order from religion by explaining the processes of "outer-nature," i.e., natural disasters (Habermas, 1975:119-120). It is through legitimations that the growing complexities of "social co-existence" also finds a sense of order, albeit an illusionary one (Habermas, 1975:119-120).
Legitimations, therefore, are merely mythologies developed to create a sense of order (Habermas, 1975:119-120). The primary manner in which legitimations are validated, according to Habermas, is through "distorted communication" (Habermas, 1975:106-108). This distorted communication is what continues to mystify the true workings of our system. "Truth" is arrived at when this distortion of communication is removed (this is discussed in more detail later in this section). First, I would like to present one of Habermas's examples of how distorted communication operates.

One manner in which the system has been legitimized is through reinforcement of the achievement ideology (what Habermas refers to as "Leistungsideologie"): According to bourgeois conceptions that have remained constant from the beginnings of modern natural law to contemporary election speeches, social rewards should be distributed on the basis of individual achievement... Since it has been recognized, even among the population at large, that social force is exercised in the forms of economic exchange, the market has lost its credibility as a fair (from the perspective of achievement) mechanism for the distribution of life opportunities conforming to the system (Habermas, 1975:81).

To reduce the uncertainty about the legitimacy of the system, more recent assumptions of the achievement ideology perpetuate the notion that success is mediated through formal schooling as opposed to success in the market (Habermas, 1975:81). This newer version of the achievement ideology is credible only if the following conditions are met: (1) equal admission to higher education; (2) non-discriminatory standards of
evaluation for performance in school; (3) educational success translating into occupational success; (4) labor processes whose material structure permits evaluation according to individually accountable achievements (Habermas, 1975:81). If these conditions are not met, something which most educational research seems to indicate (cf. Kozol, 1967, 1991; Persell, 1977; Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Bourdieu, 1971), then the illusion must be created that they are met. Along this vein, the myth of meritocracy is still perpetuated in all agencies of society, including the education system. This myth states that as long as one works hard success will be achieved. This myth is perpetuated even though there is a vast amount of research which indicates the contrary to be true.

The problem is that a system which uses legitimations to secure approval has lost its relation to "truth." Here I feel it is important to define what Habermas meant by "truth." Truth is arrived at when people can communicate freely without the distortions of legitimations (Habermas, 1975:104-110). It is, therefore, through consensus in undistorted communication that individuals find truth -- after meeting what Habermas referred to as "validity claims" (Habermas, 1975:107). According to Habermas:

If belief in legitimacy is conceived as an empirical phenomenon without an immanent relation to truth, the grounds upon which it is explicitly based have only psychological significance...If, on the other hand, every effective belief in legitimacy is assumed to have an immanent relation
to truth, the grounds on which it is explicitly based contain a rational validity claim that can be tested and criticized independently of the psychological effect of these grounds (Habermas, 1975:97).

When a system of legitimations can no longer be seen as valid, because it becomes apparent it has lost its relation to truth due to overwhelming evidence to the contrary, "legitimation crisis" occurs (Habermas, 1975: 68-75).

"Legitimation crisis" deals with advanced capitalism and the problem that Habermas is concerned with is when socially produced wealth is distributed in an inequitable and unfair manner, yet it is made to seem legitimate (McCarthy, 1981:358-386). The "legitimation crisis" is in the changing relationship between the state and the economy, through government credits, subsidies, loans, labor policies, and basic interference in the market. "Legitimation crisis" is also the expanded activity of the state, formerly thought to be part of the private sphere (McCarthy, 1981:358-386). A crisis in legitimation is typically apparent either through overt protest movements, or in more covert expressions such as political absenteeism (not voting).

Part of the problem is the integration between the educational and occupational structure. As in the example provided above about achievement ideology, if it became evident to the masses that the barriers to education, to the primary means of gaining success, prevented certain groups from achieving, the legitimation of education as a vehicle to
success would be questioned. In essence, the old system which has lost its legitimacy has to be reinvented so that order can be re-established.

As stated above, Habermas feels that the solution to the problem of legitimations is open and free communication. In fact, Habermas's political goal is a society of undistorted communication (communicative action) which would reveal "truth" through consensus. Habermas draws a parallel between the psychoanalyst who tries to uncover the sources of distortion in the patient with the critical theorist who serves the same purpose for oppressed groups (Habermas, 1975:95-96). Both the psychoanalyst and the critical theorist remove the distortions of legitimations so that open and free communication can take place. Habermas uses the concept of rationalization previously used by both Marx and Weber. Marx and Weber both felt that increased rationalization was one of the major problems faced in the modern world. Increased rationalization takes control over the individual, so that eventually we are controlled by the culture we ourselves created, what Weber referred to as the "iron cage." Habermas agrees that increased rationalization of purposive-rational action is detrimental and leads to a loss of control over culture, but, unlike Weber, he distinguishes between rationalization of purposive-rational action and communicative action. Increased rationalization of communicative action is what is required to remove legitimations (Habermas, 1970:118).
The rationalization of communication, instead of being inhibiting, is liberating, it is what will lead to free and open communication -- the removal of "distorted communication."

I use legitimations as part of my theoretical framework for this study of how a citizenry is reproduced. It is my contention that belief in the status quo is perpetuated in future generations through validation of our way of life, as well as denigration of those who differ. In terms of enmity, I assert that designating a group or individual as an "enemy" or the "other" is done primarily through legitimations. By this I mean that the main agencies of society create a climate where denigration of a group is seen as justified and acceptable. An excellent example of how a group is legitimized as the enemy is seen in the mass-media treatment of the Japanese in the United States.

I would contend that in recent years Japan has become a target for our own frustration with the economy in the United States. During the recent presidential campaign of 1992, for example, every candidate felt he had to take a stand on the issue of Japan. Candidates attempted to answer the question how is it possible that Japan could be faring better economically than the United States? The answer was that they did not operate fairly in the market with reference to the so-called low importing, high exporting economic strategy. Democratic presidential candidate John Kerry used a sports metaphor in one of his television advertisements to state that
if the Japanese were not going to "play fair" and accept more American imports, then we would not accept more imports from Japan. Also, in response to the comment made by the Prime Minister of Japan that American workers were lazy and illiterate, Senator Ernest Hollings (D-SC) stated the following:

Hollings told Hartsville, S.C. workers on Monday that they 'should draw a mushroom cloud and put underneath it: Made in America by lazy illiterate workers and tested in Japan' (Greene, 3/5/92:2A).

To make light of an incident, the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which was responsible for killing hundreds of thousands of people, besides being tactically unnecessary as some historians contend, reinforces a climate which legitimizes hatred against the Japanese. This climate is evident in the actions of the U.S. auto workers who destroyed Japanese cars, and in those gas station owners who charged more money per gallon of gas to owners of Japanese cars.

Essentially, "Japan-bashing" deflects our attention from our own responsibility for our current economic problems. This climate also legitimizes the growing number of violent incidents directed against the Japanese specifically and Asians in general (Takaki, 1989:474-482). One such incident occurred in Detroit in 1982 where a Chinese American man was mistaken for a Japanese man and beaten to death by two auto workers who blamed the Japanese for their loss of work (Takaki, 1989:482). It is also important to say that these men never spent any time in jail for their actions, their
sentence was three years probation and a fine of $3,780 each (Takaki, 1989:482). In this example, therefore, not only was there a structural climate which legitimized the violence prior to the incident, but the courts further legitimized anti-Japanese violence by allowing the murderers to go unpunished. It is this perception, I fear, that is being internalized by the children of this country.

In the interviews with children, I examine their acceptance or rejection of the status quo. If the interview indicates an acceptance of the status quo, I attempt to discern whether this acceptance was fostered by the larger agencies of socialization, e.g. the schools and the media. If there is a rejection of the status quo, I am interested in determining if this is due some type of legitimation crisis. The next section will explore some of the criticisms of Habermas made in the ongoing debate between Habermas and Hans-Georg Gadamer. I have included this section to acknowledge criticisms of Habermas's theories and to illustrate that these criticisms do not fundamentally invalidate the use of legitimations for this research endeavor.

Habermas-Gadamer Debate. While I have already acknowledged my own researcher biases earlier in this chapter, I feel it is important to acknowledge and explore a different perspective to present a more balanced argument. For this reason, I have included some of the ideas of Hans-Georg Gadamer, one of the main critics of Habermas. Gadamer and
Habermas begin their study of society at two very different starting points, especially in terms of their distinct notions of the meaning of truth and understanding. Truth content means understanding in the sense that you have insight into a subject matter; Euclidean geometry, for example (Warnke, 1987:7-8). A second kind of understanding, what Weber referred to as "Verstehen," is the type of understanding one has if one is aware of the actor's motives and intentions in one's actions (Warnke, 1987:7-8). Gadamer believes that understanding in terms of truth content is the stronger form of understanding, while he feels that "Verstehen" is part of a romanticized version of hermeneutics (Warnke, 1987:7-10). Obviously, on the basis of his notion of legitimations, Habermas disagrees with Gadamer and believes that it is necessary to dig and find the motives and intentions of the actors; to uncover "distorted communication."

Gadamer asserts that this connection made by Habermas between "truth" and "method" ignores tradition:

My thesis is -- and I think it is the necessary consequence of recognizing the operativeness of history in our conditionedness and finitude -- that the thing which hermeneutics teaches us is to see through the dogmatism of asserting an opposition and separation between the ongoing, natural 'tradition' and the reflective appropriation of it. For behind this assertion stands a dogmatic objectivism that distorts the very concept of hermeneutics reflection itself (Gadamer, 1976:28).

Here he accuses Habermas of ignoring his own historical situatedness, his own tradition. Gadamer believes that "self-understanding" is never complete -- we have new experiences
which change our life philosophy -- therefore, we can never fully remove our own traditions and biases to study those of others or of the structure as Habermas contends (Warnke, 1987:29). This belief is evident in Gadamer's criticism of legitimations:

Insofar as the forces and compulsions tend to legitimate themselves linguistically, Habermas sees the critique of ideology as the means of unmasking the 'deceptions of language.' But this critique, of course, is in itself a linguistic act of reflection (Gadamer, 1976:30).

Gadamer contends that Habermas is merely replacing one form of distorted communication with another. According to Gadamer, history does not belong to us, but we to it; this point is a crucial distinction between Gadamer and Habermas (Gadamer, 1975:237).

Perhaps Gadamer is most critical of Habermas is the latter's use of the psychoanalytical doctor-client metaphor: Essentially, Gadamer's criticism of Habermas's doctor-client analogy is that it implies a degree of authoritarianism and paternalism: the belief that the delusions of the patient can only be deciphered by the doctor, the delusions of the oppressed can only be deciphered by the social scientist. According to Mendelson's analysis of the Habermas-Gadamer debate: "For Gadamer the ideal of the good life forbids claiming insight into the other's self-delusion (Mendelson, 1979:68)." This criticism is not directed merely at Habermas, but critical theory in general.

Habermas's response to this criticism is that critical
theory proves its validity only by addressing itself to the victims of domination (Mendelson, 1979:67). He contends that through undistorted communication, the victims of oppression become part of the solution; their tradition is acknowledged and validated because they are part of the conversation (Mendelson, 1979:67). Because of this, Habermas questions Gadamer's claim that critical theory is dogmatic. Habermas also disputes Gadamer's claim that critical theorists believe they have purged themselves of all links with tradition (Mendelson, 1979:62-63). Instead, he contends that critical theorists are too bound by tradition, but that the limits of tradition can be overcome through undistorted communication.

Legitimations in a Study of Enmity. In the context of this study on enmity, I do not feel that Gadamer's criticisms of Habermas and critical theory discounts the use of legitimations as a theoretical framework for studying structural designations of in-groups and out-groups. It is my contention that the histories and traditions of the "enemy" groups have not had a "voice," in Habermas's terms, in communicative action. In fact, I assert that part of the designation of enemy groups involves a mystification of their social reality, including their oppression. It is through structural legitimations that the humanity of the "other" is lost. To put this in the context of children's perceptions, I believe it is those groups that the children possess the least information about, e.g., with regard to their social
reality or humanity, or the most "misinformation" about, that will most frequently be designated as the enemy. The next section of this chapter will explore the theoretical construct used for exploration of interpersonal interaction among children.

**Interpersonal Interaction and the Setting of Boundaries**

This section will set the theoretical groundwork for examining children's perceptions of kind and unkind behavior on the interpersonal level. To explore this phenomenon, the work of psychologist James Youniss will be examined. The main concern in this micro level of analysis is in determining how children set boundaries between in-groups and out-groups in their daily interaction with others. Another concern is acknowledging children as active participants in the shaping of their reality. I will deal with this level of how children internalize their surroundings and make sense of the world in which they live.

James Youniss incorporates the theories of Harry Stack Sullivan and Jean Piaget in his analysis of the influence peers have in determining kind and unkind behavior. Harry Stack Sullivan was one of the first psychiatrists to acknowledge the importance of peers in the shaping of friendships (Youniss, 1980:xii). Sullivan's theory of the importance of peer interaction is based upon observation of his middle class clients in Washington, D.C. in the 1940s.
(Youniss, 1980:xii). Sullivan’s theory was very much in contrast with the then predominant view of psychoanalysis which largely ignored the importance of interpersonal interaction as a means of developing a sense of self:

Sullivan, on the other hand, emphasized interpersonal existence, claiming that adjustment occurs when a person is able to submit his or her personality to the common interest of a relationship with another person (Youniss, 1980:xii).

In other words, self definition occurs only through comparison and interaction with the other.

Piaget, contrary to many of the popular beliefs at the time of his writings in the 1920s and 30s, regarded children as active cognitive agents "who participate in the construction of reality" (Youniss, 1980:xiii). Piaget too felt that peers were very influential in the shaping of self in children. In fact, he felt that peers were the source of a principled morality that put common benefit above individual interest in children (Youniss, 1980:xiii-xiv). Youniss contends that peers in modern times have taken a more prominent role in the shaping of self-perceptions in light of decreased time in the home and increased time in schools (Youniss, 1980:xvi-xvii).

In the early years of development, children depend mainly on the perceptions of their parents to shape their social reality (Youniss, 1980:18-19). At this time, parents are in a position of authority and what they present to their children is accepted, usually without question. When children
enter school, they are exposed to peers with contrary viewpoints (Youniss, 1980:22). Children have two options once entering school: either they can constantly run up against one another's viewpoints or they must learn to resolve their differences in a cooperative manner:

Differences between relations are due to differences in structure, when structure refers to the types of interactions which take place between child and other. Children come to see themselves as being able to construct order in society either through adults or with peers (Youniss, 1980:21; emphasis in original).

Children's sense of order has changed. Initially, it is dependent upon their parents perceptions, later on it is expanded, out of necessity, to incorporate the perceptions of peers (Youniss, 1980:22). Through interaction with peers comes the questioning of the unilateral authority of parents (Youniss, 1980:33). In order to illustrate the development of the healthy and morally mature personality in the Sullivan-Piaget framework, Youniss outlines five characteristics: mutuality, standards of worth, similarity between self and other, interpersonal sensitivity, and relational possibilities. Each of these characteristics will be discussed. In Chapter IX, these characteristics will be utilized to explore responses concerning micro (small group) interaction among children. Those who exhibit these characteristics have a greater acceptance of those who differ. **Mutuality:**

Mutual understanding is arrived at through cooperation as
opposed to unilateral authority (Youniss, 1980:36). With unilateral authority, the person of authority possesses the powerful position in the relationship because of their already well-informed view of reality (Youniss, 1980:37). Their presentation to the other is that their perception is the one to be adopted; it is non-negotiable. In order to achieve mutual understanding, discussion, debate, and compromise needs to occur (Youniss, 1980:36). In this type of interaction each participant's perception is seen as having a degree of validity and it is through compromise that consensus is arrived at.

Standards of Worth:

In cooperative relations no one is viewed as the final authority. Criteria of worth are derived, therefore, by interpersonal consensus (Youniss, 1980:39). This means that persons are judged worthy on the basis of how clearly they present their ideas, how well they listen to the perceptions of the other, and finally, how ready they are to work toward consensus (Youniss, 1980:38-39). Much different criteria of worth are used in a relationship based on unilateral authority. Worth in this relationship is measured by how willing the less powerful person (child) is to conform to the authority and by how charitable the authority is in helping the other to conform (Youniss, 1980:39).

Similarity between Self and Other:

One important aspect of a healthy and morally mature
personality is the ability to understand that one's own personality is similar to that of others (Youniss, 1980:39). This is an important element for this study on enmity because it is usually the inability to acknowledge a similar sense of humanity that leads to the designation of inferiority. It is through establishing this common ground that friends as opposed to enemies are created. If there is not reciprocity in a relationship, the inequalities between people will further be emphasized and the friendship is lost (Youniss, 1980:39). In contrast, a relationship based on cooperation and an emphasis on similarities leads the children to realize they should treat others as they themselves wish to be treated (Youniss, 1980:40).

Interpersonal Sensitivity:

This characteristic is an extension of the acknowledgement of similarities between individuals. While it is important to find a common ground to establish friendship, it is also important to appreciate differences (Youniss, 1980:40). Here, children must seek a balance between what they have in common with their peers and how they differ from them (Youniss, 1980:40). While it is important to find similarities and a common basis for interaction, it is equally important to be sensitive to and to appreciate differences. This characteristic is also a very important one for the study of enmity. All too often differences are perceived in standards of inferior or superior. This leads to a
denigration of those deemed inferior. This perception was stated best by one of the students I interviewed when he asserted: "...different can be better, it doesn't have to be worse -- it's all right to be different (Field notes #1, MW:33)."

Relational Possibilities:

Both Sullivan and Piaget believe that the sign of a psychologically healthy individual is not achieved by becoming an autonomous individual, but by acknowledging the primacy of the need for relations with others (Youniss, 1980:41). Children must determine how their own selves fit in relation to others (Youniss, 1980:41). This knowledge comes through understanding the self in relation to others and vice versa (Youniss, 1980:41).

These five characteristics will be used as a framework to analyze children's responses dealing with kind and unkind behavior on the interpersonal level. The degree to which the responses reflect the cooperative model of relations outlined by Youniss will be assessed. It is my contention that the responses will reflect both the desire for interaction based upon equality and cooperation, and the need to set boundaries to distinguish "us" from "them." I also believe that those responses to questions asking the children to define kind and unkind behavior in adults will illustrate the influence of unilateral authority as opposed to the more cooperative model.
Summary

The theoretical concerns of this study are twofold: (1) assessing the larger cultural indoctrination of children into believing in the status quo, including perceptions of enmity, and (2) exploring interpersonal interaction and the designation of in-groups and out-groups on the smaller scale. On the macro level of exploration the theories of hegemony and legitimations will be utilized to explore if, in fact, the ideological hegemony of the dominant groups has been legitimized to children by the larger agencies of socialization. On the micro level of examination the theories of peer interaction proposed by James Youniss will be regarded to determine if the larger cultural constructs of "in-groups" and "out-groups" also influence interpersonal interaction.

The next chapter will explore the origins of stratification, aggression, and enmity. In fact, the intent of the next three chapters (IV, V, and VI) is to define the ideological hegemony evident in the Western world. If I am to assert that children’s perceptions reflect this hegemony, it is important to clearly define how this ideology has evolved historically to serve as a justification for imperialism, colonialism, expansionism, and brutality. For this reason, the next three chapters will define in detail the evolution of the ideological hegemony of the Western world (especially the United States) by providing a socio-historical analysis of victimization.
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CHAPTER IV

THE STRUCTURE OF DOMINANCE IN THE NATION-STATE: STRATIFICATION AND THE CREATION OF ENEMIES

The primary concern of this study is to explore how the dominant ideologies of the nation-state are reproduced in future generations. The most harmful component of these ideologies of the nation-state is when they legitimize the classification of groups as either "inferior," or as "enemies," to children. One of the most important aspects of this study is to discern whether or not the social construction of enemies by the larger agencies in society are legitimized to and internalized by children. Before exploring children's perceptions of the "other," it is crucial to clearly define the ideologies espoused by the nation-state which legitimize this classification. The next three chapters present this social construction of victimization; they are a socio-historical account of the ideologies which necessitate enmity formation.

This chapter investigates the foundations of social stratification and violence so apparent in the process of creating enemies. First, I address the various theories about the formation of social stratification and enemy creation. Secondly, I regard the roots of social stratification in the Western world. Here I present the cultural transformation in terms of dominant ideologies in the Western world. I explore
the transformation from a society characterized by the "partnership model," a society that appreciates differences in pluralistic terms, to one dominated by the "dominator model," classifying differences as either superior or inferior. These models are also used in Chapter IX where I examine whether children's perceptions of the "other" are presented in the language of the "partnership" or "dominator" model. Finally, this chapter discusses the enemy as a sacrificial victim to further define the formation of a cultural ideology which necessitates the classification of groups as the "enemy."

The main question in this chapter is where do the roots of violence lie? There have been many different responses to this question in recent years. For example, socialists and communists blame capitalists and vice versa (Eisler, 1987:xiv). If we look at reality, however, we see that socialist, communist, and capitalist countries alike are responsible for making our world more violent with the production of nuclear armaments. Others blame our "industrial paradigm," or our "scientific paradigm," "secular humanism," or "feminism" (Eisler, 1987:xiv). Some, such as the "Moral Majority," call for a return to the "good old days" when religion had a more significant role in our world. But, if we look to our religious roots, we see more bloodshed and massacre, by the Huns, Romans, Vikings, the slaughters by the Christian Crusade, and the Inquisition; hardly a more peaceful time (Eisler, 1987:xiv).
The question remains, is enmity a "natural" process, or is it the creation of culture? Has our history always been permeated with the creation of enemies, with war and aggression, or have there been civilizations void of these tendencies? Has there been an historical justification for an ideology which necessitates the creation of enemies and, if so, is this ideology legitimizied to future generations? The intent of this chapter is to provide some answers to these questions. I begin by considering various perceptions about aggression, violence, and stratification.

**Origins of Enmity: Perceptions of Aggression, Violence, and Stratification**

The popular perception is that our world has always been characterized by aggression, war, and domination. The disagreement lies in determining whether this aggression is rooted in biology or culture. Konrad Lorenz states that aggression and war is the result of an instinctual "aggression drive":

Unreasoning and unreasonable human nature causes two nations to compete, though no economic necessity compels them to do so; it induces two political parties or religions with amazingly similar programs of salvation to fight each other bitterly, and it impels an Alexander or Napoleon to sacrifice millions of lives in his attempt to unite the world under his scepter (Lorenz, 1963: 228-229).

This "aggression drive" is necessary for the preservation of the species. Lorenz compares the aggressive territoriality of fish, birds, and rats with that of humans. While Lorenz
provides an intriguing argument, it is the assumption of my research that violence, aggression, stratification, and enmity is the result of cultural influences and not biological ones. I base this assumption on the fact that both historically and currently some societies have been void of aggression, violence, and war. I also believe this to be a cultural phenomenon because to state that it is biological is to give up hope of change. If violence is part of our biological make-up, then there is no hope of altering the situation. An overriding assumption in this study, perhaps one might state a researcher bias, is that change is possible; there is hope for a more peaceful world.

Those researchers who subscribe to the cultural creation of violence, aggression, stratification, and war believe that there is hope for a more peaceful future. Sam Keen states the following about violence and enmity:

The problem seems to lie not in our reason or our technology, but in the hardness of our hearts. Generation after generation, we find excuses to hate and dehumanize each other, and we always justify ourselves with the most mature-sounding political rhetoric. And we refuse to admit the obvious. We human beings are Homo hostilis, the hostile species, the enemy-making animal. We are driven to fabricate an enemy as a scapegoat to bear the burden of our denied enmity (Keen, 1991:10-11; emphasis in original).

While Keen seems to be saying that the process of enemy creation is a "drive," implying that it is a product of biology and not culture, he states that this drive is based on cultural learning and we can remedy the situation by regarding the humanity of the enemy (Keen, 1991:11). This can be done
only if we face the enemy within (Keen, 1991:11). Keen states the commandment "love your enemy as yourself" acknowledges the enemy within and that we must know ourselves to humanize the enemy (Keen, 1991:11). Keen asserts that the media and political rhetoric provide individuals with a projected target for their own self-hate; the "other" (Keen, 1991:6-12). He further reinforces the idea of the social construction of the enemy in the following quotation:

> Once invented, warfare became a nearly universal practice. But there are enough exceptions to establish the crucial point on which hope rests its delicate case: enemy making and warfare are social creations rather than biological imperatives. The peaceful peoples, such as the Hopi, the Tasaday, the Mbuti Pygmies, the K'ung Bushmen of the Kalahari, the Copper Eskimo, the Amish, and others, show us that human beings are capable of creating sophisticated cultures without the use of systematic violence, without a warrior class and a psyche organized around defending the tribe against an enemy (Keen, 1991:16-17).

Similarly, anthropologist Ashley Montagu asserts that we have no "killer instinct," but instead that in earlier civilizations the emphasis was on cooperation and not conflict (Montagu, 1968:15).

Fredrick Hartmann, in his analysis of enmity The Conservation of Enemies, asserts that enmity exists on three different levels: the first, and most extreme, is war; second, are the less dramatic crises that may result in war if they are not "managed"; and third, are the daily tensions which may eventually erupt into the first or second levels (Hartmann, 1982:3). The goal of this study is to reveal these three levels of tension as they are perceived by children and to try
to pinpoint where these perceptions originate. Although Hartmann believes that creating enemies is a product of culture, like Keen, he also uses language that would suggest it is somewhat biological or economic. He states that the "ingrained" tendency for people to organize into groups necessitates the process of enemy creation:

The consensus is that responding to the needs such as defense and subsistence by organizing groups necessarily creates a sense of alienation from those left outside the group. Here we have one important societal root of the phenomenon of enmity: the hostility of organized group versus organized group (Hartmann, 1982:14).

Hartmann makes a valid point: the roots of enmity are found in the designation of groups, "us" versus "them." As stated in Chapter I, the process of setting boundaries is done to further define a group’s social reality. Seemingly inherent in these processes is the creation of enemies. Before the destruction of a group or culture is justified, dehumanization into enemy status must occur. The question, however, lies in Hartmann’s statement that this process of distinguishing groups "necessarily" creates enemies. Does the classification of the "other" necessarily entail the designation of "inferior?" Why are differences between groups equated with "inferior" or "superior?" I assert that this hierarchical designation of differences is were the roots of enmity lie. The next section will explore the roots of this distinction.

Cultural Transformation Theory:

There have been many alternatives presented to examine history. Some explore history in terms of whole cultures and
not merely elite individuals (Spengler, 1976). Oswald Spengler, for example, examines history in terms of stages of development such as herbivores and carnivores, the development of tools, the development of language, and the rise of the machine culture (Spengler, 1976). Likewise, Arnold Toynbee regards "challenge and response" among competing civilizations (Toynbee, 1954). Lewis Mumford explores history in terms of technological complexes in different phases of history to help to explain types of social organization and prevalent identity (Mumford, 1934). Similarly, there is a growing number of anthropologists who investigate history in more holistic terms. The main question addressed in this research is how has culture evolved?

One such anthropologist, Riane Eisler, asks the following question in her analysis of what she refers to as "cultural transformation":

What is it that chronically tilts us toward cruelty rather than kindness, toward war rather than peace, toward destruction rather than actualization (Eisler, 1987:xiii)?

Eisler states that we have the perception that society has always been violent and male-dominated (Eisler, 1987:xvii). By perceiving society in these terms we are not acknowledging a logical alternative; there can be a society in which difference is not necessarily equated with inferiority or superiority (Eisler, 1987:xvii). In Eisler’s cultural transformation theory there are two basic models of society. In the dominator model society is characterized by ranking,
typically as either patriarchal or matriarchal, and differences are categorized as either superior or inferior (Eisler, 1987:xvii). In the partnership model social relations are primarily based on the principle of linking rather than ranking and diversity is not equated with inferiority or superiority.

Cultural transformation theory also proposes that the original direction our cultural evolution was headed was toward partnership and not domination as previously believed (Eisler, 1987:xvii). A fundamental social shift from the partnership to the dominator model occurred after a period of chaos and almost total cultural disruption (Eisler, 1987:xvii). This shift is more evident in the Western world because of the greater availability of data due to the ethnocentric focus of Western social science (Eisler, 1987:xvii). Eisler feels this shift is also apparent in other parts of the world. In her book *The Chalice and the Blade*, Eisler uses the symbol of the "chalice" (or grail) to symbolize the point in history when the partnership model dominated, and the "blade" to symbolize the takeover of the dominator model (Eisler, 1987:xvii). She states that while she equates the blade with the male:

The underlying problem is not men as a sex. The root of the problem lies in a social system in which the power of the Blade is idealized - in which both men and women are taught to equate true masculinity with violence and dominance and to see men who do not conform to this ideal as 'too soft' or 'effeminate' (Eisler, 1987:xviii).

It is also the tendency to view anything associated with
femininity or women -- traits such as nurturance, empathy, and sensitivity -- as secondary. The remainder of this chapter will regard this cultural transformation through Prehistoric cultures, as well as the legitimization of the dominator model through such agencies as religion.

The Prehistoric World. During the Paleolithic period women were equated with the life giving force (Eisler, 1987:2). The dead wore beads that looked like vaginas and were covered with red ocher pigment symbolizing the life giving force of menstrual blood (Eisler, 1987:2). The belief in this burial ritual seems to be that this would provide the dead with rebirth. There were also many female figurines that were found from the Paleolithic period (Eisler, 1987:3). While these rituals and figurines seemed to validate the life giving force of the "Goddess," the interpretation of scholars was quite different. The assumption, initially, was that it was only prehistoric man who was responsible for Paleolithic art (Eisler, 1987:3; Stone, 1976:xxiii). The perception also was that "primitive men" were blood thirsty, warlike hunters, which contradicts the reality of the primitive gathering-hunter societies found in recent years (Eisler, 1987:3). Eisler asserts that some of the stick and line drawings found in caves that were believed to depict weapons (bows, arrows, spears) could have just as easily been vegetation and the foliage present in the surrounding landscape (Eisler, 1987:3). In fact, some of the "weapons" depicted were not even invented.
until much later (Eisler, 1987:3). Finally, when the drawings or figurines of women were discovered they were usually interpreted as obscene sex objects (Eisler, 1987:3).

Andre Leroi-Gourhan's analysis of the art in some sixty excavated Paleolithic caves confirms that feminine representations and symbols played a central part (Leroi-Gourhan, 1968:61). In fact, he found that female figures were often located in the central position of the caves and the male figures occupied either peripheral positions or surrounded the female figures (Leroi-Gourhan, 1968:61). These findings support the hypothesis that women played a major role in Paleolithic society. Essentially, Eisler asserts that the interpretation of Paleolithic art was done in the dominator model (Eisler, 1987:7).

In Neolithic art the worship of the Goddess was also evident (Eisler, 1987:12). The principle deity appears to be a goddess, this is evident in the vast number of clay figurines of the goddess as either a young woman, a pregnant woman, or an old woman (Stone, 1976:17). There was also the discovery of temples of the Goddess in nearly every Neolithic excavation (Stone, 1976:xviii).

I have included a brief review of these prehistoric societies because not only were they void of sexual stratification, but virtually any stratification. One element missing from Neolithic and Paleolithic art that warrants mention is the complete absence of images of cruelty, armed
might, and violence based power (Eisler, 1987:17). Archeological finds from the Neolithic period, for example, reveal that there was an absence of heavy fortifications -- they lived in areas because of their aesthetic beauty and not their defensive value (Eisler, 1987:13; cf. James, 1959). There was also an absence of weapons and there was no evidence of warfare for 1500 years (Eisler, 1987:13-14). Marija Gimbutas also believes that the evidence indicates that this civilization was matrilineal and that women played roles in all aspects of social life (Gimbutas, 1991:9). Neolithic art also does not have images of either the goddess or her son consort carrying weaponry of any kind (Eisler, 1987:18). This art suggests that early society is more characteristic of the partnership rather than dominator model.

Crete (6000 B.C.) was the last of the early civilizations characterized by the partnership model (Eisler, 1987:30). Crete was still characterized by the goddess when most other civilizations were beginning to worship warlike male gods (Eisler, 1987:30). Crete was also highly advanced in terms of pottery, metallurgy, engraving, and architecture (Eisler, 1987:31). The art in Crete was characterized by a glorification of nature (Eisler, 1987:36). Crete also appeared to be a very peaceful and egalitarian community, there were weapons, but they were not glorified in the art, there were no military fortifications, there were no battle or hunting scenes, and the notion of ambition was absent, names
of artists were never attached to art and there were no records of the deeds of rulers (Eisler, 1987: 36-37). The next section will look at the destruction of these peaceful early civilizations and their replacement with the dominator model.

**A Cultural Transformation.** The first agricultural societies settled in desirable land along lakes and rivers chosen for their fertile soil (Eisler, 1987:43). The evidence also suggests that there were nomadic bands which travelled in the much harsher peripheral areas of the countrysides (Eisler, 1987:43). Approximately 7,000 years ago there were "patterns of disruption" in the agricultural societies (Eisler, 1987:43). The nomads invaded the partnership areas. The nomads were believed to be the Kurgans who were Indo-Europeans and Semitics or ancient Hebrews (Eisler, 1987: 44). Both the Kurgans and the ancient Hebrews had one thing in common, they were characterized by the dominator model of social organization:

...a social system in which male dominance, male violence, and a generally hierarchic and authoritarian social structure was the norm (Eisler, 1987:44).

The art of the Kurgans also reveals that they worshipped the blade instead of the chalice; their art was characterized by weapons and the goddess was replaced with warlike gods (Eisler, 1987: 48). Stratification is also evident for the first time -- burial practices indicate these hierarchical and violent tendencies (Eisler, 1987:50). There were marked
differences in the size of graves and "funerary gifts" in those of higher status. In these male graves there were also large numbers of skeletal remains of women who were presumably the wives, concubines, and slaves of these powerful men (Eisler, 1987:50-51). Weapons of destruction were also found in the tombs indicating the great social value that was attached to the blade (Eisler, 1987:50). There were also efforts to fortify dwellings, locating them on hilltops as opposed to the fertile valleys (Eisler, 1987:51). The early partnership societies were either wiped out or radically changed (Eisler, 1987:53).

The reinforcement of the dominator model, both in early civilization and much later on, was done in the following manner:

Directly, through personal coercion, and indirectly, through intermittent social shows of force such as public inquisitions and executions, behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions that did not conform to dominator norms were systematically discouraged. This fear conditioning became part of all aspects of daily life, permeating child rearing, laws, schools. And through these and other instruments of socialization, the kind of replicative information required to establish and maintain a dominator society was distributed throughout social system (Eisler, 1987:83).

Therefore, it was through the main agencies of society that the dominator model was legitimized.

Some of the advanced technologies of the partnership societies were adopted into the dominator societies, but the egalitarian nature of these early societies was never adopted (Eisler, 1987:90). In order for the dominator model to work,
women had to be stripped of their power. The culture went from matrilineal to patrilineal and women no longer had a role in the sacred (Eisler, 1987:91). To justify the subordination of women, the power of the blade over the chalice had to be legitimized. In order to achieve this the goddess was discredited (Eisler, 1987:92). The goddess was belittled through myth where she was either humiliated or raped, relegated to the subordinate status of consort or wife of a more powerful male deity, and some goddesses were transformed into more martial deities as opposed to peaceful ones (Eisler, 1987:92). Male scribes of the gods replaced female scribes of the goddess; history was written in an androcentric perspective (Eisler, 1987:93).

After invasion technologies of destruction were now given highest priority. Precious metals and jewels that were used for art in spiritual icons during the partnership era were instead used to decorate weapons (Eisler, 1987:91). Initially, the dominator model was imposed through force; later it was legitimized through the main agencies of society.

**Legitimization of the Dominator Model through Religion.** We see the reinforcement of the dominator model in Biblical references in the Old Testament:

...interlaced with what is humane and uplifting, much of what we find in the Judeo-Christian Bible is a network of myths and laws designed to impose, maintain, and perpetuate a dominator system of social and economic organization (Eisler, 1987:94).

Symbols of the goddess during Neolithic times, such as the
snake, were discredited and made into something evil in the Bible (Eisler, 1987:86). Also, there are two stories of creation in the Bible, one that is more indicative of the partnership model, the other the dominator model:

The first tells that woman and man were simultaneous divine creations. The second, more elaborate one tells that Eve was created as an afterthought from Adam's rib (Eisler, 1987:86).

In the Bible, women were relegated to property status. If, for example, a woman was caught "laying with a man" she could be bought by that man from her father (Eisler, 1987:96). Also if a woman was shown by her husband to not be a virgin she could legally be stoned to death:

The answer is that a woman who behaves as a sexually and economically free person is a threat to the entire social and economic fabric of a rigidly male-dominated society. Such behavior cannot be countenanced lest the entire social and economic system fall apart. Hence the 'necessity' for the strongest social and religious condemnation and the most extreme punishment (Eisler, 1987:97; emphasis in original).

Hence, Christianity legitimized the subordination of women.

It is not only the subordination of women that is justified through religions such as Christianity, but stratification, war, and enmity as well:

To shed enemy blood was to recapitulate the cosmic drama, to participate in the sacrament by which life was renewed, to take part in the primal battle between the forces of creation and the forces of destruction (Keen, 1991:28).

Those who were worshipping the goddess in the remains of the partnership societies were said to worship "false" gods and their destruction was legitimized. These messages are found
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not just in the Bible, but also the Koran, the Bhagavad-Gita, and the Book of Mormon (Hartmann, 1982:13). Violence, war, and enmity was also legitimized in the religious art. This art glorified religious battles and the torturing of early Christians (Eisler, 1987:103). The enemy had become followers of rival religions; their destruction was a sacred act.

In some of the teachings of Jesus we see a return of the partnership mode of thinking. Jesus openly talked with women, including a prostitute. His preachings were also about more 'feminine values' -- love, sensitivity, compassion, and responsibility (Eisler, 1987:120-123). The beliefs of Jesus are believed to be revealed in great detail in the suppressed texts known as the "Gnostic Gospels" (Eisler, 1987:126). These texts were viewed as heretical and ordered to be destroyed by Church authorities. The Gospels stated that access to the deity need not go through the religious hierarchy (Eisler, 1987:126). They also revealed that Mary Magdalene was one of the most important figures in early Christianity (Eisler, 1987:126). These Gospels were not discovered until 1945.

Later, we see a reinforcement of the dominator model in the witch hunts both in Europe and the United States. Barbara Ehrenreich and Deidre English explore the reinforcement of the dominator model through the suppression and annihilation of women healers. Church educated male "physicians" were threatened by "wise women" who possessed the powers of healing
(Eisler, 1987:141). These women worshipped a female deity and her son consort. The threat these healers presented was dealt with in the following manner:

The witch-craze was neither a lynching party nor a mass suicide by hysterical women. Rather, it followed well-ordered, legalistic procedures. The witch-hunts were well organized campaigns, initiated, financed and executed by the state (Ehrenreich and English, 1973:7).

The perceived "deviance" of these women was socially constructed because of their threat to the social order. A similar perception was apparent in the witch hunts in New England:

Men who fear witches soon find themselves surrounded by them; men who become jealous of private property soon encounter eager thieves. And if it is not always easy to know whether fear creates the deviance or deviance the fear, the affinity of the two has been a continuing course of wonder in human affairs (Erikson, 1966:22).

To reinforce the dominator model, these women were first discredited and later annihilated. They had been accorded enemy status; a threat to God and country.

Anne Hutchinson in colonial New England also was perceived as a threat to the Puritan way of life. She questioned the validity of the ruling clergy elite accusing them of preaching a "covenant of works"; the belief that good works translated into salvation (Erikson, 1966:82). Puritans believed in a "covenant of grace" meaning salvation was predestined (Erikson, 1966:82). Hutchinson questioned the authority of the Church because she stated since the belief should be in the covenant of grace, why was it necessary to abide by a Church God himself may not have chosen
(Erikson, 1966:85)? This debate was really between the old Puritanism, represented by Hutchinson, and the political authority of the new Puritanism, represented by the elite male clergy (Erikson, 1966:93). The religious elites response was to excommunicate Hutchinson stating she had been deluded by the devil (Erikson, 1966:990. Hence, the dominator model had regained its authority. In the next section I will examine the notion of the sacrificial victim and its applicability to enemy creation.

The Enemy as the Sacrificial Victim:

Renè Girard explores the idea of the enemy and the scapegoat in his book Violence and the Sacred. Girard examines the idea of the sacrificial victim in both primitive religion and Greek tragedies. He states that the use of sacrifice can be regarded as a predecessor to our own judicial system. The act of sacrifice and the judicial system serve the same function; they both reduce vengeance (Girard, 1977:22-23). The judicial system is more effective than sacrifice because it conforms more strictly to the principle of vengeance in that it is actually the one that committed the act who is punished (Girard, 1977:28). With sacrifice, the sacrificial victim is the surrogate for the one who actually committed the violence. The actual offender is not sacrificed because this would cause the community to become polluted by the initial violence causing more violence to ensue (Girard, 1977:27). Unlike our modern judicial system, therefore, there
is no reciprocal violence; it is not the offender who is punished, but a surrogate victim.

Girard believes that substituting the actual offender with a surrogate victim is the basis for sacrifice because:

As I see it, the relationship between the potential victim and the actual victim cannot be defined in terms of innocence or guilt. There is no question of 'expiation'. Rather a society is seeking to deflect upon a relatively indifferent victim, a 'sacrificeable' victim, the violence that would otherwise be vented on its own members, the people it desires most to protect (Girard, 1977:4).

The sacrificial victim protects the community from its own violence, it becomes the outlet for violence (Girard, 1977:8). For example, Girard discusses the Biblical murder of Able by his brother Cain. Girard believes that Cain murdered Able because he had no sacrificial outlet. While Able was a herder who had the outlet of animal sacrifice, Cain was a farmer and had no such outlet (Girard, 1977:4). The perception of the sacrificial victim is that he or she:

...[is] considered a polluted object, whose living presence contaminates everything that comes in contact with it and whose death purges the community of its ills -- as the subsequent restoration of public tranquility clearly testifies (Girard, 1977:95).

The sacrificial rite also reinforces the bonds within the community. This is true because it demands collective participation of the community (Girard, 1977:100). The sacrificial rite creates solidarity in the community because it serves to "dissolve distinctions" in the group's hierarchy (Girard, 1977:111). All within the community participate and for the purposes of the ceremony all are at the same status.
level. This is illustrated in some ritual customs where the King is symbolically killed (Girard, 1977:111). At the end of the ceremony the King is replaced by a surrogate victim (human or animal) who is murdered in his place. The symbolic use of one as lofty as the King serves another purpose, to reinforce the belief that the surrogate victim is the master of all violence (Girard, 1977:111).

I have included such a lengthy discussion of the Girard's notion of the sacrificial victim because I believe that this practice continues today in the form of the enemy. The sacrificial victim is the scapegoat whose demise symbolically removes violence from the tribe and brings the community together. I see a similar process in the creation of enemies -- they are created out of a mythology which states they are responsible in some way for the ills we suffer. After their removal, or at least through their collective denigration by the group, a burden is lifted and we come together to battle a common foe.

Summary

In this chapter I have presented some theories on the foundations of enmity, violence, stratification, and war. I have illustrated how the ideology of the "dominator model" has taken priority over that of the "partnership model." The main purpose of this chapter is to set the foundation for the formation of cultural ideologies which necessitate the
creation of enemies. Since it is my hypothesis that this cultural ideological hegemony not only exists, but is passed on to future generations, it is vital to clearly define the formation of this ideology in the Western world. While I believe that the process of creating enemies is quite pervasive in our cultural history, I also have hope that the "dominator model" can be replaced by the "partnership model."

The next two chapters continue this exploration of enemy creation in the Western world by focusing on the social construction of victimization historically in the United States. They further define the "ideology of enemy-making" as it has been shaped historically in the United States. These three chapters are crucial for setting the stage for this empirical endeavor; exploring the internalization of these ideologies of enemy making in future generations. Chapter V examines the ideological climate in the United States beginning with European invasion and continuing through the expansion west.
CHAPTER V

THE HISTORICAL CREATION OF THE ENEMY
IN THE UNITED STATES

This chapter will provide an historical examination of the notion of the enemy in the Western world. It provides an exploration of the historical formation of an ideology which necessitates the notion of the enemy. This is one of many ways the history of the United States could be explored (for an alternative explanation: cf. Niebuhr, 1965, 1969a, 1969b). The primary focus of this chapter will be on the political rhetoric, ideology, and mythology which creates, sustains, and perpetuates the idea of the enemy in the United States. The main question addressed in this chapter and Chapter VI is how does the dominant ideology of the United States contribute to the process of creating enemies? To answer this question the following will be regarded: first, the historical changes in definitions of what constitutes an enemy in the Western world, second, an examination of the ideology of "empire as a way of life" and how this ideology has been perpetuated in the early history of the United States, and finally, how the hegemony of "empire as a way of life" leads to the creation of enemies by externalizing evil.

Later in this endeavor, in Chapters VIII and IX, I illustrate how this ideology is apparent in the responses of
children both in their discussion about enemies within the nation-state and, especially, with their description of international enemy groups. This finding suggests that this ideology is both perpetuated and legitimized by agencies of legitimation in the nation-state; children are indoctrinated into the status quo, including the designation of enemies. The first portion of this chapter probes the changing perceptions of the word "enemy" and its significance in the classification of groups that differ.

**Changing Perceptions of the Enemy**

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, an excellent analysis of classical and Biblical notions, the idea of the enemy in the western world went through some dramatic changes in the period from 1300 to the present. The enemy has always been perceived as one who antagonizes or one who seeks to inflict injury upon another. Initially, however, the enemy was associated with the devil ("The prynce of derknes...our goostly enemey the deyull (1526)") (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989:298). Hence, the enemy was the adversary of all Humankind, not merely individuals or groups of individuals. At this time, the enemy was either an evil spiritual force or a person whose body was inhabited by such a force. In the latter instance it was believed that if you loved, blessed, and forgave your enemy the evil would be overcome: "Forgiue vine eneme (1362)" or "Blessen vr enemys (1398)" (*Oxford
English Dictionary, 1989:298). In the period between 1300 and the early 1700s the enemy was seen as a threat to religion, faith, and God.

In the Western world in the late 1700s until the present time, with the advent of the separation of church and state, a growing secularized climate, expansionism, immigration, and increasing nationalistic sentiment, came a dramatic shift in the notion of the enemy. The enemy that began as a threat to religion, faith and God was now viewed as a threat to a way of life. One's own way of life was viewed as the best. The enemy was no longer seen as an evil force, but had become personified. Enemies were those whose lifestyles and cultures differed from our own: "All outside the family; tribe, or nation were usually held as enemies (1874) (Oxford English Dictionary, 1989: 298)." No longer was the enemy someone who should be loved and forgiven, now the enemy was to be feared, hated, and fought against: "Where can I get me...arms to fight my enemy? (1872) (Oxford English Dictionary, 1989:298)." This chapter proposes to examine the mythology which surrounds the latter definition of the enemy.

It is no coincidence that this change in the definition of "enemy" coincides with a changing definition in the word "race." Race, prior to the sixteenth century, referred to a line of descent; it was synonymous with "bloodlines" or "stock" (Williams, 1983:248). With the advent of expansionism, colonialism, and conquest came the changing
definitions in both "race" (Smedley, 1993:15) and "enemy." "Race" and "enemy" both became connected with terms of either inferior or superior (the "dominator model"). In terms of race, this became associated with biologically discrete and distinct groups which are by "nature" unequal (Smedley, 1993:18). Race became a justification for inequality, brutality, and discrimination to further the exploits and profits of technologically "superior" groups. The enemy became one who obstructs a "way of life." This is the epitome of the ideology of "empire as a way of life" which is explored in the next section.

The Hegemony of Empire as a Way of Life

Historian William Appleman Williams defines "way of life" as those patterns, beliefs, and ideologies which have become institutionalized (Williams, 1980:4). A way of life is our conception of the world and how it works; our "weltshauung," or world view (Williams, 1980:4). It is the contention of this study that the dominant weltshauung is the ideology of "empire as a way of life." This is the belief that the security, prosperity, and social peace of the nation is dependent upon continued expansion of its borders (Williams, 1980:7-8). As a consequence empire as a way of life is dependent upon imperialism for survival. Williams defines imperialism as "the loss of sovereignty --control-- over essential issues and decisions by a largely agricultural
society to an industrial metropolis (Williams, 1980:7)":

If we accept that basic definition of imperialism, then we have no trouble dealing with similar relationships - superior over inferior - between industrial societies. That is a more complicated and fluctuating involvement, but it can and has produced serious tension and widespread violence. Indeed the outbreaks of World Wars I and II, as well as America's relationship with Western Europe and Japan after 1945, can be understood as manifestations of that variation on the theme of modern imperialism (Williams, 1980:8).

The essence of empire as a way of life, therefore, is the subjugation of the less powerful to serve the interests of those with power.

Williams states that because the United States has expanded its own economic system throughout much of the world it has become very difficult for other nations to retain economic independence (Williams, 1962:11). A second, more pressing, problem is the belief that America's well-being depends upon this expansion. According to Williams, this leads, first, to a neglect of internal development within the nation, and second, to an externalization of the causes for the problems we as a nation face:

...this strong tendency to externalize the sources or causes of good things leads naturally enough to an even greater inclination to explain the lack of the good life by blaming it on foreign individuals, groups, and nations (Williams, 1964:11).

It is this practice of blaming the "other" for our own problems, this "externalization of evil," that leads to the creation of enemies. I would add that this externalization of evil occurs not only on a global scale, but within the nation-
state itself. By this I mean that certain groups "within" are blamed for national social problems. Chapter IX provides many examples of the children in my sample "externalizing evil"; blaming both groups outside and within the United States for the problems we face.

This ideology of empire as a way of life is perpetuated by the State. The agents of the State consist of both elected officials and their appointed staffs, national and civil bureaucracies, the military including the CIA, the civil police force including the FBI, and the judicial system (Williams, 1980:10). While this dominant weltshauung is perpetuated by the State, Williams states that its origins are actually found in the "Establishment." The Establishment is made up of the elites in society, those who are powerful in the economy, the intellectual realm, and other areas (Williams, 1980:11). I see Williams notion of the Establishment as comparable to what C. Wright Mills referred to as the "power elite." Essentially, the leaders of the State are put in positions of power because they represent and perpetuate the weltshauung of the Establishment. To put this in Gramsci's terms, it is the ideological hegemony of the Establishment that is legitimized by the agents of the State. Williams warns against confusing the State and the Establishment:

We foster an illusion that electing or appointing different people will produce or lead to a change in the outlook or Weltshauung. But we are in reality changing the wrong people, and the recent
rise in political and electoral apathy indicates a rudimentary awareness of that truth (Williams, 1980:11).

Williams also states that while the American people are led to believe that we are the Establishment, we are actually absent from the discussion (Williams, 1980:11).

This ideology which is perpetuated by an ever smaller group of elites (the Establishment) is accepted by Americans because:

...Americans of the 20th century liked empire for the same reasons their ancestors had favored it in the 18th and 19th centuries. It provided them with renewable opportunities, wealth, and other benefits and satisfactions including a psychological sense of well-being and power (Williams, 1980:13).

While the rhetoric used to legitimize empire as a way of life has changed throughout our history, the result -- that is, expanding the borders and imperialism -- has remained. While this study concentrates on the United States, empire as a way of life is not peculiar to Americans; nor, for that matter, is it peculiar to the Western world. History indicates, however, that empire as a way of life is especially prevalent in the Western world with its expansionism, imperialism, and colonialism, and, I would contend, most pervasive in the United States following World War II, an issue which will be addressed in Chapter VI. The question is why is the ideology of empire as a way of life more common to the Western world? I believe that Max Weber's study of the Protestant ethic and the "Spirit of Capitalism" provides some answers to this question.
Weber asserts that there are several components evident in the "Spirit of Capitalism." First, in a capitalist system, work is valued as an end in itself. Work takes on the meaning of a duty in a calling (Weber, 1958:53-54). Second, in a capitalist system, acquisitiveness, trade, and profit are viewed not merely as occupational success, but as proof of personal virtue. Third, there is the overwhelming belief that one should live a methodically organized life governed by reason. This manner of conducting oneself is regarded not merely as a logical means to achieve long term goals, but also as an inherently proper and even righteous way to live. Fourth, immediate happiness is perceived as hedonism; instead, one should forgo this to achieve future satisfaction. In other words, instead of living in an ostentatious manner when one acquires wealth, one should lead more of an ascetic lifestyle and reinvest the wealth to obtain more (Weber, 1958:53-54).

According to Weber, Protestantism was particularly conducive to the spirit of capitalism. This sentiment is evident in the following quotation where Weber explores the spirit of capitalism and the notion of competition in the guilds of the Middle Ages and the Protestant sects:

The capitalist success of a guild member undermined the spirit of the guild - as happened in England and France - and hence capitalist success was shunned. But the capitalist success of a sect brother, if legally attained, was proof of his worth and of his state of grace, and it raised the prestige and the propaganda chances of the sect (Weber, in Gerth and Mills, 1946:322; emphasis added).
In the Protestant sects, the individual worked hard to gain occupational success and this was perceived as working for the glory of God. Success of a Protestant served to elevate the status of the whole sect. Weber examined the Calvinist religious doctrine most extensively to illustrate the links between Protestant ideologies and the spirit of capitalism.

Calvinists believed in the doctrine of pre-destination, meaning salvation was determined by a covenant of grace rather than a covenant of good works. This led to uncertainty among the early Calvinists because salvation could not be guaranteed by sacraments performed by workers of the church such as priests (Weber, 1958:153). To reduce this tension, Calvinists believed that "signs" could be uncovered which would indicate whether or not they were chosen for salvation. There were two clues that would indicate salvation in Calvinist doctrine. First, faith was essential: everyone had to believe they were one of the chosen by combating all worldly temptations of the devil. Second, intense world activity: if they found success in this worldly activity (especially the accumulation of wealth), this generated self confidence that they were among the chosen (Weber, 1958:153). As in other Protestant religions, being ostentatious with one's personal wealth was frowned upon in Calvinist doctrine. Instead of living the "high life," Calvinists reinvested their wealth and more capital accumulated, providing further evidence of salvation. Calvinism justified, as did other Protestant religions, the
accumulation of personal wealth. It was not seen as greed, but as divine providence. Hence, Calvinism also justified the stratified system. If one did not achieve financial success, this indicated he or she was not chosen for salvation. Besides living an ascetic life, Calvinists were also expected to live life unencumbered by emotions, superstitions, and desires of the flesh (Weber, 1958:153). This belief melds nicely with the capitalist belief that one should lead a methodical, rational, and efficient life. It is the separation of the individual from mysticism and the supernatural.

While the religious roots of the Spirit of Capitalism were later secularized, and people began to enjoy the fruits of their labor, the belief that the acquisition of wealth was not greed but indicative of superior attributes was perpetuated. In fact, it is the cloth that America's all-pervasive myth of a meritocracy is made from. What Weber has uncovered are the religious roots of our modern cultural values: an emphasis on work as an end in itself, an emphasis on the legitimacy of profit, an emphasis on living one's life rationally and methodically to obtain economic success, and forgoing immediate gratification for future prosperity:

...it is not the ethical doctrine of a religion, but that form of ethical conduct upon which premiums are placed that matters. Such premiums operate through the form and the condition of the respective goods of salvation. And such conduct constitutes 'one's' specific 'ethos' in the sociological sense of the word. For Puritanism, that conduct was a certain methodical, rational way
of life which - given certain conditions - paved the way for the 'spirit' of modern capitalism. The premiums were placed upon 'proving' oneself before men in the sense of socially holding one's own within the Puritan sects. Both aspects were mutually supplementary and operated in the same direction: they helped to deliver the 'spirit' of modern capitalism, its specific ethos: the ethos of the modern bourgeois middle class (Gerth and Mills eds., 1946:321; emphasis in original).

What this leads to is the belief that salvation is attained not through the church, but through personal success in work (Khleif, 1992:3). This also leads to diverting emphasis away from the community and placing it on the individual:

[the Protestant ethic]...has not only contributed to the rise of capitalism but also to an ascetic emphasis in personal life, one manifested in spiritual isolation and a sense of inner loneliness. That is to say that individualism and loneliness are a reflection of separateness, albeit exaggerated separateness: one purchases one's salvation through individualistic striving and competitiveness; lack of an institutionalized culture of mediation leads to an ego-centric preoccupation with self (Khleif, 1992:3).

This is the component of the Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism which is most relevant to explaining why the ideology of "empire as a way of life" is most pervasive in the Western world. The interests and needs of the individual are put before those of others, particularly those outside of the dominant culture. The subjugation of others is justified because it is to the benefit of the individual. According to Weber:

The Puritan sects put the most powerful individual interests of social self-esteem in the service of this breeding of traits. Hence individual motives and personal self-interests were also placed in the service of maintaining and propagating the
'bourgeois' Puritan ethic, with all its ramifications (Weber, in Gerth and Mills, 1946:321; emphasis in original).

Weber believed that Protestantism set the historical foundation for modern individualism because it broke away from the "patriarchal and authoritarian bondage" that was seen in such religions as Catholicism (Weber, in Gerth and Mills, 1946:321). There was no longer the necessity for an intermediary between the individual and God in Protestantism.

This separation of the individual from the authority of the church, and later the separation of the church and state, led to this new glorification of individualism and the transition from the gemeinschaft (community):

This was the case in Medieval Europe, until the phenomenon of culture-contact dubbed in the West as the Renaissance, being partly a result of exposure to Greek and Arab philosophy, helped to launch a new outlook on life, the first stirrings (intifada) of 'individualism,' that is, of a gradual separation of the person from the world of the supernatural, from a Church-centered interpretation (Khleif, 1992:2).

Essentially, the result of this separation of the individual from the Church and the community is a society characterized by increased rationality. Weber contends that rationality is the most significant by-product of the spirit of capitalism. Weber states there are six properties evident in a society characterized by formal rationality: an emphasis on calculability (those things which can be counted or quantified), focus on efficiency, concern with ensuring predictability, replacement of human technology with nonhuman
technology, control over uncertainty, and finally, rational systems have a series of irrational consequences for the people involved with them, for the systems themselves, and for the larger society (Ritzer, 1983:124-5). Rationalization, as the process of de-magicalization of life, of dis-enchantment, of playing down the personal and the emotional, could not replace the traditional religion it had displaced. By definition, rationality is anti-religious: a rational culture is one characterized by a lack of mysticism and a loss of magic. Rationalization promises a modern world devoid of emotion, of ethical, or moral foundation; it leads to isolation and loneliness. It is a world ultimately characterized by alienation and anomie. Weber saw increased rationality as gaining power and influence in the modern world. He used the metaphor of the "iron cage" to describe how increased rationality actually limited or controlled those who created it (Ritzer, 1983:115-118).

Hence, an ideology grew in the West -- one which emphasized the needs of the individual over the group, the righteousness of personal wealth -- providing moral justification for a stratified system. This results in a system based upon competition, pitting one individual against another. While some remnants of cooperation exist, this is typically done only to further the goals of the individual:

"Work with some, but do so in order to defeat everyone else...Whatever is to be gained by cooperating depends upon working to defeat a common enemy. Every 'We' needs a 'They'" (Kohn, 1986:152;
emphasis in original).
Because this ideological foundation was in place early on in the Western world, it is plausible that the ideology of "empire as a way of life" was a natural outgrowth of this type of thinking. I contend that it also became a significant component of American culture. The next sections will probe the adoption of the ideology of "empire as a way of life" in the history of the United States. The first section will address the embrace of this ideology in early America. The last section will be an examination of "empire as a way of life" as Americans conquered the frontier and all the groups who stood in their way.

Early Americans and the Quest for "Social Peace":

"Empire as a way of life" was an ideology early Americans inherited from the British. John Locke, a British subject who was at the center of politics there from 1660 to the end of the century, provided the model for British colonialism that was later adopted by America. Locke stated that empire as a way of life involves "taking wealth and freedom from others to provide for your own welfare, pleasure and power (Williams, 1980:26)." Since imperialism by the English and other Europeans was certainly not a matter of self defense it had to be justified in other terms:

Over the years, scholars dealing with that problem have tended to separate into two groups: one emphasizes the importance of color (blacks and browns are inferior); the other stresses Christianity (heathens are agents of the Devil and so must be converted or destroyed) (Williams,

Williams states that these two categories are not mutually exclusive; "heathens" tended to be darker (Williams, 1980:28). A further justification employed by Europeans foreshadows the language of social Darwinism that would gain prominence one hundred years later. They perceived themselves as hearty people that had survived threats from not only "infidels," such as the Muslims, but also from disease and other disasters (Williams, 1980:28). This indicated they were a stronger breed whose destiny it was to be superior.

The actions of early American settlers indicate that they had already embraced the ideology of "empire as a way of life." Williams criticizes other historians who make the distinction between imperialists and anti-imperialists in early America (Williams, 1980:30). Instead, he distinguishes between "soft" and "hard" imperialists, stating that there were, and are, very few anti-imperialists in America (Williams, 1980:30). The early soft imperialists acknowledged the humanity of the Native Americans. They appreciated that there was much they could learn from these Natives about the terrain of North America. They appropriated much of this knowledge in their own farming and hunting techniques. While they acknowledged the humanity of the Natives, the overwhelming perception among the soft imperialists was that these peoples were "noble savages"; still inferior to Christians (Williams, 1980:30). The hard imperialists
perceived the Natives are "ignoble savages" who stood in the way of the land they desired:

Even if the softies win, empire is still a way of life...Empire as a way of life is predicated upon having more than one needs (Williams, 1980:31).

Williams states that it was the hard imperialists who won.

Benjamin Franklin was the first American leader to use the language of "empire as a way of life." He equated expansionism with prosperity, social peace, and freedom (Williams, 1980:37). Franklin believed that, given the propensity for people to procreate, surplus land was necessary to generate wealth through agriculture and commerce (Williams, 1980:37). It was also necessary for the early Americans to spread throughout North America because a crowded country became socially and politically corrupt and unstable (Williams, 1980:37). According to historian Walter La Ferber:

...[Franklin] committed himself to developing systematic policies of an expanding American empire at least as early as 1751, a quarter century before the revolution (La Ferber, 1972:11).

Franklin acknowledged that if the frontier ceased to expand, the primary source of wealth would be checked as would the power of the empire (La Ferber, 1972:12). Franklin also suggested how America could be preserved as a "New Eden" for Anglo Saxons:

And while we are, as I may call it, Scouring our Planet, by clearing America of woods, and so making this side of our Globe reflect a brighter light to the Eyes of Inhabitants in Mars of Venus, why should we in sight of Superior Beings darken its people (cited in La Ferber, 1972:13; emphasis in original)?
Here we see not only a justification of expansionism, but a legitimization of conquering the "inferior" races who got in the way.

Essentially, early American leaders like Franklin and James Madison were contradicting the conventionally accepted wisdom of Montesquieu. Montesquieu warned against the troubles of governing a growing Republic. He believed that once a Republic had expanded too far the result would either be that the government would lose control of the distant fringe areas or enforce so much control that the nation would become despotic (Montesquieu, 1989:124-153). These early leaders were saying just the opposite; freedom, social peace, and prosperity would cease without continued expansion.

To put the ideology of "empire as a way of life" amongst early Americans into a conceptual framework I will use the work of Ronald Takaki. In his book Iron Cages: Race and Culture in Nineteenth-Century America, Takaki reconceptualized Weber's notion of rationality and his metaphor of the "iron cage" to illustrate how our increasingly rationalistic American society has not only limited the freedom of action for the dominant cultures, but has also excluded the realities of subordinate cultures such as African Americans, Native Americans, Mexicans, and Asians. Essentially Takaki feels that increased rationality has led to more radical distinctions between in-groups and out-groups. These iron cages set up boundaries and definitions for who and what is
American. Takaki cites the creation of three types of iron cages evident in American culture: republican ideology iron cage, bureaucratic capitalist iron cage, and expansionist iron cage. The first iron cage, republican ideology iron cage, is relevant in a study of early Americans.

The republican ideology iron cage enabled Americans to distinguish themselves from other groups both within and outside of the United States. Within the U.S. the settlers distinguished themselves from groups like the Native Americans and the African Americans. Outside of the U.S. they distinguished themselves from governments whose political dogma differed from their own, such as the British. An image of America as a nation of virtuous farmers was perpetuated by the intellectuals and political elite. According to Richard Hofstadter, this "agrarian myth" refers to the sentimental attachment we Americans feel towards a perception of rural life (Hofstadter, 1955a:24). The farmer is typically viewed as someone who is to be admired for his or her honest industry, independence, and "frank spirit of equality" (Hofstadter, 1955a:24). The agrarian myth evolved mainly from English and classical writers. It was the intellectual class in this country, including Thomas Paine, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, who clung to and perpetuated this myth (Hofstadter, 1955a:27). With the widespread acceptance of this myth came the condemnation of lifestyles that differed. To further this image and further distinguish the "American"
from the "heathen," early settlers discussed the nomadic ways of the Native Americans (Williams, 1980:31). In actuality, many Native American tribes had settled, cleared, and farmed the land. It was easier to justify taking the land if it was proclaimed that the Native Americans had no legal stake to it (Williams, 1980:31). A perceived threat by these "nomadic Natives" was created, perpetuated, and legitimized by the political elites.

The establishment of the republican ideology iron cage also restricted the emotional side, and increased the rational side of these new "Americans." This notion of creating virtuous citizens was strongly perpetuated by the intellectuals and the political elites because, with the adoption of a new form of government, came the need to make all Americans self-regulatory. Because this new government was planning on spreading the power of the king to all of the people it was necessary to create citizens virtuous enough for this hefty responsibility (Takaki, 1979:10). This adoption of the republican ideology iron cage made it necessary for the political elite to create in the American people a sense of moral obligation and responsibility to their country. Americans needed to control their emotional side if they were to become the virtuous lot which ruled themselves. Within months after the Declaration of Independence was signed, political leaders, such as John Adams, were complaining that there was too much corruption and vice in this new America.
(Takaki, 1979:3). The dogma of the republican ideology was rooted in the Protestant ethic, in that, Protestantism perpetuated the idea that it was necessary to curb one's emotional side (Takaki, 1979:vxii). In order to instill such a sense of responsibility among the American people their way of life and political system had to be presented as the best system.

The cultural hegemony of the republican ideology enabled the newly arriving settlers to control their emotional side. Of course this process of indoctrination for "citizenship" did not extend to the Native Americans or to the newly arriving slave population. These two groups were seen as childlike, savage, and unable to handle the responsibility of ruling the country (Takaki, 1979:12; Gossett, 1969:54). This new political elite had a very explicit definition of what it meant to be a civilized citizen, one must be Christian, rational, sexually controlled and white (Takaki, 1979:12). The perception of Native Americans was that they were savages incapable of "civilization":

The trouble was that the Indians were beastly degradations of human life. They scalped men, butchered women and children, and were 'by disposition' cruel and bloody-minded. Furthermore, they had no capacity or potential for citizenship, not to mention civility: 'Negroes, Indians, and Kaffrarians [inhabitants of the Transkeian Territories of South Africa],' [John] Adams wrote [Benjamin] Rush, 'cannot bear democracy any more than Bonaparte and Talleyrand...’ (Drinnon, 1980:75).

The perception of African Americans was similar. Even Thomas
Jefferson, an outspoken opponent of slavery (even though he himself owned 200 slaves), felt that the African Americans did not have the intellectual capacity to be good citizens:

...he [Jefferson] tried to extricate himself by depicting blacks as creatures of the body and sensation rather than the mind and reflection, and doubted their fitness for freedom; but he disguised this 'anti-Negro diatribe' by casting it as a scientific hypothesis subject to further verification (Drinnon, 1980:80).

Similarly, Jefferson felt the Native Americans should be dealt with in one of two ways, either civilized ("us") or exterminated ("them") (Takaki, 1979:55). Unlike the African Americans, Jefferson felt that the Native Americans did have the capability for "civilization." If the Native Americans refused the whites their "civilizing mission," however, the white majority would have no recourse but annihilation of the Native population. In other words, if the Native American population refused to convert to the white lifestyle, they would be viewed as an enemy to the American way of life.

The U.S. political doctrine also perpetuated the notion that it was superior to other forms of government because it did not begin as a feudalistic, monarchal, or aristocratic system (Hofstadter, 1955a:36). The ruling elite perpetuated the notion that America was ruled by all even though groups such as African Americans, Native Americans, women, Mexicans, Asians, and later immigrant groups, were systematically excluded from this grand design. Hence, the mythology of American life began. This American myth included the
glorification of rural life, a system ruled by all, and the superiority of our system to all others. The perpetuation of this "agrarian myth," combined with the Protestant ethic, helped rulers instill the republican ideology.

With the adoption of the republican ideology Americans were able to distinguish themselves from other groups. They distinguished themselves from groups within, such as the Native Americans, African Americans and other racial and ethnic groups. These groups were viewed as not possessing the all important virtuosity, emotional control, and agrarian lifestyles of white Americans. They distinguished themselves from different groups without, such as Britain, because theirs was a nation ruled by the people, and not a monarchy or feudalistic type of government. Early American history reveals that "empire as a way of life" was an accepted ideology. The next section will explore the perpetuation of "empire as a way of life" as Americans expanded west.

**Expanding the Frontier Within the United States:**

Expansion in the early United States occurred in two phases: expansion west, beginning in the 1820s and 1830s, and in the late nineteenth century, expansion abroad. Takaki refers to these two periods as the "bureaucratic iron cage" and the "expansionist iron cage." Both time periods are characterized, first, by the ideology of "empire as a way of life" and, second, by an increasing brutality directed at the "other." This section will explore the "bureaucratic iron
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cage," while the "expansionist iron cage" is addressed in the next chapter.

The Jacksonian era, the beginning of the bureaucratic iron cage, marked a dramatic change in the lives of Americans. This period was characterized as a time for great liberation and freedom for white Americans which was achieved primarily through more significant oppression of African Americans and Native Americans. The situation for white Americans was also improved because of a shift in capitalism from a more controlled, centralized, organized system to a more individualistic, random, free market (laissez-faire) capitalism (Williams, 1980:78-79).

Takaki also refers to this iron cage as the age of confidence (Takaki, 1979:81). This period in American history was characterized by increasing brutality directed toward both Native Americans and African Americans. Native Americans were being pushed out as the new American settlers moved westward and appropriated the Native American lands. African Americans were being brought in as slaves. They were forced to give up their native language, customs, and culture (Takaki, 1979:109). Even though all of this brutality was taking place Americans had to have confidence and moral faith in themselves. They had to be sure that they were innocent of brutality and sin even if they had to tell themselves it was so. If they were to admit what they were doing was brutal and inhuman they would be admitting their belief of themselves as
virtuous people was wrong. Obviously such a confession would invalidate their accepted republican ideology.

According to Takaki, Andrew Jackson served as America’s "confidence man" (Takaki, 1979:106). Jackson protected the moral character of the American people as he served the class interests of the speculators, farmers, and planters (Takaki, 1979:106). He assured the people that the appropriation of Native American lands was fair and just. Using another of Herman Melville’s phrases, Takaki refers to Jackson as the "ultimate practitioner of the metaphysics of Indian hating":

Undeniably, as President Jackson himself acknowledged, how whites conducted themselves in relations with Indians was 'deeply interesting' to their 'national character’. They must not be guilty of capitalist corruption, moral absurdity, or mass murders. As President, Jackson told them they were not, and skillfully exercised confidence in his own conduct toward Indians. He excluded them from 'real people' and claimed they were hunters and wanderers as he encouraged intruders to seize cultivated and improved Indian lands (Takaki, 1979:106).

Jackson encouraged in the American people the belief that Native Americans were not the same type of people they themselves were. He portrayed the Native Americans as childlike and misguided. This belief allowed whites to destroy the Native American while at the same time assuring themselves that this extinction of the Native population was not to be regretted. Jackson enabled the white population to create an enemy for practical and moral utilitarian purposes.

In a note to his wife, Jackson states:

I think I may say that the Indian war is at an end for the present, the enemy is scattered over the whole face of the Earth, and a least one half must
starve and die with disease (Drinnon, 1980:108).

It must be remembered that the Native Americans held title to their land and many tribes (like the Cherokee) even abided by the paternalistic doctrine devised by the government to keep their land (Williams, 1980:82). Yet, these treaties were violated repeatedly. One of these treaty violations led to the forced relocation of the Cherokee, enacted by Jackson, which resulted in the death of some four thousand people. Williams warns that Jackson’s actions were not the sole reason that these atrocities against Native Americans took place:

...it is a mistake to personalize it around the President. He was important but not crucial: the highly acclaimed symbol of a widespread antagonism toward the First Americans and a visceral determination to acquire their land, other resources, and space (Williams, 1980:82).

Hence, while Jackson facilitated these practices of brutality against Native Americans by providing the American people with moral justification for their actions, the sentiments for these actions were already in place.

Similarly, the white southern planters had to convince themselves that their treatment of the African American slaves was also acceptable. To do this they too had to convince themselves that the African American was somehow less than human. They perpetuated the image of the African American as both childlike and savage (Takaki, 1979:115). The ideology of the African American as a child/savage enabled the planters to defend their use of slavery. The "sambo" image of the docile, contented slave was created because the slave masters had to
convince themselves as well as the north that slavery was moral (Takaki, 1979:119). This image also assured the slave masters that their slaves were both content and controlled. While slaves were thought of as the "other," they were not elevated to enemy status. The stereotyping of the slave was done only to calm moral conscience, not because they were seen as a threat to a way of life.

Another element in this bureaucratic capitalist iron cage was technology. With the advent of technological advances came the increased tendency to dissociate mind from body (Takaki, 1979:148). The body was viewed as instinctual, something which had to be risen above. There was an increasingly negative view of the body which seemed to coincide with the invention and use of machinery. The mind was represented in the increasing technological advances:

Technology, both as ideology and as economic development, had an enormous impact on culture and race in America: It served as metaphor and materialist basis for the domination of mind over body, capital over labor, and whites over Indians, blacks, Mexicans, and Asians (Takaki, 1979:148). Technology destroyed the savage life. Technology represented not only the mind, but also civilization. Western expansion was seen as technological progress. White Americans and technology were seen as civilization. Groups typically associated with both the body and savagery, such as Native Americans, African Americans, Mexicans, and Asians, were further separated from whites. Here distinctions are being made between civilized vs. savagery, us vs. them, and friends
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vs. enemies.

Technological advances brought industrialization, and industrialization brought immigration. These new populations expanded the boundaries of those designated as "others." For example, the Chinese immigrant population which came to California between the 1830s and the 1840s was associated with the groups the white Americans had historically set themselves apart from. Like the Native Americans and African Americans, the Chinese were viewed as morally inferior, savage, childlike, lustful, and sensual (Takaki, 1979:216). In the late 1880s, the Japanese began to come to this country (again, settling primarily in California) in more significant numbers (Daniels, 1981:5). The strong anti-Chinese sentiment was merely carried over to the Japanese. Strong anti-Asian sentiment was most apparent in California. In fact, anti-Asian legislation was quite common in California. The California Constitution actually had an anti-Asian clause added to it in 1879:

...prescribe all necessary regulations for the protection of the state, and the counties and towns...from the burdens of evils arising from the presence of aliens who are and may become...dangerous and detrimental to the well being or peace of the state, and to impose conditions upon which such persons may reside in the state and to provide the means and modes of their removal (cited in Daniels, 1981:4)

While initially most of the anti-Asian sentiment was directed toward the Chinese, in 1888 anti-Japanese propaganda began (Daniels, 1981:9). Local Californian politicians would run on discriminatory platforms such as "The Japs Must Go" (Daniels,
Similarly, a San Francisco newspaper began to run anti-Asian headlines. Anti-Asian sentiment was not confined to one political party; its rhetoric was found in all parties, Republican, Democrat, and Populist (Daniels, 1981:10).

The white immigrant groups coming into the country were also distinguished from what was deemed "American." Now the definition of an American was a white of Anglo-Saxon Protestant stock. Anti-Catholic sentiment and prejudice, for example, began early on in this country and continued through the nineteenth century. As early as the 1830's anti-Catholic sentiment was gaining influence in the U.S. (Hofstadter, 1965:19). In fact, prior to the Civil War anti-Catholicism dominated American nativist thought (Higham, 1955). Catholics, like many of the other immigrant groups, were seen as a threat to the very essence of America (Hofstadter, 1965:19). The main result of the Revolutionary War in this country was a common regard among the American people for political liberty. The authoritarianism of the Catholic Church was viewed as a threat to this liberty (Higham, 1955:8). Americans also resented the Catholic Church's association with monarchical and feudalist governments (Higham, 1955:8). S.F.B. Morse, felt that Catholics represented not only religious tyranny, but were also acting on the part of all of "despotic Europe" (Hofstadter, 1965:20). Morse also felt that ignorant, ill-educated immigrants in the U.S. would supplement the efforts of the Jesuit agents
(Hofstadter, 1965:20). Similar warnings came from Lyman Beecher, father of the famous Harriet Beecher Stowe, who felt that Protestantism was engaged in a life-or-death struggle with Catholicism (Hofstadter, 1965:21). He feared that unless action was taken quickly Americans would "sell their country into an everlasting bondage" (Hofstadter, 1965:21). Anti-Catholic sentiments were also perpetuated in the Media as is evident in the following taken from a Texas newspaper article in 1835:

...It is a notorious fact that the Monarchs of Europe and the Pope of Rome are at this very moment plotting our destruction and threatening the extinction of our political, civil, and religious institutions. We have the best reasons for believing that corruption had found its way into our Executive Chamber, and that our Executive head is tainted with the infectious venom of Catholicism... The Pope has recently sent his ambassador of state to this country on a secret commission, the effect of which is an extraordinary boldness of the Catholic Church throughout the United States...These minions of the Pope are boldly insulting our Senators; reprimanding our Statesmen; propagating the adulterous union of Church and State; abusing with foul calumny all governments but Catholic; and spewing out the bitterest execrations on all Protestantism (Hofstadter, 1965:8).

From this quotation it is obvious that it the "Catholic conspiracy" had infiltrated all levels of the U.S. government. At stake was not only our political system and the freedom it entailed, but also our Protestant religious beliefs and practices. These are similar accusations that would later surface against both Italians and communists.

While the republican ideology iron cage restricted America's emotional side, the bureaucratic iron cage restricted its conscience. Both iron cages enabled Americans
to distinguish between in-groups and out-groups. The definition of an American was all those within the United States who were white Anglo Saxon Protestants. Those groups which did not fit this description were seen as inferior groups whose power needed to be kept in check. With these first two iron cages we have distinguished an enemy within, those groups which differ from the white, mostly male, notion of the American citizen.

**Summary**

This chapter reviewed the foundations of "empire as a way of life" in the United States. This was a tradition the United States inherited from the British, one which embraced the tradition of the dominator model. With this initial incorporation of empire as a way of life, the enemy within had become clearly defined; the enemy was all those groups who stood in the way of the "weltshauung" of the dominant group. A similar classification of groups is evident in the responses of children; primarily in their discussion of immigrants. Responses about immigrants typically centered on the children's fear that these groups increased social problems in the United States. This will be explored further in Chapters VIII and IX.

The next chapter will explore the designation of the enemy outside of the United States. After we reached the boundaries within the United States, the ideology of "empire
as a way of life" necessitated designation of the enemy overseas. While the language used to justify "empire as a way of life" changed as we expanded overseas, the result, imperialism, remained.
CHAPTER VI:

"EMPIRE AS A WAY OF LIFE" AND THE EXPANSION OVERSEAS

This chapter considers the continued expansion of the United States after exhausting the Western frontier and the changing emphasis in ideologies to justify this growth. Expansion West had clearly defined enemies inside the United States; all those groups who were in the way of continued empire. Even after the territory within the United States had been expended, growth was still necessary to maintain "empire as a way of life." Expansion overseas could not be justified with the old language of "empire as a way of life"; imperialism abroad simply was not a legitimate endeavor for securing social freedom, prosperity, and peace for Americans. The main questions addressed in this chapter, therefore, will be: how was the language of "empire as a way of life" changed to rationalize expansion overseas?, how did this expansion broaden American notions of enemies?, and why was the ideology of "empire as a way of life" most pervasive during the Cold War? Chapters VIII and IX address children’s responses which reflect this different sentiment of "empire as a way of life."

The U.S. as a Benevolent, Progressive Policeman

The enthusiastic acceptance of the ideology of "empire as
a way of life" in early America is best illustrated in the Monroe doctrine and the notion of "manifest destiny." The ideological hegemony of both the Monroe Doctrine and "manifest destiny" is foreshadowed in the comments made by John Quincy Adams in a letter to John Adams:

The whole continent of North America appears to be destined by Divine Providence to be peopled by one nation, speaking one language, professing one general system of religious and political principles, and accustomed to one general tenor of social usages and customs (cited in Drinnon, 1980:113; emphasis in original).

The message is clear; it is the destiny of North America to be ruled by white, English-speaking, Christian men. The Monroe doctrine of 1823 consisted essentially of prohibitions to European powers:

(1) they could not colonize the American continents; (2) they could not extend their political systems to 'this hemisphere', an imaginary geographical area which Monroe discreetly refrained from defining; and (3) they could not intervene to put down revolutions that had occurred or that might occur in 'this hemisphere' (Van Alstyne, 1960:98; emphasis in original).

The Monroe doctrine read like a list of "thou shalt nots" (Van Alstyyn, 1960:99). More important than the document's restriction of European influence in America, is its implicit intention: "Hands off for Europe meant Hands on for the United States (Williams, 1980:73)." This gave the Americans the exclusive right to the interior; a right to colonize without saying the word (Van Alstyn, 1960:9).

According to Van Alstyn, manifest destiny was the ideological fuel needed to make the implicit meaning of the
Monroe doctrine -- that is, more empire -- a reality. John L. O'Sullivan, the publicist who coined the term in 1845, declares:

Other nations have intruded themselves in a spirit of hostile interference against us, for the avowed object of thwarting our policy and hampering our power, limiting our greatness and checking the fulfillment of our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions...(cited in Van Alstyne, 1972:91).

This notion of manifest destiny is the perfect counterpart to the Monroe Doctrine. It too avoids unappealing concepts such as imperialism, colonialism, empire, conquest, and greed. Instead it states that it is inevitable, ordained by a higher authority, that "Americans" -- meaning white Anglo-Saxon Protestants -- will rule the interior and, later, beyond. As the Western frontier quickly diminished, it became necessary to formulate a new ideology that would permit the continued growth of the empire. First, I will explore the frontier hypothesis proposed by Fredrick Jackson Turner. Second, I will regard the accumulation of surplus goods in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the need to expand our markets globally in order to continue the empire. Finally, this section will examine the shift in ideology which justified global expansionism.

The Significance of the Frontier:

Historian Frederick Jackson Turner, in his paper "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" written in 1893, stated that the official end of the frontier in the
United States occurred in 1880 (Turner, 1966:199). The frontier had always been a significant influence on white American thought (Takaki, 1979:265). The frontier, he states, was significant because it furnished "the forces dominating American character (Turner, 1966:200)." He also asserts that the frontier provides a continual rebirth of this "American character" through expansion. The frontier was the "meeting point between savagery and civilization (Turner, 1966:200)."

According to Turner, Americans have an inherent tendency for expansionism, and expanding the frontier serves this "instinctual" need. Using a quotation from F.J. Grund, Turner discusses the need for Americans to "enlarge their dominion over inanimate nature (cited in Turner, 1966:204)."

Conquering "inanimate nature" refers to both the wilderness of the West and the Native American inhabitants of the frontier (Turner, 1966:204). Turner did not consider Native Americans as human beings, but as natural obstacles that have to be overcome much in the same way one would clear a forest to build a home:

Their 'primitive Indian life' had to be destroyed - - their 'savagery' made to disintegrate -- so each territory along the way could progress onto the next 'higher stage' (Drinnon, 1980:462).

Turner also states that the frontier promotes individualism, and this "frontier individualism has from the beginning promoted democracy (Turner, 1966:222)." Obviously these "democratic principles" did not extend to the needs of Native Americans. The loss of the frontier did not extinguish the
American need for expansion:

Since the days when the fleet of Columbus sailed into the waters of the New World, America has been another name for opportunity, and the people of the United States have taken their tone from the incessant expansion which has not only been open but has even been forced upon them. He would be a rash prophet who should assert that the expansive character of American life has now entirely ceased. Movement has been its dominant fact, and, unless this training has no effect upon a people, the Americans energy will continually demand a wider field for its exercise (Turner, 1966:227).

In fact, Americans had not satiated their need for expansion by conquering the Western frontier.

Production of Surplus Goods and the Expansion Overseas:

Technological advances enabled Americans to conquer the interior frontier and they also made overseas expansion possible. Bureaucratic capitalism had also caused the market to reach its limit within the United States. Upon the realization that we had reached our "frontiers" inside of the U.S., American expansionists began looking for new frontiers (Takaki, 1979:265). These expansionists felt that what was required in order to restore republican self-control was to pursue a new frontier. Instead, American expansionism did not restore republican ideology, but merely imprisoned the bureaucratic iron cage, discussed in Chapter IV, with the "expansionist iron cage" (Takaki, 1979:265).

In the late 1800s the bureaucratic structure of industry was changing rapidly. Before the 1850s factories were usually small, family owned, and family controlled (Takaki, 1979:255). Since the first factories were so small they really did
not require a clearly defined administrative structure. During the next fifty years, however, corporate bureaucratic capitalism came to dominate and a new corporate expansionist iron cage develop.

This new iron cage was characterized by increased rationality and calculation (Takaki, 1979:255). This new industrial order replaced the individualistic republican ideology (Takaki, 1979: 254). No longer were Americans self-regulated, now they were corporate-regulated. Each worker was now a "cog" in the huge bureaucratic structure:

Rationality and calculation, values republican fathers had promoted for individuals, became the methods and goals of centralized structures that imposed regularity and uniformity everywhere they reached (Takaki, 1979:255).

Another characteristic of this corporate iron cage was the increasing tendency toward corporate consolidation (Takaki, 1979:257). Business leaders made conscious decisions to consolidate their empires in order to "earn profits from the promotion of stock sales, eliminate competition, and rationalize the production process (Takaki, 1979:257)." The result of this consolidation venture was the creation of huge, powerful monopolies.

These new Captains of Industry had invested so much capital in the new machinery, that they had to keep their plants operating all of the time to cover overhead expenses (Takaki, 1979:257). American industry was soon producing many more goods than could ever be used by the American population
(Takaki, 1979:262). The United States had to find an outlet for this surplus of products. If something was not done with the surplus, America would be in danger of more economic gluts and higher rates of unemployment (Takaki, 1979:258). The solution was to expand into foreign markets. Americans had exhausted the western frontier, their new frontier became the ocean. The largest market overseas, initially anyway, was China.

Many, like Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, encouraged this newfound overseas expansionism. Mahan felt that the rise in bureaucratic capitalism had created a dilemma in the U.S.; this new world of bureaucratic capitalism threatened republican individualism (Takaki, 1979:275). Bureaucratic capitalism had taken the wealth and the power held by all and put it into the hands of the protected few. In other words, once again America had a disinterested, omnipotent king who ruled from a distance. Mahan saw imperialism as the solution to this problem. By expanding the frontier once again, Mahan felt there would be a return of republican idealism. Expansionism would take the power of the few and redistribute it into the hands of the many. Mahan also feared the threat to the capitalist system in the United States posed by revolutionary threat abroad -- a theme which would be revisited in the Cold War -- this threat could also be checked through expansionism (Williams, 1980:148).

In 1880, Reverend Josiah Strong also advocated
expansionism as a cure for the ills of this increasingly rationalized society. Unlike Mahan, Strong did not see the evils of society arising merely from increasing power in the hand of the few but also from the following:

'Class' conflict was hardening; the cities were becoming huge festering sores of social ills; southern European immigrants were crowding into the land and threatening to outnumber the Anglo-Saxon population; and Roman Catholicism was entrenching itself in Protestant America. An illiterate, ignorant, immoral, and 'criminal' population, dominated by their 'appetites,' prejudices, and liquor, was growing and swelling the ranks of the working class...Living in congested cities, these workers constituted a 'tenement population,' a class attracted to 'socialism,'... (Takaki, 1979:260).

Strong believed that Anglo-Saxon Americans possessed a genius for both technology and republicanism (Takaki, 1979:262). Strong saw expansionism as a way to reduce psychological and class tensions within America (Takaki, 1979:261). He felt Anglo-Saxons had a special innate affinity for creating technological advances. To him, it seemed only natural that the "advanced races," such as the Anglo-Saxons, become the masters of technology everywhere else in the world:

In Strong's vision of the 'Kingdom,' Protestant perfection, republican ideology, racial dominance, and expansionism were all integrated into a world view: Mind and soul were separated from body, 'civilization' from 'savagery,' and Anglo-Saxon Americans from Africans and Asians. The quest for the 'kingdom' required not only an inner control of the self but also an imperial involvement in the world and the affairs of other races (Takaki, 1979:263).

Therefore, Strong's justification for expansionism and imperialism was simply that it is only natural for the
biologically superior Anglo-Saxon to take the reigns of the world's progress.

Perhaps the most revealing element of the ideological climate in the last half of the nineteenth century was the growing popularity of social Darwinism. This misinterpretation of Darwin's theory of evolution perceived society and its institutions as evolving in the same manner as biological organisms. Social Darwinists believed that society should be left to its own devices; to "evolve naturally" (Gossett, 1969:144). Any type of interference, such as any type of social welfare or aid, disrupts the natural order of things. Inequality is merely a fact of life for social Darwinists as indicated in the following quotation taken from current social Darwinist Fred Winner:

[The]Fundamental basis of society is inequality. Otherwise there would be no society. Each individual takes his position upon the rung of a ladder. Each by instinctive prompting steps aside for the common good. And much more, each is born according to the position he is predestined to take. Some are born to be non-competitive subservient, some to be workers, some to be leaders, and some to sacrifice (Winner, 1983:8-9; emphasis in the original).

Social Darwinists do not believe in social reform, but in social determinism. The very essence of social Darwinism, of the so-called "survival of the fittest," is to categorize certain groups as superior ("fit") and others as inferior ("unfit").

According to Richard Hofstadter, initially it was the
laissez-faire conservative that best exemplified social Darwinist ideology (Hofstadter, 1955b:5). The laissez-faire conservatives wasted little time thinking about human beings, their interest was in "homoeconomicus" (Rossiter, 1966:131). This group did not concern itself with those individuals who were faced with societal constraints. Their only concern was to provide each individual with the unrestricted ability to get things done (Rossiter, 1966:132). Social Darwinism appealed to the laissez-faire conservatives in two ways:

(1) 'struggle for existence' and 'survival of the fittest'...suggested that nature would provide that the best competitors in a competitive situation would win, and that (2)...the conception that all sound development must be slow and unhurried (Hofstadter, 1955b:6).

The rich and powerful were that way because of their own talents. To those who were "lazy or stupid," no one owed him or her a living:

The drunkard belonged in the ditch, the lazy man in the poor house, the dullard in the shack, the hard-working man in the cottage, and the hard-working talented man in the mansion. Self-reliance was the command of God and nature (Rossiter, 1966:132).

It was futile to institute measures of social change, if society was left alone it would eventually evolve to perfection. In other words, the belief was that social reform inhibited the "weeding out" process of undesirables. Society is best left to its own devices, any means to prevent its natural evolution could result in the population growth of undesirables (e.g., poor, criminals, mentally ill, racial and ethnic groups). The care and support of these "flawed" groups
merely prolongs suffering, impedes human progress, and interferes with the laws of nature.

In the period from 1897-1910, social Darwinists were coming under increasing attacks by social theorists like Charles Horton Cooley and John Dewey. While these criticisms did have some impact on the social Darwinist movement, it was also during this period that the eugenics movement was gaining popularity (Hofstadter, 1955b:161). Charles Darwin's cousin Sir Francis Galton laid the foundation for the eugenics movement. The main premise of the movement was to inhibit or prevent procreation in the undesirable groups. By 1915, the movement had reached the proportions of a fad in both the United States and England. Several eugenics organizations, such as the American Breeder's Association (1903), the Eugenics Record Office (1910), and even the National Conference on Racial Betterment (1914) were founded (Hofstadter, 1955b:162). The ideas of the movement began to receive practical application in 1907. Indiana, for example, adopted a sterilization law, and by 1915, twelve other states followed Indiana's lead (Hofstadter, 1955b:162). There were strong beliefs in Anglo-Saxon superiority in this movement. Any group not of these origins was seen as degenerate breeding stock. Hence, the fear of the eugenists was this "unfit" group if not controlled would eliminate, or at least out number, the superior genetic strains of the Anglo-Saxon.

The message of social Darwinists and eugenists was clear:
any group which differs from the Westernized Anglo-Saxon is inferior. To accommodate or encourage these groups in any manner will lead to the demise of the Western world. While these movements agreed with the expansionists in the belief that individual strivings which led to financial gains, even if it meant subordination of groups, indicates superiority, they did not agree with civilizing mission that became attached to expansionism. Social Darwinists and eugenists believed it was best to leave the "natives" alone and let them weed themselves out.

The Ideological Shift in "Empire as a Way of Life":

While the America had steadily expanded its influence, territory, and power beyond the continental United States in the last half of the nineteenth century, it still lacked the ideological justification for doing so:

But the dramatic acceleration and intensification of that imperial outreach made it necessary to develop an appropriate ideology to coordinate overseas parts of the imperial political economy, and to devise a military strategy that would preserve and extend the empire without wasting its psychic or cultural or economic substance (Williams, 1980:112-113).

The ideological shift to legitimize the growth of the empire was that growth was perceived as essential to ensure individual liberty and progress. A nation which protected the ability of other regions to ensure individual liberty and freedom was a benevolent one (Williams, 1980:113). America became the global protector of these rights; it became the benevolent policeman. This ideology legitimized expansion as
a means of protecting the freedom of other nations. According to Williams, there are six cultural fundamentals which provided legitimacy to this ideology:

First, the Smithian political economy predicated upon equal access to, and treatment in, the capitalist marketplace for all competitors produced the greatest good for the greatest number. Second, political, social, and intellectual freedoms were dependent upon the economic system. Economic freedom was the foundation of all freedom. Third, for that reason, as well as because of its own inherent logic, the system had at all costs to be maintained through expansion. Growth was the key to economic welfare and hence to all other good things. Fourth, the American example provided the ultimate proof of those propositions and was therefore the model for humankind’s progress.

Fifth, the Monroe Doctrine offered the model for the policy appropriate to that golden future by providing traditionally successful rules for the global competition. Hands off for marketplace competition to produce freedom and welfare. Sixth, the debate about which kind of military force would sustain and expand such an empire was decided in favor of the navy (Williams, 1980:127).

The fourth, fifth, and sixth fundamentals were most influential in shaping global policy with regards to expansion in the Cold War. The next section will looking at the height of "empire as a way of life" in the United States, the Cold War.

The Post-1945 Era as a Context for the Post-Cold War Era

There were many factors which lead to the Cold War mentality. One of the most significant occurred prior to World War I, when the designation of enemies was determined on the basis of the political ideologies of other nations as opposed to other interests. Woodrow Wilson was the first to /
discuss making the world "safe for democracy" (Gaddis, 1992:11). In fact, he declared this to be the nation's main objective entering World War I (Gaddis, 1992:11). The enemy of World War I was not Germany, but their autocratic form of government. This is the first time that ideologies took precedence over interests:

...Wilson had reversed the order: henceforth ideological differences would claim priority, from the official perspective of the United States government, even over the existence of shared interests...It is ironic that in this situation Americans more than Russians appear to have been the prisoners of ideology (Gaddis, 1992:12).

From World War I to the present, the enemies are those nations that are not democratic. The goal of the United States as the benevolent policeman became the spread of "democracy." This perception is also evident as the United States entered World War II. Franklin Delano Roosevelt declared that the isolationist practices of the past would not work in a world ruled by gangsters (Gaddis, 1972:1):

In a most consequential way, Roosevelt was defining America as the watchman (and enforcer) who acted on the basis of projecting community values (and practices) as the single standard for the world (Williams, 1980:131).

Wilson had legitimized the ideological hegemony of the United States as the only suitable global "way of life" and Roosevelt set out to enforce this world wide.

While the United States was stressing ideological dominance -- making the world safe for democracy -- it was also trying to gain economic dominance globally. The United
States had been pushing for open markets for years. The justification for open markets was that in this type of global economy, individual producers could concentrate on what they produced most efficiently, also an open global market would promote peace:

Wars, they [American leaders] tended to believe, grew out of rivalries resulting from economic nationalism; if nations could become economically interdependent, war itself might become obsolete (Gaddis, 1992:10).

Obviously this doctrine of free trade would bring more benefits to the United States than any other region. Besides the open door policy, the United States also called for the self-determination of regions. Each region should be free to live under the regimes they wished (Gaddis, 1992:10). If this self-determination was granted, this too may abolish wars. In actuality the United States was really only critical of communist countries which did not allow self-determination (Gaddis, 1992:10). United States policy seemed to turn a blind eye to the violations of self-determination made by allies and also made by America itself. The ultimate goal espoused by the United States government was a balance of global power. It was through the spread of democracy, an open door economic policy, and self-determination of regions that this balance of power could be achieved:

Thus Roosevelt’s Big Stick can be seen as the embodiment of the theme of America as the policeman, Taft’s emphasis on Dollar Diplomacy as the symbol of economic expansion, and Wilson’s concern To Save the World for Democracy as the epitome of benevolent police action in the name of
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progress, freedom, and welfare (Williams, 1980:130).

Apparently, a "global balance of power" entailed spreading the American way of life throughout the world.

Other factors which led to the Cold War mentality include the Munich Agreement, the Nazi-Soviet Pact, and the establishment of a professional military following World War II. The Munich Agreement of 1938 was an agreement between Nazi Germany, France, and Britain. France and Britain agreed to allow a re-integration of German speaking regions in the hopes that this would appease the enemy. Soon after the agreement, Hitler violated by moving into and taking all of Czechoslovakia. From this point on the perception in the West was that you could not appease or compromise with the enemy; you must never appear weak to the enemy (Gaddis, 1972:4). In an attempt to prevent the Nazis from invading Poland in 1939, Stalin signed an agreement with Hitler. In the political purges of 1936-1938 Stalin had murdered many of his own officers (killing an estimated 6,000,000 of his opponents). Stalin realized that his military power was questionable so he agreed to the Pact with Hitler. This move equated communism with fascism in the Western world. Finally, prior to World War II there was not a professional established military in the United States. After World War II, the decision was made to maintain the military that had been formed during the war. The best way to justify an established military -- and the cost entailed -- is to create a threat. The Cold War became
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this threat.

The result of these policies and historical events was a belief amongst the leaders of the United States that communism anywhere was a threat to the global balance of power:

For decades after the onset of the Cold War the United States officially took the view that adherence to Marxism-Leninism not only made governments internally repressive but also -- through their presumed subservience to Moscow -- a threat to the global balance of power. There was never very good evidence to support these claims (Gaddis, 1992:13).

Policy makers in the United States failed to recognize that communism, like democracy, was not monolithic (Gaddis, 1992:13). This was the overwhelming perception that guided foreign policy during the Cold War. This is the perception, in my opinion, that led to a loss of moral focus in the shaping of policy. The paramount importance placed on the stopping of communism caused us to support competing regimes that were at least as brutal as the communist regimes they were fighting.

The necessity for an enemy outside the United States has never been more apparent than in the post-World War II era, the era of the U.S. as a superpower. Most of our political rivals were either wiped out or severely disabled during the war (Chomsky, 1992:7). Since our national territory was never under attack, we did not suffer as did the rest of the world (Chomsky, 1992:7). In fact, the War brought to America a time of incredible prosperity and increased world power. Our production more than tripled, we had 50% of the world’s wealth, and we controlled both sides of the ocean (Chomsky,
Construction of enemies on a worldwide scale has to be understood as part and parcel of the global hegemony of the U.S., after 1945, over both the First World of Western Europe, North America, and Japan, and the Third World of most of Asia, Africa, and Latin America -- a hegemony only occasionally counterbalanced by the Second World of the U.S.S.R. and China, countries with large populations but backward economies. Ideological support for the U.S. as a uniquely supreme hegemon, identifying the U.S. as the "world police" or global enforcer, that is one to protect "our interests" (i.e., imperial command and access to resources and markets), was devised in NSC-68 (National Security Counsel document 68), a doctrine known as the Grand Area. These secret documents were made available to the public through the Freedom of Information Act in 1971.

The main goal of American planners was to maintain and increase this dominance (Chomsky, 1992:8). NSC-68 continued to propagandize about the Soviet intention for world domination:

...the Soviet Union, unlike previous aspirants to hegemony, is animated by a new fanatic faith, antithetical to our own, and seeks to impose its absolute authority over the rest of the world...On the one hand, the people of the world yearn for relief from the anxiety arising from the risk of atomic war. On the other hand, any substantial further extension of the area under the domination of the Kremlin would raise the possibility that no coalition adequate to confront the Kremlin with greater strength could be assembled (NSC-68, 1950:4).
The National Security Counsel called for a "New World Order," one which eliminated the Soviet Union as a threat and made way for democracy:

Our determination to maintain the essential elements of individual freedom, as set forth in the Constitution and Bill of Rights; our determination to create conditions under which our free and democratic system can live and prosper; and our determination to fight if necessary to defend our way of life, for which as in the Declaration of Independence, 'with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor' (NSC-68, 1950:5).

The intention of this statement is clear; the United States will be the leaders of this "New World Order" and it is the American way of life (weltshauung) which will be spread and legitimized. NSC-68 outlines the extensive plans necessary to maintain the powerful position the United States had acquired during the War (Chomsky, 1991:16).

The first goal of NSC-68 was to disable the Soviet system. This would be done through any means necessary (Williams, 1980:190). The assumption was that the Soviet system could be destroyed economically through continued expansion of the war-making capacity of the United States. If we forced the Soviets to spend more and more of their Gross National Product on the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction in the hopes of keeping up with the United States in the arms race, this would eventually lead to their financial ruin (the U.S. had a much larger GNP) (NSC-68, 1950:16-19).
Another main tenet of the Grand Area was that the rest of the world was subordinated to the needs of the American economy (Chomsky, 1992:11). The Grand Area was to include the Western hemisphere, Western Europe, the Far East, the former British Empire, the energy resources of the Middle East, and if possible, the rest of the world. Every part of the new world order was assigned a specific function designed to help maintain the power of the U.S. (Chomsky, 1992:12). Industrial countries such as Germany and Japan would provide technological knowledge (Chomsky, 1992:12). The major function of the Third World was to supply raw materials and a market for the industrialist capitalist societies (Chomsky, 1992:12). In other words, the government had instituted a plan to exploit the "inferior" people and races of the world for the gains of the Western world. The "inferior" people were increasingly depicted as enemies.

In order for the Grand Area to work it became necessary to restore traditional conservative rule in the countries involved (Chomsky, 1991:16). This meant returning Nazi and Fascist collaborators into power. Nationalist movements of any kind were a threat to the Grand Area because they were setting a dangerous example of national independence (Chomsky, 1992:13). This is why the Vietnam War emerged — the threat of a good example of political unification (Chomsky, 1992:13).

The main concern of the Grand Area was to gain control over the Third World at any cost. Kennan expressed this
concern when he stated the need for "police repression by the local government" (Chomsky, 1979:17). Kennan also stated that "harsh government measures should cause no qualms as long as the results are on balance favorable to our purposes (Chomsky, 1991:17)." Hence, a political leader or group [a comprador class] that understood the "right priorities" must be put in power (Chomsky, 1991:17). It was the Soviet Union's unwillingness to accept the right priorities that was the real basis for hostility between our countries (Chomsky, 1991:17). According to Chomsky, independent nationalism in the Third World "whatever its political cast, has been seen as a 'virus' that must be eradicated (Chomsky, 1991:17)."

When the Middle East was incorporated into the plans of the Grand Area, the main premise was to squash nationalism wherever it popped up. The Middle East was to be exploited by the U.S.-dominated system for its incomparable energy reserves (Chomsky, 1992:17). The policy goal in this Grand Area was to dominate the world system. There was no better way to achieve this than by controlling the world's energy sources (Chomsky, 1991:18) -- which means having leverage over government policies of Japan and Europe. Again, independent nationalism had to be prevented at all costs: the enemy had become Third World nationalism. The "enemy image" the media derided was Third World Nationalism, especially those movements in the Middle East (Link, 1991:33). It was absolutely imperative that the nationalist movements be stopped if the Grand Area was to
be established.

Obviously there is a significant degree of hypocrisy in policies which condemn the Soviet Union for attempts at world domination while, at the same time, outlining methods for a "New World Order" controlled by the United States:

It [NSC-68] raised the dilemma of ends versus means: how did one resist Soviet 'imperialism' without taking on 'imperialist characteristics one's self? By what right did the United States seek widely dispersed spheres of its own -- as in Latin America, East and Southeast Asia, and Western Europe -- when it denied to the Russians the right to do the same thing in those parts of the world adjacent to it (Gaddis, 19992:30)?

According to John Lewis Gaddis, the hypocrisy of American policy was justified through a doctrine of "moral relativism" (Gaddis, 1992:55). The defense of national security was vital, any inconsistency in policy were justified to ensure this: "moral compromises made tentatively and with some anguish during the early days of the Cold War now became 'mere procedures' (Gaddis, 1992:55)." These "moral compromises" included exaggerating an external threat to the "free world" in order to maintain Congressional and public support for containment of the Soviets, the so-called "missile gap" to justify further military spending, and the intervention of the United States into the internal affairs of other nations -- practiced by Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and I would add, Reagan (Gaddis, 1992:55-56).
Summary

This chapter scrutinized the expansion of the United States overseas, the continued designation of enemies on the global level throughout the Cold War, and the changes in ideology to legitimize this expansion. The dominant hegemony as we expanded our borders outside of the United States was that the weltshauung of Americans should be legitimized globally.

The vast majority of children I interviewed indicated that the did seem to feel that the American weltshauung was the only legitimate one. Many of the children also indicated that they support the designation of the United States as the benevolent global police. This was especially evident in discussions regarding communists, Russians, Arabs, Muslims, and the Japanese. Children frequently discussed how the power of these groups had to be kept in check because they were a threat to "freedom" and "democracy." Other children also spoke about how groups like these resented America because they want what we have: power, freedom, democracy. All of these issues are discussed in much more detail in Chapters VIII and IX.

The next chapter presents previous research concerning the political socialization of children. This research indicates that children are typically indoctrinated by the larger societal agencies of socialization into accepting the status quo. There are many similarities between the findings
in this earlier research and my own. This is especially apparent in terms of children’s attachment to national symbols, perceptions of political authority, and sentiments of patriotism and nationalism.
CHAPTER VII

POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION OF CHILDREN

This chapter explores how a political system maintains a notion of itself over time by legitimizing the ideological hegemony of the nation-state in future generations. This process, known as political socialization of children, is the gradual acquisition of the workings of the nation-state. This chapter is concerned with how political awareness in children is shaped and which agencies in society are most influential in the legitimation of the status quo. In order to explore this phenomenon, previous research regarding the political socialization of children is examined.

Many of the findings in this past research are similar to my own findings and this exploration of past research sets the stage for my own empirical endeavor. My own research findings, however, do differ from past research in one significant way. My study focuses not only on attachment to the nation-state, but also on how the ideologies legitimized by the agencies of socialization cause children to distinguish between "us" and "them" and between "friends" and "enemies." In essence, my study also explores the legitimation of the both national and international stratification to children. Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron discuss the reproduction of stratification in schools through the favoring
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of the dominant culture and through the perpetuation of the myth of a meritocracy (achievement ideology) (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977:61). They refer to this process as "symbolic violence." I contend that this "symbolic violence" is perpetuated and legitimized not only in schools, but also by the mass media, and through political rhetoric. The responses of many of the children in my sample reflect that social stratification, or the classification of groups as either "superior" of "inferior," has been internalized and accepted.

While there has been much written dealing with the necessity to educate children about their roles as citizens (cf. Dewey, 1926; Durkheim, 1961; Plato, 1974; Rousseau, 1979), the research dealing with how political indoctrination of children occurs is not nearly as extensive. There are primarily two reasons for the neglect in this area of research: first, the hesitancy to approve research using children as subjects, and second, the difficulty in assessing where children learn their roles as citizens because of the interactive nature of socializing agencies. Most of the research which explores this phenomenon in the United States was conducted in the late 1950s through the early 1970s. This era marked a time of both political and cultural upheaval in the United States -- the aftermath of the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Watergate, the counterculture movement, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Feminist Movement all occurred during this time -- researchers became concerned about how these
historical events would affect the political socialization of future generations. The primary question of inquiry in this research was, would the legitimacy of the political realm be questioned by children, or will the status quo be maintained? Most of the research conducted at this time indicates that the status quo is usually maintained:

To a considerable extent, political socialization seems to be conservative in its effects. Socialization processes foster the status quo through the perpetuation of class and sex differences in political participation, continuity between generations in party preferences, continuation (and perhaps even strengthening) of adult assessments of the relative importance of political institutions (Greenstein, 1965:158).

This research is considered in more detail later in the chapter.

This chapter first regards models which explore the internalization of political knowledge in children. Secondly, children’s attachment to the nation-state and figures of political and legal authority and how this allegiance is created and perpetuated will be explored. Finally, I will address some of the existing research concerning which agencies of socialization are most influential in the political socialization of children.

Defining Political Socialization of Children

Research which explores the development of children as politically active and aware citizens relies on the assumption that their knowledge is the product of their social world
(Cahan, et al., 1993:192). This means that the perceptions of children are not merely the result of developmental biological forces, but also the outgrowth of social and historical events (Cahan, 1993:192). The political socialization of children is done both formally and informally through the larger agencies of society (i.e. family, schools, religion, government, and the media). There are four important conditions in childhood which influence this process of socialization: the physical environment, which would include the place of the child in the larger stratified system; the social environment or the larger cultural climate during development; the "imperial" practices of adults, meaning the imposition of the adult world onto the child; and the "native" practices of children which refers to the influence of peers in the developmental process (Cahan, et al., 1993:196-201). When one is studying the political socialization of children:

Attention must be devoted to both the socialized and the agents of socialization, with the assumption that the political socialization process varies within and between societies and over time. And, a broad conception of 'socialization' involves consideration of how non-conformity as well as conformity is learned -- both discontinuities and continuities in political learning (Greenstein, 1965:10).

This quotation asserts the importance of the social world in the political formation of children.

According to Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, there are four main models which address the process of how political attitudes develop in children (Hess and Torney,
These models are used by researchers as devices to examine both the attitudes children bring to the socializing process and the manner in which they utilize the political information presented to them. Each model is appropriate at various stages of political socialization.

The accumulation model assumes that there is a gradual acquisition of political knowledge. Initially the child does not perceive the interconnectedness of politics. Knowledge about the political workings of the nation-state are obtained through direct teachings (Hess and Torney, 1967:19). The information internalized by the child need not be understood in any logical or consistent manner. Also, there does not need to be a logical connection between the attitudes of the child and the information acquired. For example, if a child displayed a significant distrust for authority figures such as the police, this does not necessarily mean that this same child would be unable to comprehend the justice of the law or how the courts function (Hess and Torney, 1967:20). The assumption in this model is that the information about the political system can be internalized by the child without distortion from her or his own attitudes. It is also assumed that the child can be taught any material if it is made sufficiently simple (Hess and Torney, 1967:20). Essentially, the cognitive ability of the child as well as her or his own personal biases are irrelevant to the process of political socialization (Hess and Torney, 1967:20). This model is
important in understanding the role of school in formation of political knowledge (Hess and Torney, 1967:22).

The interpersonal transfer model presumes that the child begins the process of political socialization with a great deal of experience in interpersonal relationships:

By virtue of his experience as a child in the family and as a pupil in the school, he has developed multifaceted relationships to figures of authority (Hess and Torney, 1967:20).

The child draws on this knowledge of interpersonal relationships and uses it to understand the workings of the political realm. There is a transference of this knowledge of authority to the larger social agencies. For example, the child may see the authority of her or his parents as comparable to the authority of the president over the country (Hess and Torney, 1967:20). Similarly, respect for the rules in the family or school are transferred to the laws of the political system. The child processes the information about the social system which is unfamiliar by relating it to objects and persons who are familiar (Hess and Torney, 1967:21). The interpersonal transfer model is useful when exploring the early attachment to and understanding of politics (Hess and Torney, 1967:22).

The identification model asserts that the child develops politically by adopting the attitudes of some significant person -- usually a parent or teacher -- in her or his life. This transmission of attitudes in inadvertent, in that, the adult does not consciously attempt to influence the child's
perceptions (Hess and Torney, 1967:21). This model is used most extensively when trying to explain the child's acquisition of party preference (Hess and Torney, 1967:21). The internalization of this information need not be consistent with other attitudes the child may have; she or he is merely imitating the opinions of a significant person.

The cognitive-developmental model postulates that the child's cognitive ability may limit the amount of political information that can be processed. This model, therefore, contradicts the accumulation model which asserts any political knowledge can be understood by the child if it presented in a simplified manner. This model assumes that the child may not be able to comprehend a given concept if they have not reached a certain level of cognitive development (Hess and Torney, 1967:21). With time the child should be able to understand the more abstract and complex aspects of government, but until she or he reaches this stage of cognitive development it is futile to try teach these elements of politics. This model is important when one is attempting to understand how the child grasps some of the more complex and abstract aspects of government (Hess and Torney, 1967:22).

These models of how children acquire political knowledge are referred to in the next section which explores the child's attachment to the nation-state. They will also be utilized in Chapters VIII and IX with my own analysis of children's perceptions about nationalism, politics, and enmity.
Children's Attachment to the Nation-State

This section explores children's overall attachment to the nation-state, their perceptions about the president, police, and the influence of agencies of legitimation in the acquisition of political knowledge in children. Hess and Torney found three stages in the way our nation is conceptualized in early life. First, there was a strong attachment to the national symbols such as the flag and the statue of liberty (Hess and Torney, 1967:28). In fact, 95% of the young children interviewed felt our flag was the best (Hess and Torney, 1967:26). Similarly, Stanley Moore, et al., found a significant recognition of and attachment to the flag and other symbols among kindergartners, even though only 21% of them were able to answer what country they live in correctly (Moore, et al., 1985:46-47). Second, the children begin to embrace the more abstract ideological concepts of the United States. They begin to talk about things such as democracy, freedom, and equality; emphasizing the ideological principles America stands for rather than the symbols (Hess and Torney, 1967:30). Finally, they begin to see our country as part of a larger system of countries; they begin to acknowledge the outside world, albeit frequently in ethnocentric terms (Hess and Torney, 1967:30).

The research conducted on children's attachment to the nation-state suggests that children tend to believe, in fact in younger years embrace, the status quo:
The oft-proclaimed stability of the American political system, in spite of a remarkably heterogenous population, suggests that powerful psychological mechanisms encouraging obedience are present in the citizenry...If what is learned early in life is hard to displace in later years, we have here an important increment to our understanding of the sources of stability in the American system...should contribute (Greenstein, 1965:53-54).

Fred Greenstein’s study of 700 children in grades 4 through 8 from New Haven, Connecticut during the Eisenhower administration indicates that children tend to embrace the status quo. Greenstein’s study reveals that children are at least as likely as adults to perceive high political roles as being important, children seem more sympathetic to individual political leaders than adults, their images of political leaders are qualitatively different than adults especially in their perceptions of the beignness and benevolence of those in authority, and finally, there was no widespread political cynicism in these children (Greenstein, 1965:42). These findings may not seem so startlingly, after all the Eisenhower era was a very conservative time. However, research conducted during other historical periods, including the culturally chaotic times of the 1960s and 1970s, reveal similar findings.

Hess and Torney also found a significant attachment to the nation-state in the 17,000 elementary school children they interviewed in the early 1960s (Hess and Torney, 1967). When these children were asked if America was the best country they usually responded affirmatively (Hess and Torney, 1967:25). When asked why America was the best country many children
stated it was because of democracy, but very few children prior to the sixth grade were able to define what "democracy" meant (Hess and Torney, 1967:25). The attitudes of children prior to the sixth grade were typically generalizations; America was best because it was a democracy, communism was seen as bad even though very few children were able to define either what democracy or communism (Hess and Torney, 1967:25-26). It is interesting to note that all of these children had received instruction about the principles of democracy beginning in the third grade, hence, this finding provides support for the cognitive developmental model (Hess and Torney, 1967:26). The findings of this study reveal that not only do American children feel that their country is the best, but also their language is the best (Hess and Torney, 1967:27). Torney and Hess assert the following about these findings:

Although it is difficult to obtain evidence on the nature of this early attachment, interview material and early questionnaires indicated that in the United States the young child develops a sense of 'we' in relation to his own country and a sense of 'they' with respect to other countries (Hess and Torney, 1967:26).

A similar result was found in a study conducted by Helen Meltzer in 1941 when she found children were likely to respond affirmatively to the statement "Americans are the best" (Meltzer, 1941:343-358). When asked why Americans were the best the most frequent response was "I am one" (Meltzer, 1941:343-358). In a similar study conducted in the years
following Watergate, there was also a strong attachment to the nation expressed by these children (Moore, et al., 1985:191). This study differs from other studies because the sample of children was much younger, ranging from kindergartners to fourth graders.

These results support the notion that boundaries between in-groups and out-groups are frequently done in the framework of the dominator model. The tendency for children to embrace their own country in ethnocentric terms was illustrated in many of these early studies:

The young child’s involvement with the political system begins with a strong positive attachment to the country; the United States is seen as ideal and superior to other countries. This attachment to the country is stable and shows almost no change through elementary school years (Hess and Torney, 1967:213).

While most studies also found that the ethnocentrism does decline somewhat with age -- as children gain more knowledge about the world around them -- none really explored this aspect of ethnocentrism in any significant way. In fact, I would assert that there has been very little research which explores the significance of this finding. It is my hope that my research will contribute to this scarcity of information.

The research of psychiatrist Robert Coles is one significant exception to this omission in children’s political socialization:

Who can listen to children, of any nationality, and not hear the political superego constantly exerting its requirements upon eager and vulnerable minds? I refer not only to the indoctrination one sees in
totalitarian societies, but also to some of the agitated jingoism, the hateful chauvinist invective, the arrogant nativism that one may find in democracies (Coles, 1986a:66).

Coles conducted interviews with children all over the world about their perceptions of nationalism, politics, morality and spirituality. He found that children tend to mix history and national confrontations so that their country comes out in the best possible light (Coles, 1986a:93). This tendency is understandable considering most of the information children are presented with about their countries by the larger agencies in society tend to do the same thing. Coles also found examples of extreme nationalist attachment:

Yet although nationalism may be perceived in any of these ways, the love of country (and conversely hatred for those who don’t belong to it) is part of a seamless web of experiences, loyalties, convictions, suspicions, antagonisms - to which language, culture, religion, social values all contribute (Coles, 1986a: 160).

It seems that the embracement of one’s own culture and society is done through the degradation of others. The findings of this research also indicate that definition of one’s own culture is typically done by defining other cultures that differ as inferior.

The research of historian William M. Tuttle, Jr. also examines the distinctions of in-groups and out-groups among the homefront children during World War II. Tuttle interviews the homefront children forty years after World War II and puts their experiences in the context of the war. The war years were a time when groups attempted to de-emphasize their ethnic
identities because of the strong nativist sentiment apparent at this time in the nation-state (Tuttle, 1993:100-101):

Buried have been countless stories of hostility suffered by children because of their race, ethnic heritage, and religious beliefs. Suffering most were America's children of color, but also affected were Jewish-American children, children of German descent, Mexican-American children, and children of religious pacificists, and nonconformists...The victims were children, but so too were many of the bigots (Tuttle, 1993:162).

Tuttle recounts many of the stories of both children who were the victims and perpetrators of racism. This racism was displayed in children's songs, jump rope rhymes, and the use of ethnolinguistic labels (Tuttle, 1993:173-182). Of course the sentiments of the children were merely a reflection of the larger cultural climate where adults would wear buttons reading "Jap Hunting License -- Open Season -- No Limit" and 120,000 Japanese Americans were interned, when urban areas were plagued with race riots directed against African Americans and Mexican Americans, and there was cultural propaganda that the Italians and Germans were setting up a "fifth pillar" in the United States (Tuttle, 1993:99-185). In fact, some of the anti-Japanese sentiments that were created during the war and felt by many of these homefront children are still felt by them forty years later (Tuttle, 1993:173). This was revealed by their admission that they felt that the Japanese were taking over the United States in the 1990s and also by the fact that very few of these homefront children expressed regret over the internment of the Japanese during
the war (Tuttle, 1993:173). Tuttle’s analysis reveals the problems with creating enemies among children; this dehumanization may persist into adulthood. It is for this reason that this area of inquiry is an important research endeavor. Understanding both where children’s perceptions originate and how pervasive they are, might help us as a nation to counter or nullify these negative images. The next section explores children’s perceptions of authority as an indicator for attachment to the nation-state. The final section will regard the various agents of socialization and their influence in shaping children’s political perceptions.

**Children’s Perceptions of the Authority of the Nation-State:**

The research dealing with the political socialization of children indicates that children overwhelmingly perceive the nation-state and the agents of authority as being benevolent (Greenstein, 1965:38-39; Hess and Torney, 1967:63; Easton and Dennis, 1969:230-244; Moore, et al., 1985:227-229; Coles, 1986a:24-37). Hess and Torney state: "Children have an implicit trust in the wisdom and benevolence of the government" (Hess and Torney, 1967:63). Initially children tend to understand abstract concepts of law and the government by conceptualizing them as people (Hess and Torney, 1967:32). The government was perceived as a man who lives in Washington by 60% of the fourth graders who were interviewed by Torney and Hess (1967:32). Congress was perceived as many men who helped the president (Hess and Torney, 1967:32). Children
also believe that the government is directly concerned about what they say and how they feel (Hess and Torney, 1967:40-41). Similarly, Greenstein found that children spoke about the services provided to children by politicians and their general benevolence (Greenstein, 1965:38-39). This personalization of politics would support the interpersonal transfer model of political socialization.

This research also indicates that children have very little understanding of the workings of the political realm. Children do not understand the role of pressure groups in politics. Until the seventh grade, children rated the influence of the police as agents of the nation-state as higher than that of other individuals, the president, and labor unions (Hess and Torney, 1967:66). They also tended to rank the influence of rich people, the media, and big companies as very low (Hess and Torney, 1967:66). Hess and Torney feel the reason for this lack of information about pressure groups is because children are taught nothing in schools about them (Hess and Torney, 1967:66).

Children also have very little understanding about the voting process as an important aspect of political participation (Hess and Torney, 1967:75). Young children indicated voting as an important vehicle for influence only 4% of the time, but this number did rise to 47% by the eighth grade (Hess and Torney, 1967:75). Among kindergartners, the most frequent response to the question "Who picks the
president?" was God or Jesus (Moore, et al., 1985:49-50). Most children also saw the motives for running for office as reinforcing the status quo; the most frequent reason cited was "They want to keep things as good as they are in this country" (Hess and Torney, 1967:76). The next sections regards children's perceptions of the president and the police.

Perceptions of the President. As with their perceptions of the government in general, most children tended to personalize the authority of the president. Most young children felt that the president was directly responsive to their needs and wants (Hess and Torney, 1967:40-44). Because they perceived the president as kind and responsive to their needs, they responded reciprocally through loyalty (Hess and Torney, 1967:40-44). Similarly, Greenstein found children ranked the president as the most important agent of the nation-state, even though very few were able to verbalize what the president does (Greenstein, 1965:34). While older children also tend to idealize the president, there is also evidence of more cynicism about his role in the nation-state than in younger years. Older children tend to perceive the institutions of the government as more important, reliable, and infallible than the president (Hess and Torney, 1967:40-44).

While most of these studies reveal an almost blind acceptance about the authority of the president, some research indicates skepticism among children. Howard Tolley, Jr.'s
study of children’s perceptions of the Vietnam War indicates that there is more significant cynicism of President Nixon and the involvement in the war than these earlier studies indicate:

Questions in the survey...ask about the President’s credibility and fallibility. On both counts, the President is suspect. Of the children surveyed, less than a third of those in grades five to eight believe President Nixon was doing the ‘right’ thing in Vietnam. An even smaller proportion, 22%, believes he always tells the truth about the war (Tolley, 1973:130).

This finding would lend support to the notion that the cultural climate of the late 1960s and early 1970s does have an impact on the political indoctrination of children. Similarly, Tolley also found much less support both for the Vietnam War and the President among African American children (Tolley, 1973:72). Tolley asserts that the significant cynicism among African American children is due to the fact that many more of them were directly impacted by the war; 12% of African American children as opposed to 3% of white children reported losing a relative in the war and 28% of African American children compared to 15% of white children had a father or brother who had fought in the war (Tolley, 1973:72). Coles also found a great deal of suspicion about the government and the President among African American children living in the south during the 1960s (Coles, 1986a:29-30). In fact, Coles found that children of color tend to be more skeptical overall of political authority (Coles, 1986a). This issue was not as evident in earlier
research because it tended to interview children primarily of the dominant group. In studies which interview children of out-groups as well as in-groups there is more questioning of the legitimacy of the nation-state.

Children's Perceptions of the Police. Most of the early research indicates children interviewed have a surprisingly favorable reaction to police (Easton and Dennis, 1969:231; Hess and Torney, 1967:50-54). Children tend to see the law as protective and helpful; laws keep people safe, they do not punish (Hess and Torney, 1967:50-51). Laws were perceived as just and unchanging (Hess and Torney, 1967:52). Also young children see punishment as an inevitable consequence of wrong-doing (Hess and Torney, 1967:57). There was a significant trust in the police among most of the young children. When asked the question "if you think a policeman is wrong in what he tells you to do, would you do it?", only 6% of the young children indicated that they would not do it (Hess and Torney, 1967:54). Easton and Dennis ask the following question about the blind trust children apparently feel toward the police:

What is there about the role of the police that gives them a unique position in society? Above all else, the peculiarity of their role in democratic systems flows from the capacity to use violence in the pursuit of occupational ends (Easton and Dennis, 1969:230).

Easton and Dennis assert that if the children question the authority of the police, this is perceived by them as questioning the validity of the whole system (Easton and Dennis, 1969:240). Again, it is important to state that the
apparent acceptance of the authority of the police is not as significant in later years (after fourth grade), nor is it apparent to the same degree among children of color. African American children of the South in 1965, for example, spoke of the sheriffs and police officers as "devils" (Coles, 1986a:28). This again illustrates that there is more questioning of the legitimacy of the agencies of the nation-state among children of color. The next section addresses the question: what agencies are most influential in shaping these perceptions in children?

**Agencies of Political Socialization:**

When exploring where children acquire their perceptions of the political realm, it is very difficult to discern, with any confidence, which agents of socialization are most influential. Most research acknowledges that the interconnectedness of socializing agents makes this a difficult task. However, there have been some findings which suggest which agents are most influential in certain areas of political socialization of children. Research in this area finds that the child's partisan attachment is procured primarily through the parents (Greenstein, 1965; Hess and Torney, 1967). The media is influential primarily by providing children with political knowledge as opposed to influencing their attachment to the nation-state (Tolley, 1973:106-107). All of this early research indicates that the single most influential agent of socialization of children's
perceptions about politics are the schools.

It is primarily through education that the cultural hegemony of the dominant group is perpetuated. The nation-state gains legitimacy through schools:

...they [schools] are agencies of legitimation, affirmation of the status quo, and indoctrination; they teach the prevalent system of power and economic arrangements, a particular view of society and the world (Khleif, 1971:223).

There are several ways the nation-state is legitimized through schools. First, it tends to make those groups who deviate from the dominant group into out-groups or non-groups (Khleif, 1971:224-225). Second, schools control the perceptions of children through language. Only the language of the dominant group is valued while other languages or dialects are devalued. In fact, how well a child succeeds in school is dependent upon their knowledge of the dominant group's language, after all, lectures, lesson plans, and textbooks are all written in this language (Khleif, 1971:224-225). Third, education also serves to reproduce the larger stratified system; lower classes are taught enough to succeed in their "proper station" (Khleif, 1971:224-225; Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Persell, 1977). Fourth, it is the history of the dominant group that tends to be taught and legitimized in schools (Khleif, 1971:224-225). Finally, belief in the dominant culture is also reinforced in schools through a glorification of national symbols (Coles, 1986a:36-37).

Hess and Torney also assert that schools appear to be the
most important agent of political socialization:

The schools reinforce the early attachment of the child to the nation. This reinforcement of patriotism is accomplished in a number of ways in the schools in which we tested - displaying the flag, repeating the pledge of allegiance, and singing patriotic songs (Hess and Torney, 1967:105).

While these rituals become exceedingly important to children, the real meaning behind them is frequently not understood (Hess and Torney, 1967:105-106). For example, most of the second grade children interviewed felt that the pledge of allegiance was a prayer to God (Hess and Torney, 1967:105-106). These symbols take an especially significant meaning when they are not appreciated in the proper manner; as in the example of a Jehovah's Witness not saying the pledge of allegiance in school, or discussions concerning the burning of the flag (Hess and Torney, 1967:105-106). Schools tend to reinforce only the positive aspects of the American government:

The school stresses ideal norms and ignores the tougher, less pleasant facts of political life in the United States. While it would probably be unwise to discuss political corruption in early grades, the process of socialization should include a somewhat more realistic view of the operation of the political system (Hess and Torney, 1967:218).

Essentially, schools indoctrinate loyalty among children at the expense of providing accurate information (Tolley, 1973:12). The single most influential factor in determining whether or not children supported the Vietnam War was also what school they attended (Tolley, 1973:45). Those children
attending a military or public school were much more likely to favor United States involvement in Vietnam than children who attended private or religious schools (Tolley, 1973:45-46). The schools are such a primary agent of socialization in this area because they tend to be the main source of information about politics in early years.

Summary

This chapter explored the political indoctrination of children into citizens of the nation-state. The primary area of inquiry was examining the perceptions of children about the political realm and where these attitudes originate. The research findings indicate children display a strong attachment to the nation-state, especially those children of the dominant group, and that the most influential agent of socialization is the education system. This earlier research provides a framework for my own research endeavor in terms of exploring children's perceptions of nationalism and patriotism.

The next two chapters interpret the data collected for my research endeavor. Chapter VIII presents a more quantitative analysis focusing on the those groups children were most likely to cite as enemies of the nation-state. In Chapter IX the data are scrutinized in a more qualitative framework. Children's responses to questions about kind and unkind behavior will be explored in the following manner: in terms of
sentiments of patriotism and nationalism; whether children are more likely to discuss groups that differ in terms more indicative of the "partnership" or "dominator" model; whether there is evidence of language in children's responses reflective of the ideology of "empire as a way of life"; and if the internalization of dominant ideologies of the nation-state influences interaction on the interpersonal level.
CHAPTER VIII:

QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS: ENEMIES OF THE NATION-STATE

The concern of this chapter is to present the macro level perceptions of children regarding those they perceive as "out-groups" in a quantitative framework. I will discuss children's ideas about the world in which they live on the basis of their responses, exploring national and international groups and events. Here, I present and interpret the tabulated results of children's responses to the question: "Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America." This chapter reveals those groups children are most likely to cite as enemies of the nation-state.

Since the children were allowed to respond to the question "Tell me a story about a person or group who is unkind to America" in any manner they chose, many children provided more than one response. All the children in the sample provided at least one answer to this question; the total number of answers did not exceed five. I then coded all responses (394 responses for 142 children). The average number of responses per child was 2.8.

First, I will present the overall findings of the sample regarding enemies of the nation-state. Secondly, I will
provide the frequencies on the basis of region: Northeast, South, and Midwest. Thirdly, results will be presented by grade to explore whether answers differ on the basis of the age of the children. Finally, frequencies on the basis of race and gender will be provided.

Frequencies of International and National Enemies: Total Sample

This section will present and interpret the results of the sample as a whole. Table 5 presents the results for the entire sample in order of the frequency of the response.
Table 5: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>28.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexist</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>38.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>47.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>52.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competition</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>58.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>62.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>67.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>72.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>75.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>77.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>79.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>81.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>83.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>84.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>85.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>87.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Symbols</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>88.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>89.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>90.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>91.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in Sample | 142       | 100.00 |
Total Responses | 394       |

These categories require some explanation. To describe the content of these categories, I will first discuss those groups within the United States who were cited as unkind to America and then I will look at those groups outside of the United States.

The most frequent response to this question was various social problems we face in the United States. This category is a very general one which includes crime, drug and alcohol abuse, child and spousal abuse, "deadbeat dads," gangs, smoking, and vandals. Racists and sexists, including the Ku
Klux Klan, nazis, skinheads, as well as discussion about individuals such as Rush Limbaugh (who some girls cited as sexist) and the treatment of Anita Hill in the Thomas/Hill senate hearing, were also frequently cited as being unkind. Most of the children who discussed movies and cartoons were from the pretesting session in the Northeast where I included a question, which I later dropped, asking them to describe the portrayal of groups in the media. This category deals with the role the media plays in constructing out-groups with the unfavorable portrayal of groups such as African Americans, Latinos, Asians, Native Americans, and women in the movies and cartoons. The category of polluters is really self explanatory; violators in this category were both individuals and corporations. Those children who spoke of the United States government as being unkind felt that the U.S. was its own worst enemy because of the manner in which we treat both our citizens and other countries. The individual deviant category consists primarily of those individuals who have committed some of the more sensationalist crimes (mass murderers such as Jeffrey Dahmer and John Wayne Gacy, the attackers of skater Nancy Kerrigan, etc.). Immigrants in general, and Haitian immigrants specifically, were blamed primarily for increasing social problems in the United States. Bullies were cited as being unkind only by children in first, second, and third grade. Big business refers to exploitation by industry for profit. Sports deals with national and
international athletic competition. Desecration of national symbols and responses regarding the LA riots will be addressed in Chapter IX. While there were four children who discussed gays, three did so in the context of gays in the military and all of these children disagreed with the exclusion of gays. The fourth response was made by a second grade boy from the Northeast who referred to gays as "fags" (discussion will be provided in Chapter IX).

The most frequently cited international enemies of the nation-state were Arabs and Muslims. I combined these two groups because there tended to be a great deal of overlapping in the discussions about these groups. For example, the child would discuss the Iraqis and the Gulf War and then would precede to discuss the Muslims accused of bombing the World Trade Center. This generalization of Arabs and Muslims, as well as their categorization as one of the main enemies of the United States, I assert is very telling. This will be discussed later in much more detail in Chapter IX. International competitors are unkind because they compete with the United States either economically, politically, or militarily. Communists are still seen as a strong threat to the United States as indicated in the communists/Russia category. The Japanese were also frequently cited as being unkind primarily for unfair trading practices. Historical enemies would include most groups the United States has been at war with in the past. Those children who discussed Somalia
blamed the Somalian government for their treatment of its citizens and many children were also against U.S. intervention in the problems of Somalia. Discussion about traitors and anarchists focused primarily on Aldrich Ames (although no children knew his name) the American citizen accused of spying for Russia.

The "other" category refers to all those responses made by three or fewer children. It includes men, the poor, religious groups, Israel, the Red Cross (for using blood tainted with the AIDS virus), teachers, the weather, etc.

Placing the Children in "Time and Place":
Results by Region and School

To explore this data further, I present the results from each of the three regions: The Northeast, South, and Midwest. I also place the child's responses in "time and place" by looking at the larger cultural events occurring at the time of the interview and the events occurring at the schools themselves. Table 6 presents the results from the Northeast.
Table 6: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>15.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>39.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>49.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>54.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>59.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>64.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>68.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>73.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>75.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>78.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>80.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>82.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>83.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>85.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>86.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>88.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>89.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>90.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>91.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>92.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>93.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>93.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>94.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>95.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of National Symbols</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>96.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>96.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses in the other category for the Northeast include all those answers given by only one child. In this category the issue of sexual harassment, the poor, those who try to bring about change and the disabled were both perceived by the children as being portrayed as the enemy, although they did not agree with this designation, war, teachers, police, and the apartheid policies in South Africa.
The interviews at Old Landing Junior high took place on three separate dates: January 28, 1993 and February 8th and 15th 1993. Interviews at Annandale grammar school took place on March 16th and 17th in 1993. There were many international and national events prior to the interview process which had an impact on the responses of children.

The Gulf War had ended two years (February 27, 1991) prior to interviewing, but Iraq and Saddam Hussein were still making front page news because Hussein had refused to guarantee the safety of United Nations inspectors. The bombing of the World Trade Center in New York (February 26, 1993) occurred three weeks prior to interviews conducted at Annandale. These events certainly had an impact on the responses in this region. Arabs and Muslims were groups most frequently cited as enemies of the nation-state in the Northeast. This is particularly striking since almost one half of this sample (46.5%) mentioned either Arabs or Muslims in these terms.

As indicated previously, the interviews at Old Landing Junior High took place following the 1992 presidential election. While the election certainly caused children to define their partisan preferences, I contend that it also had an impact on their perceptions of Japan. During this election every candidate, regardless of partisan affiliation, took a stand on the "Japan question." The media and political attention to Japan's trading practices were reminiscent of the
"yellow peril" propaganda apparent in the late 1800s and during World War II. By this I mean, the overriding message, it seemed to me, was that Japan was taking over the American economy. This is also the impression I had of the children’s responses about Japan. The majority of these responses are indicative of the "dominator model" and will be explored further in the next chapter.

I assert that the political propaganda during the election also influenced children’s perceptions of social problems in the United States. The democratic nominees attacked George Bush primarily on his domestic policies. The most frequent assault on George Bush was that he ignored domestic problems such as crime, poverty, and unemployment while focusing almost exclusively on foreign problems such as the Iraqi attack on Kuwait. One example of this is taken from a discussion between two sixth grade girls:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that is unkind to America.]
Jane: [the government]...because our country can’t feed its own people and we’re taking in others (she is referring to immigrants such as the Haitians).
Julie: Yea, I think the government at times is the enemy.
[Why?]
Julie: Because there are people starving here and we can’t feed them all. And we still send help to other places (Field notes #9, NE:131).

This response is similar to other responses along this vein. These answers reveal that children seem to believe that the United States is doing too much for other countries; ignoring domestic problems in the process.
The responses in the Northeast also revealed a sustained mistrust (long after the fall of the Berlin Wall) of communists in general, and Russians in particular. To put these responses in their cultural context, there was growing concern in the United States over the breakdown of the former Soviet Union particularly in terms of their historical build up of nuclear weapons during the Cold War, there was also much media attention to the social problems in East Germany and the ethnic cleansing in the former Czechoslovakia.

School events also seemed to have an impact on children’s responses. Specifically, I am referring to the significant number of children who responded that racists and sexists were a main enemy of the nation-state. Most of the children who responded in this manner were from Old Landing Junior High. I interviewed there during the school’s celebration of Black History month and many school activities centered on this theme. The classroom where interviews were conducted had posters of important African American leaders taped to the walls and I found out from the children that they had seen several films which explored the Civil Rights Movement. The findings from the two schools in the Northeast are presented in Tables 7 and 8.
Table 7: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Landing</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>29.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>38.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>46.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>54.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>60.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>66.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>70.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>74.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>77.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>80.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>99.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>17.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>31.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>45.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>51.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>56.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>61.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>65.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>68.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>72.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>75.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>78.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>80.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>82.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>84.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews in the South took place on March 9, 1994. The most newsworthy events prior to interviewing include the
massacre of forty worshippers at a mosque in Israel by a Zionist, the continued conflict in Bosnia, Aldrich Ames and his wife were prosecuted as Soviet spies, the discussion of economic sanctions against Japan, and, nationally, continued debate about Clinton's health care plan. Frequencies of the children's responses in the South are evident in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>50.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>69.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>74.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>77.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>79.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>82.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>84.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>87.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>89.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>90.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>91.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>92.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>94.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>95.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of National Symbols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>96.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>97.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>98.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in Sample | 27 | 100.00 |
Total Responses | 85 |        |

In the South, corporations and individuals who pollute were the most frequently cited enemies of the nation-state. I was unable to determine why this was such a significant
issue in this region at this time. With the exception of polluters, the most frequent responses in the South are very similar to the Northeast. The percent of responses regarding social problems, Arabs and Muslims, racists and sexist, and the Japanese are almost identical to the Northeast. Communists and Russians were identified as more of a threat in the South than the Northeast which I attribute to the Aldrich Ames case. There also was not as much cynicism in the South about the U.S. government as there was in the Northeast. The frequencies of responses on the basis of schools in the South are presented in tables 10 and 11.

Table 10: Groups Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>35.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>47.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>59.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>73.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>76.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>78.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>80.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>88.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>90.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of National Symbols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>92.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>95.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>97.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racists/ Sexists</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>13.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/ Muslims</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>27.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>39.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>51.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>60.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>67.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/ Russia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>74.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Deviant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>79.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>83.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>88.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>90.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>93.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>95.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>97.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in Sample 11 100.00
Total Responses 43

As is evident in Table 12, the responses in the Midwest indicate that these children are more concerned with national as opposed to international events:
Table 12: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>36.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>63.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>69.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>76.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>82.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>86.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>91.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>93.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>95.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>97.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of National Symbols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I attribute this to the fact that fourteen of the twenty-nine children in the Midwest were very young children (5 first graders and 9 fourth graders). Overall, younger children were less knowledgeable about international events. Those children in the junior high in the Midwest also were more likely to cite national problems or groups as being unkind to America than the children of the same age in either the South or the Northeast. I ascertained the reason for this was because these children were more affected by these problems than the groups in the other regions. Since this was an inner city school, where 80% of the student body was living below the poverty line, these social problems are very real to them indeed. This is evident in the many examples of violence and gang activity these children witnessed and spoke about. One example is provided by a seventh grade African American girl:
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[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]  
Letitia: Gang groups.  
[How Come?]  
Letitia: Because they spray paint on walls. Also, like this one time there was this guy I know about who burned this other guy's garage and then spray painted that he was going to "burn his ass."  
[Really?]  
Letitia: Yea.  
[What should be done about this problem?]  
Letitia: [thinks for a while] I don't know.  
[shakes her head] I really don't know.  
[Is the problem a big one?]  
Letitia: Yea, really big!  
[Too big to do anything about it?]  
Letitia: Probably (Field notes #1, MW:11).  

Perhaps more distressing, was to listen to the many examples of violence these kids had either witnessed or been subjected to on the interpersonal level. This issue will be explored in more detail in the interpersonal analysis of responses in Chapter IX.

One other issue that influenced the responses of the children at Metropolitan Junior High is that the I conducted my interviews during the school sanctioned "multicultural week." Each day of multicultural week was designated for a different racial or ethnic group. The day I was there (May 24, 1994) was Asian Day. I was able to attend some of the events with the students including listening to a Muslim discuss the principles of Islam, watching some of the Laotian students perform a dance from their culture, and watching a blind magician -- who incorporated the idea of tolerance for people of all races and disabilities into his act -- perform. These events served as impetus to a whole host of different
issues. One issue discussed was the principle of multiculturalism itself. Two boys discussed this issue in separate interviews. The first boy responded very favorably to the events at the school:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Joey: Racists and Supremacists.
[How Come?]
Joey: They think they are better than us. Every time we try to do something better, they do some heinous act to hurt us.
[Like what?]
Joey: Racial injustice is Southern states, slavery, and stuff like that.
[What is your reaction to people like this?] Joey: I think we should educate them about how things could be -- everyone is equal. Like multicultural week -- different can be better, it doesn’t have to be worse -- it’s all right to be different (Field notes #1, MW:33).

This statement defines the partnership model perfectly.

Another boy felt a bit differently about multicultural week:

[Tell me a story about an adult that does something unkind]
Ron: Racism. Usually adults are more likely to be racist [than kids] -- if an adult is racist and in contact with kids -- the kids will be racist. It [racism] is passed down.
[What would your reaction be if you saw this happen?]
Ron: I wouldn't look up to them [racist adults] anymore. I think this school is kinda racist sometimes.
[How come?]
Ron: They have a Black history month and the multicultural week -- but we don’t have anything about white America.
[So the school is racist because they don’t spend enough time talking about white America?]
Ron: They try too hard not to be racist -- and they go too far the other way. We should learn about the minority, but we should also learn about the majority.
[And you don’t think they spend enough time talking about the majority?]
Ron: Right (Field notes #1, MW:27).
While this boy did cite racism as a problem, he apparently did not see the schools as the place to confront this issue, at least not to the degree that this was done at Metropolitan Junior High. Multicultural week influenced other responses children made, but this will be addressed when I discuss inaccuracies in children's responses in Chapter IX. The frequency of responses on the basis of schools in the Midwest are provided in Tables 13, 14, and 15.
Table 13: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Junior High</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>45.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>91.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>95.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>86.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>93.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of National Symbols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>100.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also wanted to include the differences in responses on the basis of the age of the child. To do this I have included
frequencies of responses by grade (Tables 16-23).

Table 16: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Grade</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Grade</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is difficult to make any generalizations about the interviews with these young children because the sample is so small, it is apparent that these responses tend to be about those people or events they have direct contact with. The social problems mentioned include "stranger danger" or adults who use drugs, drink alcohol, or smoke cigarettes. These children were also more likely to cite bullies they had come in contact with as being unkind to America. This reveals the egocentrism of young children; those issues most important to America are the events directly affecting them. This finding is consistent with other research on the political
socialization of children which found that young children typically perceived political authorities (especially the president) as directly responsive to their needs (Hess and Torney, 1967:41-41). The two children who mention gypsies were friends from the Midwest, these responses will be presented in Chapter IX. The response about gays will also be regarded in this chapter. It warrants mention that none of these children discussed international enemies. It was in third grade that these international enemies began to be considered as is evident in Table 18.

Table 18: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Grade</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>19.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>39.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>56.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>63.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>70.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>77.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>81.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of National Symbols</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>84.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>87.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>90.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>92.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>95.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>97.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weather</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>98.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total in Sample           | 26   | 100.00  |
| Total Responses           | 71   |         |

While there is the inclusion of Arabs and Muslims as an enemy of the nation-state, in fact as the most frequently cited enemy group, children in third grade did not discuss
other international enemies to the same degree as older children. Also, "Bullies" still remains as an important category, indicating a continued element of egocentrism at this age. Similarly, fourth grade children (Table 19) indicates some mention of international enemies, although not to the degree of children in grades 5 through 8.

Table 19: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourth Grade</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.95</td>
<td>28.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>57.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>65.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>71.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>76.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>81.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>84.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>86.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>89.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>92.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>94.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>97.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Symbols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Tables 20 through 23, children in fifth through eighth grade consistently discussed international enemies of the nation-state.
Table 20: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fifth Grade</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>24.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>36.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>46.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>57.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>64.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>68.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>72.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>75.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>77.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>80.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>83.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>84.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>85.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>97.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>88.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>89.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>90.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>92.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>93.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>94.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>96.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>97.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>98.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>100.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total in Sample        | 28    | 100.00  |       |
| Total Responses        | 77    |         |       |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Considered Unkind to America</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>72.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>77.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>92.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weather</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seventh Grade</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>46.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>53.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>58.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>67.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>78.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>82.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>83.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>85.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>87.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>89.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>91.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>92.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>94.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>96.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>98.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eighth Grade</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>15.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>29.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>41.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>56.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>62.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>68.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>73.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>77.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>80.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>83.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>85.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>87.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>89.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>91.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>92.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>93.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>94.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>95.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>96.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those Who Try to Bring About Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>97.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of National Symbols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>98.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These frequencies indicate that children acknowledge more national and international events beginning in the third grade and consistently do so beginning in fifth grade. In this sample, the children in first and second grade were more likely to discuss individuals or groups with which they had direct contact. The next section will explore responses on the basis of race and gender.
Responses by Race and Gender

While I have included frequencies for race, it is difficult to discern differences on the basis of this social attribute because of the homogeniety of the sample (91.55% white). Tables 24 through 27 illustrate responses on the basis of race.

Table 24: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>15.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>29.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>38.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>48.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>53.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>64.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>68.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>73.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>76.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>79.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>81.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>83.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>84.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>86.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>87.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>88.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>89.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>90.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>91.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Symbols</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>92.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>93.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>93.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>94.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>95.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>95.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>96.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>97.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in Sample | 130  | 100.00 |
Total Responses | 358  |        |
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Table 25: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>42.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>57.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>71.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>85.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Symbols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Deviants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assyrian</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Sample</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of the two Assyrian boys interviewed,
responses were pretty consistent regardless of the race of the child. The two Assyrian boys were both in the first grade and their responses are reflective of other children their age. Social problems, Arabs and Muslims, polluters, and communists and Russians were the most frequently cited enemies of the nation-state by Whites, African Americans, and Asian Americans.

Really, the only significant difference on the basis of race appears to be the designation of the Japanese as one of the main enemies of the nation-state. While Whites consistently identified the Japanese as being unkind to America, neither the African American children, nor the Asian American children mentioned the Japanese. I attribute this more to the time of the interviews rather than the race of the child. Most of those children who cited the Japanese as enemies of the nation-state were from the Northeast. The portrayal of the Japanese at the time of these interviews was much more negative than during the interviews in other regions. Also, I interviewed very few children of color in the Northeast (only two Asian American girls).

There were really very few differences on the basis of gender in responses as well. The only significant difference is that girls would tend to talk about both racism and sexism in conjunction; none of the boys mentioned sexism. The fact that there is a great deal of consistency among both boys and girls responses lends support to the notion that these
perceptions are socially constructed by the larger agencies of legitimation in society. Results on the basis of gender are presented in Tables 28 and 29.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>15.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists/Sexists</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>37.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>46.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>52.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>58.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>63.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>68.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>72.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>76.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>78.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>80.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>83.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>84.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>86.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>87.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of National Symbols</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>88.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>89.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>90.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>91.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>91.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>92.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>93.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>94.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>94.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>95.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>95.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>96.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who try to Bring about Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>96.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>97.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>97.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>97.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>98.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>98.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>99.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>99.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>99.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in Sample   83  100.00
Total Responses   237
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Table 29: Groups Considered Unkind to America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>17.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Muslims</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>34.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racists</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>42.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>49.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Cartoons</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>56.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>62.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Competitors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>67.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Enemies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>70.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>73.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>76.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>78.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communists/Russia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>80.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Deviant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>82.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>84.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>85.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Riots</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor/Anarchists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>88.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weather</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>89.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>91.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>92.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>93.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>94.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Refugees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>95.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>95.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>96.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>97.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>97.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>98.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>99.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desecration of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>99.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Symbols</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in Sample</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

These frequencies reveal that children’s perceptions of unkind behavior are influenced both by larger cultural events, as portrayed in the media and political rhetoric, and by the activities in the schools themselves. This finding provides
support for the notion that children's perceptions of the world in which they live mirror those of the larger societal agencies of socialization. While this is an important finding, these frequencies do not communicate how strongly children stated their responses, whether the child felt this designation of enemy groups was a cultural construct, or whether or not the child described the group in ethnocentric terms.

Chapter IX will evaluate these issues by exploring the language used by the children to describe the "other." I will examine children's sentiments of nationalism and patriotism, whether children's responses regarding groups that differ are more indicative of the "partnership" or "dominator" models, inaccuracies in the responses made by children and the significance of these errors, and how these perceptions influence interaction with peers, teachers, parents, and other adults.
CHAPTER IX:

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS: GLOBAL, NATIONAL, AND INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN

Do children’s perceptions of the world in which they live reflect the larger ideological hegemony of the nation-state? Do the boundaries they set between "us" and "them" and between "friends" and "enemies" mirror larger social constructs apparent in political rhetoric, the media, and the schools? Does the larger social stratification in society influence their choice of friends and does it affect their perceptions of teachers and other adults? This chapter will address all of these issues by presenting the world as it is perceived through the eyes of one hundred forty two children in three different regions. At this point I have spent a great deal of time outlining the historical foundations for our current ideological climate which legitimizes social stratification in society. I have also presented past research dealing with the political socialization of children which indicates that children typically believe in the status quo. This socio-historical analysis of victimization and the use of existing research sets the stage for this empirical endeavor. Are children socialized by the larger agencies in society to accept the status quo and how does this socialization process influence daily interaction?
Specifically, this chapter will confront several issues:

1. What evidence is there of nationalism and patriotism in the responses of children?

2. Are children's responses more indicative of the "partnership" model (defining differences in more pluralistic terms) or the "dominator" model (categorizing differences as either superior or inferior)?

3. What are the inaccuracies in children's responses regarding international and national events and what is the significance of these errors?

4. How do these perceptions of the world in which they live translate into behavior and perceptions on the interpersonal level?

As indicated in chapter II, the empirical data for this study is derived from intensive interviews conducted in various school settings in the Northeast, Midwest, and South. The children were asked to provide examples of kind and unkind behavior on the international, national, local, and interpersonal level. First, I will explore children's attitudes of nationalism and patriotism. Secondly, I examine the language used to define the "other;" is this language more indicative of the "dominator" or "partnership" model? This section will also interpret the meaning of some of the inaccuracies in children's responses about groups that differ. Finally, how do these perceptions of the "other" influence interaction on the interpersonal level.

_Nationalism and Patriotism_

Evident in many of the responses by children interviewed
is a significant attachment to the nation-state. The findings in this area of inquiry are similar to other research conducted on the political socialization of children. Namely, children tend to believe in the status quo; the manner in which things are done in the United States is the way they should be done. To illustrate this belief in the status quo, as well as some examples of cynicism, children's attachment to national symbols and their perceptions of authority figures in the nation-state will be scrutinized. Since this sample of children is predominately white (as indicated in Chapter II), I will indicate the race of the child only if he or she was not white.

Attachment to National Symbols:

The schools, as an agency of the nation-state, attempt to encourage an attachment to America by legitimizing the dominant cultural hegemony. This is done in many ways. Through ritualized means such as singing the National Anthem before a school sanctioned sporting event or saying the Pledge of Allegiance in the classroom. Symbolically by placing the American flag in the classroom or by posting pictures of national leaders and historical figures. Attachment to the nation-state is also encouraged in a more concrete manner by glorifying our American traditions and figures in history texts and lectures. All of the schools where interviews were conducted, with the exception of Metropolitan Junior High School in the Midwest, had flags in the classroom. Also, all
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of the grammar schools, regardless of region, began the day with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Of course, the schools are just one of many of society's agencies which encourage this attachment, albeit, as past research indicates (discussed in Chapter VII), one of the most important ones. The theme of "love of country" is also evident in the media, political rhetoric, and is instilled in the home. This study indicates that children do feel a significant devotion and allegiance to their country. One of the many ways this is evident is through the respect and adoration they accord our national symbols.

To illustrate this attachment to national symbols I will defer to the children themselves by presenting excerpts from my field notes. All of the names used are pseudonyms to protect the anonymity of the children. While overall the theme of glorification of national symbols was not especially prevalent in these interviews (fifteen children or 10.6% of the children discussed national symbols), I assert that these responses are important because the open ended nature of the questions do not specifically ask anything regarding our national symbols. Past research attempted to determine whether children were able to recognize pictures of national symbols, such as the flag and the statue of liberty, and if the children did recognize these symbols researchers would ask their feelings about them (Hess and Torney, 1967). My intent in this research was to have children decide for themselves
whether or not national symbols were a significant issue for them. Therefore, the children who do discuss the importance of our national symbols felt strongly about their convictions.

Much of the discussion about national symbols centered on the flag and its symbolic meaning. Five children spoke about the horrors of burning the flag. A discussion between three third graders from the Northeast articulated this sentiment:

[Tell me a story about a person or group who is unkind to America]
Billy: ...people who burn the American flag.
Angela: Well sometimes you have to burn them if they’re ripped and it’s flag day.
Billy: Flags are like a country...A symbol of the country.
Jeremy: It’s not showing respect for the country [when you burn the flag]. (Field notes #11 NE:162)

Desecration of the flag is a very significant issue for these children. Not only did this group of children know that burning the flag is inappropriate, but they also knew the proper means for disposing of a flag.

One fourth grade girl from Grassy Knolls Elementary spoke about the significance of patriotic songs:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something kind for America]
Sally: Sometimes, some people get together and write songs about America...we wrote one in the second grade.
[What are these songs about?] Sally: How great America is, you know, free and stuff.
[And why is this kind to America to write songs like this?] Sally: Because it gives people good feelings about America when they hear songs like this (Field notes #3 MW:58).

Later in the interview, she asserts her point further:
[Tell me a story about a person or group who does something unkind to America]  
Sally: Our music teacher was telling us that no one really sings the National Anthem at like a [names a professional baseball team] game or something.  
[How come?]  
Sally: They’re too lazy or something, or maybe they don’t feel like embarrassing themselves.  
[And why is this unkind to America if they don’t sing the National Anthem?]  
Sally: You should be proud for your country. Like my music teacher had people here from Germany and they thought what’s wrong with these people, they are not proud for their country [because they didn’t sing the National Anthem] (Field notes #3 MW:59).

As with the children who discussed the importance of treating the flag with respect, this girl felt that the expression of one’s love of country by singing the National Anthem was of paramount importance. In this response it is also apparent that both her teacher and the school (writing the song in the second grade) played a role in her attachment to song as a symbol of patriotism. She further reinforces the importance of singing the National Anthem by stating that it is vital that people from other countries (in this example Germany) are aware that we do love our country.

Six children also mentioned the role of soldiers. While one may not regard soldiers as symbols of the nation-state, it is very apparent through the language used to describe what soldiers do that they are understood as such by these children. Soldiers were perceived as important agents for America because they would "fight for freedom"; they preserve the ideology we as Americans hold so near and dear. One eighth grade girl from the South stated that soldiers are kind
to America because: "They are fighting for freedom and they are fighting for the land (Field notes #2, South:43)." There is an element of "ideology of empire as a way of life" in her statement because these soldiers are also fighting for the land. Similarly, a fifth grade girl also from the South stated the following:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something kind for America]
Betsy: The people who go into the war help the country because they fight for our country. If they didn't fight for it we might not have freedom.
[Are they fighting different countries?]
Betsy: Other countries start a threat on us. They use bombs and stuff. Then you have to fight them. It takes brave people to go and fight for their country.
[Why do they put off bombs?]
Betsy: Other countries want to win the war so they'll look better. You can't get peace with all countries. Country is [countries are] unkind when they start putting off bombs. I watched the news and I see different countries shoot people on the road. Americans don't do that (Field notes #1, South:4-5).

In this example, she portrays American soldiers as fighting only when other countries begin the threat. While we want peace, there is no compromising with some countries -- we have no option but to fight to protect our freedom. Like the girl previously mentioned in this paragraph, she too believes that American soldiers are the great protectors of peace and freedom. This passage is indicative of what William Appleman Williams saw as the post Cold War theme of "ideology of empire as a way of life." By this I mean that Betsy perceived that the role of the United States is to protect peace and freedom; they are the benevolent global police. In this excerpt, it is
also apparent that her perceptions are legitimized (if not created) by the media. The language used in this response indicates that she believes America is better than other countries, not only because we have freedom, but because we do not "shoot people on the road." This response reveals the "dominator model," the idea that we are better than other countries because we are peaceful and free. Many children spoke about other countries using the terms of the "dominator model." In fact, it was more common for children to speak in these terms than in terms that could be classified as the "partnership model." This will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Finally, other children spoke of America's athletes as symbols for national pride:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something kind for America.]
John: Athletes want to make this country proud -- they want to give America a good name -- so they train long and hard (Field notes #2 South:33).

Two other children also spoke about athletes as a reflection and glorification of America itself. Several other children spoke about opposing sports teams as the "enemy." While pretesting my questions in the Northeast, one seventh grade girl stated the following about sports:

Jackie: Well I play a lot of sports and I think on the team we see the other team as an enemy a lot of the time.
[How come?]
Jackie: You know, it helps us to win the game -- fight against them (Field notes #3 NE:29).

Similarly, an eighth grade boy from the Northeast stated the
following:

Brian: ...I play a lot of sports and sometimes the other team or the individuals on the team are enemies.
[How come?]
Brian: Because of competition.
[So, in order to win the game sometimes it helps when you think of people on the other team as the enemy?]
Brian: Yea (Field notes #5 NE:72).

Winning isn't everything; it is the only thing, even if this means classifying the other team as the enemy.

These statements by the children reveal that some of the symbols of the nation-state, in these examples the flag, the National Anthem, soldiers, and athletes, represent for them the strong attachment they feel to America. It is important to note that none of the children in the sample overall made any negative comments about these symbols of the nation-state. It also warrants mention that of the fifteen children who spoke about the significance of these symbols, only three were in junior high; that is, the were majority elementary school children. This finding provides some support for other research dealing with political socialization of children which suggests that children initially develop an attachment to their country by embracing the symbols of the country (Hess and Torney, 1967; Moore, et al., 1985). The next section considers how children in this sample perceive the authority figures of the nation-state.

Perceptions of Political Authority:

Research on the political socialization of children
indicates that children typically perceive authority figures in the nation-state as being inherently benevolent and fair (Greenstein, 1965; Torney and Hess, 1967; Easton and Dennis, 1969; Moore, et al., 1985; Coles, 1986a). Easton and Dennis found that younger children perceive a questioning of political authority as a questioning of the legitimacy of the whole system. In my sample, eighteen different children (approximately 12.7% of the sample) mentioned various authority figures in the United States. While many of the children, especially the younger children, believed that those in positions of authority generally did work for the common good, there were also many responses which indicate a degree of cynicism about authority figures in the nation-state. The authority figures mentioned include the police, presidents, and politicians. I will first present positive perceptions of the authority figures of the nation-state and then explore some of the more cynical responses.

One eighth grade boy from the Midwest stated the sentiment of many children about the role of the police:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something kind for America]
Peter: The police.
[How come?]
Peter: They try to keep the peace. You know try to keep it quiet and help people (Field notes #1 MW:7-8).

A first grade Asian American boy also felt police were kind to America because they "kick some butt (Field notes #2 MW:41)."

Another first grade Assyrian boy from the Midwest discussed
the role of the police as a means of protection from strangers:

[Tell me a story about an adult that does something unkind]
William: If someone has a toy [a stranger] -- when strangers come -- they say "Come with me I'll take you to your mom and dad." You say no and punch them and hit them in the face.
[Even if they are bigger than you?]
William: Well yes -- or you just run.
[It's probably better to run]
William: [Yes, if] Someone is a bad boy -- if [you] find one, make a telephone call to the cops, tell them "He's a bad guy, he's going to shoot me (Field notes #2 MW:46)."

Most of the children who did mention the police did so in positive terms, typically stating they were kind to America because they fight crime.

There were some children who indicated in their responses that police were not infallible. Interestingly enough, all of these children did so in reference to the Rodney King beating and the Los Angeles riots. This sentiment is evident in the following discussion between two sixth grade boys in the Northeast:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Jack: The police, everyone is against the police.
[How come?]
Jack: Police have to do their job, but some people don't like it.
Oliver: Yea, like in LA, the people rioted there because of the police (Field notes #9 NE:123).

In the pretesting of my questions in the Northeast, one eighth grade girl discussed how the repeated playing of the tape of the Rodney King beating in the news made the police look like the enemy (Field notes #2 NE:18). A fifth grade African
American boy from the South also mentioned the Rodney King incident:

[Tell me a story about an adult that does something unkind]
Sam: The police that beat up Rodney...what was his last name?
[King?]
Sam: Yea. No, but I mean all the black people who beat up Reginald Denney.
[Why did they beat Reginald Denney?]
Sam: Because of the white policeman beating Rodney King -- I guess they figured someone had hurt one of their men so they would hurt one of theirs (Field notes #1 South:26).

This exchange was very illuminating in that it made me aware of my influence on the child’s response. While the child first stated it was the police who were wrong, he later changed his response to state that it was really the "black people who beat up Reginald Denney." After stating that it was the police who are unkind in this incident he looked up at me and changed his response. It is my impression that he changed his response because I am white and he was concerned about how I would respond to him stating that it was the white police who were at fault. At the end of the interview I asked him if he had any questions he wished to ask me:

Sam: Yea, what did you think about that Rodney King/Reginald Denney beating?
[I thought it was sad that either one had to happen. Did you see the videos?]
Sam: Yea.
[What did you think?]
Sam: I thought it was sad too (Field notes #1 South:27).

There was only one child (fourth grade white girl) who seemed to feel the Los Angeles riots were the fault of African
Americans:

Karen: ...It [LA riots] was the blacks against the whites.
[Not the whites against the blacks?]
Karen: No, the blacks started it...also when we had slaves, Martin Luther King and Malcolm X were the enemy to black people.
[They were the enemy to black people?]
Karen: Yes.
[How come?]
Karen: I'm not sure, I just know that they were
(Field notes #8 NE:110).

The manner in which she stated that Martin Luther King and Malcolm X were the enemy to black people indicated to me that she felt this strongly, but she was unable to articulate why she felt this was true. As is evident in most of the responses, there seems to be a realization that the police do make mistakes. This revelation stems from their role in the Los Angeles riots. This same cynicism is not evident in the interviews conducted in the 1960s which were fraught with race riots, including the Watts riot. I contend that this is due to the constant media attention about the Rodney King beating, with its repeated playing of the tape of the beating. It would be virtually impossible for children to ignore the brutality of the police from the tape of the beating.

The children interviewed also indicated both support and cynicism about the president and politicians. No child indicated more support for President Clinton than a first grade boy:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something kind for America]
Mark: Bill Clinton -- he says on TV that he's a parent and he wants the gunfire to stop. He cares
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about people -- God is grateful to have Bill Clinton. We’re also grateful to have cops -- because they arrest the bad guys (Field notes #2 MW:48).

He believed so strongly that "God is grateful to have Bill Clinton" that he stated this very loudly and stood up to further assert his conviction. His answer also indicates that he believes police are vital agents in society.

Three children from Grassy Knolls Elementary in the Midwest illustrated the importance of the president by discussing the horrors that occur when a president is assassinated. I found out from the children who mentioned this that they had been discussing the assassination of John F. Kennedy in their history class. One of the most interesting responses along this vein was a fourth grade girl who intertwined the killing of a president with the attack on U.S. skater Nancy Kerrigan:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Carrie: Litter. Or kill, like killing presidents causes a big problem in America -- like the Nancy Kerrigan story -- and sometimes the bad guy gets away (at this point Nancy Kerrigan’s attackers had not been caught).
[What should be done to someone who kills the president?]
Carrie: If it’s a president, then I think they should be killed themselves -- they shouldn’t get away with it just by talking in court -- they should die because it was the president and it was pretty big. It’s not just hitting someone with a metal bar [Kerrigan again] (Field notes #3 MW:62).

It was not uncommon for children in this study to combine their political perceptions with more sensationalist events such as the attack on the ice skater.
An interesting phenomenon about children's support for the president was that they often felt the president helped the United States because he collects taxes. Three children mentioned the president's role as "tax collector" in a positive light. One example:

[Tell me a story about a person or group who is kind to America]
Charlie: The president helps the whole country.
[How?]
Charlie: He collects taxes and gives them to schools and things like that (Field notes #2 South:66).

While there was some support for the president, this certainly was not widespread. In fact, there were more examples of presidents (both George Bush and Bill Clinton) being unkind to America. Most of this discussion was in the Northeast and it had to do with partisan preferences. Interviews conducted in the Northeast were done both during the presidential election of 1994 and immediately after Clinton was elected. Many children stated George Bush was unkind because he stated "Read my lips, no new taxes" and then raised taxes. This is an interesting contrast to those children who felt the president was kind because they perceived him as a "tax collector."

It was also apparent in some of this discussion that children's perceptions about the effectiveness of the president was directly related to their parents' perceptions. This is evident in the following statements made by a third grade girl from the Northeast:
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[Tell me a story about a person or group that is unkind to America]
Patty: Clinton.
[How come?]
Patty: Because my parents said he just wanted the White House.
[Why?]
Patty: To live there.

While I am reasonably sure this girl’s parents did not intend for this statement to be taken quite so literally, she stated this with very strong conviction. This finding provides support for the "identification model" of political socialization which states that children’s political attitudes mirror those of a significant person in their lives (Hess and Torney, 1967:21).

While there was virtually no discussion of politicians in general, there were two glaring exceptions. Both of these children had very negative perceptions about politicians. Both of these discussions are rather lengthy, but I have included them in their entirety to fully reveal the level of cynicism evident in these responses. The first excerpt is taken from an interview with an eighth grader from the Midwest. To put this discussion in context, the boy was discussing his disagreement with his school’s multiculturalism policies (an issue which will be taken up in more detail later). He stated that the school focuses too much on the minority at the expense of exploring the majority:

[Tell me a story about a person or group who is unkind to America]
Ron: Politicians. They are like the schools.
[In what way?]
Ron: They try to think too much for the people --
[by doing this] they don’t help the country. Like health care, if everyone gets it we’ll take advantage of it. We are not all going to have the same opportunities -- it’s just like that -- some people don’t understand this.

[Like politicians?]
Ron: Yea, they try to think for the people too much.
[So, like the schools, they worry too much about the minority?]
Ron: Yea, the government should be more about money. Not my generation but the next will really have to worry about it, we are so in debt now we’re just paying the interest on it [the deficit] (Field notes #2 MW:28).

This is the only child interviewed who spoke of America in these terms. This seemed to indicate that he feels that equality will never be achieved and politicians are kidding themselves if they feel otherwise; if politicians continue to perceive the United States in these idealistic terms, the result will be more and more debt. While equally cynical, one girl from the South, made statements which reflected a very different perception about how things work -- that is, that politicians are not even attempting to work for the common good:

[Tell me a story about an adult that does something unkind]
Gloria: When they make our lives [kids] miserable.
[What do you mean?]
Gloria: Like in legislation, we [kids] have no political rights. They ignore us, they think we’re naive. I mean being an adult just means you have had a longer time to be brainwashed...We are the only enemies that we have -- and all the weapons! This leads to national insecurity...Also the way we treat the environment. Also racism, we need to set up some economic programs -- instead we are wasting time hurting each other -- we should be working together...I think industry is the enemy. It is destroying the environment, eventually destroying our survival...It is the enemy of human existence
on earth for all animals...Basically I think the
government is our biggest enemy -- it’s so
corrupted -- a conspiracy of pocket lining (Field
notes #3 South:41-43)!

Obviously, this girl has a very different take on the manner
in which the United States is run than the boy mentioned
previously. While the first response indicates that he felt
we were doing too much to try to equalize opportunities in the
United States, this girl feels we have not gone nearly far
enough. The problem is not that we are trying too hard, but
that industry and politicians are corrupt and are more
interested in their own profit.

Children’s responses of nationalism and patriotism
indicate that the majority of children do seem to believe in
the status quo. This is especially true of younger children
(grades 1 through 5). These findings lend support to past
research on the political socialization of children. The
responses of this sample do, however, differ from past
research in the degree to which children express cynicism
about the legitimacy of political authorities. I attribute
this to several factors. First, the nature of the questions
in my study differ dramatically from past research on
political socialization. My open ended questions do not
specifically ask questions about children’s perceptions of
politics. I wanted the children to decide for themselves what
they regarded as important in the nation-state with as little
guidance as possible. Past research asked very direct
questions such as: "Which country is the best country?"; the
nature of the questions I asked allowed the child more room to express cynicism.

Secondly, I contend that media coverage of national and international events has changed since the previous research was conducted. The media now plays more of a role in either legitimizing or invalidating politicians and in constructing social problems. Also, children are watching more and more television (approximately seven hours per day per household) and this has an impact on their perceptions. While cynicism was present in some of the statements, I do not want to overstate this issue because most of the children’s response indicated that they typically supported the status quo. This is very apparent in their responses regarding those groups or people who are unkind to America. Prior to 1945, the ranking of groups on the basis of social distance (how closely you wished to be placed to groups designated as the "other") was primarily based upon ethnicity and religion (cf. Bogardus, 1959; ranking of denigrated American ethnics and religious groups was primarily done to non-white and non-protestant groups, e.g., Catholics, Jews, and the Chinese). While this theme persists after the Cold War era, denigration of groups also occurs on the basis of political ideology. This issue will be addressed in the next section which explores the language used by children to describe enemies of the nation-state.
Defining the "Other"

This section will look at the responses of children to explore how they define the "other." Specifically, I will first examine those responses which can be classified as indicative of the "dominator model" and some of the errors in children's responses and interpret the meaning of these mistakes. I will then discuss those responses which illustrate the "partnership model."

"The Dominator Model:"

As Stated previously, children were more likely to define the "other" in terms that can be classified as the "dominator model." I classified responses that categorized differences as inferior, as well as responses that called for a violent resolution to conflict as being indicative of the "dominator model." The language of the "dominator model" was particularly prevalent when children would discuss any of the four main international enemies of the United States: Arabs and Muslims, the Japanese, communists and Russians, and immigrants.

Most of the discussion about Arabs and Muslims centered either on the Gulf War or the bombing of the World Trade Center. One example is taken from a discussion with a group of sixth grade children from the Northeast:

[Tell me a story about a person or group who is unkind to America]
Johnny: Iraq.
[How Come?]
Johnny: Because they wanted to blow our faces off.
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Bob: They wanted to take over other countries that were littler [smaller].
Johnny: Everyone hates them because they ruined our earth.
[How did they do that?]
Johnny: You know they ruined the environment with the burning oil wells.
[You said everyone hates the Iraqis, is that true?]
Steve: Well, I don’t know, I mean we tried and tried to be their friends.
[How did we try to be their friends?]
Steve: We tried to talk to them and we gave them food and money.
Johnny: Yea, I mean we tried to solve this in a logical way, but his brain wouldn’t go that far.
[Who is he?]
Everyone: Saddam Hussein.
Bob: Yea, I mean he tried to kill his own people (Field notes #9, NE:120-121).

Here, the idea that there just is no compromising with some groups is apparent. In many of the responses about Arabs and Muslims there was also a great deal of misinformation:

[Tell me a story about a person or group who does something unkind to America]
Jennifer: There’s [there are] a lot of wars going on.
[Can you think of an example?]
Jennifer: World Trade Center bombing. Those people are trying to get us to get them to go over and fight.
[Who is accused of the bombing?]
Jennifer: People from some place across the sea -- Saudi Arabia or something.
[What people are trying to get us to fight?]
Jennifer: People from across the seas.
[How Come?]
Jennifer: Because they are jealous of what we have.
[What is it we have?]
Jennifer: Freedom, we have people who really care about others (Field notes #1, South:25).

In many of the responses, as in the one above, there was a definite generalization about both Arabs and Muslims. This indicates a lack of knowledge in these children about the differences in culture in these groups. There was also
evidence in many of the responses that children believed these groups resent Americans because of what we have. This sentiment is apparent in the following discussion with an eighth grade boy and girl from the South:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Ben: ...Also, there was the bombing of the World Trade Center -- I mean men lost a lot of money.
[Why did the bombing happen?]
Gwen: They were showing how they felt. But you can’t kill just because you don’t like what they do.
Ben: Yea, they did it to show how they felt.
[Who did it?]
Gwen: Religious group -- they didn’t agree with what America was doing.
Ben: Maybe they wanted to show that the U.S. wasn’t so powerful.
Gwen: Yea, and they thought this was the way to show it.
Ben: Americans can do whatever they want with smaller countries.
[What religious group did this?]
Gwen: All I know is that it was a Muslim group that didn’t like something America was doing. But they didn’t make that clear (Field notes #2, South: 34-35).

In both this excerpt and the one mentioned previously, the children begin with the assumption that America is the best and other countries either want to be like the U.S. or resent it because of its power. An eighth grade boy from the Midwest also spoke about the World Trade Center bombing and proposes a violent resolution:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Perry: Bomb threats -- like that building in New York -- was it the Empire State Building, no that’s not it.
[The World Trade Center?]
Perry: Yea.
[Who was accused of this?]
Perry: I don't know.
[Where did you hear about this?]
Perry: On the news -- you know how they have those broadcasts during programs -- those always make me mad because I miss the shows.
[What happened then?]
Perry: They found the group, but some had already left the country. So some had been convicted but others had left the country.
[What do you think should happen to these people if they are found guilty?]
Perry: The death penalty. If they take someone's life or try to take someone's life, they should get the death penalty.
[Even if they just try to take someone's life?]
Perry: Yes (Field notes #1, MW:30-31).

It was not unusual for children to express violent resolution as the best means to deal with both national and international conflict.

There were two girls from Metropolitan Junior High who discussed conflict in the Mideast not related to either the Gulf War or the World Trade Center bombing. The day before I conducted interviews here the children had listened to a Palestinian woman from a local college come and speak about the conflict there, including the Mosque massacre. When the children attempted to discuss what they had learned about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, it became apparent that they did not understand fully what was occurring. The first child, a seventh grade African American girl, discussed the Mosque massacre that happened a few months prior to the interview:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Paula: I saw on the news a man shot all these people at that mausoleum [mosque].
[How come he shot the people?]
Paula: Because he was mad.
[Where did this happen?]
Paula: Over by Jordan and all that.  
[How come he shot all those people?] 
Paula: He was mad, you can do what you want there -- if you are not that race. 
[What race?] 
I forgot, but they always wear stuff to cover their faces. They are sort of like Asians, but not Asians (Field notes #1, MW:13).

Later in the day this girl tracked me down and showed me a newspaper article about Palestinians and said that this was the group whose name she could not remember. Later, an eighth grade girl stated the following about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America] 
Darlene: We had a speaker come in [and she told us] -- a group of Germans [Israelis] came in and took over the land that was lived on by Arabs. The Jews are like "God sent us here and this is our promised land." Kids are dying, some are starving. Kids throw rocks and they get shot. But I don't see why they said "this is our land," when the earth is everyone's land. Then they took the organs of dead people.  
[Who?] 
Darlene: The Germans [Israelis] did this.  
[Why?] 
Darlene: They use them for scientific stuff. They take the organs before the ambulance comes.  
[Where did you hear about this?] 
Darlene: From the woman who spoke yesterday. It's not actually their country.  
[Whose?] 
Darlene: The Germans [Israelis], but they act like it is (Field notes #1, MW:17).

Both of these responses indicate that these girls do not have much information about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. I think this reveals the lack of information presented to Americans in general about the continuing plight of Palestinians. Darlene also replaced groups in her discussion.
of the conflict. While she said Jews once, every other time she spoke about the Germans. I attribute this to the fact that Jews are typically portrayed as victims, especially in World War II where they were systematically annihilated by the Germans. In this excerpt, Jews were replaced by their historical oppressors; the Germans.

Most of the discussion about Japan centered on their economic practices. The children tended to categorize the Japanese as unkind because of trading practices. This is evident in the following discussion of a group of sixth grade girls from the Northeast:

[Tell me about a person or group that is unkind to America]  
Terry: ...Japan.  
[Why?]  
Terry: Because of more economic reasons.  
Polly: I don’t like Japan.  
[Why not?]  
Polly: Because we sell Japanese stuff here, but we can’t sell ours there.  
Gail: Yea, that’s not fair we should be able to sell stuff there too (Field notes #9, NE:129).

In this excerpt, Polly had no qualms about stating that she did not like Japan. As stated previously, there was a cultural climate (which I assert persists today) which legitimized this sentiment. In the pretesting of the question in the Northeast, a seventh grade girl struggles with the perception of the Japanese presented in the media:

Penny: Well I know I shouldn’t feel this way, but sometimes I think the Japanese are my personal enemies. I see all the negative images about what they do and sometimes, even though I try to see it from their point of view, I find it [the negative images] rubbing off on me. It’s not that I hate
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them, I mean I try to understand them, I just don’t like what they do (Field notes #4, NE:54).

A similar sentiment is evident in the discussion between a pair of eighth graders mentioned previously in this section:

[Tell me a story about a person or group who is unkind to America]
Gwen: Really any country where there is competition is our enemy.
Ben: Like Japan. Behind closed doors they [the Japanese] despise Americans. They’re trying to take over our country -- they’re taking over our market, but we can’t sell there we helped them, but they just keep taking and taking.
Gwen: You just can’t trust them totally.
[Who can’t you trust totally?]
Gwen: Other countries...they may not return the favor. Like when we give them money.
Ben: We need to stop letting Japanese stuff in our department.
Gwen: We need to rely more on ourselves.
Ben: Japanese teens and citizens like American movies and products. But not the government. Japanese politicians are not supposed to like America and they discriminate against the U.S. They want Japan to be the biggest and the best. So, they won’t let us into their market (Field notes #2 South:35-36).

This discussion differs from others about the Japanese, in that, it distinguishes the Japanese people from the government. The Japanese citizens want our American products, but the government will not let them have access to these products. In the Northeast, one group of boys discussed Japan’s unfair trading practices and one of the boys whispered to another boy that he thought we should make Tokyo the "lost city of Atlantis (Field notes #9, NE: 122)." This is the only group that discussed a violent resolution to the conflict. There also were some generalizations about Asian groups in some of the responses. For example, one child discusses
economic issues about Japan, but states he is referring to China (Field notes #3, NE:38). Another girl states that it was Vietnam that bombed Pearl Harbor (Field notes #2, South:40). In these interviews, it became very apparent that those groups who children knew the least information about were also the ones they were most likely to make statements about indicative of the "dominator model." It is easier to place a group at enemy status if you do not have the information which enables you to acknowledge their humanity. This was true in the statements about Arabs, Muslims, and the Japanese.

Communists continue to be perceived as an enemy group although responses regarding communists were not as common as those of the other groups mentioned. The most frequent sentiment about communists was that they do not run their countries well:

[Tell me a story about a person or group who is unkind to America]
Wendy: People who are communists and other people who don’t run their countries well (Field notes #5, NE:69).

An eighth grade girl from the South stated that the Soviet Union was unkind to America because: "I heard AIDS started there (Field notes #2, South:48)." She also stated she did not know where she heard this and that she felt AIDS was probably already in the United States at the time. An eighth grade boy from the Northeast stated that Iraq was our enemy because it was a communist country (Field notes #5, NE:64).
Communists were our enemies because of their ideology for fifty years during the Cold War; for this child there is a generalization of the sentiment to Iraq.

Immigrants were also the target for the "dominator model." Several children stated that the U.S. government should stop letting immigrant groups into the country. Many stated that we already have problems feeding and taking care of our own people without letting these new groups enter the country. One fifth grade girl from the South presented an elaborate theory of what she thought might happen if we continue to let so many immigrants into the U.S.:

[Tell me a story about a person or group who is unkind to America]
Mary Anne: Haiti’s leader is being so mean to his people that he’s driving them to us, and if they keep coming there’ll be the Great Depression again. There’s be so many people that all the companies won’t be able to support all the people. We already have homeless.
[Are there other mean leaders?]
Mary Anne: One of the poor leaders is Saddam Hussein. He’s mean because when we had that war he didn’t feed his people, so they tried to come over here -- again this will lead to the Great Depression because there are so many people.
[Is it bad that all groups of immigrants are coming here?]
Mary Anne: Immigrants don’t bother me -- I love all people -- but I am just worried if they come, there’s not going to be enough food to live...People from other countries aren’t helping us. People who come here from other countries expect special rights because they are different. This is not fair -- other people don’t have the right to give them the wrong treatment, but they shouldn’t get special treatment (Field notes #1, South:8-9).

Mary Anne stated on more than one occasion during this interview that she was a Christian and loved all people.
Because of this she seemed to have to justify the exclusion of groups in need. One of Mary Anne’s classmates provided a possible solution to the problem in a separate interview:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Jill: I watch the news, and in countries like Cuba and Haiti they won’t let the immigrants leave that country [those countries] -- they are so poor. The people that are richer take more and don’t leave anything for the poor -- they starve to death. Also, if we weren’t being so greedy in America -- people would have enough. .
[Who is greedy?]
Jill: Just about everyone -- they waste a lot of food. If we were all vegetarians, meat could go to the poor people (Field notes #1, South:30).

This solution reminds me of my mother telling me when I was young to clean my plate because there are people starving in Africa; I wonder if her parents told her the same thing. An eighth grade girl from the South was not as kind as either Mary Anne or Jill in her description of Mexican immigrants:

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Lori: Mexicans -- I mean they do love to cross the border and come into our country -- They take our money, have babies an then we have to support them (Field notes #1, South:44).

As is evident from these statements, immigration was more of an issue for the children in the South than any other region. This was true even though the state where interviews took place was not a border state. There was also one group of sixth grade girls from the Northeast who also spoke about immigrants in the language of the "dominator model":

[Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America]
Katherine: ...really anyone who commits crimes.
I had not anticipated that so many children would reveal such strong sentiments about immigrants. While the country’s nativist sentiments did appear to be revived prior to interviews, this was long before issues such as proposition 189 in California were passed. There was, however, a growing amount of publicity about both Cuban and Haitian refugees.

These are just a small portion of the number of children who discussed groups in terms that could be classified as the "dominator model." As indicated previously, it was more common for children to describe the "other" in this manner. Some children did also make statements that are more characteristic of the "partnership model."

The Partnership Model:

Those who discussed issues in the language of the "partnership model" described evaluating differences in a more
pluralistic sense than the responses indicative of the "dominator model." The issue of change, specifically those who fear change, was an important concern in these responses:

Penny: We used to see to see people who tried to bring about change as the enemy. [That's interesting, can you think of some examples?]
Penny: You know like Martin Luther King, Jr. and Ghandi. Also Susan B. Anthony because she worked for women's rights. I think we also see Gay rights activists and those working to get gays in the military as the enemy (Field notes #4, NE:52).

Penny, whose fear of negative media images of the Japanese "rubbing off" on her was mentioned earlier, definitely did not agree with this enemy classification of those who try to bring about change. This sentiment was also reflected by one of Penny's classmates: "...I think anyone who has a different opinion than the majority is usually seen as the enemy. People who disagree with the majority scare others because they're afraid of change (Field notes #5, NE:79)." The "partnership model" was also evident in a discussion about enemies made by Mary Anne whose views on immigration were discussed earlier:

Mary Anne: Enemies are important, I don't think we should have enemies, but they are important. We have to try to get along with our enemies. It's hard to do. I try to be friends with people I don't like. Enemies are important because we should try to like them. Enemies also change. It's like the fox and the hound -- even though he is an enemy, you got to stick with him because later you might need him (Field notes #1, South:10).

Mary Anne is really reflecting the sentiment of Claude Levi-Strauss here; the belief that we create alliances with groups
when they can provide us with something we want or need (Levi-Strauss, 1969:489). The next section will explore children’s perceptions of interaction on the interpersonal level.

**Interpersonal Perceptions of Kind and Unkind Behavior**

To explore children’s perceptions of interaction on the interpersonal level, I will use James Youniss’s theoretical categories of interaction. These categories include the following:

1. **Mutuality:** Understanding of the "other" is arrived at through cooperation, as opposed to unilateral authority.

2. **Standards of Worth:** Determined through interpersonal consensus, not enforced conformity.

3. **Similarity between Self and "Other":** The ability to find a common ground between self and "other."

4. **Interpersonal Sensitivity:** The appreciation, not denigration, of differences.

5. **Relational Possibilities:** The child’s acknowledgement of the need for relations with others.

The descriptions of interaction provided by children will be classified in these theoretical categories. I also include a section which explores some of the responses that indicate violence on the interpersonal level.

**Mutuality:**

Most of the children who illustrated a sensitivity to mutuality discussed the necessity to be friends with everyone; even those who had been classified by peers as "dorks" or "nerds":
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Ben: There was this new kid who came to a new school -- he was pretty funny looking. The other kids took one look at him and they called him a dork. There was another kid, who had a lot of friends, he makes friends with this other kid -- he doesn’t care what people think (Field notes #2, South: 32).

Ron from the Midwest illustrates mutuality when he discusses how when picking football teams, one boy who is usually picked last is selected first by another boy (Field notes #1, MW:26).

One first grade boy from the Midwest describes his reaction to students teasing him when he went to a new school:

Mark: Once in kindergarten all the kids in my class didn’t like me except for William. I was in a new school -- and they called me 'nose picker' and I didn’t. They like me now.

[When they were unkind to you, how did you react?]
Mark: If they ever bother me I can go to the principal and he could suspend them. Or I could fight them back.

[How?]
Mark: Hit them. They hit me sometimes (Field notes #2, MW:49).

I suggested to Mark that going to the principal might be a better solution than hitting the kids that teased him.

Standards of Worth:

Most children who discussed interpersonal relations in this category explained how groups are ranked in their school:

Ginny: Basically our school is broken down on the basis of class. So, someone who is kind doesn’t separate people at all (Field notes #2, South:36).

Gloria, the outspoken cynic about politicians motives mentioned earlier, stated the following about ranking among her peers:

[Tell me a story about a child your age that does something unkind to another child your age]
Gloria: When they are judgmental...there is a complex labeling system with kids. [What do you mean?]
Gloria: Like when there is sarcasm -- when kids make fun of each other -- they are just humans of ignorance (Field notes #2, South:41).

Gloria was judged as sort of a social outcast by some of her peers. She was described as "growing up too soon." I think her feelings about her classification as a "nerd" were revealed when she was unable to provide an example of children her age exhibiting kind behavior. Another child from the South discusses how she deals with her status as a "social outcast" when she discusses how she responds when people are mean to her:

Jill: Maybe people don't respect themselves and they think they can get this respect by being mean. People make fun of me sometimes -- because I have glasses and stuff -- they think I am a nerd. But I think that they don't have respect for themselves and so they are mean to me (Field notes #1, South:29).

It was intriguing to see how these two girls coped with their status in the social hierarchy of the schools. Gloria seemed to distance herself from her peers to maintain a sense of self, while Jill, very intuitively, understood that the problem was not with her, but with those who ridiculed her.

Similarity Between Self and "Other":

The most revealing examples of similarities between self and "other" were those that did not exhibit an appreciation of this similarity. Two boys from the Midwest spoke in very denigrating terms about gypsies. The first excerpt is taken from Mark, the first grader who stated God is grateful for
Bill Clinton:

Mark: ...Sam Constantinos -- he's this good gypsy. But his cousin isn't -- he break [broke] a light. [How come?]
Mark: Sam was ringing the doorbell and he [the cousin] took a stick and broke this blue part of the house. Gypsy is something bad, but he [Sam] is good. [What is a gypsy?]
Mark: Gypsy is bad people. [How do you know gypsies are bad?]
Mark: Because I asked my sister and she said "Yea" (Field notes #2, MW:50).

Mark exhibits a significant stereotype here. Even when he has met a gypsy that is contrary to his stereotype of them, he is the exception to the rule and the stereotype persists. Mark not only has a stereotype about gypsies, but he influences his friend to believe the same thing about gypsies:

Ryan: I had this kid I was friends with until my other friend [he names Mark] told me he was a gypsy. He said the kid's family went into stores and stole stuff. I didn't know this about this kid until my friend told me. After I found out -- I went to his house and told him I couldn't be friends with him anymore. [What did he say?]
Ryan: He asked me why, and I said because his family steals. He said, "Who told you that?" I didn't want to tell on my friend so I just turned and walked away. [What is a gypsy?]
Ryan: Bad people. [Where are they from?]
Ryan: I don't know. [How do you know a gypsy when you see one?]
Ryan: Because people tell me. [How do you know they are bad?]
Ryan: Because they steal. [Have you seen them steal?]
Ryan: No. [Then how do you know?]
Ryan: People tell me. [What people?]
Ryan: Like my friend. Everyone says that (Field notes #2, MW:51-52).
Mark's stereotype of gypsies was legitimized by his sister and Ryan's was created through Mark. At the end of the interview, I tried to make Ryan see that he really had no evidence that gypsies were "bad people," but the stereotype persists. Another example of a child exhibiting a lack of sensitivity is taken from my field notes in the Northeast. Barry was a second grader who was discussing what he wanted to do when he got older:

Barry: When I grow up I am going to get a tattoo and an earring, but I'm gonna get it in the right [correct] ear because I'm not a fag. [What's that mean?]
Barry: Means I'm gonna get the earring in my left ear so people don't think I'm a fag.
[No, I mean what does the word fag mean?]
Barry: You know, fag.
Bryant: [to Barry] it's not fag, it's gay. And it means like if you're a boy and you kiss other boys. But I kiss other boys, like my dad and my brother, and I've even kissed you Bryant.
Corey: [apparently thinking I needed clarification] They're cousins (Field notes #10, NE:138).

I got the impression from Barry that he did not know what the word "fag" meant, he only knew that it was something he did not want to be mistaken for. In this exchange Bryant reinforces the idea of similarity between self and "other" by stating that there was nothing wrong with a boy kissing a boy; after all even Barry had done this before.

Interpersonal Sensitivity:

The most frequent responses in this category are those that either appreciate or denigrate groups on the interpersonal level. One example is taken from a fifth grade girl in the South:
Belinda: In my neighborhood we used to have some Russians from the Ukraine. People would make fun of them because they were different, they made fun of the way they talked. They also started spreading rumors about stuff they didn’t do. I was their friend. People should get to know each other before they start making fun of them (Field notes #1, South:19).

Another example from the South:

Ben: There was this Oriental couple in my neighborhood -- they were not great with people. My parents hear neighbors talking -- mimicking this Oriental couple -- they said "they should get their two year old to answer the phone (Field notes #2, South:34)."

Both of these children indicated that they felt it was wrong that people should be treated badly simply because they were different. Two other girls in the South discussed the stereotype Northerners have of Southerners:

Martha: I also think a lot of people discriminate against Southerners.
[How?]  
Martha: They tease me about my twang. Also I think [Northerners] believe that Southerners are all beer guzzling, motorcycle riding, racists.
Ginny: We think Northerners are richer and that they drink tea all the time.
Martha: Also the crime is much worse up North (Field notes #2, South:39-40).

While they resented the Southern stereotype, in the next statement they were discussing their own stereotype of Northerners.

Relational Possibilities:

Most of the discussion about relational possibilities comes from the pretesting in the Northeast where children were asked to define the word enemy. These responses reveal the children’s belief that the enemy is largely a social construct
and that we need to recognize the humanity of those
categorized as enemies:

Prentice: I think the enemy is someone that is
envisioned, people are brought up to believe that
certain groups are the enemy, but there really are
no enemies (Field notes #3, NE:36).

Another child from the Northeast:

Edith: I think fear or not knowing enough may be
what causes enemies. I don’t really think there
are any enemies (Field notes #4, NE:56).

Understanding relational possibilities is the realization that
we all share a common bond. It is also the appreciation that
our continued existence is dependent upon our acknowledgement
of the "other."

Interpersonal Violence:

Many of the children interviewed provided examples of
violence between children in response to the question "Tell me
a story about a child that does something unkind to another
child." In fact, examples of interpersonal violence was the
most common response to this question in all three regions.
The most troubling examples of interpersonal violence were
evident in the inner city school from the Midwest. Of the
fifteen children interviewed at this school, nine provided
examples of interpersonal violence among children. A couple
of the more extreme examples warrant mention:

[Tell me a story about a kid your age that does
something unkind to another kid your age]
Perry: Earlier this year I had a 'Starter' [brand
name] baseball cap and I was jumped on the school
bus and the cap was stolen.
[That's awful, were you okay?]
Perry: I had a black eye and a scratch on my face
where this kid’s ring scratched me. I was jumped by four gentlemen from this school and one from another school.

[What was your reaction to this?]
Perry: Well I couldn’t fight back because it was five against one so I curled up into a little ball on the seat of the bus. That way they couldn’t hurt me as much.

[That was smart, probably the only thing you could do.]
Perry: Then I took action after it happened. I went to the police and looked at pictures. The next day all four gentlemen [from his school] were late. So I went with the police down to the attendance office and identified them -- the other one got caught later -- they all got into trouble (Field notes #1, MW:29).

Another child from Metropolitan Junior High, an African American seventh grade girl, provided the following example:

[Tell me a story about a kid your age that does something unkind to another kid]
Letitia: This is from yesterday. I was walking with this boy -- who I hate to admit is a relative -- he saw this other boy who he didn’t like and started hitting him.
[How come he didn’t like him?]
Letitia: He said he owed him money.
[What did you do?]
Letitia: I told him to stop.
[Did he stop?]
Letitia: No.
[Then what happened?]
Letitia: After a while the boy [her relative] said the other boy was just some "punk nigger" and he left him alone (Field notes #1, MW:10).

This example is provided by a sixth grade girl:

[Tell me a story about a kid your age that does something unkind to another kid]
Barbara: A week ago this girl was tripped on the bus -- her kneecap got knocked out of place, see she already had a cast on it so she ended up having to wear the cast longer.
[What was your reaction to this?]
Barbara: I was wondering if she was okay. There was a substitute bus driver on the bus and he didn’t do anything. The kids denied doing it and when the girl cried they started throwing garbage.
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at her (Field notes #1, MW:37).

Obviously, these examples of violence are very troubling. Like the examples mentioned above, most of the incidents of violence discussed at Metropolitan Junior High occurred either on the bus or on the school grounds. This violence further exacerbates the problems evident in this inner city school. This atmosphere, obviously, is not very conducive to learning.

Summary

The empirical findings in the chapter reveal that children's perceptions of the "other" are influenced by larger historical and cultural events, as well as the portrayal of these groups by the larger agencies of society. On the international and national level of analysis, children typically accept the status quo. On the more micro level of analysis, my findings reveal that most children, though aware, there is definitely a system of social stratification, are still able to articulate why it is wrong to devalue groups that differ.
CHAPTER X:

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In this chapter I summarize the conclusions from my field work in the schools, using the theoretical framework presented at the outset of this dissertation. Specifically, this research reveals, naturally enough, that the perceptions of children about the world in which they live mirror the cultural hegemony of the dominant groups in the United States, that is, those who ultimately make the rules for others and whose interests and ideology, economic and patriotic, are supposed to be synonymous with those of the country as a whole. These interests and ideology are anchored in nationalism, in the belief that "our" way is the "best" way, not only for us but for everyone else; hence, groups that differ from "us" and do not follow our national will are often accorded enemy status, both within the United States and internationally. Children's responses mirror the ideology of the nation-state, especially in relation to the designation of enemy groups. The language of this ideology, discussed in the soci-historical analysis of victimization in Chapters IV, V, and VI, including the dominator model, the ideology of empire as a way of life, and the legitimation of enemy groups, is very evident in their responses. Children's responses also indicate that this perception of reality is frequently
legitimized by the larger agents of socialization in society: the mass media, political rhetoric, and the schools. This chapter addresses several issues:

1. Do children’s responses reveal an overall acceptance of the ideological hegemony of the nation-state? And, is this hegemony legitimated by the larger agencies in society?

2. Do the responses of children reflect an internalization of the ideological hegemony of "empire as a way of life?"

3. Do school sanctioned multicultural programs affect children’s perceptions of groups that differ?

4. What are some future implications for research dealing with the political socialization of children?

Each issue will be explored in more detail.

1. Legitimating the Hegemony

Hegemony, or the belief that the worldview of the rulers is the only valid worldview, is perpetuated through culture and, as such, is perceived as a form of consent and not domination (Gramsci, 1973; Said, 1978:6-7). It is the product not of political domination, but of covert cultural indoctrination in both the political and civil spheres. This is an important distinction. Because a key element of hegemony is consent, the social reality of the dominant group is truly seen as the best worldview, and this notion is legitimized by all agencies of the nation-state. The cultural leadership defines hegemony. The ideological hegemony of the
United States perpetuates the idea that the power held by the dominant group is indicative of their ability. Those who are powerless are perceived as being somewhat lacking or lazy. Hegemony, therefore, has evolved as a logical necessity to justify stratification. Groups are deemed inferior if their worldview differs from that of the dominant group.

The ideological hegemony of the nation-state is validated and reproduced through legitimations. As stated in Chapter III, legitimations are systems of ideas generated by the main agencies in society -- the government, the judicial system, the mass media, religion, and the schools -- to support the existence of the status quo. Legitimations work to secure mass approval of the system. Legitimations are validated primarily through "distorted communication" (Habermas, 1975:106-108). Distorted communication mystifies the true working of the system. In the instance of creating enemies, distorted communication would involve omission of the humanity of the group and an exaggeration or fabrication of negative aspects of the group. The message here is that our culture, government, etc. is best and theirs is inferior.

While some cynicism was apparent in the responses of the children in the sample, the overriding impression was that they believed in the status quo. This is evident in the children's attachment to national symbols which is largely secured through the school (i.e., flags in the classroom, stating the pledge of allegiance, singing the National Anthem
at school sanctioned events). By embracing these national symbols, children are internalizing and accepting the larger cultural precepts they represent (democracy, freedom, self-determination, etc.).

Belief in the status quo was also apparent in the children’s acceptance of political authority. While there were children who questioned some of the agents, of political authority most children seemed to believe that those in positions of political authority were basically benevolent and good. There was one consistent exception to this acceptance of political authority evident in the responses of children who discussed the Rodney King beating. This incident caused many children to question the authority of the police involved. What these responses seemed to indicate is that these children were experiencing a "legitimation crisis." According to Habermas, "legitimation crisis" occurs when a system of legitimations can no longer be seen as valid because it has lost its relation to the truth (Habermas, 1975:68-75). The Media's repeated playing of the tape of the Los Angeles police officers beating Rodney King provided overwhelming evidence contrary to the legitimate authority of the police involved. This caused the children to question whether or not these officers were the benevolent agents of the nation-state who always work for the common good. In this example, instead of the media securing mass approval of the system, it provided information which contradicted the legitimacy of these agents
of the state. Overall, however, the larger agencies in society seemed to present information which validated those in positions of political authority.

I contend that the discussion of enemies in the responses of children was largely a result of distorted communication by the larger agencies of the nation-state. As indicated in Chapter III, both the media and political portrayal of the Japanese at the time of these interviews was less than favorable. The impact of this portrayal was readily apparent in responses regarding the Japanese. Many children discussed the mass media's depiction of the Japanese. It is also important to note that none of the children who discussed the Japanese did so in a favorable light. Their prejudice against this group appeared to be both created and legitimized by the larger agencies of society. The responses dealing with both Arabs and Muslims revealed both the lack of information and the misinformation these children have about these groups. This I attribute to the media's portrayal and the lack of information provided about these groups in school. For example, after the World Trade Center bombing, the Media continuously displayed the defendants with their hands clasped in prayer. Hence, this was a condemnation not only of the actions of this fundamentalist fringe group, but Muslims in general. This portrayal of Arabs and Muslims by the media and the government continues. On April 19, 1995, the Federal Building in Oklahoma City was bombed resulting in the deaths
of some 200 men, women, and children. Immediate reports about the bombing indicated that three men of Middle Eastern descent were seen driving near the building and they were the prime suspects (these men were actually Pakistanis). Also, a Syrian American man attempting to visit his family in Syria was detained in both the United States and later in England. After the initial hysteria of the bombing calmed, it was discovered that the bombers were actually members of a white paramilitary group in the United States. Children interviewed also seemed completely unaware of "Arabs" as a cultural and language designation. Instead, they tended to perceive it as a religious label; all Arabs are Muslims. This, of course, ignores the fact that Arabs have four religion, not one: Christians, Muslims, Jewish, and Druze.

Similar assertions can be made for the other two frequently cited enemy groups, communists and immigrants. The communists remain one of the most frequently cited enemy groups largely because of the negative presentation of communists in general, and Russians in particular, in the past by the mass media and the government. There remains a cynicism by these larger agencies as to the intentions of communists. As in the past, sentiments of nativism have increased in recent years due to societal economic decline; this sentiment was apparent in the responses of children in the sample.

The responses of children indicate an acceptance of the
ideological hegemony of the dominant group. This research also indicates that these perceptions are legitimized by societal agencies of socialization. The next section will continue the discussion of hegemony by exploring how pervasive the "ideology of empire as a way of life" was in the responses of children.

2. Empire Continues as a Way of Life: The Ideology Persists

As stated in Chapter IV, William Appleman Williams defines "way of life" as those patterns, beliefs, and ideologies which have become institutionalized (Williams, 1980:4). A "way of life" is our worldview; our "weltanshauung." In other words, "way of life" is hegemony; it is accepted without question. The ideology of "empire as a way of life" is the belief that continued expansion and imperialism is necessary to ensure social peace within the United States. This ideology embraces the tradition of the dominator model. As was discussed in Chapters VIII and IX, children frequently discuss national and international events in the language of the dominator model. Responses characterized as the "dominator model" usually involved a glorification of our culture and political system and a devaluation of those that differ.

There are several themes in these responses indicative of the ideology of "empire as a way of life" and the dominator model. First, many children indicated that the United States
has basically good intentions, but that there is just no compromising with some people (usually in reference to Saddam Hussein). Secondly, there was evidence of the assumption that since America is powerful and free, other countries resent and are jealous of us and these sentiments usually result in these other groups trying to fight us. Thirdly, countries cited as international competitors were frequently defined in enemy terms, or at least as groups you can not trust totally. Fourthly, countries with political ideologies that differ from our own were often dismissed as those who "don't run their countries well"; the implication here is that they are not doing things the way they are supposed to, which is the way we do things here. A final frequent theme was that sometimes violence is necessary to secure the peace and freedom either within the United States or to help other countries achieve them; war is something we do not like, but it is at times necessary.

Use of the language of the "dominator model" was evident in responses of all children regardless of age. While the older children (6-8th grades) were more likely to characterize interpersonal interactions in terms more characteristic of the "partnership model" (appreciating differences), international and national groups were as likely to be discussed in dominator terms by older, as well as younger children. While older children were more likely to discuss interpersonal interaction in "partnership terms," this does not necessarily
reveal that there was more acceptance of groups that differ on this level. Many children discussed the importance of interacting with all children, regardless of their classification in the social stratification of the school. They were also able to articulate quite clearly how this stratification worked. It became clear in these interviews that while children know that judging children on the basis of their classification as "nerds" or "dorks" was wrong, that this was frequently done. This was apparent both in the responses by those children who admitted either they had done this in the past or had witnessed other children doing this. It was also evident in the responses of children who had received this unfavorable classification by their peers (see Chapter IX). It seemed to me that while the children were quite capable of verbalizing why it is important not to judge their peers on arbitrary attributes, even though their actions may reflect otherwise, this same ability was not apparent in the distinguishing of groups cited as unkind on the national and international levels. It is apparently easier to dehumanize a group like Muslims that you may not have had exposure to or information about, than it is to dehumanize a peer in your classroom. It was also quite apparent that the larger agencies in society influenced which groups were defined in dominator terms. Those groups most frequently cited as enemies of the nation-state are also the groups portrayed negatively prior to interviews by both the media and
the political realm. I would now like to spend some time discussing the differences in children's responses in those schools where interviews were conducted during a school sanctioned multiculatural event.

3. Perceptions of the "Other" and the Influence of Multiculturalism

Interviews conducted at both Old Landing Junior High and Metropolitan Junior High took place during a school sanctioned multicultural event. Old Landing Junior High was celebrating Black History month and Metropolitan Junior High was in the middle of "multicultural week" at the time of interviewing. Children from both of these schools were much more likely to cite racists as being unkind to America. These school sanctioned events seemed to encourage a greater sensitivity to people of color within the United States. The fact that few children who were not in the middle of a school sanctioned multicultural event mentioned racists as being unkind indicates that this issue was not as important to them at the time of interviewing.

All of the schools in this sample did sponsor some sort of multicultural event (usually Black History month) at some time during the year. What this finding indicates to me is that the issue of racism takes on greater significance at that point in time when it is discussed in schools. What this finding also indicates is that its significance is diminished when it is not integrated consistently into the school
curriculum. I contend that the rather fragmented approach schools have to dealing with the issue of racism -- setting aside a week or month to explore groups that differ or textbooks that "box in" (inserting colorful boxes within the text to deal with groups that differ from the norm) the reality of groups of color -- is not adequate for countering the racist images presented to children by the larger social agencies. A more integrationist approach, or inclusionary presentation, of the realities of groups that differ may counter this fragmented perception.

Another significant finding is that while this more accepting attitude of groups that differ in the United States was more apparent in those children involved in a multicultural event, these children were as likely as children from the other schools to speak about international groups in denigrating terms. In other words, this more pluralistic perception did not extend to groups outside of the United States. This I attribute to two factors. First, many of these children interviewed had very little contact with these larger enemy groups: Arabs, Muslims, Japanese, communists, Russians, and immigrants. It is difficult for anyone to understand the social realities of groups they have little contact with. Secondly, the portrayal of these groups by the larger agencies in society, especially the mass media and the government, encourages animosity about, and dehumanization of, them. We live in a world that is progressively becoming
smaller and smaller, in that, increasing technological advances bring us closer to the "global community." It is time that we appreciate and understand differences between "us" and "them" rather than denigrate and dehumanize. The final section of this dissertation will explore ideas for further research in this area.

4. Some Suggestions for Future Research

One finding I found particularly striking was the manner in which children would use the language of our ideological hegemony -- freedom, equality, and democracy -- yet would discuss groups that differ in terms contrary to these principles. An interesting study in the future would be to explore exactly how children define these principles. Do they interpret these concepts as belief in self-determination and self-definition for others as well as ourselves, or do they perceive these terms within the dominator model, that "our" way is best and "they" must conform? Past research in political socialization indicates that these terms are used in school, but frequently not defined. Another focus for future research is to explore how children define the word "enemy." I did this somewhat when I pretested my questions with junior high kids in the Northeast: they were most likely to define enemies as those who are "different." This is the essence of the "dominator model," that is, differences are evaluated in superior and inferior terms. If the findings were consistent
with what I found in my pretesting of questions, that would indicate that children have a very rigid definition of those who are "acceptable" and those who are not. This would provide further support for the need to present differences in more pluralistic terms by the larger agencies in society. It would also be worth pursuing a cross-cultural study exploring how children internalize history in other countries and how they view enemies.

Another interesting addition to a study of this sort, would be to interview teachers, especially social studies teachers, about their interpretations of children's ideas about groups that differ. How do they perceive children's classifications of groups, and is this designation of "in-groups" and "out-groups" apparent in children's daily interactions with peers in schools? While I did discuss these issues with some of my teacher contacts, I did not do so in any significant way.

A limitation of this study, is the homogeneous nature of this sample. I would like to see my interview questions tested in a more heterogeneous population. For example, how do children classified as the "other" within the nation-state define both their own group and the dominant group? Does this classification of "other" have an impact on the self-definition and self esteem of these children?
Towards Alleviating Prejudice

The findings of this study indicate that a greater awareness of the social reality of groups that differ needs to be fostered in children. I conclude that this could be achieved through a more inclusive, as opposed to fragmentary, approach to presenting groups that differ, including groups outside the borders of the United States. I also believe that if children had more direct contact with groups that differ they may develop a greater appreciation of variant cultures. For example, in Metropolitan Junior High, children were allowed to ask questions about Islam and what it was like being a Muslim to a man invited to class to discuss his religion. Most of the children in this class were African American and they were very curious about Islam in relation to Malcolm X. Many of the kids had seen the particular movie that had been released earlier. This provided for them a personal and social connection with what was discussed by the speaker and they were excited about learning more. Attempts to humanize the "other" in schools would certainly enhance an appreciation of those who differ. This, however, is just half of the battle. While this will counter the content of these stereotypes of the "other," it does not eliminate the process of stereotyping and prejudice. We need address both the content and process of creating enemies.

The process of stereotyping can be confronted by incorporating sociology into the classroom activities. The
first manner in which the process of stereotypes can be confronted is by discussing larger cultural stereotypes in the classroom setting. I do this in my own classes at the university level by first having students list for me all of the ethnolinguistic labels ("nigger," "chink," "kike," etc.) and racial and ethnic epithets ("to jew someone down," "indian-giver," "to welsh on a bet," etc.) they know and I list these on the chalkboard. From these lists it becomes apparent to students that those groups who have the most ethnolinguistic labels attached to them are not of the dominant culture, hence, language serves to reinforce the dominant position of some groups and the subordinate status of others. We also discuss the stereotypical behaviors culturally associated with these labels and phrases. This activity creates an awareness among the students about the harm that comes from these designations. In fact, many of the students admit that they had used some of the racial and ethnic epithets without being aware of the roots of these phrases; they had no idea they were perpetuating stereotypes by using them.

Other educators have also attempted to confront prejudice in the classroom with younger children. Eliot Wigginton did this in his high school classrooms in Appalachia by discussing the stereotypes many of his students had about African Americans. He then discussed historical examples of stereotypes about the impoverished white residents of
Appalachia (most of his students fell into this category). His students realized that the stereotypes about their families had little relation to the truth and this, in turn, made them aware of what it feels like to be denigrated on the basis of who you are (Wigginton, 1985:371-376; c.f. Khleif, 1980). Similarly, Jane Eliot divided her classes of grammar school kids on the basis of eye color, treating those with the "favored" eye color in a much better way than those with "inferior" eye color. All of these activities make the child aware of what it feels like to be classified as the "other," countering the process of prejudice. She later conducted the same experiment with adults who worked for the Iowa Department of Corrections (cited in Peters, 1987:141-162). These types of activities can also be used to illustrate the structural barriers faced by the impoverished. Games such as "Star Power," which uses poker chips to illustrate that what you start out with in life is frequently what you end up with because of structural barriers, fosters in individuals an appreciation of the plights of the poor. "Star Power" counters the notion of the United States as a meritocracy, illustrating that accessibility to "success" is not always open to all.

It is important that these perceptions of the "other" be countered as early as possible. Much research suggests that these perceptions are shaped very early in life, some suggest as early as four, and that these notions are carried on to

**Final Comments**

The importance of the research I have conducted, I feel, is that it reveals biases and misconceptions children have about groups that differ. It also indicates which groups, as defined by the children themselves, are most likely to be classified as enemies. This knowledge enables us to counter, contain, or nullify these perceptions. In this research, I have repeatedly indicated the role the schools must take to enhance understanding of the "other." The responsibility must also extend to our government and the mass media. These agencies play a major part in reproducing and legitimizing negative perceptions. Agencies of legitimation must play a role in enhancing understanding and appreciation of the "other."
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APPENDIX A

PARENT PERMISSION SLIP

Dear Parents,

My name is Linda Olson and I am a doctoral student in sociology at the University of New Hampshire. I am writing to you because I am currently working on a research project which explores children’s notions of friendship. More specifically, I hope to learn more about the distinctions children make between kind and unkind behavior and between perceptions of friends and enemies. In order to understand children’s ideas concerning these topics, I would like the opportunity to talk with your child at school and I hope that you will give me permission to do so.

Exploring children’s ideas about kind and unkind behavior and friends and enemies is important in understanding how children experience and interpret the variety of information they are faced with. As an educational sociologist, I hope my research will contribute, not only to a greater understanding of children’s views, but also to improved educational materials. Approximately 80 interviews have already been conducted in New Hampshire and another 30 in North Carolina. Students seem to greatly enjoy talking about their ideas and the interviews have been very helpful in learning more about the distinctions children make.

The "interviews" last approximately 10-15 minutes and in them the children are free to express their own ideas and thoughts. They may terminate the interview at any time or if they do not seem to be enjoying the interview or are uncomfortable in any way, I will stop the interview. Further, no names are ever used in the research report nor are individual schools identified. The discussions with your children will be kept completely confidential. If you have any questions about the research or the interview process or questions, please feel free to call me 603-659-6349 (home) or 603-862-1802 (school).

I very much appreciate you considering allowing your child to participate in these discussions. If you are willing to offer your permission, could you please sign this form and return it with your child to school. No student will be interviewed without this signed permission slip.

Thank you,

I______________________________________, give my child permission to participate in the interview.
APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL PERMISSION SLIP

Date

Dr. Grant Cioffi
Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects
University of New Hampshire
Service Building
Durham, NH 03824

Dear Dr. Cioffi:

Linda Olson has my permission to conduct interviews regarding children's perceptions of kind and unkind behavior in my school. Interviews will take place at __________________________. (State of the site)

__________________________________________
(Principal’s signature)

__________________________________________
(Date)
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APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Tell me a story about a child that does something kind for another child.

2. Tell me a story about an adult that does something kind.

3. Tell me a story about a person or group that does something kind for America.

4. Tell me a story about a child that does something unkind to another child.

5. Tell me a story about an adult that does something unkind.

6. Tell me a story about a person or group that does something unkind to America.