SOCIETAL CAUSES OF VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN
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In attempting to summarize the societal causes of violence against children, we faced two predicaments: The first was the one John Monahan mentioned in congressional testimony about the causes of violence. He noted that he had been allotted 20 minutes to tell everything that is known about the causes of such violence and that, unfortunately, it would be enough time (Monahan, 1993). As we surveyed the literature, we found a sketchy outline of implicated societal forces but few data with the power to move the reader beyond opinions. The second concern we faced was about moving to a level of discourse that is above what we refer to as "bar-stool commentary." Given the limited knowledge base and the complex array of macroforces of society that lead to violence against children, how does one comment without sounding like the local bar-stool pundit who has an opinion about everything and knows the solutions to any social problem, no matter how complex it is and how limited his or her knowledge is? The implied conclusion of this state of knowledge and opin-
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ion base seems to be that if one could remake the world and humanity, one could end violence against children; anything less would leave out major causes.

Beyond platitudes and wishes, and shy of concluding that too little is known, what are the details of the knowledge about societal causes of violence against children? Given this knowledge, what might be done to address the problem now to lessen the victimization of children? Our focus here is to indicate what is known about societal forces and to consider this knowledge in terms of prevention. We do not attempt to speculate about what should be done under ideal conditions but to delineate, with due reserve, a direction that can be inferred from the research and that we realistically expect can be followed in U.S. society at this time. To this end, we anchor our assessment of societal influences in the specifics of violence as it currently affects children in the United States. We focus on what is known about specific societal factors and how this knowledge can be incorporated into programs and policies designed to prevent or reduce violence (Tolan & Guerra, 1994).

We begin by examining violence against children in relation to the overall picture of youth violence perpetration and victimization (Tolan & Guerra, 1994). The perpetrators of violence toward children and adolescents are often other youth; whether one is a perpetrator or victim may simply depend on what day it is. Given a framework linking perpetration and victimization, we discuss four key areas of societal influence: (a) societal norms and conventions; (b) the institutionalization of violence against children; (c) the secondary status of children; and (d) social forces such as stress, poverty, and social isolation. From the perspective of sociological theory, the first two factors correspond to cultural explanations of violence, and the last two factors are related to social-structural theories of violence (Blau & Blau, 1982). However, in this chapter we intentionally avoid lengthy theoretical discussions in favor of describing how specific influences suggest direction for social action.

The approach offered here is that the societal influences we discuss act primarily as background influences on violence but can also directly influence its occurrence. These influences set the stage for the unprecedented violence in the United States involving children and youth. Also, we contend that no single factor can predict or explain much of the variance in recurrent violence or in who will be violent (Eron, Gentry, & Schlegel, 1994). Violence is a multiply determined behavior that develops and is influenced by, all levels of developmental factors as well as individual differences (Tolan, Guerra, & Kendall, 1995).

In Figure 1, we present a biopsychosocial model of influences on youth violence (Tolan & Guerra, 1994). Our approach is similar to the general developmental approach offered by Bronfenbrenner (1979); we assume that these multiple influences are best understood as levels of influ-
Figure 1. Multilevel model of risk factors that influence violence involving children.

ence, each nested within the less proximal influence. In this model, we
differentiate among four levels of influence on violence: individual char-
acteristics, close interpersonal relations, proximal social contexts, and so-
cietal macrosystems. Close interpersonal relations represent enduring rela-
tionships that are particularly salient environmental influences on
behavior and development. Family and close friends are the primary ex-
amples of this level. Proximal social contexts represent the primary settings
of development such as school, neighborhood, and work. Macrosystems are
the mores, laws, policies, and general influences such as the media and the
overall trends in behavior and risk in a society. The concentric circles in
the figure indicate that individual characteristics are nested within close
interpersonal relationships; these, in turn, are nested within proximal set-
tings; and these are nested within societal macrosystems. We suggest, there-
fore, that many of the societal influences work as the base from which
"smaller" and more proximal system influences occur. In other words, societal
influences are likely to be less figural and their effect more diffuse, forming
the background against which other, more dramatic influences occur.

This chapter focuses on aspects of violence toward and by children
and youths that are at the societal macrosystem level. This is because the
causes of victimization and perpetration are similar, and the segments of
the population most at risk for one are also at risk for the other. The
similarity may be due to societal causes in particular, although evidence
suggests that the shared causes extend across all levels of influence. An-
other important consideration in our perspective is the emerging data that suggest that violence against children may have a different pattern from violence against older youth.

**VIOLENCE PERPETRATION AND VICTIMIZATION**

The basic distinction between youth and child violence that is emerging is between victimization of children under age 12 and victimization of adolescents aged 12–19. Young children are primarily assaulted by adults, and the rate of victimization is lower than during adolescence (Tolan & Guerra, 1994). During adolescence, not only does risk for victimization increase, but the most likely perpetrators become other youths (Elliott, 1994). To illustrate this distinction, we focus on the case example presented in Table 1. Using murder cases involving children under age 15 in the city of Chicago during 1994, we tabulated the age of the victim by the age of the perpetrator and the perpetrator's relationship to the victim. For victims aged 5 and under, the perpetrator was almost always an adult parent or relative. In contrast, for adolescents, 60% of the known assailants were nonrelated juveniles, and only 4 of 30 victims were murdered by a relative.

The youth victimization-perpetration relation is further detailed in Table 2. As shown, over 70% of violent crimes against youths aged 12–19 are committed by other youths. Although both age groups are harmed by violence occurring at alarming rates, these trends suggest a need to focus on youths as well as children.

The data illustrate that adolescence is the time of higher risk than any other age period for both victimization and perpetration, and the risk differential may be increasing. Rates of serious and lethal violence among juveniles have been steadily increasing in recent years (Elliott, 1994). For example, in 1992, 1.5 million crimes were committed against juveniles, representing a 23% increase from 1987. Although juveniles accounted for only 10% of the population, they represented 23% of all victims of violent crime (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Planning; OJJDP, 1994). Similar shifts have occurred in perpetration, with increases in juvenile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of victim (years)</th>
<th>Adult parent</th>
<th>Adult relative</th>
<th>Adult nonrelative</th>
<th>Juvenile relative</th>
<th>Juvenile unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 and under (n = 29)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–14 (n = 38)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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TABLE 2
Percentages of Crimes of Violence Against Children Aged 12–19 by Age of Offender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of crime</th>
<th>Under 12</th>
<th>12–14</th>
<th>15–17</th>
<th>18–20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All violent crimes</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For victims of 20 years or older, 16%–25% of violent crimes were by perpetrators under 20.

Crime rates far exceeding those among adults, particularly for the most serious violent offenses (OJJDP, 1994). In some cases, such as forcible rape, arrest rates for juveniles have shown a steady rise from the mid-1980s through the mid-1990s. In other cases, such as murder, sharp increases have been noted in recent years. For example, the juvenile arrest rate for murder increased 84% from 1987 to 1991 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1992).

Childhood and adolescent violence victimization, therefore, is a complex problem consisting of both the adult abuse of children and youth-to-youth victimization, and perpetration and victimization are closely related. We discuss the societal causes as providing a context that fosters violence toward and by children and youths. The relation of victimization and perpetration to societal factors can be seen in each of the four major types of societal influences we discuss in the following sections.

SOCIETAL NORMS AND CONVENTIONS

The United States has a long-standing history of exceptionally high rates of violence, particularly lethal violence, compared to other industrialized countries (Archer & Gartner, 1984). From the Wild West to Rambo, violence has long played a role in the traditions of this country. Although one routinely hears pleas to “stop the violence,” societal norms and conventions often stand in direct opposition to these pleas. Clearly, there are multiple examples of U.S. society’s collective infatuation with violence, from the discussions about how much to use capital punishment, to the morals of popular murder mysteries, to the glory attributed to a football player who flattens an opposing player. The level of violence, the unrealistic portrayal of the effects of using violence, and the frequent use of violence by heroes to successfully solve problems in television shows and movies create a sense that violence is necessary and can solve social and personal problems. These dramatizations suggest that violence is exciting, effective, and acceptable. With the prominence of violence and its regular portrayal
as effective or entertaining, an atmosphere develops that at least tolerates violence and perhaps even encourages it.

Cross-cultural and historical studies have supported the relation between societal norms concerning violence and actual levels of violence. For example, Lambert, Triandis, and Wolf (1959) reported that societies with punitive deities tend to use punitive violence more frequently. Cross-cultural studies of child-rearing attitudes and behavior also have suggested a relation between acceptance of violence in caregiving and child abuse (Solheim, 1982). Higgins and Straus (cited in Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980) examined the use of violence in children's books from 1850 to 1970 and detected a corresponding relation between the extent of violence depicted in fiction and the concurrent violence levels in society.

The influence of norms about violence is illustrated more directly in a study by Baron, Straus, and Jaffe (1990). These authors proposed the existence of "spillover effects" of support for legitimate violence to attitudes approving the use of violence and of both of these to rates of violent acts in a society. The investigators used states of the United States as the unit of analysis and rape as the violence measure. They calculated an index of legitimate violence on the basis of three factors: (a) media violence level (readership rate per 100,000 of violent magazines and the Nielsen ratings of the six most violent shows in that state); (b) level of state-sponsored violence (state legislation permitting corporal punishment in schools, prisoners sentenced to death per 100,000, and executions per 100 homicide arrests over 40 years); and (c) citizen participation in legal or socially approved violent activities (hunting licenses per 100,000, state of origin of college football players, National Guard enrollment per 100,000, National Guard expenditure per capita, and lynchings per million during 1882–1927). The authors also calculated an index of violence approval on the basis of three factors: (a) public opinion favoring legitimate violence (percentage of respondents who support greater military spending, support the death penalty, and oppose gun permits); (b) extent of endorsement of violence in conflicts with a threatening stranger; and (c) approval of police using violence to subdue an adult male suspect. They found that the legitimate violence index and the violence approval index were highly correlated. The legitimate violence and violence approval scores did not directly correlate as highly with rates of rape as did demographic characteristics such as the proportion of the population composed of urban dwellers, blacks, or divorced males; however, these indices did relate to the demographic correlates, and they added significant variance in explanation of rape rates above that explained by the demographic predictors. Therefore, this study suggested a link between legitimate violence and attitudes that approve of violence and, ultimately, criminal violence rates.

Perhaps the strongest empirical evidence suggesting a link between societally sanctioned forms of violence and actual violence can be found
in studies of the effects of media violence. Four major types of scientific studies have examined the relation between exposure to violence on television and aggression or violence: (a) experimental studies in which children's exposure to violence is manipulated and short-term changes in behavior are evaluated, (b) static observational field studies in which exposure to media violence and aggressive behavior are assessed, (c) longitudinal field studies in which children's exposure to media violence and their aggressive behavior are assessed at two or more points in their lives, and (d) community studies of changes in availability of television.

A review of this literature is beyond the scope of the chapter and can be found elsewhere (e.g., Eron & Huesmann, 1987). In short, there is clearly a convergence of evidence across all four types of studies suggesting that the current level of interpersonal violence in U.S. society has been boosted by the long-term effects of childhood exposure to a steady diet of dramatic media violence. This does not mean that the current level of violence is solely or even primarily due to the long-term exposure to media violence. However, it is evident that media violence is a contributing societal factor to the learning of aggression and violence in children.

It is important to realize that exposure to violence can affect risk to both populations and individuals. For instance, it has been shown that the advent of television is related to increases in general levels of aggression among children in a community (Eron & Huesmann, 1987). Additionally, within populations, children who watch more violent television are more at risk for aggression (Eron & Huesmann, 1987). Exposure to violence not only relates to aggression during childhood, but also has been shown to predict adult arrests for serious crimes as well as harshness of physical punishment toward one's children (Eron et al., 1994).

These societal macrosystem influences seem to carry cultural values that are expressed as normative influences (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1982). This orientation can build a "code of violence" that fosters a willingness to use violence with little reservation (Anderson, 1990). Similarly, for some men, violence toward women may be embedded in a subculture that promotes dominance of women through aggressive means (Bowker, 1983). It may be that in some segments of society men are supported in seeing violence as their province. A more insidious effect is an overall acceptance of violence that makes it easier for individuals to engage in violent acts with believed legitimacy; this acceptance may make it more likely that citizens will overstep the bounds of previous behavior regulations and engage in aggressive or violent acts because these acts are judged to be appropriate by normative comparisons. To the extent that violence is socially sanctioned, prevention and intervention efforts must compete with this normative influence.
THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN

Consistent with a high level of societal acceptance of violence is a clear pattern of institutionalized support for violent practices against children in the United States. These practices have their roots in some of the earliest forms of child maltreatment. Although it is no longer routine to terrorize children or leave them to die, as was common throughout history, some violence against children by both parents and caregivers is seen as the prerogative of adults (Levine & Levine, 1992). The legitimacy attached to this kind of caregiving has been supported by numerous Supreme Court rulings. For example, in Ingram v. Wright (1977), the Supreme Court ruled that corporal punishment in school was acceptable for controlling students. The Court resorted to tautological reasoning, ruling that such violence was acceptable because it was a long-standing and commonplace practice in U.S. society. The second reason given for supporting corporal punishment was that those subjected to it were protected from misuse of the punishment because of the public nature of such actions: The Court said that because corporal punishment was publicly administered, it would not be unjustly, too extensively, or too vigorously applied. The Court concluded that corporal punishment did not constitute cruel and unusual punishment and that children in school did not need the same due-process procedural protections that are afforded adult criminals and most persons in most other public institutional settings.

Another important policy statement from the courts concerned parents' prerogative to use violence to punish children. In the Delaney case (1989), the Supreme Court addressed the issue of children as property of parents. This was one of a series of decisions affirming parents' rights to raise children as they see fit, growing out of their right to control their children's development and behavior in a manner akin to property owners' rights, including the use of physical punishment. The contention in Delaney (1989) and other cases that extreme physical punishment is an infringement on a child's civil rights and that therefore the state could intervene and regulate such behavior was put forward. By not disallowing such behavior in an earlier case, the court reasoned that the state (through its child protection services agency) had affirmed the parents' property rights over the child to do as the parent sees fit. Thus in the Delaney case, the court stated that an abusing parent could not be charged with violation of a child's rights because the state had not acted earlier to protect the child from the abuse. Besides employing twisted logic, the decision is also important because it focused on the idea that there is a conflict between the parent and the state with regard to the treatment of children and made the primary issue whether the state can intrude on parents' rights to manage their "chattel" as they see fit. The ruling overlooked the issue of the
ways in which corporal punishment can be inflicted and how that variation can change the balance between parental rights and the state's interest in protecting children from abuse. Unfortunately, in cases such as these, the rights of the victimized child are considered almost irrelevant to the legal evaluation.

Such rulings do not create attitudes supporting violence toward children. For the most part, they merely reflect current attitudes concerning parental and caregiver rights to use violence toward children. Most parents see spanking and hitting children as acceptable and appropriate behaviors (Straus et al., 1980). Corporal punishment is legal and sanctioned in schools that routinely suspend or expel students for acts of aggression. In some states, schools can invoke physical punishments that would be considered child abuse in other settings. The institutionalization of violence against children in key systems such as the family and the school further reinforces the norm that violence against children is acceptable, and it provides a context for a broad range of violent actions. The legal reinforcement of such violence by major court rulings makes its continuation more likely.

THE STATUS OF CHILDREN

In part, the acceptability of violence against children is related to the social status of children. Historians and social analysts who have traced the status of children consistently have noted that legal and social traditions have relegated children to secondary status in the United States (Levine & Levine, 1992). Although lengthy and complex descriptions of the roots of these observations could be provided, we simply note here the basis of parental rights in property law, the long delay in extending basic constitutional rights to children, and the continued discrepancy between the civil, economic, and criminal protections afforded adults and those afforded children (McCarthy & Carr, 1980).

Another indicator of the secondary status of children that may contribute to the acceptance of violence toward children is the level and nature of allocations for children's programs. For example, support services available for children often are determined by provider constituents or agency boundaries and departments rather than by the needs of children. This situation can quickly lead to an inefficient attempt by multiple agencies to address some aspect of children's problems. The agencies become bureaucracies focused on patronage employment and what are deemed "entitlements," or nonessential, services. They are labeled "money-wasting labyrinths." For example, Coughlin and Perry (1993) identified 28 offices within the federal government that administer programs for children and families, and the programs are overseen by a variety of committees within
Congress. These committees do not speak with one voice; in fact, the members may not even speak with each other. Instead, each focuses on funding programs and on establishing policies that affect its constituency. The impact on children frequently is a secondary concern at best. That their nominal purpose is to serve children may be lost in political wrangling. There is no single voice or interest group requiring that the focus on children take first place.

Administrative organizations such as these can be found at both state and local levels. They often lead to program decisions that impede due attention to the violence problems of children. For example, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974 was the first federal statute addressing the operation of child protective service agencies. It was meant to organize and elevate the quality of service rendered to abused children. However, it has had limited impact on the reporting of cases or on the strengthening of public child protective service responses (Vandeven & Newberger, 1994). In part, this is because the law was worded as a mandate rather than to indicate specific policy and practice. In addition, the level of funding has always been too small to have substantial impact on practices. The second-class status of children is reinforced by such inefficient actions.

**SOCIAL FORCES**

Most analyses of social forces within a society vis-à-vis violence have centered on factors related to social injustices; specific reference is made to social forces that reflect differential opportunities, rewards, and status. It is clear that racial and gender discrimination, differential access to resources, and other social inequities represent societal influences on violence; however, the mechanisms through which this effect occurs and the extent of the impact have not been determined. Researchers have placed particular emphasis on stress, poverty, and social isolation; studies indicate that these factors play a critical role in violence perpetration and victimization, although direct effects are less likely (Garbarino & Kostelny, 1993). Clearly, children as a group suffer more from these social forces than do other groups. Additionally, for children there is frequently a double effect: Children who are at high risk for violence perpetration and victimization also receive little protection and relief from the service delivery systems.

One type of social condition that can affect the risk of violence involves the transitions and stresses in children's lives (Attar, Guerra, & Tolan, 1994; Gorman-Smith, Tolan, & Henry, in press). Stressful life events have been shown to affect parental abuse of children as well as children's own interpersonal aggression, although the correlations have been neither
unequivocal nor strong. A number of researchers have found that abusive families report more life stressors than do nonabusive families (Straus et al., 1980). Others have extended these findings to include mild stressors such as daily hassles (Herrenkohl & Herrenkohl, 1981). Stressful life events, including exposure to community violence, have been shown to predict children’s aggression toward peers (Attar et al., 1994).

It is common to find that violence rates are related to poverty, particularly at the neighborhood level. There is more crime and violence in poor neighborhoods than wealthier neighborhoods, although relations between income and violence within a given neighborhood are relatively weak (Jencks, 1992). It is unlikely that this effect is due to income alone; it is more likely a consequence of economic inequality (Currie, 1986). Blau and Blau (1982) examined crime rates in 125 metropolitan areas in the United States. Focusing on economic inequalities, they found significantly higher murder rates in cities where the difference in income between rich and poor was extremely high and where employers discriminated against blacks. Cross-national studies of murder also have supported this influence, with the income gap between rich and poor countries accounting for as much as one sixth of the variation in countries’ murder rates (Archer & Gartner, 1984).

Child abuse also appears to be significantly related to social class (Straus et al., 1980). What is less clear is the precise nature of this relation. For example, in their national survey, Straus and Gelles (1986) noted that the only difference by social class in violence toward children was that the highest income group had lower rates than other groups. Furthermore, although living in poverty related to a 75% increase in child abuse, witnessing child abuse, apart from social class considerations, had the same relative influence. The combination of poverty and witnessing child abuse related to a 400% increase in likelihood of abuse. It may be, therefore, that poverty sets the stage for increased risk for violence through increased exposure to child abuse.

Another factor associated with poverty and economic inequality is unemployment. Unemployment and part-time employment both have been shown to relate to violence against children. For instance, Steinberg, Catalano, and Dooley (1981) examined the relation between changes in employment and child abuse in two metropolitan areas. Their findings suggested that increases in abuse are related to decreases in the size of the workforce. Nonetheless, it is difficult to conclude that poverty directly influences child abuse independently of the prevailing social standards. One need only consider that the depression of the 1930s was associated with dramatic declines in murder rates, despite levels of unemployment among the highest in this century (Archer & Gartner, 1984).

Finally, social isolation, another factor often associated with poverty in urban settings, has been associated with overall levels of community
violence as well as violence toward children. In one study comparing two neighborhoods matched for social class but differing in rates of child abuse, Garbarino and Sherman (1980) found that lower rates of child abuse and maltreatment were associated with more extensive social networks among families. Such networks can provide help with daily tasks, increased monitoring of children, and access to resources that help children and families cope with stressful circumstances.

There is evidence that socioeconomic influences interact with other social forces to affect violence. We have previously noted that Zuravin's (1989) review of the ecology of child maltreatment showed neighborhood economic status to be related to violence only as part of a larger array of predictive characteristics. Income level and stability, residential stability and social support, the quality of housing and business, the distribution of men and women of different age groups, economic inequalities, and job opportunities seemed to be more influential predictors. Thus, the correlates of poverty rather than poverty per se may best predict violence toward children.

CONCLUSION

The multiple influences discussed suggest that violence toward and by children and youths is dependent, at least in part, on the mores, policies, and practices of U.S. society. Any attempts to modify the alarming rates will necessitate affecting these societal factors. We have noted several societal causes of violence and have summarized data and ideas that might move the discussion "off the bar stool" to a broader social science conceptualization. We believe that it is important to consider violence against children as occurring in multiple forms and with different causes underlying those forms. We also think that consideration of child victimization in its relation to child perpetration is valuable.

The empirical understanding of these causes and of the relations among the different forms is in its infancy. In part, this is due to the difficulty in manipulating conditions or even finding comparable conditions to permit quasi-experimental evaluations to discern the important factors and processes. We have suggested that consideration of the relation of victimization to perpetration is one important advance because it is likely that the societal influences on both aspects of violence are the same. In addition, we have suggested that a useful theoretical perspective is to view the societal factors as background influences within which more proximal, and perhaps more direct, influences are nested. Finally, we have suggested that there is a need to consider how adolescent risk compares to child risk in focusing efforts toward understanding and intervention. It may be that the same societal influences are important contributors to risk for both
groups, but it may also be that the greater risk for adolescents is due to the greater impact on adolescents of societal influences. Of course, these contentions need to be tested in research.

Clearly, there is need for more information—from surveys as well as correlational and intervention studies. Cross-societal studies may be a key type of research. By examining the effects of variations in policies and practices on different types of violence, researchers may gain some of the most convincing evidence about the extent of the relation between societal influences and violence in general. Also, such studies will permit the specification of which societal factors relate to violence and what the mechanisms are.

In addition to the need for more sound information, there is a need to recognize that societal causes ultimately reflect fundamental social ills. Social scientists need to consider carefully how these ills are caused and maintained, as well as how to remove some of the deleterious effects of stable societal causes, how to manage meager resources allocated to aiding children, and how to bring about the needed changes in norms, social conventions, and institutionalized supports for violence against children. Social scientists also need to consider the cost of less extensive responses or failure to recognize the basic nature of these causes. Although the effects of social ills may not be direct, they provide a background, or setting, within which more direct influences occur; addressing these societal influences is a requisite for substantial improvement.

The issues involved in the societal causes of violence against children can be summarized by the following comment by Halpern (1993):

When we define the problem as neglect of children, we tend to look to solutions that seem immediately linked to the neglect—better health care, better child care, more investment in education, more responsive child welfare services. These obviously are critical. But the basic reasons for the lack of well-being of many children in American society are not found in schools or health clinics or social service agencies. They are found in the primacy of the marketplace in defining people's worth and entitlement, and in shaping social relations. ... Building a reform agenda primarily on children's issues only masks the contentious issues of our common life ... to try to protect children from the toxic effects of their society has reflected the same tendency towards denial of social reality. ... Children's problems cannot be addressed separately from the more general problem of society. (p. 1)
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