

The Proceedings of the conference on
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON CHILDHOOD

Jeløya/Moss, Norway 8 - 11 September 1988



Report no. 17

The Norwegian Centre for Child Research

Trondheim, May 1990

Bernhard Eric Jensen

Childhood history as socialization history

If someone were to look back - let us say around the turn of the century - on recent Scandinavian developments within childhood history¹, I think it rather likely that he or she would single out this conference as one of the more significant turning points in the history of this field of study.

As I see it, the present conference on Historical Perspectives on Childhood is significant in more respects than one. It is important in that it is an attempt to establish contacts and exchanges between ongoing British and Scandinavian research. An attempt of this kind has never been made before, at least not on the present level. The conference is also significant since it is the first time that the new Scandinavian Network for Childhood History will be meeting. The occasion will be used to discuss, among other things, the outlines of a common 'research programme' for childhood history in Scandinavia. Finally, the conference is remarkable in that both its size and its budget clearly signalize that childhood history today is something more and very different from what it was - say - two or three decades ago.

The purpose of these opening remarks is to justify the raising of a specific question at this conference. Put in its most straightforward fashion the question is: where is childhood history to go in the years to come? It is not, however, the kind of question that can be treated on its own. An attempt to answer it requires raising other questions such as: (i) what is childhood history actually about?, (ii) why is it worthwhile as a field of study? and (iii) what - if any - is the broader significance of childhood history?

There is little doubt in my mind that it is pertinent to raise the question of the future of childhood history at this very point in time. Why this is so, should hopefully become clear from the following. Yet, it will also become evident that my contribution to an answer can - at its best - be only a partial one. I am not actively engaged in this field of historical research and lack therefore both the experience and insight of the specialist. Consequently, it is as an interested 'outsider' that I will be approaching the question of the future of childhood history. And it will be done in the context of an interest in clarifying and assessing the overarching conceptions and prevailing research strategies in contemporary historical scholarship.

Looking back

Today childhood history is a 'booming' field of research and seems to be at the point of becoming recognized as a respectable specialism within the world of academic history. However, this is a very recent development indeed. A few examples can indicate the extent of the shift that has occurred during the last two decades or so.

Children have been given scant attention in traditional historiography. This fact is clearly evidenced in, for instance, the Danish Historical Bibliography (which so far has not got beyond 1976). One seeks in vain here for a special section devoted to childhood history. Studies treating the lives and conditions of children are relatively few and are to be found in two different parts of the bibliography.

The larger number of entries are listed in that part which is devoted to 'the educational system'. To the extent that it at all made sense to talk of childhood history during the first six decades of this century, it was mainly identified with educational or school history. In the bibliography one finds a special sub-section listing studies of 'the teachers and their education', but there is no similar section treating 'the pupils'. Such studies seemingly do not exist.

The rest of the relevant studies are listed in a sub-section of a sub-section of that part of the bibliography which is devoted to 'manners and customs'. Studies treating 'childhood' are listed here between on the one hand: those concerned with 'birth' and 'naming customs' and on the other: studies of 'the position of women', 'engagement and marriage', 'death and funeral customs', 'places of dwelling', 'food and drink', 'clothes' etc. Thus, paging through a standard historical bibliography not only makes evident the very marginal importance which Danish historians traditionally have assigned to children. It also clearly demonstrates that much the same is true in the case of women and everyday life.

It has to be stressed that this tendency to overlook children is in no way a specific trait of Danish or Scandinavian historiography. Today Philippe Ariès' Centuries of Childhood is considered to be one of the classical studies within this field. And rightly so. Yet, it is worth noting that when it was originally published in France in 1960 - (an English translation appeared in 1962, a German in 1973, a Norwegian in 1980) - it had very little impact and was almost completely overlooked in the review sections of the established journals of academic history. Such a fact indicates that the concern for childhood history must have been fairly negligible in the 60's².

The first Scandinavian conference on childhood history - held in Copenhagen in January 1988 - may be employed as a point of contrast. Its theme was The Socialization of Children - Past and Present, it had 85 participants and one of its overarching aims was "to ensure that the study of childhood history will get beyond Ariès"³. Thus, compared with the 60's, the situation is very different in the late 80's. Neither the work of Ariès nor the lives of children are any longer being ignored by historians. On the contrary, childhood history has today established itself as an expanding, fertile and respectable field of research.

I have looked back over the last two or three decades in order to establish a point of reference for looking forward in time. However, if a discussion of the future of childhood history is to

take place in the light of its past, then it seems rather crucial that its emergence as a branch of academic history be placed in a broader setting.

Childhood history - it should be remembered - is not the only, nor is it the most remarkable new branch of history to emerge during the 70's and 80's. Its emergence as a field of research has a great deal in common with other, more notorious 'newcomers' to the world of academic history. Here I am thinking more especially of: feminist history, different variants of 'history from below' as well as ethnohistory. As I see it, these new fields have the following features in common:

1. They have all been carried forward by, among other concerns, a desire to democratize history.
2. They have all stressed the relevance and significance of historical studies for everyday life.
3. They have all pointed to the need for employing a multiplicity of viewpoints when studying historical processes.
4. During their years of emergence they all represented a 'break' with the disciplinary divisions of the past and became established as new interdisciplinary fields of research.
5. Yet, all of these new fields now seem to be in the process of becoming specialised and segregated branches of academic research.

On other points, however, childhood history has to be distinguished from these other new branches of history.

1. Childhood history has not in the same way as, for instance, ethnohistory been rooted in contemporary socio-political movements.

2. Nor has childhood history fulfilled the same functions with regard to establishing forms of collective identity as has been the case with, for instance, feminist history. This difference may be explained, at least partly, by pointing to the fact that so far it has not been children who have been pursuing childhood history.
3. Nor has childhood history been exposed to anything like the same amount of theoretical analysis and discussion as has been the case with regard to, for instance, the study of working class culture.

Taken as a whole, the impact of these new fields of historical research has been significant indeed. Thus, if we were to compare history books of the 50's on a broad scale with those of the 80's, it would soon become evident that a remarkable shift has occurred in regard to who 'populates' history nowadays. Peasants and workers, women and children, minorities and dissidents, 'strangers' and 'natives' have all become more visible in history than ever before. This is no mean achievement judged by any ordinary criterion of success!

What are the challenges ahead?

This very rough sketch of the emergence of childhood history has been structured along the lines of a story with 'a happy ending'. That has been quite deliberate on my part. As long as we are looking back in time, such a structure seems, on the whole, to be justified. The achievements of childhood history are then compared with what is seen as the traditional standard of academic history.

However, I now want to move on and look forward in time. As soon as one does this, the standard by which achievements are to be assessed change. The standard can no longer merely be that of correcting the 'shortcomings' of traditional historiography. It will also have to include some vision of the more overarching aims of historical scholarship.

The question of the future of childhood history may then be phrased in one of the following ways: (i) what do 'we' want to make childhood history in the years to come? or (ii) what do 'we' want to achieve through our work in the next decade or so? To phrase the question in these ways has the advantage that it brings out the point that the challenges ahead are - in a very real sense - those challenges which 'we' decide to make an integral part of our programmes of work.

The establishing of the Scandinavian Network for Childhood History has made it imperative - at least for the organizers - to raise and face the question of the future of childhood history. The programme for the network may be seen as an attempt to come up with an answer to this very question. It is interesting here to consider both the issues which are taken up in this programme and those which it appears to overlook. As presented in the programme the main aims of the network are:

- to establish and maintain contacts between childhood historians throughout Scandinavia,
- to coordinate and integrate ongoing research within this field,
- to initiate - in the years to come - a common research project in which comparative analysis is to be at the centre of common endeavours.

These tasks are both central and worthwhile. No one will dispute that, I think. Yet, it is pertinent to ask: what is the overarching framework within which the aims of the network are being conceived? Here the working assumption seems to be that childhood history is a fairly specialized and segregated branch of academic history and that its future development will do nothing to change this state of affairs.

Conceiving childhood history in such a way may 'explain' why the network programme does not address two questions which at least

from an outsider's point of view appear to be very central and pertinent when the future of this field is being considered. I am here thinking of the questions: (i) why is it worthwhile to invest time and energy in the pursuit of childhood history? and (ii) what is its significance in a broader context?

Obviously, I do not wish to imply hereby that the organizers of the new network do not have some well considered views on the significance of childhood history. The absence of any such discussion may be explained by the fact that childhood historians share a set of common assumptions concerning the value and functions of their own field of research. And to explicate such assumptions in the programme may not seem necessary when one is primarily addressing fellow specialists.

Moreover, there has been little or no apparent need to argue for the value of childhood history in recent years. The reason is that this field of research has been fulfilling a 'compensatory' function in relation to traditional academic history. It has done so by focussing its attention upon one section of the population which by and large has been overlooked or marginalized in traditional historiography. As long as it has been fulfilling this compensatory function, the value of childhood history has appeared as more or less self-evident. And few - if any - have seriously questioned the need to democratize history.

Consequently, there has been little 'outside' pressure on childhood historians to consider and clarify the ways in which the fruits of their work may be used in a broader context. They may believe, for instance, that the results of their specialized research will be used in forthcoming histories of society in much the same way as results stemming from economic or political, demographic or cultural history have been incorporated into 'general histories' in the past. Such a belief, however, rests on two assumptions:

- that there is a real interest in incorporating the specialized fruits of childhood history into 'general history' or histories of society⁴, and
- that the insights and findings of childhood history can be incorporated into the existing models (paradigms) for writing 'general history' or histories of society, without running into any major difficulties.

When presented in this way it should be fairly obvious that there is a manifest need to clarify the ways in which childhood history may fit into broader frameworks of historical analysis.

Yet, it is not only childhood history which has to confront this challenge. The other new branches of academic history - feminist history, 'history from below' and ethnohistory - are in very much the same situation. As I see it, the most interesting attempt to meet this challenge has emerged within feminist history.

What about following the feminists?

The compensatory function of feminist history has been one of its most obvious and blatant features. When it emerged during the 70's, it was carried forward by a broadly felt desire to make women from all walks of life visible in the world of academic history. By now feminist history has become both a recognized and respectable branch of academic history. And at most universities there is one or more positions in what appears to be the most popular of the new fields of historical research.

Yet, not all feminist historians have rested satisfied with the success which their field has been having during the 80's. They have gone a step further and started to explore the role and place of feminist history in the years to come. Here the starting point has been the insight that feminist history is not merely a another new specialised branch of academic history. The significance of feminist history - so they argue - goes far beyond that of merely compensating for the neglects of traditional historiography.

It has become increasingly clear, - according to this line of analysis - that the insights and findings of feminist history cannot be incorporated into general history in any straightforward way. If one's point of departure is the existing models of a history of society, then it is simply not possible to adequately illuminate or explain the specifically female ways of life. Thus, feminist history does more than add a new series of findings to the well-known ones. It also questions the adequacy of the prevailing paradigms of historical analysis.

A new fundamental category of analysis has to be introduced - it has been asserted - if the insights and findings of feminist history are to be given full and adequate attention in historical analysis. This new category is 'gender'. Moreover, well-known categories such as 'class' and 'race/ethnicity' as well as concepts such as 'work', 'economy' and 'politics' will have to be revised and re-conceptualized in the light of the 'gender' category⁵.

However, as a discipline feminist history is also being effected by the introduction of this new category. It carries with it the implication that feminist history will have to start to re-define itself as an integral part of a new broad field of historical research which may be named 'gender history'.

In the light of their rather similar origins it might be worthwhile to raise the question: what will happen if childhood historians begin to follow the lead set by the feminist historians when they are considering the future of their discipline?

If this were attempted, then it would seem to have three implications. First, the 'compensation' argument in favour of childhood history would - in the main - have to be pushed into the background. Second, instead of arguing in terms of compensation it would be necessary to attempt to ground the need for childhood history in terms of a theory of society or social process. Third, one should also work with the expectation that childhood history might have to re-shuffle its own newly established disciplinary identity as a consequence of such an attempt to re-think the future of the discipline.

Why have children been neglected?

As a way to legitimate change the 'compensation' argument has certainly proved itself in practice during the 70's and early 80's. Guidelines such as: 'make the overlooked visible' and 'place the marginalized at the centre of attention' did not only have a broad appeal. The idea of democratizing history was able to stimulate the imagination of many and generate a real commitment to changing the prevailing state of affairs.

Yet, the success of this strategy ought not to prevent us from seeing its intrinsic limitations. As a mode of legitimation the 'compensation' argument is essentially based on insights into the preferences and biases of the established traditions of historical research. The need for change can be grounded in such insights. But they say little, if anything, about how to go about it. Thus, it has to be acknowledged that little can actually be inferred about how to shape the research strategies of the future from insights into 'the sins of the past'.

If we want to get beyond arguing in terms of 'compensation', it is necessary to start by tackling the question: why have historians traditionally neglected children? It is not due to any lack of basic demographic knowledge that children, and women for that matter, by and large have been overlooked or marginalized in traditional historiography. Thus, we are not faced with a situation where well-established modes of historical analysis have to be revised and re-structured due to the discovery of a set of new basic 'facts' - in this case facts concerning the distribution of age and gender in a population.

The reason for the neglect of children (and women) has therefore to be found elsewhere. Actually, they have not been 'neglected' in any strict sense of the word. From a traditional point of view it would be more accurate to talk of children and women being bypassed or pushed aside in historical analysis - and this for what is seen as good reasons! They have been bypassed by histo-

rians because an understanding of their lives has not been considered in any way essential when seeking to grasp and explain socio-political change.

It might be worthwhile noting here that such a bypassing of children and women makes quite a lot of sense if the traditional definitions of 'production', 'economy', 'politics' and 'organization' constitute one's point of departure. On this specific point, moreover, there does not seem to have been any great or decisive difference between conservative, liberal and leftist traditions of history writing.

All historians - irrespective of differences in their theoretical position - will employ distinctions between what is considered 'the essential', 'the less essential' and 'the inessential'. Historical analysis is not possible without employing such a conceptual tool kit. The point at which a meaningful debate arises concerns what constitutes 'the essential'.

Now, if the traditional bypassing of children and women is due to an understanding of what constitutes the essential when explaining historical change, then the 'compensation' argument carries little or no weight when it comes to challenging or changing traditional paradigms of a history of society. Thus, as long as these overarching models of historical analysis remain unchallenged, so long will childhood history remain marginalized in the context of writing general history! And this will continue to be the case disregarding the extent to which childhood history flourishes as a specialized branch of academic history.

If childhood historians want to overcome this kind of marginalization, then they will have to follow the lead set by the feminist historians! They will have to leave - at least temporarily - the familiar and secure world of their specialized field of research. They will have to challenge the established paradigms of historical analysis. In order to do so they will have to move into a broader and more complex arena of conflict. In short: they will have to engage themselves in the ongoing debate as to what a history of society ought to entail.

If I were to attempt such a venture here, then the next step would be: an attempt to outline the significance of childhood history in a broader context. In other words: it would require arguing for childhood history - not in terms of compensation - but in terms of a theory of society or social process.

Why is childhood history important?

Academic historians have traditionally bypassed the lives and conditions of children. They have felt justified in doing so because they have believed or assumed that this field of study has had little or no essential contribution to make to general history. Thus, if childhood history today is to be attributed more significance in the context of a history of society, then it must be shown that this field of study actually treats central social processes - processes which traditionally have been either misunderstood or overlooked.

There is more than one way of arguing such a case. However, as I see it, the most obvious is the following one. Its main point of departure is the assertion that the prevailing traditions of historical research have not given due attention to the socio-cultural processes of reproduction when studying historical continuity and change.

Such an assertion is of course bold. But is it too bold? There can be little doubt that historians - on the whole - have tended to focus their attention almost exclusively on the spheres of 'power' and 'production' when they have been working on general history. Of course I do not thereby wish to imply any idea of a general consensus. Historians have seriously differed about the relative importance of 'the political' versus 'the economical'. And this issue has provoked many important and interesting debates.

Until very recently, however, there has been very few, if any serious attempts to integrate the sphere of 'socio-cultural reproduction' into the theoretical frameworks for writing a history of

society. Here I am of course disregarding the numerous 'reductionist' attempts to see the processes of socio-cultural reproduction as a mere function of the sphere of 'production'. Thus, as I see it, the socio-cultural processes of reproduction have not been given the attention in historical analysis which they ought to have according to many modern theories of society or social process.

As soon as historians begin to attend to the socio-cultural processes of reproduction, then it will become apparent that childhood history is a rather crucial field of study. Many of the most central processes of socio-cultural reproduction cannot be grasped or explained without attending to the years of childhood.

Childhood history as socialization history

When it comes to understanding, for instance, how attitudes and norms, outlooks and roles are formed and changed, childhood no doubt constitutes a very crucial part of the life course. Yet, it is equally clear that childhood is not the only part of the life course which is of pivotal significance when it comes to explaining socio-cultural reproduction. Therefore, childhood history is to be seen as part of a much wider field of research.

At present there does not exist any well-established name for this broader field of historical research. I am here thinking of something similar to well-known terms such as 'political', 'economic', 'social' or 'cultural' history. This fact, however, should of course not surprise us since - as noted earlier - historians have generally tended to neglect the study of the socio-cultural processes of reproduction. There has not been any manifest need for a name.

If this field of historical study is to be placed more centrally than hitherto, then there is an obvious need for a name. But what should it be? The term 'historical socialization research' [historische Sozialisationsforschung] has popped up in West-Germany

during the last decade or so. Historians such as Rainer Elkar, Ulrich Herrmann og Jürgen Schlumbohm have employed it to describe their own new field of research.

As they conceive it, 'historical socialization research' has two main and complementary aims. First, it is an attempt to introduce the notion of historical conditions and change into contemporary research which is concerned with developing theories of socialization. On this point it can be seen as an attempt to challenge and get away from the non-historical assumptions which have been an integral part of many of the classical theories of socialization. Second, it is an attempt to introduce theories of socialization into ongoing research which is concerned with the history of childhood and education. On this point it can be seen as an attempt to develop a historical research strategy which is mediated by available social theory.

The term 'historical socialization research' is certainly a possibility when one is looking for a name for the study of socio-cultural processes of reproduction. But it is neither the most obvious nor the most appropriate choice. As I see it, the term 'socialization history' is both neater and more to the point. Not only is this term much more simple and straightforward. It also has the advantage that it appears as a clear-cut parallel to well-established terms such as 'economic history', 'social history' or 'cultural history'.

Whatever name one opts for, the work of Elkar, Herrmann and Schlumbohm will be central. To my mind, they have made some of the most important contributions to this new field of historical study, and these contributions concern both theoretical-methodological issues and actual empirical research⁶. Yet, the difference in names nonetheless does indicate a certain difference in viewpoint and approach.

Elkar, Herrmann and Schlumbohm see their work mainly as a contribution to the history of education in the broad sense of that term. They have therefore not felt under any pressure or obligation to relate their work to the ongoing debate about how a

history of society is to be structured. In other words: their historical research on socialization has neither been conceived nor does it appear as a challenge to the prevailing paradigms of historical analysis.

This challenge, by contrast, is precisely what has been the main concern of mine. I have attempted to argue that if childhood history wishes to be more than a respectable, yet rather marginalized specialism within academic history, then it is necessary that childhood historians move beyond the boundaries of their specialism and begin to question the prevailing models of historical analysis. I have suggested, moreover, that the recent example of feminist historians might be worthwhile following when attempting to do so.

Just as feminist historians have argued that it is necessary to make 'gender' a new fundamental category of historical analysis, in much the same way childhood historians should argue that 'socialization' is to be another new fundamental category. 'Socialization' is here used as a blanket term to cover the various attempts to grasp and explain the interrelationships between, on the one hand, the formation and re-moulding of the identity of specific persons/groups and, on the other, the existing social structures. Here it should be remembered that "the process of identity formation and the process of social reproduction are one and the same", to use Philip Abrams' apt phrase⁷.

Feminist historians have pointed out that the introduction of 'gender' as a new key category calls for the revision and re-conceptualization of such standard categories as 'class', 'race', 'production', 'politics' etc. In much the same way childhood historians may argue that a re-thinking of the prevailing frameworks of historical analysis will be necessary as soon as 'socialization' and 'identity' have gained the status of new key categories.

The introduction of 'gender' as a fundamental category has implied in the case of feminist history that, as a discipline, it has had to begin to see itself as an integral part of a new and broader

field called 'gender history'. Likewise, if 'socialization/identity' are made some of the key categories of historical analysis, then childhood history will have to re-define itself as part of a new field called 'socialization history' or even 'identity history', if the latter term does not sound too way out⁸.

An ill-considered encroachment?

It may be experienced as something like an encroachment of one's territory when I - as an outsider - have been attempting to outline how childhood historians ought to re-define their field of research in the years to come.

At first such an experience may seem to be wholly to the point since it cannot be denied that I have been interfering in what is mainly the business of others. Yet, the main purpose of this paper has not been to encroach upon the territory of others, but to present a view of the future of childhood history which, on one very central point, is distinctly different from the view found in the proposed programme for the Scandinavian Network for Childhood History. Thus, if I were to state by way of conclusion why my interference should not be perceived as an ill-considered encroachment, then I would like to make two final points.

The programme for the new Network assumes that childhood history is going to remain a specialized branch of academic history in the years to come. It is the adequacy and fruitfulness of this implicit assumption that I have been questioning. I have not done so in order to make some of the well-known points about the mixed blessings of specialization as such. Those points may be made in almost any context today.

I have questioned the notion of childhood history as a specialized and segregated field of study in order to make the point that this field may be conceived as being far more central and significant than even childhood historians normally assume. The reason for this is that this field of study clearly highlights the need to transform the prevailing paradigms of historical analysis.

Childhood history may therefore be seen as one of the hinges around which a re-thinking of the structure of a history of society is to take place.

Yet, it is not possible to attribute this kind of transforming significance to childhood history without at the same time questioning its present identity as a specialized branch of academic history. To do so may seem rather rough in the light of the fact that it has just achieved general recognition as a specialism. It is nonetheless necessary. One way of doing this is by raising the question: how adequate or suitable is its present name?

As long as one is thinking and arguing in terms of compensation, a name such as 'childhood history' will be suitable and to the point. It has the obvious advantage that it immediately focusses attention upon one of the groups which has been traditionally bypassed and neglected by academic history. Yet, this seems also to be its only clear-cut advantage.

In other contexts the term 'childhood history' does not appear to be either very suitable or very obvious. One apparent difficulty with this name stems from the fact that it is far from clear what the terms 'childhood' and 'children' actually refer to. Are they 'biological' or 'social' concepts or both? And if they are both, then it is necessary to explore the relationship between the biological and the social levels.

One may also object to the present name in the light of what the field actually encompasses today. It is clear that childhood history does not concern itself solely with children. It is even debatable whether it primarily concerns itself with children. Adults frequently play a very central, if not the dominant role in many studies devoted to childhood history. And rightly so! If one were to single out what appears to be the distinctive feature of this field of study, then it is probably more accurate to say that it is the study of the outcomes of interaction between different age groups, rather than the study of children as such.

One should here raise the question: are there good reasons for believing that a division according to age groups will turn out to be a fruitful principle of specialization? Are we to wish that the emergence of childhood history will be followed by the emergence of a series of new specialisms: 'youth history', 'early adult history', 'middle age history' and 'old age history'?

I do not think that there is much to be gained from furthering this type of specialization. Stating this, however, does not mean that I am disputing or questioning the view that the categories 'age' and 'generation' ought to become much more central in historical analysis than they are today. One of the main purposes of making 'age' and 'generation' key categories is to clarify and explain the distinct conditions and features of different age groups/generations.

If this is to be achieved, then it implies not only that 'a specific generation' is followed through its whole life course. It also implies that one at every stage compares the conditions and features of this generation with those of earlier as well as later generations. But that is not the same as dividing the historical study of 'age' into a series of segregated fields such as childhood, youth, early adult, middle age and old age history.

When reading the programme for the new Network one may get the impression that even childhood historians are far from satisfied with the name 'childhood history'. When seeking a name for this Network the organizers did not opt for what might have seemed the most obvious, simple and straightforward choice, namely: Network for Childhood History. Instead they have chosen something very much more complicated, namely: Network for the Study of "Children between Institution, Family and Play - Past and Present".

The organizers must have hesitated for more than a moment, I would guess, before they actually opted for such a troublesome name for the new Network. Yet, it should be stressed that there are good reasons for choosing the difficult and complicated rather than the simple and straightforward. The term 'childhood history' is simply too imprecise and diffuse. It does not serve the purpose of focusing

one's attention upon what is the important and essential. It was precisely in order to highlight what they see as the important and essential that the organizers have opted for what no doubt is a rather troublesome formulation. Here they have singled out institution (e.g. schools), family, play (and work). They have done so because they see these areas as the most important "fields or arenas of socialization".

If childhood historians can agree that these issues constitute the core of childhood history today, then there is no reason for not going one step further and transforming childhood history into socialization history. That name not only has the obvious advantage that it clearly denotes what is seen as the important and essential processes. It is at the same time fairly simple and straightforward. Thus, all in all, 'socialization history' is both a neat and an obvious name for this new field of historical research.

NOTES

1. At present there does not exist a term which is generally recognized as the standard name of this field of research. In the following I will be using the word 'childhood history' as a comprehensive term, i.e. it covers both the history of children and the history of childhood.
2. See Vann, R.T.: The Youth of the "Centuries of Childhood", History and Theory 21:1982, 279-97.
3. It is the phrase used in the programme. The proceedings of this conference have been published in At forske i børn før og nu (= Nordisk Pedagogik 8 (3):1988).
4. In the following I will be using the term 'history of society' as the English equivalent of the German term 'Gesellschaftsgeschichte' and the Danish 'samfundshistorie'.
5. An interesting discussion of these issues may be found in: Nagel-Docekal, H. & Wimmer, F.: Neue Ansätze in der Geschichtswissenschaft, 1984 (G. Bock: "Der Platz der Frauen in der Geschichte", H. Nagel-Docekal: "Frauengeschichte als Perspektive und Teilbereich der Geschichtswissenschaft", H.-J. Puhle: "Frauengeschichte und Gesellschaftsgeschichte"). For more recent contributions to this debate see, for instance: Bock, G.: Geschichte, Frauengeschichte, Geschlechtsgeschichte, Geschichte und Gesellschaft 14:1988, 364-91.

Frevert, U.: Bewegung und Disziplin in der Frauengeschichte. Ein Forschungsbericht, Geschichte und Gesellschaft 14:1988, 240-62.

Scott, J.W.: Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis, American Historical Review 91:1986, 1053-75.
6. Since the work of these German historians do not seem to be very well-known in Scandinavia, I will list a fair number of their rather numerous studies:

R.S. Elkar: Junges Deutschland im polemischen Zeitalter. Das schleswig-holsteinische Bildungsbürgertum in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jhrh. Zur Bildungsrekrutierung und politische Sozialisation, 1979.

R.S. Elkar: Historische Sozialisationsforschung und Regionalgeschichte. Umriss, Methoden, Zwischenergebnisse, in F. Koppitzsch (ed.): Erziehungs- und Bildungsgeschichte Schleswig-Holsteins von der Aufklärung bis zum Kaiserreich, (= Studien zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte Schleswig-Holsteins bd. 2), 1981.

U. Herrmann: Probleme und Aspekte historischer Ansätze in der Sozialisationsforschung, in Hurrelmann, U. & Ulich, D. (ed.): Handbuch der Sozialisationsforschung, 1980.

- U. Herrmann: Neue Wege der Sozialgeschichte. Zur Forschungspraxis der Historischen Sozialisationsforschung und zur Bedeutung ihrer Ergebnisse für pädagogische Theoriebildung, Pädagogische Rundschau 38:1984, 171-84.
- U. Herrmann: Geschichte und Theorie. Ansätze zur neuen Wegen in der erziehungsgeschichtlichen Erforschung von Familie, Kindheit und Jugendalter, Zeitschrift für Sozialisationsforschung und Erziehungssoziologie 4:1984, 11-28.
- U. Herrmann: Das Konzept der 'Generation'. Ein Forschungs- und Erklärungsansatz für die Erziehungs- und Bildungssoziologie und die Historische Sozialisationsforschung, Neue Sammlung 27:1987, 364-77.
- U. Herrmann, A. Gestrich, S. Mutschler: Kindheit, Jugendalter und Familieleben in einem schäbischen Dorf im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, in Borschied, P. & Teuteberg, H.J. (ed.): Ehe, Liebe, Tod. Studien zur Geschichte des Alltags, 1983.
- J. Schlumbohm: 'Traditionale' Kollektivität und 'moderne' Individualität: einige Fragen und Thesen für eine historische Sozialisationsforschung, in Vierhaus, R. (ed.): Bürger und Bürgertum in Zeitalter der Aufklärung, 1981. (A partial English translation in Social History 5:1980, 71-103).
- J. Schlumbohm: Geschichte der Kindheit - Fragen und Kontroversen, Geschichtsdidaktik 1983, 305-15.
- J. Schlumbohm, Kinderstuben. Wie Kinder zu Bauern, Bürger, Aristokraten wurden 1700-1850, 1983.
7. P. Abrams, Historical Sociology, 1982, 262.
 8. In the article: Identitet som faghistorisk forskningsfelt, Historiedidaktik i Norden 2:1985 I have argued in more details for the advantages to be gained from making 'identity' and 'socialization' some of the new key categories of historical analysis.