



Developments

Child, Image, Nation

Second Edition

Erica Burman

DEVELOPMENTS

How does developmental psychology connect with (what used to be called) the ‘developing world’? What do cultural representations indicate about the contemporary politics of childhood? How is concern about child sexual exploitation linked to wider securitisation anxieties? In other words: what is the political economy of childhood, and how is this affectively organised? This new edition of *Developments: Child, Image, Nation*, fully updated, is a key conceptual intervention and resource, reflecting further on the contexts and frameworks that tie children to national and international agendas.

A companion volume to Burman’s *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology* (third edition, 2017), this volume helps explain why questions around children and childhood, including their safety, welfare, their interests, abilities, sexualities, and their violence, have so preoccupied the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries, showing how the frames for these concerns have extended beyond their Euro-US contexts of origination. In this completely revised edition, Burman explores changing debates and contexts, offering resources for interpreting continuities and shifts in the complex terrain connecting children and development. Through reflection on an increasingly globalised, marketised world, that prolongs previous colonial and gendered dynamics in new and even more insidious ways, *Developments* analyses the conceptual paradigms shaping how we think about and work with children, and recommends strategies for changing them. Drawing in particular on feminist and post-development literatures, as well as original and detailed engagement with social theory, it illustrates how and why reconceptualising notions of individual and human development, including those informing models of children’s rights and interests, is needed to foster more just and equitable forms of professional practice with children and their families.

Burman offers an important contribution to a set of urgent debates engaging theory and method, policy and practice across all the disciplines that work with, or lay claim to, children’s interests. A persuasive set of arguments about childhood, culture, and professional practice, *Developments* is an invaluable resource to teachers and students in psychology, childhood studies, and education as well as researchers in gender studies.

Erica Burman is Professor of Education at Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester. She is an internationally renowned researcher, teacher, and activist, as well as a group analyst and psychotherapist. Her work supports critical and reflexive practice with and for marginalised and disadvantaged people, including children.

This brilliant book is an indispensable tool and urgent reminder for all education and childhood studies scholars to the imperative of interrogating cultural associations and affective relations mobilised around the image of the child, including those underpinning their own research. The new introductions for each chapter reflect the most current socio-political, economic and theoretical developments to re-contextualize and re-position the astute theoretical resources developed. It offers essential reference points to the various movements in understanding and researching the intersections of child and international development with newly written chapters about transnationality and childhood.

—Zsuzsa Millei, *Professor of Early Childhood Education,
Tampere University, Finland*

Erica Burman's *Developments* is a masterpiece of reading for submerged constitutive relations: between child and adult, North and South, psychological expertise and social policy Tracking the peculiar rhetorical powers of discourses on childhood, the chapters move deftly through a wide range of materials, from aid campaign to classical tragedy to soap commercial to Indian cinema. This new edition extends the transnational frame and updates the conjunctural analysis, taking account of expanding psychologization, austerity, nationalist sentiment, and nostalgic reconstructions of boyhood in the context of feminized labour.

—Jennifer Henderson, *Associate Professor, Department of English
and School of Indigenous and Canadian Studies,
Carleton University, Canada*

Burman places developmental psychology in ongoing political, development and environmental challenges worldwide, thus offering us an opportunity to see what we are likely to miss if our narratives of human development are monolithic, linear and sans social responsibility ... This book should become a mandatory reading for disciplines such as education, psychology, psychiatry, and development studies as a reminder of the kinds of reflections we need to do before we buy into a single narrative of development.

—Manasi Kumar, *Senior Lecturer, Department of Psychiatry,
University of Nairobi, Kenya*

Erica Burman's *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology* showed in the early 1990's how hegemonic economic models and gender relations were reproduced by psychological theories of development, and subsequently, how important it was to address specific developments, their particular economic and social context, away from grand abstractions and homogeneous developmental models ... In this 2nd edition of *Developments*, Burman pushes her critical understanding of development further while arguing for the importance of attending to these international perspectives. This completely revised and astounding edition, which includes a new introduction to each chapter and a new section on transnational dynamics, could well work as a proper inoculation against extreme right wing developments worldwide ... while reflecting, in particular, on everyday childhood issues and concerns.

—Ángel Gordo, *Lecturer in Sociology, Universidad
Complutense of Madrid, Spain*

Erica Burman is a leading voice in critical (developmental) psychology, and I highly recommend her second edition of *Developments: Child, Image, Nation* because her transdisciplinary and transnational critique of both psychological and economic developments ... provides her readers with a post-/anti-developmental political conceptualization of childhood, which is both psychosocial and anti-capitalist. Burman shows us that the discourse of psycho-economic development, as exemplified by signifiers like 'growth', 'change', 'stage', 'cycles', 'investment', and 'progress', is a modern rhetoric that is ideologically sustained by the colonial logic of capitalist imperialism, which is inherently oppressive This is why Burman frames children, in the context of her critique of the discourse of psycho-economic development, as the oppressed alongside other historically oppressed groups or nations in the Global South and beyond ... In sum, Burman's book undoes the dangerous fantasy of development by deconstructing the complex network of discourses and practices on which it is based.

—Robert K. Beshara, Assistant Professor of Psychology and Humanities,
Northern New Mexico College



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

DEVELOPMENTS

Child, Image, Nation

Second edition

Erica Burman

Second edition published 2021
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2021 Erica Burman

The right of Erica Burman to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

First edition published by Routledge 2007

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-0-367-25524-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-367-24872-7 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-28824-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by codeMantra

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements to the first edition</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Acknowledgements to the second edition</i>	<i>xi</i>
Introduction	1
PART I	
Child: children and development: what is at stake?	29
1 Dis/placing development	31
2 The child, the woman, and the cyborg: (im)possibilities of feminist developmental psychology	48
3 Pedagogics of modernity: the address to the child as political object and subject	64
PART II	
Developing images	89
4 Childhood, sexual abuse and contemporary political subjectivities	91
5 Sexuality: contested relationships around the control of desire and action	107
6 Appealing and appalling children	134

PART III	
International development	153
7 Beyond the baby and the bathwater: developmental psychologies for diverse childhoods	155
8 Developing differences: gender, childhood and economic development	173
9 The abnormal distribution of development: policies for Southern women and children	190
PART IV	
What follows postdevelopment?	207
10 Rhetorics of psychological development: from complicity to resistance	209
11 Between two debts: points of suspension in childhood and economic development	221
12 Between two deaths: reconfiguring metaphors and rhetorics of childhood	240
PART V	
Transnational dynamics	259
13 Between identification and subjectification: affective technologies of expertise and temporality in the contemporary cultural representation of gendered childhoods	261
14 'It shouldn't happen here': cultural and relational dynamics structured around the 'poor child'	278
15 Contingent connections: between German and British childhoods – Marion Daltrop	295
<i>References</i>	<i>311</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>349</i>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS TO THE FIRST EDITION

In terms of formal acknowledgements, I should make clear that Chapter 2 originally appeared in K. Henwood, C. Griffin, and A. Phoenix (eds) (1998) *Standpoints and Differences: Essays in the Practice of Feminist Psychology* (pp. 210–232), London: Sage. Chapter 3 was originally published in K. Lesnik-Oberstein (ed.) (1998) *Children in Culture: Approaches to Childhood*, London/New York: Macmillan/St Martin's Press. Chapter 4 is a modified version of a chapter that appeared in P. Reavey and S. Warner (eds) (2003) *New Feminist Stories of Child Sexual Abuse: Sexual Scripts and Dangerous Dialogues*, London/New York: Routledge, while an earlier version of the text was first drafted for presentation as an invited Keynote for OMEP (Organisation Mondiale pour l'Éducation Préscolaire) Annual Lecture on Early Childhood Care and Education, University College Cork, Ireland, April 2000. Chapter 6 was originally published in *Psychoanalytic Studies* 1, 3 (1999): 285–302 (Basingstoke: Carfax). Chapter 7 was originally published in *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal* 9, 1 (2001): 5–22 (Oxfordshire: EECRA/Amber). Chapter 8 was originally published in *Children & Society* 9, 3 (1995): 121–141 (London: National Children's Bureau). Chapter 9 was originally published in *Gender, Place and Culture* 2, 1 (1995): 21–36 (Abingdon: Carfax). Chapter 10, 'Rhetorics of Psychological Development: From Complicity to Resistance', was first presented as a Keynote at the Sociedade Inter-Americana de Psicologia (SIP)/Inter-American Psychology Congress, Caracas in 1999 and subsequently published in *Interações: Estudos Pesquisas em Psicologia* IV, 8 (1999): 11–33 (Universidade São Marcos, São Paulo). Beyond the formal acknowledgement to the publishers, I want to thank the editors and reviewers of those books and journals whose comments have undoubtedly improved my texts.

While the Introduction, Chapters 1, 5, 11, and 12 are previously unpublished, Chapter 1 is based on two papers, one entitled 'Dis/placing Developments', which was originally presented as a paper in an invited symposium that I convened entitled 'Spacing Out: Topographies of Culture, Gender and Sexuality in Psychology', to the XXVII International Congress of Psychology, Stockholm in 2000 and also builds on material drawn from a second paper, prepared for an interdisciplinary workshop, 'Rethinking Childhoods', convened at the University of Berkeley, California in 2005. Chapter 5 is based on a seminar paper of

this title prepared for a programme on ‘Contested Childhood in a Changing Global Order’, convened by Pamela Reynolds at the University of Michigan in 2002, the invitation for which I want to record my gratitude. It was my struggle with this theme that – while since then updated – prompted the analysis discussed in that chapter. (A part of this chapter was translated into German and published as ‘Kinder und Sexualität’ in *Das Argument*, 260 (2005): 237–251.) The Introduction and Chapters 11 and 12 were written specifically for this volume.

In addition to the formal acknowledgements for the material presented here, I want also to record many personal ‘thank yous’. Particular thanks go to many friends and colleagues who have supported this work:

Pam Alldred, Fernando Alvarez, Agnes Andeneas, Janet Batsleer, Liz Bondi, Jo Boyden, Jill Bradbury, Daniela Caselli, Khatidja Chantler, Lise Claiborne Bird, Jude Clark, Gerald Cradock, Mark de Kesel, Wendy Drewery, Chris Dunker, Judith Ennew, Harriet Goodman, Angel Gordo-López, Liv-Mette Gulbrandsen, Hanne Haavind, Uma Kothari, Karin Lesnik-Oberstein, Ann Levett, Eva Magnusson, Michel Marchand, Deb Marks, Patricia Miller, Richard Mitchell, John Morss, Johanna Motzkau, Olga Nieuwenhuys, Dimitris Papadopolou, Ian Parker, Vibhuti Patel, Gill Peace, Ann Phoenix, Vanessa Pupavac, Pamela Reynolds, Rex and Wendy Stainton Rogers, Irmgard Strauble, Julia Varela, and Valerie Walkerdine. Sadly, Ann Levett and Rex Stainton Rogers have passed away in the interval between initially formulating some of this work and this book appearing, but their influences remain here in this text, as elsewhere. In particular I want to express my gratitude to Wendy Drewery, Ann Phoenix, and Jaan Valsiner for their enthusiastic response to the draft of this book, a reception that helped see me through the process of revision, and to Berenice Burman and Ian Parker whose belief in the value of this work has sustained me over the long period of its production.

Erica Burman
September 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS TO THE SECOND EDITION

In terms of formal acknowledgements, this second edition includes a new Part on ‘Transnational Dynamics’ comprising three chapters. Chapter 13 is a revised version of an article published in 2012 in *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 20, 2: 295–317 as ‘Between identification and subjectification: affective technologies of expertise and temporality in the contemporary cultural representation of gendered childhoods’ (DOI: 10.1080/14681366.2012.688767). Chapter 14 is a revised version of ‘It shouldn’t happen here’. Cultural and relational dynamics structured around the ‘poor child’, which first appeared in Lucy Hopkins and Arathi Sriprakash’s 2016 edited collection *The ‘Poor Child’: The Cultural Politics of Education, Development and Childhood* (pp. 23–42) (London: Routledge). Finally Chapter 15 is a revised version of ‘Contingent connections between German and British childhoods: Marion Daltröpp’, in Sandra Dintner and Ralf Shneider’s 2017 edited collection *Conceptions of Childhood in Contemporary Britain* (pp. 170–189) (London: Ashgate). I am grateful to the editors and the publishers for their enthusiastic permission for these pieces to be re-presented here.

In addition to those, I want to thank the many friends, colleagues, and students (and ex-students) – too many to name individually here, but I am sure you know who you are – who have inspired and supported the elaboration of the ideas in this book. The interval between the first and second editions of this book has seen many changes – political as well as personal – some of which are reflected in this revised edition. The transnational links of academic and personal support have been vital to me in so many ways, and in these days of increasing global nationalisms and particularisms, such solidarities are of enormous importance for intellectual and psychic survival. Thank you. Finally, a particular debt of gratitude and inspiration goes to Ian Parker for his remarkable, consistent support on all fronts that enabled both versions of this book to happen.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

INTRODUCTION

This second edition of *Developments* traces different claims made for ‘development’, ‘development’ in its multiple senses – connecting children, human, and international development. In doing so, it aims to contribute to a critical re-envisioning of theory and practice in increasingly postindustrial, postcolonial contexts, where globalisation and multinational markets have given rise to new forms of colonialism and labour, and in particular new configurations of (including delimitations of) citizenship and transnational relations. It takes as its key focus why debates around children and childhood – their safety, their sexuality, their interests, entitlements and abilities, and also their labour and their violence (attributed or enacted) – have so preoccupied the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, and it identifies analytical and practical strategies for better practice. Drawing on feminist, postcolonial, and postdevelopment literatures, alongside intersectional and decolonial analyses to inform perspectives on individual and social development, the book argues for the need to reconceptualise notions of individual and human development, including those informing models of children’s rights and interests, to foster more just and equitable forms of professional practice with children and their families.

The title and structure of the book, *Developments*, speak to its argument that claims to the term ‘development’ inextricably link psychological, cultural, and international (social and economic) models and practices. This is so, even now as we approach the middle of the twenty-first century, amid increasingly widespread cynicism and disaffection with development as responsible for such crises as the new iniquities of exploitation, displacement of peoples, and impending environmental catastrophe. Far from disappearing, the more claims to development appear discredited the more manic it seems are the circulation of – and indeed attachment to – forecasts and political promises of growth and restoration of prosperity (especially national prosperity). Children and notions of childhood seem to work in crucial ways to secure such beliefs.

By explicitly addressing these different ‘developments’ and critically reflecting on the forms and consequences of these links, this book aims to generate deeper perspectives on each. Concerns that are typically treated as separable – the psychology of the individual, child

2 Introduction

development, political, philosophical, and religious legacies of representations of childhood within the modern Western imagination, child protection, child rights, economic aid, and development policies turn out to be integrally related to each other's conceptualisation and application, in particular to national and transnational dynamics and their geopolitical contexts. (Here I mobilise this broad formulation of 'Western' as a provisional and inadequate way to characterise the ways European cultural forms were taken up in North America – especially the United States, and thence through global capitalism and its cultural sequelae – have become global, but see my later comments on terminology.)

These connections arise because the incipient social sciences of the nineteenth and early twentieth century emerging in Europe and the United States drew upon prevailing understandings of childhood to structure and warrant their interventions. Indeed, as is now widely accepted across both queer theory and childhood studies (Edelman 2004; Jessop 2018), the widespread slogan that 'children are our future' – whether mobilised for economic or planetary welfare considerations (see Taylor 2013; Sheldon 2016) – highlights the links between individual children, notions of social progress, and national welfare that circulate within national and international policy debates. As I analyse extensively in this book, and whose complex temporalities are now topicalised by queer theory (Gill-Peterson et al. 2016), the motif of the child is conventionally abstracted from culture and society through structures of sentiment that obscure the ways such policies inform representations of 'race'/culture, gender and what – marking the inception of the Cold War – used to be called 'First'/'Third' World. Indeed, the fact that successive UNICEF evaluations of the health, well-being, and happiness of children in economically advantaged countries continue to document how countries with higher income gaps – such as Britain and the United States – give rise to higher levels of poverty, as well as misery, is surely indicative of those disparities within as well as between countries (UNICEF 2007; Hudson and Kühner 2016). The book traces how the symbolic trappings mobilised by childhood mean that educational, social policy, and international development practitioners are ill-equipped by their theories, and the ways those theories are taken up, to attend to the contexts and positions of actual children the world over (that is, across so-called 'developed' contexts and those sometimes called 'less' or 'under'-developed' contexts – but what might be more accurately termed 'de-developed').

Here some comments on terminology are needed. In general I use the terms North and South as the widely used formulation to refer to inequalities structured through colonial and imperialist legacies and actualities that, broadly speaking but as seen above imperfectly, map on to the historical and current relations between countries of the northern hemisphere with those of the south. Other terms in circulation include the First/Third World, designations forged from the post-World War II Cold War settlement whose significance in relation to understandings of childhood and development is now gaining key critical attention (Silova et al. 2017, 2018). The problematic binaries of West/Third World assumed to map onto, 'developed/developing countries' are probably best characterised by the simpler 'rich/poor' (or, given the diversity within such national contexts, probably 'richer/poorer' is better). The increasingly preferred formulation 'majority/minority world' usefully draws attention to how wealth and status have been concentrated within the hands of a minority, more typically referred to as 'the West', at the expense of the rest of the world, which is in fact the majority. Useful as this formulation is, it should not be confused with other references to majority/minority status when used to refer to sociopolitical dynamics of cultural normalisation or mainstreaming vs. marginalisation *within* specific national contexts.

Confusing as this diversity of terminology may be, at the very least what it indicates is how each set of terms carries its own history, problematic, and problems, not least in its complex and multiple political-geographical conditions.

Hereafter I will largely use the formulation 'North'/'South', whilst not overlooking the many norths and souths that lie within and across the geographical and political North and South; nor indeed the way the 'East'/'West' binary has not only been structured by orientalist fantasies of authentic origins that can be either tapped or improved by 'Western' influence, but also how the 'East' of Europe marked the destabilising and disconcerting presence of communism within this capitalist bloc. In mobilising the formulation of North/South I am aware that this opposition is not appropriate for all countries and contexts, and (at the risk of repetition) differences within countries cannot be overlooked: there are many national, regional norths and souths within the northern and southern hemispheres. With this set of caveats, however, this formulation retains some usefulness in characterising the agentic donor-recipient dynamics elaborated within aid and development policies and programmes, as also within other cultural and economic exchange systems. In part because the material presented in this book spans a considerable time period of writing, but also because none of them is entirely satisfactory, the reader will see that I move between various formulations.

Disciplining development?

One key rationale for this book is to counter how different audiences typically engage only selectively with critiques of development. As someone writing across a range of disciplines (sociology, politics, development studies, postcolonial studies, education, childhood studies), inspired by arguments occurring outside my discipline of origin (psychology), I have become aware how partialities of perspective wrought by disciplinary perspectives give rise to some significant, and sustained, occlusions. In relation to the reception of my own work, I have seen child rights and educational researchers and practitioners either focusing on the pieces that have explicitly dealt with critiques of representations of childhood, or else as offering critiques of mainstream Anglo-US developmental psychology. It seems one cannot be simultaneously a psychological theorist and commentator, educational researcher, critic of international child rights initiatives, and social theorist of contemporary cultural politics. Indeed, it is true, when I started working on these topics, few developmental psychologists seemed to address the link that formed the conceptual basis for this book, although it was fortunate that educationalists (such as Dahlberg et al. 1999; Moss and Petrie 2002; Cannella and Viruru 2004; Dahlberg and Moss 2005; MacNaughton 2005; Penn 2005) were also offering useful resources. Yet then as now, what typically remains insufficiently analysed is how the concept of development on which the discipline of developmental psychology relies, and which informs child development policies at national and international levels, has resonances with economic developmental policies whose global direction via multinational organisations and corporations (whether the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, or Google, Amazon, Facebook and Netflix) are shaping and constraining the contexts for individual and national development.

It would be too easy to claim that psychologists are unaware of debates happening outside their discipline, although I hope this book may function to bring disciplinary diversity in an accessible form to them too. However, as the acknowledgements to (both editions

of) this book indicate, the papers gathered and revised here owe much to relatively small but significant international networks of critical educational, development, developmental psychological, and childhood researchers, as well as decolonial cultural theorists, who have supported these engagements. Rather than performing the ritual denunciation of my original discipline, as a (sometimes token) (anti)psychologist now in childhood and educational studies arenas, the book offers a sustained analysis as well as critique of the uses and functions of claims to development, including – but not only as they occur elsewhere – in discussions of psychological development and mental health, and a nuanced evaluation of the possibilities of either transcending or dispensing with, or even replacing, these.

There are also tensions in the chapters below between critique of developmental psychology and critique of the interpretations or applications of developmental psychology, including, for example, to educational and social policy (see for example my analysis of how UK government sponsored research on ‘resilience’ and ‘character education’ programmes was selectively cited and (mis)used within policy documents, Burman 2018a). While making the distinction between theory and its application might make the arguments of the book more palatable to some, it is a somewhat disingenuous move that – as Riley (1983) amply documented early on in relation to the impacts of post-World War II childcare and education – underplays the active role that psychologists have taken in popularising and promoting the reception of their ideas. Clearly, discussions of the performativity of policy (Ball 2003; Singh 2015) would disallow this binary between theory and policy. But, equally significantly, maintaining such oppositions privileges an individualist reading of the history of psychology and education (focused on the contributions of individual authors, their actions and responsibilities) over an understanding of its historical and institutional constitution and material-economic conditions. Valuable critical and culturally grounded work has been undertaken in critical and cultural psychology, for example (Shandon et al. 1997; Rogoff 2003), social psychology (Gjerde 2004; Jovchelovitch 2004; Parker 1997a, 1997b), psychoanalysis (Parker 2008; 2010; Frosh 2015; Parker and Siddiqui 2018), and cultural-historical approaches (González Rey 2014; Jovanović 2015; Yasnitsky and Van der Veer 2015) with constructionist and interpretive perspectives becoming increasingly influential. But nevertheless this work has made headway despite, rather than because of, ever increasing pressures towards the generation of a particular kind of ‘useful’, policy-relevant knowledge, even as its resistance also highlights the complexity and diversity of intellectual and political agendas within each too. Hence the arguments put forward in Chapter 1 about distinguishing between, and resisting, the expertise attributed to developmentalists vs. other claims to knowing that could be asserted. Nor of course am I singling out psychology or developmental psychology as sole culprit in the set of problems mobilised by ‘development’, but rather using this as a significant starting point for reflecting upon the wide reverberations and consequences of the ‘developmental paradigm’ (for more on the ambiguous agencies and capacities presumed and suppressed by ‘development’, see Gendzier 2017).

At any rate, without open cross-disciplinary debate, a debate that acknowledges the specific preoccupations, legacies, and problems of different disciplinary approaches (rather than imagining such issues can be dispensed with in some ahistorical, born-again interdisciplinary muddle), there is a danger of reinventing disciplinary orthodoxies and expertise in new forms, or rediscovering and even reifying the old ones (Burman 2012a). Such for a while was the fate of discussions of ‘development’ within early discussions in what was then called the ‘new’ sociology of childhood, which disparaged psychology for its ‘deficit’ view

of children but then periodically was forced to re-engage – albeit critically – with that when it reaffirmed embodiment and the material (all longstanding themes of feminist scholarship and analysis, see also Rosen and Twarmley 2018).

A further disciplinary resource drawn upon, and one that marks this book as traversing the (often hidden) border between the social and human sciences, is psychoanalysis. Here I draw upon not only cultural studies renderings of psychoanalytic theory (e.g. Burgin et al. 1986; Penley 1989; Copjec 2004) but also a psychotherapeutic practitioner's awareness of the instabilities and uncertainties of both the meanings and impacts of childhood experiences. Psychoanalytic approaches feature here as both topic and method to highlight how concepts of childhood closely connect with those of dominant cultural understandings of both emotion and memory. Psychoanalytic theory is useful as an interpretive framework to understand what is at stake in the dynamics of child-viewing and child-saving: the affective positioning of the child is treated as an indicator, or symptom, of wider concerns. As Bornstein (2001) noted of child sponsorship, humanitarian interventions realised through children generate complex emotional as well as economic relationships, with ambiguous personal and political effects (see also Wells 2007, 2008; Chapters 6, 8, 9, and 14 this volume). These include fostering a transnational belonging at the expense of sometimes engendering local jealousies and inequalities, while the dynamic of individual empowerment they institute can, paradoxically, work to disempower parents, families, and (especially poor and marginalised) communities.

A range of psychoanalytic frameworks is drawn upon in this book – including object relations and Lacanian analysis as well as the wider range of psychoanalytic resources typically used in literary and film studies. Such symptomatic reading of the investments fulfilled by representations of childhood, connecting psychic with financial economies, can work to generate analysis at the societal level. Indeed, the term 'investment' itself betrays semantic and practical links between children and the market that are more widely expressed by notions of 'growth' which also mobilises a discourse of nature that is in urgent need of critical reformulation (Taylor 2013). For this reason, at various points I draw, after Castoriadis (1994), on the notion of 'social imaginary' which I mobilise to apply psychoanalytic processes, alongside other discursive approaches, beyond the individual to the societal level. Towards the end of the book, in Chapters 11 and 12 I apply psychoanalytic (specifically Lacanian) frameworks to interrogate further the motif of the (girl) child identified throughout Chapters 5–9 in terms of the ethical-political positions it fosters, while the final chapter, Chapter 15, includes consideration how such resources might actually figure within the meaning-making of an adult looking back on her traumatic childhood.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) has become – at least rhetorically, since the question about whether children's rights are actually increased through this is another matter – powerful at national levels. Its emphasis on participatory rights makes it increasingly important for social work, educational, and childhood practitioners to have access to critical conceptual resources to facilitate its implementation (see also Ansell 2005; Cordero Arce 2012, 2015; Larkins et al. 2015; Goodfellow and Burman 2020), and there remains much evidence that these are not well understood (Powell and Smith 2009; Driscoll 2012; Goodfellow 2020). This is a highly complex matter, since (as Mitchell 2005 concluded from his earlier review) the Convention is ultimately a legal instrument rather than a theoretical statement about children and childhood. This means that it demands of its practitioners the continuous work of interpretation and translation into

specific contexts and moments, as Hanson and Nieuwenhuys's (2012) collection demonstrates (and is also evidenced in Holzscheiter's 2010 analysis of the processes of formulating the Convention). Yet examples abound of 'best interest' principles being used to undermine and contradict participatory rights – and claims to expertise over determining 'competence' can trump a child's expressed wishes (Giesinger 2019) – whether in terms of access to contraception or healthcare (although Alderson 2002, took this up in a British context with some success).

Early on, particular challenges posed by the Convention in terms of the principles of indivisibility and universality were posited as central to the 'second human rights revolution' (cf. Gready and Ensor 2005) – whereby the generality of the Convention was seen to open up not only spaces for cultural inflections but also, therefore, contests over how claims to equality mesh with those of difference. Coercive associations between Northern-dominant Enlightenment universalism and economic globalisation are played out to generate claims to particularity and autonomy as resistance, although, as legal and political theorists have pointed out, this too is a false opposition that obscures key arenas of struggle and change (Sunder 2003).

Claims to indivisibility connecting civil, political, and economic rights can work to support challenges to the traditional separation of children from societal processes and practices (as Oswell 2013 has also argued). This includes moving beyond treating children as a homogeneous group, as if untainted by social divisions structured around axes of class, gender, 'race', culture, (dis)ability, and heteronormativity. So instead of reiterating the exclusions and presumptions of the call to 'save the children', or the usually conservative measures generated by the reproach: 'but what about the children?', it has been important to attend to the more socially attuned question of '*which* children?' (Taefi 2009; Rodó-de-Zárate 2017). As perhaps a particular exemplification of intersectionality theory, even before it became so influential in Anglophone contexts (see Phoenix and Pattynama 2006; Hill Collins and Bilge 2016), attending to the specificity of the aged, classed, racialised, gendered, dis/abled, and geographical positionings of children has become vital to understanding why some children appear to exemplify, and even warrant, childhood status more than others, with the position of child migrants a key current focus of concern (Lind 2019).

Moreover, in this book, I interrogate how feminist or gender analyses and child-focused perspectives have often been treated as competing alternatives. This intervention works symmetrically to comment on both feminist and childhood debates. While current scholarship at least topicalises this question (Rosen and Twarmley 2018), it is worth reflecting briefly on why this has been so. In the past, I was surprised to find childhood studies relatively impervious, and sometimes even hostile, to feminist perspectives, while as Thorne (1987) pointed out some time ago, feminist critics did not always sufficiently recognise the significance and relevance of children's rights and childhood studies (with Riley 1987 attributing this to how class positions structured women's positions in relation to childcare). This is understandable given the ways in which women's and children's interests have typically either been equated or collapsed into each other, in ways that historically have usually worked to oppress women further (Sylvester 1998; Burman 2008a). Nevertheless feminist psychologists have increasingly applied and elaborated broader critiques of development to question the eurocentricity, instrumentalisation, and cultural masculinity of psychological models of development and change (e.g. Kofsky Scholnick 2000).

Hence a further cross-disciplinary engagement mobilised by this book is one of opening up further the tense and contested character of the child-woman, as well as child-adult,

relationships. Various chapters in this collection discuss not only the need to work across disciplinary boundaries but also why and how it is important to recognise the ways these have structured and continue to influence paradigms and practices around children and childhoods. It is interesting to note that recent literature within (the hybrid discipline of) childhood studies has called for attention to the practice of interdisciplinary analysis (Moody and Darbellay 2019).

From the 1970s onwards, claims of the ‘end of history’ highlighted how the failure to deliver on the promises of modernity, that is, of social and technological ‘progress’ as a national project compromised the credibility of the rational, scientific, industrial economy. Indeed, the banking crisis of 2008 highlighted the rise of claims of the irrationality of global markets (typically described in affective terms such as ‘nervous’ or ‘anxious’), whose reification of course obscures the actions of those directly responsible, notwithstanding that we are all suffering its consequences with decades of ‘austerity’. Similarly the asocial masculinity of the rational autonomous model of dominant models of psychology was exposed as a reflection of the *laissez-faire* liberal economic subject, even as it has been increasingly replaced by a feminised (anxious, vulnerable) one (Hickinbottom-Brown 2013). Beyond the lived connections between women and children and gender and childhood, intensified via the discourses of ‘nation’ (discussed below), there are also various cultural sets of associations whose gendered shifts merit attention. The neoliberal world disorder destabilised the traditional, culturally masculine, model of the rational unitary subject, to instead valorise flexibility, mobility, and even relationship (Hultqvist and Dahlberg 2001). It is no accident that ‘emotional literacy’ programmes were elaborated across the ‘developed world’ to resocialise angry disenfranchised working-class young men (alongside the marketing in Africa, and beyond, of self-help books on ‘ubuntu’ – the promotion of traditional community networks, that is, usually male extended family solidarity – as a business resource), while public concern in the North has long been focused on how (some middle-class) girls outperform boys in school examinations. Such ‘developments’ indicate the mutability of apparently inviolable structures of subjectivity and their proximal relation to shifts in forms of capital. In particular they highlight how the cultural shifts towards positive promotion of interpersonal qualities and emotions traditionally associated with both feminisation and childhood can be appropriated by the market (and the military, see Burman 2004a) for far from feminist ends (see also Gordo López and Burman 2004; Burman 2005a, 2006a, 2009a).

As already indicated, the analyses elaborated in this book coincided with, and in part benefited from, the emerging discussion of ‘intersectionality theory’ (see Phoenix and Pattynama 2006; Yuval-Davis 2006). While this – significantly – emerged from women’s studies and through feminist debates about how to adequately configure the experiential and structural significance of racialised, classed, diverse sexualities, and (dis)abilities within understandings of women’s positionings and relationships, such arguments have also key relevance for both analyses of and for children and childhoods and the evaluation of the differential distributions of development (see Chapter 8). Clearly taking up an approach formulated in one arena – in this case feminist practice, specifically black feminist activism (Crenshaw 1991) – and applying it to children and childhood requires some critical reflection. Fortunately not only are childhood, educational, and health researchers recognising the relevance of attending to children’s multiple and mutually constitutive positions with other social (both structural and experiential) dimensions (e.g. Nadan et al. 2015; Souto-Manning and Rabadi-Raol 2018), there are also critical reflections on what this move

achieves and risks (Burman 2013; Alanen 2016; Konstantoni and Emejulu 2017). Given intersectionality theory's exponential rise in the period between the two editions of this book, its future status as a key interpretive paradigm through which to engage debates about children and childhood may seem assured. And yet it is important to acknowledge that major debates remain about its status, including as formulated from the Global South (Lugones 2010), and whose pedagogical and social justice implications are being taken up (Case 2016).

Hence although a feminist commitment has sometimes provoked marginalisation in both psychology and childhood studies, I argue that such views from the margins are what are needed to generate the critical crossings of theory and practice necessary to challenge the hegemony of dominant formulations of development (see also Chapter 3). As with gender and sexuality studies, the study of children and childhoods offers both a distinct field and a lens by which to view other disciplines, including their practical and theoretical disputes. For, like gender-sensitive perspectives, it is hard to identify any social issue that is not touched upon by, or relevant to, the study of childhood. Rather it is its ghettoisation, its separation from those wider debates, that needs to be contested, as I take up throughout this book, and as has come to be indicated by queer and feminist engagements with children and childhoods (Burman and Stacey 2010; Gill-Peterson 2015; Gill-Peterson et al. 2016). Thus (alongside the crossdisciplinary awareness called for earlier), a resolutely and rigorously conceptualised *interdisciplinary* (or even *alterdisciplinary*?) stance is necessary for an adequate treatment of the complex issues posed by 'development' and its successors. Indeed in current times, where development seems to be both troubled and troubling, and instability and conflict threaten 'progress', what is needed is – as Amar (2016) argues – to be even more vigilant about the forms of epistemological infantilisation that come to inform policy and public reception, especially in relation to forms of political agency enacted by children and young people.

Why 'developments'?

The title of this book expresses two key claims: first, that any specific disciplinary address to development cannot, ultimately, be adequately understood without engaging with its others (and this of course means identifying and engaging with who those others are); second, that any account which takes 'development' as singular not only dangerously simplifies the diversity of possible and available forms but thereby contributes to their marginalisation, devaluation, and even exploitation or oppression. The first claim is probably relatively uncontroversial, although its far-reaching implications are insufficiently acknowledged. As argued throughout this book, discussions of development share common historical and cultural-political origins which underlie their political effects (Shandon et al. 1997), notable additions to these kind of analyses have been those which connect forms of childhood with the specific practice of colonial projects and with the continuing exclusionary impacts of slavery (Stoler 2002; Bernstein 2011). The second claim is not only epistemological or political but, as illustrated by the analytical applications to specific arenas presented in this book, has key methodological and practical consequences in terms of envisaging possibilities for change. Katz (2004) discussed this in relation to how material social practices of both work and play not only structured and regulated but also were subverted by children and young people. More recently Gottlieb and DeLoache's (2016) imagined childcare advice for children from eight different societies offers a particularly creative account not only of specific

cultural practices surrounding childbirth and early childcare and education, but also of how these necessarily shift and modulate in contexts of migration, displacement, and other social changes and, especially, oppression.

It is important to note that treating ‘development’ as multiple does not necessarily imply a relativist position – one of simply adding an ‘s’ to ward off accusations of hegemonic privilege or implying the harmonious coexistence of the various developmental accounts. Relativism was seen as a consequence of deconstructionist destabilisings of received ‘truths’. But the strategy of mobilising alternative readings, or indicating alternative possibilities, need not – contrary to some ‘weak’ forms of social construction (Danziger 1997; Edley 2001) – lead to a pluralist celebration of individual agency that at the next blink turns round to blame the ‘victim’ for – what are now rendered as individual – failings. Such readings are misinterpretations of the political-ethical engagement that prompted poststructuralist and postcolonial critique (e.g. Harasym 1990; Derrida 1994) even wilfully so, in robbing them of their political bite – still less how such resources have been generative of decolonising methodologies (e.g. Tuhiwai Smith 1999) identified by Cannella and Viruru (2004) as specifically relevant to practitioners working around children and childhoods. They also betray a superficial grasp of their arguments. In the same way as Butler’s (1990) championing of the notion of performativity was misunderstood to mean a neglect of the body and a facile underestimation of societal limits (prompting her to write a sequel, *Bodies That Matter*, Butler 1993), so attending to the ways that multiple possibilities are constrained by the specificities of power relations operating within particular conditions goes a long way to explain why and how these many ambiguities come to be realised as singular outcomes.

Education and childhood researchers have begun to embrace this point through discussions of the posthuman (e.g. Murris 2016; Hackett and Somerville 2017; Kuby 2017), mobilising Barad’s (1999, 2003) new materialism, Haraway’s discussions of subjectivities and agencies produced by (the engagement with) new technologies (Haraway 1997) and the nonhuman (Haraway 2003), and (especially via Braidotti 2006) Deleuzian ideas. These usefully engage how children’s marginalised positions are shared with other devalued and marginalised categories of person (including black, minority and indigenous peoples, working class people, sexual minorities...) and the nonhuman (animals, plants, land, water). Yet, as I discuss elsewhere (Burman 2018c) fruitful as these discussions may be, they do demand critical analysis, not least in thwarting the seduction of the ‘new’ (what’s new about ‘new’ materialism, for example?) to which academics tend to fall prey (see also Gerard et al. 2017; Petersen 2018). Welcome as it is to see this engagement with feminist philosophy in particular, it is worth noting that many of the key points now being heralded as ‘new’ were long ago raised by geographers, anthropologists, even some psychologists, and especially feminists (including myself, Burman 1990a, 1993). At any rate, Mookherjee’s (2006) distinction between different varieties of relativism within human rights discourse may be useful, positing a ‘reconciliatory’ feminism that can offer relativising mediation between universalist and cultural rights. While elsewhere I question the affective dynamics producing the desire for development (Burman 2013), and engage more deeply with post-colonial resources to interrogate modes of childhood (Burman 2019a), various chapters in this book offer key steps in the interrogation of what is at stake in claims to development, while Chapter 12 explicitly explores what it might do to ‘imagine there’s no development’ as an application of Copjec’s (2004) exploration of the consequences of Lacan’s claim that ‘the woman does not exist’.

Thus, drawing on my original disciplinary background in developmental psychology, the key rationale for and intervention made by this book is to explore links between discussions of models of human development, and specifically child development (though interrogating how these have come to be treated as equivalent), with economic development. By 'link' I lay claim less to a project of specifying exactly how they are, let alone should be, connected, than to assert that one domain cannot adequately (including ethically as well as analytically) be dealt with without the other, even as there is an urgent need to decouple one from the other. Each has profound consequences for the other while, as the pages below highlight, the contemporary resonances between the terms of each set of frameworks are often unfortunate if not oppressive. As Katz (2004) also commented in her Preface: 'In pairing development and development – children's coming of age and the structured transformation of their local environment ... [n]either form of development can be understood fully without the other' (p. x).

Hence, a second aspect of the plural designation 'developments' works to emphasise the multiple and contested character of each of its axes or levels (individual, child, economic, national, and international). Even as critical educationalists and geographers have highlighted the pernicious neocolonial trajectories inscribed by these resonances (Shahjahan 2011), so it becomes even more important to ward off their elisions. Just as per capita income is not the same as either gross domestic product (GDP), nor the latter as gross national product (GNP), so – notwithstanding the shift in psychological models noted early on by Kessen (1993) towards the 'hardwired child' arriving ready-equipped for any eventuality in an increasingly uncertain world, as with policies promoting the 'smart child' (Cradock 2006; Millei and Lee 2007; Millei and Kallio, 2018) and preschool provision to shape future worker-citizens – the promotion of children's autonomy (Lister 2005, 2006) is not the same as the creation or prefiguration of a free market economy. One way of thwarting these crude reductionisms threatened by the apparent uniformity of terms of developmental discourse is by attending to these instabilities and tensions. At the very least, reflection on such resonances can be useful in fostering other terminologies and, hopefully, the emergence of new strategies: reading each 'take' on development 'awry' (Žižek 1991a) to generate new critical commentary and perspectives on each.

Of course such resonances have not emerged by accident. They speak to the conditions giving rise to development discourse – its origins within European industrialisation and colonialism. It was this fateful conjoining of the birth of capitalism with imperialism that gave rise to a discourse on development concerned with maximisation – development as profit, surplus value, economised into units of production. Indeed, as Sohn-Rethel's (1977) analysis established three decades ago, the very move towards abstraction in number, time, and space coincided with processes of reification and commodification central to capital accumulation. And here too it is worth noting that, while evolutionary theory was used to warrant the linearity of development (with women, children, 'primitives', and the 'insane' positioned on inferior rungs of its ladder, so responsible for fostering divisive relations between their liberation struggles), this was not a necessary or inevitable reading. In one of the earliest of the recent wave of critical developmental accounts, Morss (1990) discussed how selection came to be privileged over variation within the reception of Darwin's work. Hence the tainted association of evolution with notions of 'survival of the fittest' reflects a history of appropriation, including a 'history of the present' (a history mobilised to legitimate present-day arrangements). The enduring vogue for sociobiology and evolutionary

psychology (albeit now framed through neuroscience), which thrives via the appeal to discourses of nature and the natural, necessarily founders when survival value is weighted equally with variation (as Hrdy 2000, among others, pointed out from within comparative anthropology). Its more recent varieties, of course, blend environmentalist with innatist discourse, suggesting a mutability of hardwired predispositions that fuel early interventionist apocalyptic policies focusing on supposed ‘critical periods’ in infant and child development (Allen 2011a, 2011b; see Gillies et al. 2018). Yet as many commentators have pointed out (Edwards et al. 2015, 2016; Lowe et al. 2015), this firmly locates the domain of intervention and responsibility at the level of parent/caregiver and family rather than society – of a piece with ‘austerity politics’ that privatise the social (Millei and Joronen 2016).

It is, of course, as problematic to attempt to read social processes back on to the development of the individual as it is to treat individual development as the prototype and site of manipulation for social development. For significant reasons, the latter has more typically dominated the academic and policy discourses since – and perhaps as a significant indicator of – modernity. Once Galton formulated the quasi-evolutionary claim that ‘phylogeny recapitulates ontogeny’, the project of social engineering via mapping and then intervening in children’s development took shape – although it should be noted how civilisations the world over have probably always engaged in some such socialisation practices and indeed theorising. At any rate, as is explicated further in this book and has long been widely acknowledged (e.g. Sachs 1992; Mehmet 1995), concerns with and practices of individual and social development, at national and international levels, share some key terms under modernity: growth, change, progress.

These applications do not even or only apply to individuals. So conceptions of stages of development, and especially the description or prescription of developmental endpoints, have been especially problematic; the former working to confirm the inferior status conferred by the disavowedly partial renderings of the latter. As Foucauldian analyses highlighted, once technologies of administration for the measurement and application to groups and populations had been created, this gave rise to a common conceptual and methodological framework that connected individual and social (Rose 1985). There is thus an implicit influence of psychology within (international) development studies, in the form of approaches to the study of and intervention in community development, in particular via the application of techniques from organisation studies (Cooke 2001). This is evident in models of groupwork and community development, which subscribe to the idea that there are stages or cycles to interpersonal processes that not only institute culturally specific norms as if they were universally applicable but also open up strategies for manipulation and intervention. In particular participatory approaches were hailed to redress the problem of imposing Northern, industrialised norms and understandings upon Southern peoples by generating locally defined norms. As Chambers (2005: 72) recalled:

It is difficult to express the amazement and exhilaration of those days when we discovered that ‘they can do it’, that poor people, without education, women, children and men, had capacities to map, diagram and analyse of which we had not dreamt.

But although this argument problematised the question of cultural imposition of developmental goals, it still left intact the prevailing structure of intracommunity and structural power relations constituting the research and its agenda. Hence such approaches were

criticised as merely exposing local knowledges to make social structures more legible and therefore amenable to regulation (Parpart 1995; Cooke and Kothari 2001). Thus, critics identified ambiguities structured within the project of development in development studies, in terms of whether it is ‘about’ or ‘for’ development:

There are those who feel that the study of development is most closely connected to ideas about social, economic and political change, while others are informed by a more instrumental goal of shaping policy and a practical concern with the implementation and devaluation of development interventions. Thus, there is disagreement as to where development studies should be located along a continuum from intellectual analyses and interpretations of processes of change to ‘doing development’ utilising the practical skills and techniques associated with transformations on the ground.

(Kothari 2005a: 5–6)

These ambiguities are paralleled in developmental psychology. Moreover, there are of course explicit links to psychology, both within children’s programming and via the relations between models of child and nation, as discussed below.

Child

The key focus of this book is the interrogation of the work done by dominant social imaginaries of childhood as these impact on policies and practices around families, communities, national, and transnational economic development and, not least, on children themselves. Perhaps the most explicit preoccupation explored here is how developmental theories and practices – from psychology to economics and beyond – do not often really, or adequately, address the position of particular children in specific cultural and historical contexts (see also Ansell 2005 on this point). That is, dominant imaginaries – the sets of cultural associations and affective relations mobilised around ‘the child’ – oppressively occlude the real conditions of children’s lives, with the complexity and diversity of children’s lives typically reduced and abstracted (especially from class and national identifiers) into some notional, highly symbolised, and usually singular (and often young and/or female) ‘child’. This means that children whose life circumstances and practices of daily living fail to confirm to those idealised norms suffer further marginalisation, or even pathologisation. As discussed below (Chapters 4–8 and Burman 2006b, as well as Balagopalan 2008, 2014; Lavalette 2000; Nieuwenhuys 2001; Burr 2006; Liebel 2012, 2015), discussions around child labour, or working children, are a case in point – but so also are children whose lives do not conform in other ways to the dominant model of childhood as a period of irresponsibility, indulgence, and play. The globalisation of childhood (Boyden 1990; Burman 1996a; Ansell 2005) remains a challenge as a key site for the reiteration of prevailing inequalities between rich and poor. (Chapter 4 addresses the particular challenges posed by policies and practices for children who have been abused, while Chapter 5 engages with the complex dilemmas around children’s sexuality.)

Moreover, it is not only children who are affected by these paternalist conventions. As many commentators noted (e.g. Coulter 1989; Holland 1992; Meyer 2007) the convention of portraying needy children abstracted from context, as the indicator of more generalised deprivation, has consequences for the maturity, responsibility, and autonomy associated

with the classes, families, countries, and even regions those children are associated with, with the recent vogue for white US celebrities to adopt ‘orphaned’ African children exemplifying the enduring character and status of this trend. The fact that (as emerged when the singer/performer Madonna adopted a Malawian child in 2006) some children in orphanages may have one or more living parent clearly illustrated how poverty and the cultural value accorded children (especially girl children), as well familial transitions, can make the economic demands posed by bringing up children intolerable (a point also elaborated by Burr 2006 in relation to South East Asia).

Indeed, the colonial resonances between adult and child, and donor and recipient, along with themes of dependency that are recapitulated within child aid imagery have long been a focus of critique (Reeves 1988; Hart 1989; Gronemeyer 1992; Mehmet 1995). But notwithstanding widespread acknowledgement of this problem, there remain practical tensions for aid organisations between mobilising funding through claims about children (as in child sponsorship schemes, for example) and the increasing drift of international government organisations (IGOs) and nongovernment organisations (NGOs) to see aid for children as necessarily linked to broader development investment at local and national levels (see also Chapter 14 in terms of the ways ‘here’ and ‘there’ become mobilised via the generationally proximal or distal relations elaborated around adults and children). In terms of contemporary challenges it is worth noting that, within this moral-affective economy, the child is more easily associated with the ‘needs-based’ approaches that characterised earlier approaches to development studies, while child programming actually presents a strong case for (evaluation of the) application of current rights-based models. Here too what can be noted is how the abstraction marked by the recourse to childhood allows the segmentation of aid interventions to be played out in exclusionary ways. So, for example, in her early critique of the limits of ‘gender mainstreaming’ as working paradoxically to reduce awareness and intervention around gender-based inequities, and as ‘reducing their [NGOs] capacity to advocate, organize and intervene in terms of gender and class-based disadvantages’ (p. 173), Pearson (2005) took as a key and indicative example how Save the Children (UK) then abolished the post of ‘gender advisor’.

Various chapters below (especially Chapters 3–5) refer to the history of this dominant affective relationship that has come to be associated with ‘the child’, as generated by the particular confluence of the new biological and social sciences, from the eighteenth century onwards in Europe, including the transformations that would come to be marked by the emergence of psychoanalysis. As Foucault (1981) among others described, the transformations of subjectivity created by the rise of modernity were marked by the emergence of a sense of interiority, of having a sense of self that was not only continuous and stable, but also grounded by the connection between childhood and memory (Hacking 1996). While Rousseau, Froebel, Pestalozzi and others wrestled with the problem of how best to educate children – each according to the philosophical commitments informing their models of childhood (Singer 2005; Taylor 2013) – their project was a reflection of wider cultural shifts in European sensibilities that came to equate the child with the true or inner self (cf. Steedman 1995; Burman 2017a, 2017b).

This remains a dominant motif of the culture and sensibility surrounding children and childhood in the North, despite its multiple proliferations within cultural, popular, professional, and policy fora. So just as doctrines of original sin and essential innocence are still with us, jostling alongside each other are calls for greater child protection in the form of

segregation of children's lives (Moss and Petrie 2002) as well as castigation of child assertion, aggression, and disorder (Franklin 2002a; Garlen 2019; Warming et al. 2019). This is where the discourse of childhood as (malleable) dependency meets that of national and international policies addressing poverty, in ways that pathologise the poor and privatise poverty (Klein and Mills 2017; Mills and LeFrançois 2018). A key example here is of how 'bad' behaviour is seen as amenable to management via diagnosis and medication in attention deficit hyperactive disorder (ADHD) (Newnes and Radcliffe 2005; Timimi 2005). Such moves go beyond the medicalisation of childhood to its psychiatrisation (Coppock and LeFrançois 2014; Mills 2013, 2015), such that possible geographically distributed asymmetries in attribution or negotiation of psychiatric categories both warrant attention and risk being flattened into the uniformity demanded by global markets (Burman 2012b).

Similarly, the child as signifier of either the 'true' self, or even the (biographically prior, or never experienced but longed for) 'lost' self, has coincided with a historical sensibility of ever greater personal alienation and dislocation. Therapies mobilise notions of the 'inner child', with idealised and romantic expressive qualities emphasising spontaneity and creativity, while national and international social policies increasingly focus on modelling flexible, independent, entrepreneurial, selves through their pedagogical practices (Hultqvist and Dahlberg 2001). The rise and rise of the discourse of 'resilience' and its increasing privatisation and embodiment within the figure of the child is a case in point (Burman 2018a; Cretney 2014). Hence childhood has become a site of multiple emotional as well as political investments: a repository of hope yet a site of instrumentalisation for the future, but with an equal and opposite nostalgia for the past.

It seems as if the ever greater political and existential insecurities of the twenty-first century bolster an intensification of identification with the child that can be read as an index of other key cultural-political dynamics. In a now celebrated controversial critique, Pupavac (1998) discussed how the progressive undermining of parental authority under neoliberalisation has been accompanied by the increasing reliance on experts to advise on and intervene in family functioning. Experts are not only empowered to intervene; rather, their knowledge of this power and possibility works, like Bentham's panopticon, not only to regulate but to promote *self*-regulation. What elsewhere she called 'the international child rights regime' (Pupavac 2002a) has produced a 'misanthropy without borders' (Pupavac 2001), a transnational condition of subjectivity that is 'diminished' of its political efficacy as an effect of the extended powers of state and interstate apparatuses to intervene in people's lives. Such conditions create children and childhood as risky zones – as sites for major social unease and ambivalence. For they generate a profound identification that is tempered by an equivalent resentment at the potential for intervention they embody – either wielded personally or on their behalf (see Chapters 4 and 5 and Burman 2008; Burman and MacLure 2011).

While confidence in experts has also since dwindled, not least through disclosures of (sexual) exploitation of children and young people at the hands of professionals in the very institutions that were supposed to be caring for them, it is still worth noting that there are paradoxical effects of these concerns. So, for example in the 1980s United Kingdom, the Father's Rights movements arose alongside British government efforts encouraging fathers to take more (economic) responsibility for their children. This was of a piece with the retraction of welfare state, which correspondingly positioned families ever more centrally as the sole unit of social reproduction. Correspondingly, some men increasingly asserted claims to child contact and custody. Probably because of this political agenda, imaginaries of abuse

and abusive fathers were not well conceptualised within contemporary British social policy agenda. As well as the quid pro quo or retribution for having to pay for children, Scourfield (2006) put forward the interesting proposal that, for some men, such claims may be their only remaining recourse to an imaginary of family life in contexts of (marital) relationship breakdown, job uncertainties, and wider social fragmentation. That such incitements to the revival of paternal engagement are cynically motivated by nation states to reduce their own welfare bills was recently highlighted by research showing how welfare ‘reforms’ (that is, cuts) affecting housing provision in the United Kingdom specifically disadvantaged non-custodial fathers, as a result of which some of whom were risking losing custody of their children (Greenstein et al. 2016).

Image

While mention has already been made of imaginaries of childhood, some explanation is required of the significance of, and claims made around, notions of ‘image’ in this book. Image (as cultural product) and imaginary (as social fantasy and subjectivity) are interrelated. Awareness of the productivity of forms of ‘image’ in relation to ‘developments’ fulfils five functions here. First, their juxtaposition mobilises a different set of semantics around ‘development’ that also thereby draws attention to the specific cultural technologies they rely upon. Vision has long been regarded as the key physical sense privileged by modernism and modernity (Jay 1993; Levin 1993). The ‘society of the spectacle’ everyone is transfixed by, and equally transfixes, others. Indeed, vision has perhaps been vital in the ordering of difference, and the specular is regarded as a privileged way of knowing and constructing knowledge that combines discourses of nature (‘seeing is believing’) and possession (what can be ‘captured’ in a glance) central to empiricism (and, arguably, as in Irigaray’s 1985 account, patriarchy). The rise of visual technologies also therefore indicates the fateful combination of two key features of modern power characterising the industrialised North: the claims to omniscience (the ‘god’s eye’ view from nowhere) that belies the cultural and political partialities of appeals to universal knowledge; and the commitment to an ethics of revelation, of discovery (as where the very term ‘fieldwork’ betrays a suspect legacy of naturalism that presumes the privileged interpretive position of the researcher, and the passivity of the ‘field’ of study, Burman and MacLure 2011).

Second, development work (of the many kinds addressed in this book) illustrates how apparently merely methodological issues have profound consequences, giving rise to a failure to understand how the problem under investigation may be constructed via the very practice of its investigation. Such claims to knowledge work to recapitulate colonial relations, insofar as the act of ‘giving voice’ runs the risk of simultaneous exposure, surveillance, and regulation of those presumed to be being ‘empowered’. This critique remains as relevant to the project of giving voice to children as it is to empowering marginalised communities, in terms of making legible practices of resistance and survival that thereby become more amenable to disempowerment and manipulation (see e.g. Parpart 1995; Marks 1996; J. Scott 1997; Cooke and Kothari 2001 on communities; Alldred and Gillies 2002 on children; Alldred and Burman 2005). But such practices were also criticised as failing to understand and engage with power struggles within communities, as well as the political, cultural, and spatial complexity of the processes of translation and interpretation that stakeholders negotiate within any development intervention (Crewe and Harrison 1998; Larner and Craig

2005). To take what was (for me) a local example, the British policy discourse of promoting ‘community cohesion’ nicely indicated the tensions and conflations of the liberal precepts of individual privacy and order to the level of the group, while thereby – under neoliberalism – disowning responsibility for both its oppressions and exploitations (which could then be seen as occurring within a separate and inviolable sphere). It is for this reason that legal critics such as Sunder (2003) refuted the perceived opposition between religion and law, seen as the contest between the domain of rationality and culture, that structures so much of the discourse around (child and social) development. She argued instead not only for recognition of the complicities of past colonial interventions and current global manipulations, but also for a better understanding of how international law should be actively mobilised to support local struggles over the interpretation of cultural rights, interventions that are so often focused on women and children.

Third, it is no accident that the seemingly academic questions around image move the discussion into urgent contests between claims to local autonomy vs. neocolonial intervention. Practices of representation invoke the domain of law and politics as well as culture. In both cases, what is highlighted is that children and childhoods can only be known through representational practices (in their political as well as textual varieties). The challenge posed here is to understand and redress how these have usually involved Northern-derived and oriented models and agendas. Hence a key analytical question posed by this book asks *whose image* is being viewed, and what are the political and ethical dynamics of looking and being looked at, of being seen or overlooked? This highlights the importance of reflexive methodologies. Once the specificity and prescription of the implied position of the viewer within the viewed is acknowledged, the object of study turns out to tell us more about ourselves than perhaps anything else (Burman 1995a).

Clearly a position that merely recentres the position of the privileged Northern author/viewer (as is the danger of some current ‘whiteness’ studies, Ahmed 2004a) is inadequate, even if it marks an important starting point for reconsideration of dominant models and practices). Similarly, I am unconvinced about the adequacy of the move towards ‘pedagogies of the powerful’ advocated by Chambers (2005), despite its rather satisfying reversal of the usual knower-known relations to position the more powerful as in need of ‘immersion’ and coming to know about the peoples and contexts that they legislate over. I have more recently attempted what I hope will emerge to be a democratising critical pedagogical investigation of childhood that I have entitled ‘Found childhood’, a study of photographic records of (some very particular remnants of modern industrialised) childhood in which my own shadow (as photographer) is sometimes literally present, so disclosing the perspective of the viewer in producing what is made visible (Burman 2019b). At any rate, there remain major political and methodological challenges in elaborating, implementing, and evaluating practices of (self-)representation. Indeed, the case of research making claims to child self-representation demonstrates how this is inevitably framed by other textual and institutional representational practices (Marks 1996; Marshall and Woollett 2000; Alldred and Burman 2005; Burman 2007; Komulainen 2007). As Lesnik-Oberstein (2015) indicated so clearly in relation to the covert perspectives and assumptions involved in claims-making about neuroscience in child development, representation is always a practice of power.

Fourth, it should therefore be clear that the philosophical claims I am making about ‘image’ go beyond specifically visual material to also include textual (written) representation. Hence the analytic focus in this book includes representations in the form of policy documents, research literature, media reports, and popular cultural examples. I recognise

that the juxtapositions made here of philosophy with filmic and literary examples, alongside imagery and marketing text, may offend cultural studies purists since my analysis, doubtless, pays insufficient attention to questions of genre and audience. But my arguments concern what these – admittedly diverse texts – exemplify about general dynamics of viewing and relating to children. That is, I am not elaborating any particular claim about such images beyond drawing attention to their particularly privileged, and indicative, status as modern technological forms.

Nevertheless it is relevant to note the particular role played by images of children historically in print media and in art (Jordanova 1989) – even now appearing as spectacle; non-speaking, and therefore amenable to abstraction and commodification. The passivity and asymmetry of visual dynamics have played their part in securing the sentimentalised affective status accorded children; abstracted from social context as a representational cliché of timeless and culture-free innocence, their neediness warrantable only at the cost of social abjection. It is no accident therefore that agencies such as Save the Children and Oxfam formulated explicit policies on the representation of children. Hence, in Chapter 6, I apply Winnicott's discussion of the sadism that is covertly present in sentimentality to analyse child aid and development imagery, alongside discussing the relevance of other psychoanalytic accounts (see also Burman 1994a, 1994b). The now established practice in research with marginalised groups – especially children and young people – to involve participants in the generation of material for analysis by, for example, giving them disposable cameras to take pictures (see e.g. Miles and Howes 2014; Bradbury 2017) nevertheless exemplifies some of the political ambiguities recapitulated within methodological practices that were identified above. Control of the research technology is no guarantee of democratic research relationships; nor does it secure participants' control over the interpretation and reporting of the work. Indeed, the latter may be neither necessarily desirable nor perhaps ever achievable. Rather my point here is to bring to, and into, discussion an attention to how technological developments (with mobile phones and other information technologies prime examples) inflect as well as reproduce representational, including research, processes as well as educational and social care practices.

Fifth, and finally, I invoke the discourse of 'image' in relation to 'developments' to import a discursive intervention that takes further the analysis of the cultural-technological origins of its methodologies. So, to play with its ambiguities, 'developments' can be understood literally in its film processing sense, as the process of producing new images from photographic negatives – as technological artefacts or blueprints for intervention (see Burman 2013). Indeed, far from this digital age dispensing with its relevance, the potential obsolescence of this particular technological metaphor (amid its grossly unequal distributions) is surely indicative. Attention to the disjunctions between the 'negative' and its particular realisation, its 'development' in the form of technological processing from celluloid film to paper copy, prompts a dialectical reconsideration of the normative, opening up for critical attention asymmetries (of access, distribution and normative rights) that can pave the way for alternative perspectives.

Nation

In these times of economic and political globalisation, it may seem anachronistic to identify 'nation' as the third term of the subtitle of this book. In his review of development studies trends across a 30-year period, Cameron (2005) characterised the period up to the early

1980s as positioning the state as the prime development agency before, as he puts it, the ‘intellectual iceberg of neo-liberalism’ (p. 144) came to ‘freeze all meaningful debate on poverty and inequality’. Contemporary globalisation was largely understood as ‘resituat[ing] the nation state’, as Gready and Ensor (2005: 5) euphemistically put it, displacing some of its traditional authority to IGOs, multinational corporations, and NGOs. Discourses of ‘governance’ have replaced those of ‘government’, and imperatives of ‘logistics’ mask the coercions of capitalist extraction and imperialism (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013b). In this context, increasing attention has come to be paid to the political ambiguities attending the greater political and economic roles played by the nongovernmental sector (including how this relates both to changing structures of transnational regulation and to the militarisation of both humanitarian intervention and funding, Duffield 2001; Lewis 2005; Choudry and Kapoor 2013). These are important discussions that reflect in significant ways upon the continuing para- or neocolonial effects of international aid and development initiatives formulated in relation to children (and beyond children, to other recipients of aid and welfare; Pupavac 2002b, 2004; Balagopalan 2019; Chapter 14 this volume).

Even as an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 2006), the state remains a key arena for the interpretation and application of even international policies, notably the UNCRC, and the key context in which children’s developmental and life chances are played out. Nor is its political significance waning in uniform ways for all groups. This is notwithstanding regionally based superpowers (including the European Union as ‘Fortress Europe’, an exclusionary economic bloc) and massive labour migration as a necessary feature of the movements of global capital. Significantly, this includes women’s caring/domestic labour involving children, where immigrant women do the domestic labour to enable their middle-class employers to take advantage of the call for women citizens to enter the national labour market (Hochschild 2000; Morokvasic 2004). Yet as is all too evident in the current moment, discourses of nationality increasingly govern access to legitimate residency and service provision through their links to citizenship entitlements and, at least at the level of popular rhetoric, structure political agendas at the level of the resource vigilant (especially right-wing politicians).

As I suggest elsewhere (Burman 2018d) and as discussed from a different but compelling perspective by Meiners (2016), the recourse to the child seems to figure prominently in securing right-wing populist notions including racism, xenophobia, and homophobia. Similarly, highlighting national differences in historical models of and interventions for children even across a geographically close context such as Europe can be very instructive, in revealing how the state produces and limits particular forms of children and childhoods (as was highlighted by comparative studies discussed by Moss and Petrie 2002 and Dahlberg and Moss 2005).

For these reasons alone, the nation state merits retaining as an analytical category (see also Kabeer 2005), notwithstanding the multiple ways it is superseded or traversed by the transnational familial, as well as business relations, of global dynamics. But more than this, national contexts remain key sites for the reworking of international policies, with multiple political valences: undoing or limiting the progressive impetus implied by international human rights legislation (as in the efforts to ward off the application of European human rights legislation in the United Kingdom, for example), or potentially providing some kind of institutional buffer to mediate international demands (as in the national variations in extradition or child custody agreements, for example). As Bornstein’s (2001) analysis

illustrated, cultural and national contexts of familial ties, as well as escalating levels of HIV infection, interacted with transnational relations to structure the possibilities for, and limits of, child sponsorship. Maithreyi and Sriprakash's (2018) discussion of the implementation of the 'right to education' in India as consolidating paternalist state policies in the context of global forces towards the marketisation of education provides a more recent indicative example. Whether as a site of application of, or resistance to, international agencies, nation states remain key arenas for, and of, both discussion and intervention – not least in terms of broadly indicating the range of relevant linguistic and cultural practices involved, including the elaboration of nation-specific conceptions of (proper and improper) childhoods.

In particular, discourses of citizenship have become a key contested arena for children's inscription in and engagement with the nation. Citizenship education is both an implicit and often explicit feature of many nation state's schooling citizens (with schools in the United Kingdom now having an obligation to teach 'fundamental British values'). How nation states legislate to enculturate their young citizens is indicative not only of prevailing models of persuasion and influence but also of sociopolitical preoccupations and priorities. Citizenship and the status of children as citizens (or not) also, of course, articulates key boundaries of emotional and political belonging. As Millei (2014) put it:

Both 'nation' and 'childhood' are invested with attachments, belonging, forms of nostalgia and longing. In the twenty-first-century, interconnected, mobile and transnational world, 'childhood' and 'nation' open productive avenues to engage with children's highly complex everyday and...can serve as a diagnostic tool for testing and grappling with how larger sociopolitical processes are taking shape and operate.

(p. 140)

Indeed, the relations between forms and structures of childhood and the performance of nation are now key areas of analysis (Zembylas 2010; Millei and Imre 2016). As Millei (2019) discusses, the now significant literatures on everyday nationalism – as performed through daily lives and practices – can be combined with analysis of cultural pedagogies that recruit children (as also adults) into normative morally sanctioned habits. In her analysis, national pedagogies (Lappalainen 2006) as explicit educational policies work alongside more implicit codes and ways of being that enact claims and identities of belonging and, correspondingly, exclusion. These features are not necessarily consciously or intentionally communicated but are nevertheless passed on through shared emotional and behavioural patterns of familiarity. Mobilising Fox's (2017) methodological focus on 'breaches' and 'edges' as diagnostic of such assumed rules, Millei suggests, such means '...explore how through iterative processes forms of sociality emerge and experiences sediment in children to make the nation anew in mundane encounters' (p. 94). Such work is sorely needed both in accounting for the increasing grasp populist nationalist rhetoric seems to exercise, and to explore ways of countering this. It is such analysis, as with the interrogation of the structures of affect mobilised by the figure of the child – and navigated by children as well as adults – that is the focus of various chapters in this volume. What is newer in this debate is not only the move towards affect, the attention to embodied experiences, but also the elaboration of specific methodologies that can document and interrogate the performance of nation within specific – in this case childhood-related – settings. Such concerns extend those already informing this book, asserting the bi-directional, mutual, and reciprocal constitution of childhood and nation, of

childhood and development, such that analysis of one not only illuminates the construction and functioning of the other, but can be seen as indispensable to it.

Taking such analyses up in a specific way, attending to the interwoven relations between transnational and national-specific dynamics enables attention to the negotiation and perpetuation of colonial histories within child rights governance practice. Discussing how children's rights and education are structured by, and compromised by, continuing policies that marginalise and indeed consolidate the marginalisation of poor, especially Dalit, communities in India (that Maithreyi and Sriprakash 2018 also discuss), Balagopalan (2019) argues for the need to historicise both the theory and practice of children's rights. She considers recent measures de-regulating child labour (in the name of supporting their families' economic survival), showing how 'the state retains its moral legitimacy through effectively privatizing the social and economic exclusions that have marked the lives of marginal populations' (p. 313). Instead of focusing on national policies on children's rights governance, then, she argues against (what would be) a paternalist or neocolonialist focus on supposedly 'new' entitlements confirmed by recent international child rights legislation to

...instead work with the fragility of legal assurances as that which is necessary but far from sufficient in realigning existing hierarchies...to explore... how the existing apparatus of postcolonial development worked upon these marginal communities to deepen and naturalize existing hierarchies within its citizens.

(p. 314)

Moreover, as a key exemplification of these challenges and contests, I draw on discourses of nation as an intertextual axis to interpellate a further literature informing the analysis offered here. Yuval-Davis (1997) persuasively highlighted how the control and regulation of women's sexuality has long been central to notions of national and cultural belonging (whereby women's behaviour and dress signify cultural integrity and 'honour' across religions and cultures). This is intensified in contexts of struggle and equally of transition, as Clark's (2006) analysis of the burden of representation carried by South African women also indicated. Such perspectives have vital relevance for understandings of children and childhoods. If women's positions have typically been circumscribed according to traditional discourses that elide biological with cultural reproduction, then this precept also produces particular positions for children, as the future products and expressions of these cultural or national identity projects. While the arguments of Yuval-Davis and Anthias (e.g. Yuval-Davis and Anthias 1989; Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1993) were particularly applicable to understanding the practices and positions of minoritised groups within Northern, historically Christian, national contexts (see e.g. Burman 2005b), McClintock's (1995) historical analysis highlighted the centrality of interventions around women and children to the colonial project. She discussed how the naturalised model of the patriarchal family was formulated to warrant the equivalent inequalities instigated by colonial occupation. Themes of the safeguarding of women's sexual purity (also discussed by Ware 1992) that were central to the elaboration and consolidation of colonialism are not dissimilar to those concerning contemporary child protection (in particular, around contests over children's 'innocence', etc.).

Hence, this literature works also to exemplify a key theme of this book: highlighting the interwoven character of women's and children's positions as perhaps one of the most

compelling examples of the so-called interdependence and indivisibility characterising current understandings of rights (see also Burman 2008a, 2018b). This is so, notwithstanding increasing involvement of fathers in childcare in Northern contexts, and longstanding shared care and intergenerational care of children in the South, as well as more recent destabilisations of gender categorisations with the rise of transgender debates. Three key features are worth noting about this. First, it demonstrates the impossibility of dealing with one party, or set of rights holders, without addressing others – and their social, economic, civil, and political rights. While discourses of citizenship initially found favour among both child rights and feminist theorists, as ways of acknowledging and ‘including’ parties who had previously been marginalised or excluded, this privileging of national belonging threatens a corresponding marginalisation and exclusion of those who do not qualify (as in the case of detained asylum seekers, including children whose UNCRC entitlements are often dispensed with because of their precarious residency status).

Second, it also shows the limitations of taking only a synchronic or cross-sectional reading of positions: for the positions of children and women, as cared for and carer, cannot be absolutely separated. This is evident where women and children are treated as politically synonymous (as historically excluded from decision-making rights, for example) or when their economic and welfare interests have been presumed to be equivalent, giving rise to the sometimes mistaken (cf. Peace and Hulme 1993) strategy of giving aid to women on the assumption that it will ‘trickle down’ to children.

Third, as Beinart’s (1992) analysis of historical shifts in the production and content of images of African children highlighted, interventions for women and children, especially in relation to childbirth and early child health, operated as a vital site for performing the ‘benevolence’ of colonial rule and the shaping of docile subjects. Thus, attention to gender issues inflects, and so unifies, but also destabilises the opposition between women and children. Girls are, potentially, incipient mothers; indeed they are often addressed as such within international development policy (think of the slogan: ‘Educate a girl and you educate a nation’; or even more worryingly: ‘Education is the best form of contraception’). As Chapters 9 and 10 argue, in such contexts it is clearly important to resist collapsing the two categories of girl and woman, even as it is equally important to be analytically sensitive to their complex interrelations. Examples of such complexity include Katz’s (2004) description of how children’s labour enabled the women in the rural Sudanese village she studied to maintain their observance of purdah; of how what might be understood as a traditional cultural practice, of giving enemas to babies, or alternatively a form of physical abuse of very young children, was better interpreted as a strategy enabling women’s agricultural labour (Gottlieb 2014); while Bravo’s (2005) study showed how, in Northern industrialised contexts, culturally specific understandings of childrearing practices in relation to discipline and access to such welfare services as therapeutic support can become the arena in which professional-client conflicts are played out within women’s domestic violence refuges. Equally, given reactionary policy pressures that too often address the position of girl-children in terms of reproductive issues (not least with how ‘sex education’ becomes tied to a policy agenda of reducing teenage pregnancy, so erasing the role of boys and men, Stronach et al. 2007), it becomes important to attend to how the rhetorical position of ‘child’ (while rarely, if at all, lived ‘outside’ gendered meanings and relationships) may offer some release or protection from the ‘dangers’ or limited positions available to girls.

Transnational contests and re-inscriptions

New to this revised edition is the focus on transnational relations, with an additional section (Part V) comprising three new chapters. The rise of discussions of the transnational has arisen through feminist, especially black feminist, discussions that focus on border crossing the forging of alliances and solidarities across national (and other associated cultural and language) boundaries (Kaplan et al. 1999; Swarr and Nagar 2012; Patil 2013). Notwithstanding significant debate and critique of the concept (Mendoza 2002), such analyses continue to hold significant promise in taking intersectional analyses of gender, race, and sexuality beyond national borders, and highlighted the importance of the different forms feminist movements take. As McCann and Kim (2013: 15) put it:

Transnational refers to the literal movement of people, ideas, and resources across national boundaries. At the same time, when used to refer to persons, it evokes the processes and experiences of crossing geopolitical borders and identity boundaries. Such crossings have both physical and psychological implications, as migrants live their lives both here and there, physically separated from but often in frequent contact with kin, community, and culture.

Clearly, attending to transnational dynamics requires attending to crossgenerational as well as crossgender issues. These can challenge as well as clarify important collusions and contests between national and familial authorities, not least in how the nation overrules family authority in contexts of migration, as Palmary and Mahati (2015) clarified in their analysis of the selective detention and familial consequences of children crossing national borders in and out of South Africa. Adequate attention to the conditions of and for children's life trajectories correspondingly benefits from transnational analyses, as also Mezzadra and Neilson's (2013a) focus on borders indicates as a key way to trace transformations in relations of labour and capital (which I take up in relation to discussions of childhood in Burman 2019a).

The transnational has increasingly been taken up in a range of other arenas, more recently as analytic tools to explore both connections and (historically or currently constituted) barriers. As Atanasoski (2016: 223) put it: 'Transnational analysis decenters "the center" wherever it may be, and it explores the way that the center is always multiply constituted in and through its relationship to the periphery'. This is where discussions of queer temporalities (Pryor 2017) supplement postcolonial and decolonial critiques to highlight lives lived beyond regimes of the temporality of neoliberal, historically Euro-US dominated, narratives of development. Emerging analyses of postsocialism both extend and disrupt the discourse of transnationalism, but while the latter emphasises connection (even if this connection is one of complicity in perpetrating oppression), the former – in recalling subjugated histories of living under state socialist rule – at the very least demonstrates that capitalism was never monolithic or universal (Atanasoski and Vora 2018). Just as commentators on queer childhoods write of 'growing sideways' to highlight that there is single route to 'growing up' (Stockton 2009), so postsocialist scholars help ward off the erasure of the memory of nonnormative histories of biographical and economic development, fostering resources for imagining alternatives to current hegemonic social, political, and economic arrangements.

The three chapters included here under the rubric of 'transnational relations' significantly revisit and extend the theme of developments in its treatment so far in this book, mobilising

the relationality of North–South dynamics to attend to diversities and subversions as well as the extension of influence. In Chapter 13 this is analysed via the theme of technologies, including mass media, digital, and psychological (as in ‘psy’ expertise in education); while Chapter 14 revisits the genre of aid advertising to see how a major child-focused agency attempts to engage and rework dominant discourses of relative and absolute poverty as they have traditionally – but inadequately – articulated the North–South relationship. In closing the book, Chapter 15 fleshes out, so to speak, the more abstract discussions of Chapters 11 and 12, through analysis of the significance transnational relations producing and shaping the life of a child refugee who became an inspiring activist and therapist working with children, as well as engaging with wider peace and environmental movements. This, more local (to me) example, also brings in a more personal-political note by way of conclusion.

Contents and discontents

To contextualise and position the critical perspectives outlined in this book, I indicate here something of my own trajectory: how I came to be concerned with these questions, as well as how this book came to be composed. As if to underscore the fiction of individual, biographical progress and intellectual teleologies, the chapters comprising this book reflect how my work has not been linear in its own development. (As is addressed in more detailed in Chapter 1), I began as a modernist post-Piagetian researcher, studying developmental psychology not because I was interested in children but, like Piaget (1926, 1929, 1932, 1971, 1972), through an interest in the epistemological questions *fostered by* the study of children. In that sense I was already (as it were) an early subscriber to the modernist developmental fallacy in its broadest claim of answering general questions through the study of children, or rather ‘the child’, as well as the specific version that the earlier you see something the more ‘natural’ it is (Lieven 1981; Burman 1994c). My doctoral research took up Piaget’s clinical method – outlined in Piaget (1929), the neglect of which has further compounded the reception and representation of Piagetian ideas in Anglo-US contexts (Burman 1996b), focusing on his earlier work (Piaget 1919, 1921, 1926, 1951, 1953) – to investigate a more ‘social’ aspect of children’s developing understandings: that of age as a subset of understandings of time (Piaget 1969; see Burman 1990b). But my encounters with children soon forced me to realise that the methodological challenges of researching with, and making claims about, children pose all the key issues about power/knowledge relations that psychologists only inadequately, but quite typically, framed in methodological terms as the ‘performance-competence’ problem (Burman 1992a), while the sentiment surrounding childhood in modern contexts bolsters the logical elisions typically made from individual, to child, to nation state, that obscures more useful ways of thinking (Riegel 1976; Rotman 1978; Broughton 1981a, 1981b).

Developments is composed of two different sets of material: the first, previously published single-authored papers that originally appeared across a range of discipline-based outlets – spanning early education, geography, women’s studies, psychotherapy, literary theory, development studies, and childhood studies. In the first edition I presented these previously published papers in their original form, each prefaced by a commentary offering specific contextualisation and reflection on the particular contribution made by the piece to the argument formulated throughout this book, and with some additional Endnotes.

For this revised, second, edition I have updated both these and the second set of material, comprising previously unpublished papers written specifically for this volume. These have been revised in the light of subsequent shifts and changes, plus I have incorporated the end-notes into the main text for ease of reading.

Completely new to this second edition is now added a further three chapters addressing Transnational Dynamics, written in the last few years and once again revised and updated for publication here. As before I consider that, as a whole, the chapters in this book address a coherent set of preoccupations surrounding the role of rhetorics and metaphors of childhood across a range of theoretical and professional practices that also reflect upon their changes over the historical period spanned by this work, whose particular contexts I try to topicalise rather than erase or obscure. After all, especially in the domain of work around children and childhood, it is all the more important to stay with temporal-spatial specificities of narration and topicalisation. The shift of focus and perspective within these papers not only reflects my own personal developmental trajectory but also intimates changing debates about the nature and conditions of childhood and international development over the period of their formulation. These include notably increasing awareness around environmental degradation and planetary precariousness alongside – at least in the North – more explicit expression of ambivalence about children and childhood – that moves from the cult of infantilisation of the 1980s and 1990s to the pinning of social order and economic self-sufficiency agendas on to the young of the twenty-first century, as the neoliberal agenda has come to make increasing inroads.

In undertaking this revision, I was surprised to see how much of the arguments I was making so many years ago are ones that continue to be made now, often as if they were new discoveries – such is (alongside the disciplinary silos that inhibit transfer of ideas) the persistence of the pernicious trope of childhood innocence and knowledge, the abstraction, reification, idealisation, and globalisation of childhood, and corresponding need to challenge this. Other features emphasised here from the outset, such as the call to articulate local practices surrounding childhood with global discourses and transnational imperatives have since received much more attention (e.g. Twum-Dansoh Imoh and Ame 2012; Lightfoot-Rueda and Peach 2015; Twum-Dansoh Imoh et al. 2019), while the calls for ‘early intervention’ programmes generated from international and percolating into national social policy have become even more influential, with attendant dangers of the regulation and pathologisation of local communities and cultures (Gillies et al. 2018).

Obviously thinking around children’s rights and their articulation in and through specific cultural practices and geopolitical contexts is now a matter of presumption rather than to be argued for, as was the case earlier. Yet even if the theoretical resources currently animating critical childhood and educational (as also critical psychology) arenas are now more likely to be new materialist and posthuman inspired, there remains a need to ground this in analyses of political economy and wider social theory (see also Gerrard et al. 2017). Hence, in the trajectory of my own writing and theoretical development, there are clear lines of continuity between the chapters comprising this book and my later book that is specifically engaged with and inspired by postcolonial and anticolonial resources (Burman 2019a, 2018e), as well as, I hope, contributing a little to these in insisting on the specific role of children and childhood in these.

It is important to clarify that – while very much aiming to *inform* practice – this book does so primarily through an evaluation and formulation of *theoretical* resources. The selection of

papers for this volume draws on, but does not include, my more practical engagements with child rights (Burman 1996a), child fund raising (Burman 1994a, 1994b), or child labour (Burman 2009b) and welfare reform (Bragg et al. 2018; see also Winter et al. 2016; Burman et al. 2017). Rather, the focus here is on the broader, crossdisciplinary resources called for to address the complex and urgent problems posed by children and development. Together these papers present a broad, and now more integrated and updated, perspective on a set of urgent debates; engaging theory and method, policy and practice across all the disciplines that work with, or lay claim to, children's interests including in education, health, and social care as well as the various disciplines involved in development studies. So although composed of separate chapters (which can of course be engaged with independently), the book presents (what I hope remain) a persuasive set of arguments about childhood, culture, and professional practice that is designed to address and engage a wide audience. The sustained focus across a range of disciplinary arenas (psychology, education, cultural studies, child rights, development policy and practice, social policy) strengthens the overall arguments of each chapter, as well as the book as a whole.

While functioning independently, this collection was also originally prepared as a companion book to the second edition of *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology*. Now in its third edition (Burman 2017a) *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology* is obviously much more of a specifically psychological text, critiquing the assumptions and paradigms of developmental psychology in its asocial and abstracted, and so universalised, models of infancy, language development, cognitive development, and even communicative development. It directly engages with the methodological, practical, pedagogical, and ethical-political problems to which developmental psychological models of 'the child' give rise. As a complementary text, *Developments* offers both a wider disciplinary frame (engaging with literature, cultural studies, childhood studies, psychotherapy, economic development policy) and significantly deeper and wider conceptualisation. This is because, after drafting the first edition of *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology* in the early 1990s, I became increasingly concerned with the far-reaching role and functions of developmental psychological theorising outside its Euro-US contexts of initial elaboration (and the later editions reflect on this much more but with a more specific focus on educational, health, and psychological practices than is the focus here). Moreover, if early editions of *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology* may have frustrated some of its (more perceptive) readers by offering less in the way of a *theory* of deconstruction (although in discussing its application it certainly declares and outlines its position), its guiding assumptions and resources, conceptual and methodological rationale – and corresponding dilemmas and debates – are amply discussed below.

I present the material in this second edition of *Developments* in the belief that its arguments are relevant to a range of practitioners as well as policymakers and theorists, including child rights activists and researchers, educationalists, development practitioners, social workers, psychotherapists, and psychologists. While my treatment of development economics is probably insufficiently detailed to be of particular benefit to economists, anthropologists, lawyers, and geographers – though I have certainly drawn upon such perspectives – I would hope that these could also gain from seeing their application to a broader set of debates. Certainly social and political theorists have yet to adequately engage with the ways their core concerns are enacted in and through the domain of childhood and children's lives. Such engagement might include, for example, helping to explain the contextual dependence or even irrelevance of chronological age within definitions of childhood – both