Postdevelopmental Sexualities: Don't Bring the Kids

(¹)

Diederik F. Janssen, MD (²)
Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Paper delivered to the XVIth DGSS Conference: June 25 - 27, 2004, in Lüneburg, Germany

"For every image of the past that is not recognized by the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably" (³)

Abstract: This paper is concerned with contemporary, "postmodern" localisations of "sexual" "development". A collage of recent perspectives and studies is offered in sketching contemporary theoretical currency in developmental sexology. Countercurrently, the exploration is set to demonstrate that while such localisations reflect on the performances of an academic elite, the case for a child-centred or child-structured account is problematised by a trans-disciplinary (and public) hesitation to ground such an account, leaving theoretical proceedings unsupported. This situation both strains and fuels postmodern theorising of early erotics. A discussion of the "post-modernisation" of Simon and Gagnon "script" theory is followed by a brief sightseeing tour to five areas of attention for contemporary developmental sexologists.

"New" and Newly Crossbred Developmental Sexologies

Recently, William Simon identified his momentous *Sexual Conduct* (1973) as a 'prematurely postmodern' study engaged in an "anti-essentialist formulation for approaching sexualities". Co-author John Gagnon elaborates their constructionist "script" approach as follows:

> "Human development becomes the constant shuffling of possibilities as individuals face novel demands on adaptation. The idea that there is a single causal pathway from childhood to adulthood (e.g. as the explanation of sexual preference) seemed a cultural prejudice toward continuity. This desire for continuity in the explanation of the human life course remains prevalent both in the scientific construction of biographies as well in the stories that individuals tell about how they came to be what they are"[4].

Indeed, a range of stirrings within the social sciences has in recent decades been reissuing the academic performance of "childhood" and "sexuality". Just naming them is exciting: postmodernity, post-Enlightenment, poststructuralism, anti-developmentalism, critical pedagogy... This discussion will offer a try at the containment of sexual development from within these ramifications commonly understood collectively as the "postmodern condition"[5] now part of the contemporary academic *Alltag*. Such postmodernity (here taken as to be versed contra universalism, regularity, rationalism, nomotheticism, structurality, foundationalism, evolutionism, idealism, developmentalism), it has been posited, has generally invited a clarification of the 'microgeographies' and 'localities' of 'developments' and 'sexualities' as interdigitating collections of performances, spaces and discourses; hypothetically, therefore, this would have to hold true for 'sexual development'[6], as it does for the entire realms of human learning and sexual endeavour[7].

My thesis, however, will be that while postmodernity, erotics and childhood *do* interbreed as dyads in an emergent, and increasingly trans-disciplinary, playground, they might not do so as a triad. Or rather, that while they might interbreed productively in *contemplative* efforts, they do not on the *empirical* and *implementation* side.

In a longer version of this presentation, and in the entirety of a web-based project I have been running for a year[8], I set out to look at contemporary academic manoeuvring in exploration of what I have tentatively phrased *post-developmental sexology*, ideally connoting an ongoing reconsideration of 'structural' and 'modern' formulations of erotic *trajectories*. In postmodern ontologies, for instance, individual trajectories often are juxtaposed versus 'curricula', that is to say, conglomerates of practices that *embody* and *contain* eventual idiosyncratic trajectories. Our null hypothesis, thus, reads that in a self-congratulating postmodern era such 'trajectories' would begin to appear to us as 'postdevelopmental', that is, they would succeed in emancipating from curricula insofar as these in the past have been uncompromisingly disciplining in terms of chronology, content and governance.

A more specific problem in our present discussion will be what such sexology would do for "the"[9], or any, child's perspective. Even here, we should bear in mind that the term "child-centeredness" historically "balances on many layers of complex and sometimes contradictory meanings that have been forged over the years by competing interest groups, each appropriating the term and, adding to and taking away from the existing meaning, moulding it to their own purposes"[10].

In the remaining time, I would like to briefly review the 'postmodernization' of traditional script theory, followed by a brief tour around a number of test grounds pertaining to the prepubertal case of intimacy development. Predominantly referring to Anglo-Saxon literature, I will mainly address the voice of an American and British elite academic forum.

Preliminarily we might note that in recent days self-critical and self-aware ramifications of social life have fostered an ongoing cross-disciplinarisation of matters that, incidentally, are increasingly cross-bred thematically as well. As Middleton argues, while negotiating imaginable "impasses"[11] of negativism, and among alternative imperatives, we could "let neo-Marxist and postmodern and poststructural theories "rub against each other" "[12]. Likewise, Stein[13] argues for a blending of sociological and cultural analysis that combine insights of psychoanalysis, symbolic interactionism, and discourse analysis that help focus on "the cultural scenarios that make sexual practices possible in culture". Others, including Peter Redman (writing about boyhood masculinities) and Steven Angelides[14] (addressing paedophilia as a "cultural panic"), join this call by advocating fusions of constructionist and psychodynamic theorizing of the broad terrain of growing up sexually.

Concluding, there is considerable theoretical eclecticism, in terms of hybridization of entry styles, mixing different perspectives, and in de- and re-contextualizing conventional limitations of approach. How is our "script" taking this toll?

Postmodernised Scripts (?)[15]

One of many species of developmental sexology, Gagnon and Simon's *script theory* is widely adopted in discussions of the sexual curriculum in childhood, yet it is hardly studied in this age group (an overview of studies is found in *GUS*, Vol. II, p41). In 1981, DeLamater[16] even offered a simplification of script theory advocating the idea that children "are unaware of *the* sexual significance" (*emph. added*) of behaviours later to be recognised as "sexual". Early constructionists thus minimised children's active participation in their "development", that is, practices other than *reception* and *assimilation* of the available propaganda. Moreover, they normalised some "adult" case of sexological signification. Judging from a 1984 article, for instance, it appears that Simon and Gagnon normalised (or at least failed to point out the constructedness of) an adult, "societal", "real" concept of "true", "actual", "manifest", "explicit" "sexuality" that in an essential sense would escape "the" developing subject in his "childhood".

In more contemporaneous articles[17], however, the authors comment on a revolutionary emancipation of Performance in relation to Curriculum, writing, "Lifecycle stages once appeared to specify behaviour; now commitment to behaviour increasingly specifies one's life-cycle stage". Whittier and Simon's (2001) discussion of individuals' "personal sexual culture" furthermore issues the concept of "intrapsychic scripting", demonstrated by "the exhibition of several major domains of meaning as they are contained in the subjects' reports of their sexuality". Simon had previously argued for a trichotomy of texts including cultural scenarios, interpersonal scripts, and intrapsychic scripts. Illustratively, despite this imminent bankruptcy of independent stages, the authors[18] continued to write about "life cycles" textually ordered by stage-stratifications in terms of institutionally and biologically sanctioned "transitions".

Contemporary authors indeed argue that it is essential to consider the ways in which individuals "construct a sense of themselves as sexual beings"[19]. Gender, for instance, is not so much a construed, but a negotiated *performance* in which the child represents an assertive and productive agent, however choosing from available options. Gender appears to be renegotiated and relocated

through "a cycle of practice"[20]. For neo-constructionists, childhood "exists as a type of performance space or 'cultural geography' in which various images and identities are enacted"[21]. Constructionists describe, for instance, "how pubertal events (menarche, breast development, shaving, voice change, weight gain) evoke cultural meanings about gender and gendered bodies that adolescents [!] then use to construct personal meaning and sexual subjectivity"[22]. Research suggests that individual scripts are in fact personal modifications of subcultural scripts. Exploring developmental ghetto sexual identities, one study[23] found that girls had to "negotiate the dominant [stereotypical black, "ghetto"] sexual script and their own personal narrative to create personal and social equilibrium". Using Edwards' theory on "script formulations", it could be argued that "[d]iscourse does not simply reflect or express ready-made cognitive schemas; rather, scripts are actively constructed in interactions through which people 'work up' events as scripted (or as breaches of scripts), and this 'script talk' is analysable in its own right"[24]. Scripts, thus, do not create (sexuality), they get created, *as such*. This specification of "performative sexualities" reinvents essentialist and monolithic notions such as sexual "learning", "informing", "thinking", "knowing", "perceiving" and "understanding"[25], "theorising" (as in psychodynamic theory), and so on. "Scripts", in short, have been externalised as "discourses", "scenes" and, abstractly, "spaces" in which one is to manoeuvre and carve particular routes to a variable degree inspired by established routes that are privately construed *as such* (as routes, as established) in micro-contextual interactions. We now have hierarchies of scripts, and personal ways of navigating these hierarchies. Concluding, so much for "the" child and "the" script.

Ergo, as Carpenter (1995) has verbalised, contemporary register posits that

> "[…] it is through the manipulation, rejection and re-creation of their cultural world that young people simultaneously search for and validate their voice and so situate themselves culturally".

While this all makes for good reading, studies in this genre addressing children are few in number. A recent, predominantly British, school of researchers that, taking a performative-interactionist approach, has recently localised school environments as the central arenas in which sexualities "have their go" in the form of positioning and oppositioning, and through the agonism and antagonism of talk and physical manoeuvring. This line of semi-participant ethnography has been elaborated since the early 1980s by many scholars[26] (scheduled for release this year is a book about "*Junior Sexualities*" by Emma Renold, advertised as to clarify "children's understandings of their own sexualities"). Variably remote from the psychological realm, sexualities here are operationalised as public and semi-public verbal and gestural performances, as discursive, and as embedded in-group dynamics. This line of research, although biased by feminist, anti-harassment, and anti-homophobia agenda, provides an alternative to script theory, or rather, it evades the moral impossibilities associated with any method of closing in on the early cognitive script, a problem routinely lamented by self-addressed 'developmental sexologist' Prof. John Money. An illustrative fact, Money, certainly after his pioneering 1960s, contributed few insights into 'lovemap formation' *as it occurs in children* (which he postulated), beside the wealth of clinical, retrospective, and culture-critical arguments.

For the remainder of this talk, allow me to briefly hint at empirical proceedings in five thematic test grounds. For the sake of brevity, these emerge from a more general discussion of the problems of developmental psychology[27], and from a more philosophically/historically inclined elaboration of 'postmodern' developments / pedagogies / sexualities (in terms of consensus, dialogue, exchange). They include: Ontogenetic 'Subjectivities; Hi/Stories; Knowledge Regimens, Risk Curricula, and Problem Categories; Gazes, Pacing and Agency; and lastly a note on "New" Pedagogies and Absences.

1. <u>Ontogenetic 'Subjectivities'</u>

As illustrated by Broude's overview in 1981 (the title of which is tale-telling: *The cultural management of sexuality*), the main theoretical position with respect to pre-institutional sexualities taken by cross-culturalists used to be an essentialist structuralist one, mostly departing from psychodynamic ontogenetics. This structuralist hegemony has not succeeded in incorporating an idea of emergent erotic individuality; in fact, it prescribed analysis of "patterns", "structures" and "inculcated traits" as "cultural". However, in the various niches of contemporary academia, there seems to exist a blooming transdisciplinary agenda for "developmental subjectivities"[28] as gendered, embodied and desiring. This case for rethinking Selfhoods will be biased by what C. L. Carr (1999) identifies as the range of "rigid, synthetic, and fuzzy" notions of sexual ontology (and we might read: *ontogenetics*) encountered in the academic scene. From Carr's instructive overview it may seem that this range of ontologies (essentialist, constructionist and anarchist) is providing a playground for eclecticists. Something of a child's perspective, however, seems to be underrepresented: the performance of intimacies developing (rather than of *being developed*) is virtually unstudied in what would be a most interesting period in life (see Kelle, 2001 for a note on the child as developmentalist). Typically, as illustrated by a 2004 article[29], when posed to adolescents, this question is reduced to a simplex chronological binary of being "too-early" or "too-late". Nevertheless there has been a growing concern for "classroom", "playground" and "dinner table" subjectivities, as studies with adolescent subjects point out. The case for "performative" subjectivities is marked, and this turn will probably contribute to a more comprehensive coverage in the near future.

2. <u>Hi/Stories</u>

Generally, postmodern historians and philosophers question the representation of history and cultural identities: history as "what 'really' happened" (external to representation or mediation) vs. history as a "narrative of what happened" with a point of view and cultural/ideological interests. History requires representation, mediation, in narrative, a story-form encoded as historical. This central tenet is immediately transferable to the archives of human trajectories, the "childhoods". We are looking for local and explicitly contingent hi/stories, well aware of the politics: who can write? for whom? from what standpoint? Plummer[30], examining the making of "sexual stories" from a symbolic interactionist perspective, implied that children are gradually introduced to a culture characterised by a "recent exponential multiplication of [sexual] narratives", including family, emotional, representational, bodily, gender, erotic, and identity genres. In reality, studies of these stories (addressing ownership, authorship, performance) are sparse as yet, in any case as far as childhood is concerned[31]. As for another peculiarity, while autobiographical material about ´queer´ and gender-disordered childhoods are multiplying in secondary literature, few accounts are available about clinically relevant erotic orientations.

3. <u>Knowledge Regimens, Risk Curricula, and Problem Categories</u>

Much scholarship today issues the interconnectedness of knowledge regulation curricula, 'risk' curricula, and the condition of the developmental body[32]. As it turns out, modernist constructions of childhood stem from the dichotomization of innocence and corruption, the latter being synonymous with knowledge[33] or not far from it. Van Manen observes how "knowledge of and access to the cultural secrets of adult life--such as mature erotic knowledge and sexual practices

[etc.] become main criteria by which childhood is defined"[34]. This lack of knowledge is subjectified, and used to legitimise a protection-centred[35], reactionist (rather than agonistic) pedagogical bureaucracy, engineering age-stratifying ´knowledge wars´[36]. Note that this is occurring in spite of disappointingly few insights to the subjective autobiographical decursus of 'innocence'[37]. Filling the gap, authors such as Corteen and Scraton[38] have argued how "innocence" would be "manufactured", through practices which, as Reynolds[39] has noted, may be part of a wider disempowering objectification agenda.

Abstractly, the concept of innocence invites an analysis of three interlocked procedures, namely *transition, transgression and transmission*. The contemporary reappraisal of "innocence" can hardly avoid addressing a deeply ingrained triadic scheme composed of inevitable trauma, inevitable knowledge and inevitable "sexuality", the basic ingredients of psychodynamic theory. Since S. Freud appreciation natural categories and normal structures of the familial-societal complex in conflict with what would be man's psychic ultrastructure, an inevitable functional structure has been guiding clinical truths as well as academic classificationism. As argued in *GUS*, age-stratified distributions of sex-as-science translate to the compartimentalisation and curricularisation of sex, processes, as Michel Foucault observed, readily infused by nosological ramifications (that's *nosology*, the systematic classification of diseases).

Over the course of two decades, the whole matter has taken on a rather problematic character: the increasing need for truths and their institutional production and management, against the background of the bankruptcy of its very essences. *Contra* post-modern activism, today we see feverish effort to categorise and diagnose all ingredients of psychodynamic heritage, still intimately joined (knowledge -trauma - sexuality). We now hear about "preadolescent predators", with "sexual behaviour problems", as documented by the *Child Sexual Behaviour Inventory*, an instrument –tipped as the clinical "bible"– solely invented to "diagnose" abusive experiences. Illustratively, since the early 1980s I counted no less than 90 studies providing numeric and statistical impetus to the concept of "reactive sexual behaviour" in prepubertal children, thought of as "symptomatic" of "abusive" experiences.

Among the 'hip' appears to be not the deconstruction of educational and clinical praxis as an exercise of restraint (= control = arbitrary = "bad") but the "exposure" (outing) of imminent subversion of the status quo, a thesis elaborated by a number of authors including Thorogood[40]. Even acts of rendering "alternative" forms of experience valid and visible simultaneously also construct them as "sites for monitoring and regulation, as the objects of disciplinary power". Thus, "[l]iberal pluralist "empowerment" models of sex education have the unintended consequence of producing micro-techniques of power and are not unequivocally liberating or resisting"[41]. Not cited by Thorogood, Monk[42] previously had set out to demonstrate how sex education programmes are increasingly "deployed to govern [teenage] sexuality" by problematising its interactional ontology.

So in sum, (1) we seem to have ended up with more politicised knowledge, more risks, and more categories; (2) children's perceptions and contestations of these issues are hardly ever considered.

4. Gazes, Pacing and Agency

In *GUS* I have tentatively classified four contemporary gazes of the child as the "incestuous" gaze (psychoanalysis), the "patriarch" gaze (feminism), the "paedophilic" gaze (sociology, forensic psychiatry), and the (male) "peer" (though sexist, heterosexist, objectifying, etc.) gaze[43]. I concluded that these constituted a "gaze curriculum" that allegedly proves traumatic from

normative to *perverse* pole. The crucial issue of "being gazed at", meanwhile, has been underrepresented in academic discourse, as well as being heavily politicised, until recently; the masculine side appears to be neglected as well. More broadly speaking, the literature is predominantly geared toward 'exposing' ('outing', 'naming/shaming') the scopic environments of the child, not toward children (ideas most prominently developed in James Kincaid and in Chris Jenks). Again, a child's eye perspective appears to be peripheral in these writings. This articulates badly, conversely, with a related component of postmodern sexologies, which is *agency*: for, theoretically, "Where the modern child was seen as dependent upon varying levels of adult attention, supervision, and protection, the postmodern child is more often seen as capable of dealing independently with complex issues presented in the media and encountered in the world"[44]. Few studies substantiate the idea that this independency is forthcoming in the area of erotic self-determination, as judged from the ongoing legal cocooning of children, within evermore 'risky' (for instance digital) environments. A pioneer of the mentioned ethnographic approach, Barry Thorne[45] argued that the (re-)issuing of children's agency is a complex task; today, this may have become more "complex". One factor may be that the whole notion of erotic aptitude seems to be interlocked in increasingly hard to negotiate notions of pacing, timing, 'hurriedness', and 'inappropriate' introductions, whether 'cultural' or incidental in nature.

5. "New" Pedagogies and Absences

A range of people and institutions in the course of the late 20th century have identified themselves with "anti-authoritarian", "democratic"[46], "radical", "critical", "feminist", and "queer"[47] agenda, that is, each activist motive fostered a theoretical programme implying an ontogenetic rationale and pedagogical agenda. Among the broad claims, these people seek to subvert essentialised identities, normalities and hierarchies, primarily in institutional-scholastic settings. In spite of these initiatives, and apart from the new dialectic opportunities they propagate[48], many researchers point out that there is a progressively oppressive industry of body surveillance involved in primary education. For instance, in a series of articles Alison Jones[49] describes the novel curriculum of self-surveillance and the production of "safety" in the management of New Zealand primary school body proximities. A score of authors suggests the early touch curriculum in the US is likewise changing its face[50], with potential pleasures of both parties "erased". This may not prove a very specific culture trait. In England, according to Skelton[51] and Australia, according to Sumsion[52], too, male teachers have come to represent an *a priori* problematic factor in educational settings. Interestingly, all these authors observed the teachers' side, not the children's. Concurrently, US mainstream ethics apparently allow 'abstinence' governed curricula as elementary reflections on human essentials: Curricula of Risk Management policing Curricula of Risk Behaviour. Meanwhile, sexual abuse prevention programmes are hardly postmodern: they propagandise binary normative notions of touch, with a privileging of the "no" option and eradication of in-between and hybrid realities. Obviously, the production of *Not-doing*, of *preliminalities*, *anticipations* and 'risks' ('virginities', *no*-touch, *red flag people*) is a fruitful yet badly neglected research object in sexology[53].

Postmodernist entries to pre-institutional sexuality can at times be distinctly emancipating and interventionalist[54]. The feminist case for authentic "girlhoods" has proven some instrumentality in observing, localising, penetrating, conserving, deconstructing, imagining, and saving such 'hoods; to consolidate such ventures, a number of authors have issued how 'the child' would be "a feminist issue". What impresses the unsuspecting reader is the degree of essentialism involved in these writings. In general, D. Carr[55] argues that conceptions of moral formation have been "inherently normative—precisely, more evaluative than descriptive—". The new pedagogies,

thus, may prove too self-centred, too interventionalist, too universalist and too evaluative to forge truly honest micro-accounts of emerging sexualities.

Summarising Arguments

In matters concerning developmental sexology, the usual context for writing about "postmodernities" is, paradoxically enough, that of an era in which children *in general* are seen to be trapped in *particular*, *inescapable new* kinds of *passive* reception or "cultural" immersion, in terms of risk discourses (Valerie Walkerdine), deprivation with regard to normative structure (Kay Hymowitz)[56], recruitment in nostalgia projects (Chris Jenks[57]) and in otherwise regimental 'cultures' (James Kincaid). This brand of culture-critique in itself is not very hopeful; it is not very post-modern either.

However it remains possible to look at the instruments of an enduring modern regimen that serves to align, civilise and uniformise human pathways, possibilities and imminent originality. In the expectation of a major event on matters next year[58], I do not claim that erotic authenticity is anywhere likely or attainable a concept. I *do* think, however, that when it comes to 'American' Eros, there has been an increased sensitivity regarding any form of dissent (if only 'developmental'), and that such vigilance is progressively vandalising even the developments formerly contained as 'essential', 'likely', 'natural', 'explicable', 'anticipating', 'entitled' and 'important'. What remains is an unworkable situation for 'development', as an action and as a passion.

A perspective proposed by many including Simon and Gagnon, post-industrial contexts would be fading out on curricular categories. In my view, however, the essence of sexological cultures worldwide, with gender and other dichotomies eroding, seems increasingly tied up to *curricular status quo* (i.e., age stratification), and as far as I am concerned today this is seen to run deeper discursively than gender configurations (a point I like to refine in future elaborations). To counterbalance ongoing medico-legal encroaching on children's life spaces (in terms of 'prevention', 'awareness', and 'health promotion'), some humanistic implications of my reviewing can nonetheless be listed in brief (for someone at home in contemporary literature it will seem obvious that today these are remote from substantial implementation):

- With regard to **ontological status**, one imagines a de-privileging of adult sexualities as norm, normal and normative, that is, a reconsideration of the reductionism implied in mainstream "development" stories. In issues addressed with the term 'sexuality', the discursively non-developable seems to be obscured by the discursively developable and the developable reduced to its developing. In other words, "the boy is just being curious, of course this will pass over when he's satisfied, don't worry about it too much";

- As is concerned **functional-structural status**, one observes the need for deconstructionist approaches to pre-adult sexualities when propagandised as "necessary", "essential", "healthy", "critical", "at risk", "plausible", "contributory", and, indeed, "developmental" (I leave out more horrendous formulations like "sexual learning");

- Obviously the foregoing necessitates a reassignment of **methodological priority** to privilege recognition of agency, performance and subjectivities;

- **Thematically**, study needs to appreciate the ways in which Curricula might be contested, adapted and digested (rather than internalised). A rather well explored topic is that of the development / construction of "variant" orientation within alleged "variant-phobic" or "normalist" environments (e.g., "homosexuality" within U.S. "homophobic" and "heterosexist" society). A rather unexplored

theme is that of "deviate" orientation within "deviance-hostile" environments (e.g., "paedophilia" within U.S. "abuse culture" [Kincaid]). Both the fact that such studies are apparently not appreciated or funded, and the data they might generate, are dramatically and immediately "culture"-identifying, and of obvious interest to constructionists. In identifying and mapping the cultural manufacture of normalities, study needs to be directed to these nonnormative or atypical trajectories, as well as to the atypical in not so institutionally atypical trajectories.

Literature Cited and Considered

- Aitken, S. C. (2001). *Geographies of Young People: The Morally Contested Spaces of Identity.* London & New York: Routledge.

- Ajzenstadt, M., & Cavaglion, G. (2002). The sexual body of the young Jew as an arena of ideological struggle, 1821-1948. *Symbolic Interaction*, 25,1, 93-116.

- Amuchastegui-Herrera, A. (2001). The hybrid construction of sexuality in Mexico and its impact on sex education. *Sex Education*, 1,3:259-77.

- Angelides S. (2003). Historicizing affect, psychoanalyzing history: pedophilia and the discourse of child sexuality, *J Homosex* 46,1-2:79-109.

- Angelides, S. (2004). Feminism, Child Sexual Abuse, and the Erasure of Child Sexuality. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 10,2:141-77.

- Baber, K. M., & Murray, C. I. (2001). A Postmodern Feminist Approach to Teaching Human Sexuality. *Family Relations*, 50,1, 23-33.

- Barker, Ph. (1998). *Michel Foucault: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Beausang, C. C. (2000). Personal Stories of Growing up Sexually. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, 23,3, 175-192.

- Bhattacharyya, G. (2002). *Sexuality and Society: An Introduction.* New York: Routledge.

- Blume, L. B. & Blume, T. W. (2003). Toward a dialectical model of family gender discourse: Body, identity, and sexuality. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65,4, 785-94.

- Bradley, B. S. (1993). The future of developmental theory, *Theory & Psychology*, 3,4, 403-414.

- Britzman, D. P. (1998). *Lost Subjects, Contested Objects: Toward a Psychoanalytic Inquiry of Learning.* New York: State University of New York Press.

- Broude, G. (1981). The cultural management of sexuality. In R. L. Munroe, R. Munroe, & B. Whiting, (Eds.). *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Human Development* (p633-673). New York: Garland STPM.

- Brownlie, J. (2001). The "Being-Risky" Child: Governing Childhood and Sexual Risk. *Sociology*, 35,2, 519-537.

- Bryson, M. & de Castell, S. (1993). Queer pedagogy: Praxis makes im/perfect, Canadian Journal of Education, 18,3, 285-305.

- Bullough, V. L. & Ruan, F. (1990). Sex Education in Mainland China. *Health Education*, 21,2, 16-19.

- Burman, E. (1995). "What is it?" Masculinity and femininity in cultural representations of childhood, in S. Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger (Eds.). *Feminism and Discourse: Psychological Perspectives* (p49-67). London: Sage.

- Burman, E. (1997). Developmental Psychology and Its Discontents, in Fox, D. & Prilleltensky, I. (Eds.) *Critical Psychology: An Introduction.* London [etc.]: SAGE, p134-49

- Burrows, L., & Wright, J. (2001). Developing Children in New Zealand School Physical Education. *Sport, Education & Society*, 6, 2, 165-182.

- Buzwell, S. & Rosenthal, D. (1996). Constructing a sexual self: Adolescents' sexual self-perceptions and sexual risk-taking, *Journal for the Research on Adolescence*. 6,4, 489-513.

- Carpenter, C. H. (1995). *In Our Own Image: The Child, Canadian Culture and Our Future.* Paper for the 9th Annual Robarts Lecture, March 29.

- Carr, C. L. (1999). Cognitive scripting and sexual identification: essentialism, anarchism, and constructionism, *Symbolic Interaction*, 22,1, 1-24.

- Carr, D. (2002). Moral Education and the Perils of Developmentalism, *Journal of Moral Education*, 31,1:5-19.

- Carr, D. (Ed.). (1998) *Education, Knowledge and Truth.* London: Routledge.

- Chung, Sh., & Walsh, D. J. (2000). Unpacking child-centredness: a history of meanings. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32,2, 215-34.

- Corteen, K. & Scraton, P. (1997). 'Prolonging 'Childhood'': Manufacturing 'Innocence' and Regulating Sexuality'. In P. Scraton (Ed.). *Childhood in Crisis.* London: UCL Press.

- Cotton, S., Mills, L., Succop, P.A. et al. (2004). Adolescent girls' perceptions of the timing of their sexual initiation: "Too young" or "just right"? *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 34,5, 453-8.

- Danvers, j. (2003). Towards a radical pedagogy: Provisional notes on learning and teaching in art and design. *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 22,1, 47-57.

- Devrome, M. A. (1997). *Sexuality in Adolescence: Recounting Lived Experience.* PhD Dissertation, University of Calgary.

- Dio-Bleichmar, E. (1995). The secret in the constitution of female sexuality: The effects of the adult's sexual look upon the subjectivity of the girl. *Journal of Clinical Psychoanalysis*, 4,3, 331-342.

- Dio-Bleichmar, E. (1996). Tópica intersubjetiva del significado sexual en la niña, *Revista de Psicoanálisis*, 53,2, 413-428.

- Diorio, J. A., & Munro, J. A. (2000). Doing Harm in the Name of Protection: Menstruation as a Topic for Sex Education. *Gender & Education*, 12,3, 347-365.

- Elden, S. (2001a). *The History of Sexuality and the Constitution of the State.* Paper prepared for delivery at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, August 30-September 2.

- Elden, S. (2001b). The constitution of the normal: monsters and masturbation at the Collège de France, *boundary*, 2, 28,1, 91-105.

- Elkind, D. (1995). School and family in the postmodern world. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77, 8-14.

- Elkind, D. (1997a). The death of child nature: education in the postmodern world. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79, 241-245.

- Elkind, D. (1997b). Schooling and family in the postmodern world. *Yearbook* (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development). p27-42.

- Forrester, M. A. (1999a). Reflections and projections of the developing self. *Theory and Psychology*, 9,1, 29-46

- Forrester, M. A. (1999b). Recognising the gauntlet: Anti-developmentalism in developmental psychology. *British Journal of Psychology*, 90, 305-311.

- Foucault, M. (1976). *Histoire de la Sexualité.* Vol. 1. 1980 English ed., New York: Vintage Books.

- Foucault, M. (Ewald, F. et al., eds., 1999). *Les Anormaux; Cours au Collège de France (1974-1975).* [Paris]: Gallimard / Seuil.

- Frayser, S. G. (1994). Defining normal childhood sexuality: An anthropological approach. *Annual Review of Sexual Research*, 5, 173-217.

- Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. (1973). *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality.* 1974 paperback ed. Chicago, IL: Aldine Press.

- Giroux, H. A. (1996). Teenage Sexuality, Body Politics and the Pedagogy of Display, *Rev Educ Pedagogy Culture Studies* 18,3, 307-331. Reprinted in J. S. Epstein (Ed.). *Youth Culture: Identity in a Postmodern World* (p24-55). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Goldman, R. & Goldman, J. (1981). *Children's Sexual Thinking: A Comparative Study of Children Aged 5-15 Years in Australia, the United States of America, England, and Sweden.* London: Routledge.

- Harris, D. (1993). The cute and the anti-cute. *Harper's Magazine*, 287, 26.

▪ Haywood, Ch. (1996). Sex education policy and the regulation of young people's sexual practice. *Education Review*, 48,2, 121-129.

▪ Heins, M. (2001). *Not in Front of the Children: Indecency, Censorship, and the Innocence of Youth.* Hill & Wang.

▪ Hengst, H. (1999). *Agency, Change and Social Structure: Children's Culture(s) in Societies of late Modernity.* Paper presented at the Conference Research in Childhood. Sociology, Culture and History, Denmark.

▪ Hillman, Ph. L. (2000). *Negotiating the Dominant Sexual Script: Middle-Class Black Girls Tell Their Story*, DAI-A 60, 7, Jan,2698-A.

▪ Holt, J. C. (1974). *Escape from Childhood.* New York: E. P. Dutton.

▪ Horowitz, G. (1987). The Foucaultian Impasse: No Sex, No Self, No Revolution. *Political Theory*, 15,1, 61-80.

▪ Hostetler, A. J. & Herdt, G. H. (1998). Culture, sexual lifeways, and developmental subjectivities: rethinking sexual taxonomies. *Social Research*, 65,2, 249-291.

▪ Howley, Ai., Spatig, L., & Howely, C. (1999). Developmentalism deconstructed, in J. L. Kincheloe, Sh. R. Steinberg, et al. (Eds.). *Rethinking Intelligence: Confronting Psychological Assumptions about Teaching and Learning* (p27- 49). New York: Routledge.

▪ Irvine, J. M. (2000). Doing It with Words: Discourse and the Sex Education Culture Wars. *Critical Inquiry*, 27,1, 58-76.

▪ Jackson, S., & Scott, S. (1999). Risk anxiety and the social construction of childhood. In D. Lupton (Ed.). *Risk and Sociocultural Theory: New Directions and Perspectives* (p86-107). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

▪ Janssen, D. F. (2002-3). *Growing Up Sexually*. Volume II: *The Sexual Curriculum: The Manufacture and Performance of Pre-Adult Sexualities.* Amsterdam / Nijmegen / Berlin. Download fulltext: http://www.books-reborn.org/janssen

▪ Janssen, D. F. (Nov., 2003). *Post-Development, Erotic Propaedeusis, Spinal Ankylosis, and the Perpetual Poetics of Curricularity.* Unpublished reflection [available from http://www.student.kun.nl/d.f.janssen/GUS/reflect/janssen2003propaedeusis.htm]

▪ Jenkins, Ph. (1998). *Moral Panic: Changing Concepts of the Child Molester in Modern America.* New Haven & London: Yale University.

▪ Jenks, Ch. (1995). Constituting Child Abuse-A Problem of Late Modernity? *Sociol Stud Child*, 7, 155-175.

▪ Jenks, Ch. (1996). *Childhood.* London: Routledge.

▪ Jenks, Ch. (1997). Kindheitsbilder und der Diskurs uber den sexuellen Mißbrauch, *Zeitschrift für Sexualforschung* 10,3, 208-222.

▪ Johnson, R. (1996). Sexual Dissonances: Or the 'Impossibility' of Sexuality Education. *Curriculum Studies*, 4,2, 163-189.

▪ Johnson, R. (1997). The "no touch" policy, in Tobin, J. J. (Ed.) *Making a Place for Pleasure in Early Childhood Education.* New Haven: Yale University Press, p101-18.

▪ Johnson, R. T. (2000) *Hands Off! The Disappearance of Touch in the Care of Children.* New York: Peter Lang.

▪ Jones, A. (2003a). Primary Teacher Trainees: identity formation in an age of anxiety, Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education 31,3:181-93.

▪ Jones, A. (2003b). Touching children: policy, social anxiety and the 'safe' teacher, *Journal of Curriculum Theorising,* 19,2:103–16.

▪ Jones, A. (2004). Social anxiety, sex, surveillance, and the 'safe' teacher, British Journal of Sociology of Education 25,1:p53-66.

- Jones, A. (*in press*). Risk Anxiety, Policy and the Spectre of Sexual Abuse in Early Childhood Education, *Discourse*, 25, 3, 2004 [author's draft, received Jun 21, 2004]

- Jones, A. (*in press*). *Sex, Fear and Pedagogy: Sylvia Ashton-Warner's Infant Room.* To be published in McConaghy, Cathryn & Robertson, Judith P. (Eds.) *Provocations: Sylvia Ashton-Warner and Excitability in Education* [author's draft, received Jun 21, 2004]

- Jordan, E. & Cowan, A. (1995). Warrior Narratives in the Kindergarten Classroom Renegotiating the Social Contract? *Gender & Society* 9,6, 727-743.

- Karmanoila, A., Knecht, C., & Parrat-Dayan, S. (1992/3) Le discours sur la sexualité infantile. Évolution du XIXe siècle à nos jours. *Bulletin de Psychologie*, 46(409), 121-129.

- Kelle, H. (2001). The discourse of "development": how 9- to 12-year-old children construct "childish" and "further developed" identities within their peer culture. *Childhood*, 8,1, 95-114.

- Kelley, P., Buckingham, D., & Davies, H. (1999). Talking dirty: children, sexual knowledge and television. *Childhood* 6,2, 221-242.

- Kennedy, D. (2002). The Child and Postmodern Subjectivity. *Educational Theory*, 52,2, 155-167.

- Kincaid, J. (1998). *Erotic Innocence: The Culture of Child Molesting.* London: Duke University Press.

- Kline, S. (1999). *Moral Panics and Video Games.* Paper presented at the conference *Research in Childhood.* Sociology, Culture and History, University of Southern Denmark

- Krivacska, J. J. (1993). Antisexualism in Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programs-- Good Touch, Bad Touch … Don't Touch? *Issues in Child Abuse Accusations* 5,2. [http://www.ipt-forensics.com/journal/volume5/j5_2_3.htm]

- Lamanna, M. A. (1999). Living the postmodern dream - Adolescent women's discourse on relationships, sexuality, and reproduction. *Journal of Family Issues.* 20,2, 181-217.

- Leahy, T. (1991). *Negotiating Stigma: Approaches to Intergenerational Sex.* PhD thesis presented to the University of New South Wales. Online ed., Books-Reborn.

- Luhmann, S. (1998). Queering/querying pedagogy? Or, pedagogy is a pretty queer thing. In Pinar, William F. (Ed). Queer theory in education. (pp. 141-155). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Manen, M. van, & Levering, B. (1996). *Childhood's Secrets: Intimacy, Privacy, and the Self Reconsidered.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Martin, K. A. (1995). *Puberty, Sexuality, and the Self: Gender Differences at Adolescence*, DAI-A 55(9-A):3006.

- Masschelein, J. (2001). The Discourse of the Learning Society and the Loss of Childhood. By: *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 35,1, 1-20.

- McAdams, D, P. (2001). The Psychology of Life Stories. *Review of General Psychology*, 5,2, 100-122.

- McKay, A. (1998). *Sexual Ideology and Schooling: Towards Democratic Sexuality Education.* The Althouse Press.

- McLaren, P. (1994). Moral panic, schooling, and gay identity: Critical pedagogy and the politics of resistance, High School Journal, 77,1-2, 157-68.

- Meyer, J. (1996). Sexuality and power: perspectives for the less powerful. *Theory & Psychology*, 6,1, 93-119.

- Middleton, S. (1998). *Disciplining Sexuality: Foucault, Life Histories, and Education.* New York & London; Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

- Monk, D. (1998). Sex education and the problematization of teenage pregnancy: a genealogy of law and governance, *Social & Legal Studies*, 7,2, 239-259.

- Morss, J. R. (1996). *Growing Critical: Alternatives to Developmental Psychology.* London & New York: Routledge.

- Moss, P., Pence, A., & Dahlberg, G. (1999). *Beyond Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: Postmodern Perspectives*. London, UK: Falmer Press.

- Mullaney, J. (2001) Like A Virgin: Temptation, Resistance, and the Construction of Identities Based on "Not Doings", *Qualitative Sociol* 24,1:3-24.

- Olssen, M. (1999). *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education*. Critical Studies in Education and Culture Series. Westport, Conn. Bergin & Garvey.

- Phelan, A. M. (1997). Classroom management and the erasure of teacher desire, in Tobin, J. J. (Ed.) *Making a Place for Pleasure in Early Childhood Education*. New Haven: Yale University Press, p76-100.

- Plummer, K. (1994). *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds*. London: Routledge.

- Plummer, K. (1995). Telling Sexual Stories in a Late Modern World, *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 18, 101-20.

- Poster, M. (1984). *Foucault, Marxism and History: Mode of Production Versus Mode of Information*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Rademakers, J., Laan, M., & Straver, C. J. (2000). Studying children's sexuality from the child's perspective. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, 12,1-2, 49-60.

- Redman, P. (2001). The discipline of love: Negotiation and regulation in boy's performance of a romance-based heterosexual masculinity. *Men & Masculinities*, 4,2, 186-200.

- Reynolds, P. (2000). Citizenship, sexuality and youth: some conceptual considerations, in K. Crawford, & K. Straker, (Eds.). *Citizenship, Young People and Participation: Conference Proceedings* (p16-29). Leicestershire: JPC publishing.

- Rivkin-Fish, M. (1999). Sexuality education in Russia: defining pleasure and danger for a fledgling democratic society. *Social Science and Medicine*, 49,6, 801-814.

- Robertson, Th. L. (1997). Gay male development: Hermeneutic and self psychological perspectives, DAI, 1997 Apr; Vol 57(10-B): 6589.

- Rogers, W. S., & Rogers, R. S. (1999). What is good and bad sex for children? In M. King (Ed.). *Moral Agendas for Children's Welfare* (p179-197). Florence, KY, USA: Routledge.

- Schalet, A. (1999). *Raging Hormones, Regulated Love: Adolescent Sexuality and the Constitution of the Individual in the United States and the Netherlands*. Paper presented to the Society for Comparative Research / Center for Comparative Social Analysis, UCLA, May 8-9, LA.

- Schmauch, U. (1996). Körperberührung unter Generalverdacht? Zur Skandalisierung und Tabuisierung von sexuellem Kindesmissbrauch, *Zeitschr f Sozialisationsforsch & Erziehungssoziol* 16,3:284-98.

- Schneider, B. E., Nardi, P. M., Gagnon, J., & Simon, W. (1999). John H. Gagnon and William Simon's Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality: A 25th Anniversary Retrospective by the Authors. *Sexualities*, 2,1;113-33.

- Schwartz, D. (1999). The temptations of normality: Reappraising psychoanalytic theories of sexual development. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 16,4, 554-64.

- Scott, S., Jackson, S., & Backett-Milburn, K. (1998). Swings and Roundabouts: Risk Anxiety and the Everyday Worlds of Children. *Sociology*, 32,4, 689-705.

- Scott, S., Jackson, S., Backett-Milburn, K. & Harden, J. (1998) *Risk Anxiety and the Social Construction of Childhood*. Paper for the International Sociological Association

- Simon, W. & Gagnon, J. H. (1984). Sexual Scripts, *Society* 22,1(153):53-60.

- Simon, W. & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change, *Arch Sex Behav* 15,2:97-120

- Simon, W. (1996). *Postmodern Sexualities*. New York: Routledge

- Skelton, Ch. (1991). A Study of the Career Perspectives of Male Teachers of Young Children, *Gender & Educ* 3,3:279-89.

- Stein, A. (1997). Sex after "Sexuality": From Sexology to Post-Structuralism, in Owen, D. (Ed.). *Sociology after Postmodernism.* London: Sage, p158-72

- Stoler, A. L. (1995). *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Sumsion, J. (1999). Critical Reflections on the Experiences of a Male Early Childhood Worker, *Gender & Education* 11,4:455-68.

- Sweet, S. (1998). Practicing radical pedagogy: Balancing ideals with institutional constraints, *Teaching Sociology*, 26,2, 100-11.

- Thormann, J. (1996). The unconscious and the construction of the child. *Literature & Psychology*, 42,4, 16-36.

- Thorne, B. (1987). Re-Visioning Women and Social Change: Where are the Children? *Gender & Society* 1,1:85-109.

- Thorogood, N. (1992). Sex Education as Social Control. *Critical Public Health*, 3,2, 43-50.

- Thorogood, N. (2000). Sex education as a disciplinary technique: Policy and Practice in England and Wales. *Sexualities*, 3,4, 425-438.

- Tien, L. (1994). Children's Sexuality and the New Information Technology: A Foucaultian Approach. *Social & Legal Studies*, 3,1, 121-147.

- Tobin, J. (2001). Childhood sexuality after Freud: The problem of sex in early childhood education, in Winer, J. A. & Anderson, J. W. (Eds.). *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. XXIX. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press, p179-98.

- Tobin, J. J. (1997). Playing doctor in two cultures: The United States and Ireland, in Tobin, J. J. (Ed.) *Making a Place for Pleasure in Early Childhood Education.* New Haven, CT, US: Yale University Press, 119-58.

- Tolman, D. L. (2001). Echoes of sexual objectification: Listening for one girl's erotic voice. In D. L. Tolman, & M. Brydon-Miller, (Eds.). *From Subjects to Subjectivities: A Handbook of Interpretive and Participatory Methods* (p130-44). *Qualitative Studies in Psychology.* New York: New York University Press.

- Wagener, J. R. (1998). The Construction of the Body Through Sex Education Discourse Practices. In Th. S. Popkewitz, & M. Brennan (Eds.). *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge, and Power in Education* (p144-70). New York & London: Teachers College, Columbia University.

- Walkerdine, V. (1993). Beyond developmentalism? *Theory & Psychology*, 3,4, 451-69.

- Walkerdine, V. (1999). Childhood Sexuality and the Subjectivity of the Researcher. In W., Maiers, B. Bayer, et al. (Eds.). *Challenges to Theoretical Psychology.* Toronto / New York: Captus Press.

- Walkerdine, V. (2001). Safety and danger: Childhood, sexuality, and space at the end of the millennium. In K. Hultqvist, & G. Dahlberg, (Eds.). *Governing the Child in the New Millennium* (p15-34). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

- Walsh, A., Parker, E., & Cushing, A. (1999). "How am I gonna answer this one?": A discourse analysis of fathers' accounts of providing sexuality education for young sons. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 8,2, 103-14.

- Whittier, D. & Simon, W. (2001). The fuzzy matrix of "my type" in intrapsychic sexual scripting, *Sexualities* 4,2:139-65.

- Woodson, S. E. (1999). Mapping the Cultural Geography of Childhood or, Performing Monstrous Children. *Journal of American Culture.* 2,4, 31-43.

Notes

---

[1] This paper is based on four reflections written as far back as 2002 in the context of project *Growing Up Sexually*, henceforward: **GUS**, themselves drawing particularly from appendix IV, and further from chapters 1, 7 and 16 of the two-volume e-book corpus web-published under the same name. The work presents a cursory and tentatively ethnological reflection on the performance of pre-adult intimacies/sexualities. The initial work was financially supported by the Amsterdam-based Dr. Edward Brongersma Foundation.

[2] D.F.Janssen@student.kun.nl

[3] Walter Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History", in *Illuminations*, Ed. Hannah Arendt. Transl. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, 1969, p253–64

[4] Sneider et al. (1999:p123)

[5] An expression originally ventured by Lyotard.

[6] Aitken, (2001); GUS, *op.cit.*

[7] Cf. Masschelein (2001)

[8] http://www.growingupsexually.tk

[9] Rademakers et al. (2000)

[10] Chung and Walsh (2000)

[11] Horowitz (1987)

[12] Middleton (1998:ix-x)

[13] Stein (1997)

[14] Angelides (2003, 2004)

[15] I am building here on GUS, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, ch.1, which can be consulted for a general discussion of theoretical formats.

[16] DeLamater (1981:p269-71)

[17] E.g., 1984, 1999

[18] E.g., Gagnon (1989)

[19] Buzwell and Rosenthal (1996)

[20] Jordan and Cowan (1995)

[21] Woodson (1999)

[22] Martin (1995)

[23] Hillman (2000)

[24] Frith and Kitzinger (2000:p216)

[25] All available in the 1981 classic by Goldman and Goldman.

[26] Including Best, Epstein, Connolly, Kehily, Luria, Nayak, Lee, Mac an Ghaill, Redman, Renold, Skelton, Thorne, Walkerdine, and Wolpe.

[27] It may be appreciated that developmentalist discourses represent a limiting force (Howley et al., 1999), a restraint on **trajectorial plurality and self-determination**. For instance, Burrows and Wright (2001) demonstrated how "the construction of a normative, hierarchical trajectory for child development categorises, classifies and marginalises groups of children whose developmental patterns differ from those mapped out in [a physical education] syllabus". Generally, developmentalist discourses aid normalising projects (Schwartz, 1999) at the expense of tolerance (and also of investigation) of **plurality, polymorphy and ambiguity**. A most compelling observation apparent from ongoing literature reviewing is concerned with the conceptualisation of "childhood" and "adolescence" as continua in the course of "turning adult" (in diverse emic texts: turning "boy-crazy", becoming "hot", "awakening") being a **cross-culturally diverse** issue. This sensitises contemporary quests for "normative" baselines, perhaps especially "cross-culturally informed" ones (Frayser, 1994). The material in the Atlas part of the project (*Volume I*) was collected partly in the hope that it would contribute to avoidance of, as Valerie Walkerdine (1993) phrases the thing, "fetishizating western rationality as the universal pinnacle of development" (cf. Bradley, 1993). This is particularly relevant in projects addressing "life phases" as "monolithic cultural categories" (Burman, 1995). Today, sociologists begin to address how such categories could be and are being "construed", "deconstructed", "decoded", "reconstructed", "reinvented", "manufactured", "contested", "renegotiated", "represented", "theorised", and, thus, "governed", "regulated", "disciplined", "contained" and "reclaimed". For instance Mike Forrester (1999a,b) agues in favour of a discursive ethnomethodologic study of the developing Self, in terms of **self-positioning, narrativization and dialogic representation**. As Burman (1997) agrees, there are definite "**absences**" in developmental psychology, as well as "abusive and oppressive practices reproduced and meted out in the name of development".

[28] Dio-Bleichmar (1995, 1996); Hostetler & Herdt (1998); Tolman (2001)

[29] Cotton et al. (2004)

[30] Plummer (1994, 1995)

[31] E.g., Kelley et al. (1999); Beausang (2000). Cf. Lamanna (1999)

[32] Consider Haywood (1996); Schalet (1999); Redman (2001); Walkerdine (2001); Brownlie (2001)

[33] Cf. Thormann (1996)

[34] *1994 online research outline*. Cf. Van Manen and Levering (1996)

[35] Scott, Jackson et al. (1998); Scott & Jackson (1999)

[36] E.g., Heins (2001)

[37] E.g., Devrome (1997)

[38] Corteen and Scraton (1997)

[39] Reynolds (2000)

[40] Thorogood (1992, 2000). Thorogood reminds that "[…] sex education, as any education, does not take place in a neutral environment. It is always about the transmission of values and by implication acts as a form of control. This is most clear in the traditional, "restricted information" approach, which uses the twin bases of "objective scientific fact" and "moral frameworks" to achieve the "sexual socialisation of young people" […]" (2000).

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] Monk (1998)

[43] *GUS*, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, <u>chapter 16</u> (v0.0)

[44] O'Neill, L. & Pittman, K. (2000/1) Mapping the Modern-Postmodern Divide, *Classroom Leadership Online* 4, 4 [http://www.ascd.org/readingroom/classlead/0012/1dec00.html], as accessed 250203

[45] Thorne (1987)

[46] McKay (1998)

[47] Luhman (1998)

[48] See Blume and Blume (2003) for a theoretical exposé.

[49] Jones (2003a,b, 2004, in press I, in press II)

[50] Johnson (1997); Krivacska (1993); Johnson (2000); Tobin (1997, 2001). Cf. Schmauch (1996)

[51] Skelton (1991)

[52] Sumsion (1999)

[53] I recommend Mullaney (2001) for a further discussion of this point.

[54] E.g., Baber and Murray (2001)

[55] D. Carr (2002)

[56] Writing, "Sexuality education exhibits a form of well-intentioned, anticultural neglect by assuming that teens are capable of making rationale decisions while sexually expressing an autonomous self. Thus, postmodern adolescents and young adults lack a deep connection to a set of values or a cultural framework and hesitate to place themselves in the adult world" (H. ,2000, *Ready or Not: What Happens When We Treat Children as Small Adults*).

[57] According Jameson, a distinct feature of postmodern styles is that historical representations blend with nostalgia. See Frederic Jameson, Postmodernism and Consumer Society, in Hal Foster (Ed.) *The Anti-Aesthetic Essays on Postmodern Culture*. Seattle: Bay Press, 1983, p111-25

[58] *Sex Education of the Young in the Twentieth Century: A Cultural History*, scheduled April 16 to 17, 2005, at the University of Durham, UK