

Feeling Scared

by Thomas J. Cottle

I begin this essay with information drawn from juvenile court reports.¹ If schools are unsafe, they are made so, in part, by those people, young and old, who appear to value neither living things nor material objects. Moreover, they are made so by young people, research reveals, who, although bullying their classmates and teachers, nonetheless often fail to meet the commonly held stereotype of the bully.²

It is interesting to note that among the children who eventually are brought to juvenile court, 50 percent will be adjudicated and never return. Apparently, the one episode that brought them before a judge was enough to, well, scare them straight. The other 50 percent represent a different story altogether. These are people characterized by learning disabilities, substance abuse, low IQ scores, and histories of suffering physical abuse. They are children living in poverty or families where they have been neglected, families where domestic violence is a relatively common occurrence. In a word, according to psychologists working at the juvenile court in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the children coming from the weakest family structures tend to be the ones most likely to return to court. Said differently, whatever the mosaic of disorders and experiences, the pivotal variable appears to be family structure.

In a similar vein, we can pinpoint with some accuracy the characteristics of children prone to violence, the children we think are making school unsafe for others. These would be the hard-to-control children, those called noncompliant: children who seem to react to barely discernible slights, act out emotions, and cannot seem to locate means of soothing themselves. In the language of psychoanalysis, they project and deny, protect their vulnerability, remain hyperalert (a symptom, actually, of having been traumatized), lack the ability to imagine what another person might be thinking or feeling, and live with the barest ability to empathize with another person, even a family member.³ Most significantly, these people feel perfectly justified engaging in aggressive behavior.

Court psychologists often differentiate aggressive children into two distinct groups, those labeled “reactively aggressive,” and those referred to as “productively aggressive.” The first group refers to the hot-blooded person, steeped very often in physical symptomatology. Children in this group report sleep disorders and adjustment problems of all varieties. They themselves appear to have been victimized, which leaves them depressed. Some psychologists assert that if one closely examines these children, one discovers them distorting social clues and revealing difficulty in processing information, which only naturally distorts their sense of judgment.

The productively aggressive children, on the other hand, are equally fascinating. These are the so-called “cool kids,” people numb, presumably, to their own feelings. I have spoken to children of this typology who describe stabbing someone with the same lack of emotion one exhibits reading a laundry list.⁴ They are people prone to taking risks, causing crimes, and presumably feeling little resembling remorse, which means they cannot feel the terror of their victims. Importantly, their coolness allows them to organize their aggressiveness and play the system. To say the least, these are children difficult to reach, difficult to engage in conversation, and hence, difficult to treat; it is hard to convince them that their actions might have profound repercussions.⁵ In the isolated world in which these young people exist, all they can rely on are their own bodies, although they frequently offer tantalizing clues about themselves. Engaged in anti-social behavior and often empowered by their membership in gangs, they may reveal ethnic and racial self-hatred, and, almost predictably, disapprove of their parents’ behavior.⁶

All of which brings us to a discussion of the family and the notion that the quality of its structure may be the best predictor of whether a young person, male or female, will return to court or cause a school to be unsafe.⁷ We begin with the proposition that the values we seek to inculcate in our children often live within our expectations. In fact, the act of socialization and much of social interaction imply the act of expecting. Ostensibly, the notion of an expectation involves the establishment or assumption of some goal, purpose, or future orientation or action. It involves, as well, a need to accomplish or become something. I expect my child to get good grades and treat classmates and teachers kindly.

Note, however, that expectation also may carry a message about the present and past. The expectation, in other words, may be intended to direct the ship on a new course, but the child often hears it as yet one more criticism of his or her being. And like those faults we needn’t really elucidate for our children, expectations too needn’t always be articulated; the children know them all too well, for we regularly have

screamed them in a variety of ways. But keep in mind that in these moments, the fear that one is defective and unlovable is always in the air, always in the balance.⁸

Popular culture has determined that self-love is the highest philosophical and psychological ideal.⁹ This determination has taken hold in part because an entire generation has grown up insufficiently loved and nurtured, or even valued. The means, learning to love yourself, suddenly becomes the end in itself. Narcissism and self-celebration triumph; the only face and soul we need glorify and nourish are our own.

But let us not overlook a fundamental truth, namely, that children come to love themselves by having been loved by their parents, by watching their parents love each other, and by becoming competent at various activities. In a sense, loving parents essentially do much of the early loving work for their child, and thus lead a child away from acting out aggressive impulses. Children, we assume, are someday meant to emerge as full-blown self-loving, self-approving adults, capable *and* desirous of loving others, hopefully forever. In fact, they ought to obtain these qualities not because honor grades were achieved in the infamous childhood curriculum, but merely because they were enrolled in the



childhood curriculum. And in this one curriculum, everyone is accepted, or ought to be, without even having to apply. Being loved is intended to be part of the unwritten and joyously lopsided contract entered into by parents and children.

Although this may sound peculiarly saccharine, one hopes that we constantly remind ourselves that all efforts must be made toward developing self-esteem while not forgetting that much of it, like the dividend payoff from a stock holding, may be the byproduct of something far more significant. The development of good character and competence typically yields a perfectly workable self-esteem. Indeed, no self-esteem can be built upon a foundation without character. But love does play a role, as Erich Fromm asserted more than a half-century ago.¹⁰

Love and work, Fromm noted, as had Freud before him, represent two activities allowing us to restore meaning to life and providing us a genuine sense of belonging and completeness. With love, and a moral scaffold, we unite with others, act altruistically, understand the notions of the common good and doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, and as Kant taught, hold these actions to be universal moral laws. As an expectation, love, for Fromm, was the most desirable way to derive meaning from life if only because it is the most desirable form of human interaction; it renders us all safe. Fromm was perfectly prepared to advocate that entire societies be developed with love as the overruling value. A balance between security and responsibility is afforded by love, he alleged, along with the development of a moral scaffold. It lies deep in the essence of respect that a parent offers to a child, a respect the parent hopes the child will incorporate for him/herself, and inevitably the child offers to another child.

The love offered by parents also provides the basis of a so-called love for life, for nature, for all living things. It leads a child, Fromm wrote, to be attracted to human growth and development, constructive life forces, creativity. Most assuredly, it leads the child away from bullying. It causes the child to define influence in terms of reason and example, rather than aggressiveness, coercion, and outright force. Just as it makes the child look outward toward the world, it tends to focus the child on the expansiveness of the future rather than on the constricting elements of the past. It allows the child, in other words, to imagine possibility rather than believe in (the continuation of) impossibility. Notice that Fromm's words suggest the significance of turning the child away from him/herself in the direction of contributing to others, supporting others, making others feel comfortable with themselves, which, in a sense, are the bases of moral behavior and a far cry from the more popular lessons that always seem to turn the child inward.

Some children, however, are not exposed to the love curriculum. They never know about love. These are the psychological if not literal latchkey children, the ones home alone even when all sorts of people may be around, the ones, perhaps, we label bullies. They are the ones on their own, independent, free, or so it would appear.

* * *

Which brings us to the myth of independence that dominates American culture, and masks the reality that one's life force turns out to be all the relationships in one's life, for one does not *have* relationships as much as one exists *as* relationships.¹¹ Why would one wish to experience blessed moments without special people, or even want to go on without them? What is there to go on for, and who is there to go to? we inevitably ask following the loss of a loved one.

Essential to the myth of independence is the necessity of being able to live on one's own.¹² Many children receive the message that, loved or not, they have to compete with other people or activities merely for the attention and time of their parents. (I recall reading a poll indicating that 76 percent of American children wish they could spend more time with their parents.) These children grow up steeped in America's false worship of independence, which they experience directly as the independence of parents from one another as well as from children. As soon as parents imagine children are old enough, and often parents guess wrong, many set about to teach their children to be able to play, work, study, entertain themselves *on their own*. Literally or symbolically latchkey children, a generation of people grew up believing that being on one's own is tantamount to developing a healthy sense of individualism. Independence, these children learn, is essential for genuine survival, even though it is total fantasy. In a word, they remain frightened, and, probably too, ashamed of something.

The notion of surviving on one's own has a perfectly concrete foundation: children in America are left on their own a great deal to fend, and fight, for themselves, as if they really could. Or they are left in the care of others, or to care for others who are equally dependent on someone else for survival. The six-year-old protects the three-year-old, both of them frightened, the older one, probably, more so since she has a remarkable responsibility to fulfill while yearning for others older than herself to perform the very function she now performs. But there is no sense crying or complaining, for long ago the child learned that no one was around to help in this genuine survival struggle. Apparently too, many of us eschew the notion of supervision—she's six going on twenty, we brag. And so it is reported that 50 percent of America's eleven-year-old children return from school to an empty home.

Think of the normal terrors of children who almost never are left alone, except at night in bed. Parents hear their periodic wailing and rush to their rooms as weeping or bawling, the children tell of monsters under their beds, bats in the attic, bugs creeping inside the walls, or ghosts in the closets. If children in average and predictable home settings are terrified of aloneness, what must be going through the minds of children who live these night terrors in the mornings and afternoons as well, and rarely if ever are comforted? And what, one wonders, do they think upon arriving at school in the morning, or when lingering around parks and playgrounds in the afternoon during the hours sociologists deem the most dangerous?

The myth that children fare well acting independently emerges in another facet of a child's life. Unwittingly, imbuing children with (false) independence prepares them for any separations or detachments, or divorces, that many children, not so incidentally, refer to as nightmares. Best I not depend too heavily on people if there is any possibility they may not be around (for me) forever. The only one going to be around forever is me, so best I look out for number one.¹³

Many parents continue to argue that the best thing to do is to teach their children to be independent. Impose too many regulations on children and one detracts from their power to make sound judgments on their own. So children wander the streets of their hometowns, scoffing at friends who must be home by ten o'clock, or short of that, are required to telephone their parents if they anticipate being late. And the younger ones wander about bullying the child they determine to be a perfect target. How is the child to know, for example, that total freedom shouldn't properly be interpreted as lack of interest?¹⁴ And hold in mind that permissiveness is perceived by the child as lack of interest, which in turn leads to children growing up disliking themselves. Hold in mind as well Fromm's notion that when parents withdraw from children, the children become destructive. (Similarly, when parents act aggressively toward children, Fromm alleged, children withdraw.)

It seems obvious that most young people dislike the notion of (false) independence that their parents seek to create in and for them. Obligated to act independently, many young people mourn the loss of attachments in their family, but remain unable to speak about these matters except to one another. Even then they may do so with shame and a sense of having betrayed their families. Or perhaps they simply remain scared. Equally significant, whatever aggressive urges arise within them have not receded in the slightest.

Adding to the burden of many of these children is the fact that they may have to act in public as if their attachments to their family were perfectly normal; in this manner, the public perceives their family as per-

fectly normal. (On second thought, it is the nature and style of the attachments of family members one to another that people employ to assess the “normality” of the family in the first place.) Perhaps the one time children seek a facsimile of independence is in their reaction to overbearing or smothering parents, but this is but another survival technique meant to prevent children from being swallowed up by overly needy and, possibly too, aggressive parents.

It may be helpful at this point to introduce a definition of family, one that may strike the reader as unusual, yet one that seems appropriate to a discussion of children feeling scared, or aggressive. In a fascinating article, professors Felton Earls and Mary Carlson defined the family in terms of the sum of the strategies adults *and* children together employ as they develop nurturance, security, and a sense of comfort with intimacy.¹⁵ Two things, at least, should be observed here. First, the authors make no mention of any relationship other than adults and children. Second, the definition implies that children nurture and make their parents feel secure in the same way that they are nurtured and made to feel secure by their parents. The result of successful nurturing, security making, and intimacy development is the opportunity for children to grow up and engage in long-term relationships, nurture their own children, and, in turn, feel nurtured by these children, and perhaps their children as well. Here, then, is a genuine definition of role models, and a far cry from the autograph feasts going on in schools, or the worshipping of celebrities who somehow have inherited the label of legitimate role model.

There is another aspect of independence, one that tends to receive little attention. When I learn that I am meant to stand alone, independent, I make an unconscious philosophical and psychological leap: I separate myself from everyone else in the universe. To depend on someone is to attach myself to that someone, yet I have learned I am not meant to do that. So I grow up with the notion that there must be a separation between me and anyone else in my life. No one has told me this; I know it by dint of the nature of family relationships. No matter how intense my relationships may be with those I choose to be intimate, there is always that space separating us, the space of false or pseudo-independence. Quite often, teenagers will reveal this space by becoming involved with the “wrong” people, people with whom they know they could never get close, but with whom they act out the psychological space of independence. Similarly, some children may employ bullying as a technique that bespeaks both their inner sadness and anger, as well as their antagonistic stance in the face of others. In the minds of some young people, independence is synonymous with defiance: I stand alone, and properly against you; I lean on no one.

It is also a space defined as mistrust. The totally (and mythical) independent person has been discouraged from trusting and experiencing intimacy. Indeed, the lack of trust in anyone becomes *the* source of his or her (falsely) independent actions and ideals. No one is permitted to get close; no one is allowed to receive his or her inner worlds as gifts. Or perhaps the young person feels he or she has no inner gifts to present. Simply put, one lives with too much armor. One cannot love or be loved, and hence a competitive or, better, combative world is probably not a bad playing field, except for the fact that many of these children are ill equipped to handle it. Now, in being separated from you by dint of this inherent space between us, I need not care for you, nor you for me. The only principle we both need live by is “Do your own thing.” If I feel like attacking you, then that is precisely what I will do. The concepts of safety and protection have no relevance for me.

In *Escape from Freedom*, Fromm spoke eloquently of people, children included, being conflicted by their simultaneous hunt for genuine independence and freedom, on the one hand, and comforting security on the other.¹⁶ We run from the group, conventions, rituals, attachments, only to discover that our newly found sense of individuality and independence causes us to feel insecure, lonely, insignificant, alienated. These feelings are precisely what some bullies cannot allow themselves to recognize. The “successful” result of striving for power and independence leads the child to feel frighteningly alone, isolated, and scared. To restore an almost childlike sense of meaning and the feeling that we belong, Fromm theorized that we attempt to reunite, re-attach, even get swallowed up by or in another person, through our work, or even better through our capacity to love. For some children, bullying another person causes them to feel that they can be swallowed up by another. Perverse or not, at least they feel some sense of personal involvement.

Children’s attempts to regain security often take the form of erasing differences between themselves and others, seeking, in other words, to become exactly like one’s special peers by conforming to all their styles, costumes, appetites, linguistic traits, and requests. (It was Erik Erikson who observed that the fundamental strength of the adolescent was not love, precisely, but fidelity.¹⁷) Parents often are saddened by these behaviors, which appear to mean that the child has sacrificed his or her entire personality for the sake of inclusion and security: anything not to feel scared. Still other children imagine that erasing vexing differences between people can be accomplished by terrorizing them to the point that they will express the fright that they live with all the time.

Fromm pointed to other more extreme psychic mechanisms for regaining security: authoritarianism, or the worship of it; masochistic and sadistic strivings (what psychologists call the “acting in” and “acting out”

of pathology); abnormal dependence on groups (characteristic of so-called “proactively aggressive” young people); a desire to see others suffer; and outright destructiveness, the goal of eliminating objects, as in the destruction of school buildings, or people, as, for example, one’s fellow students.

* * *

According to Rollo May, we live in three distinct but overlapping aspects of the world.¹⁸ There is our world with other people, the world wherein we confront ourselves, and most fundamentally, perhaps, the biologically determined world into which we are thrown. This is the realm of our biological and genetic inheritance. Like it or not, we have to sleep, we have eat, we have to die. We may also have to aggress.¹⁹

We also have to accept the fact that we are born with temperamental dispositions. It is almost as if we arrive with hardware and indeed some software that forever shape our destinies. Our shyness, resilience, happiness, sadness, perhaps too, our need to push and shove and bully may be part of this inheritance, the result of chromosomes and neurotransmitters at work. We think too infrequently, perhaps, of the neurological bath out of which we emerge as newborns.

All of socialization, seemingly, is about the development of the cerebral cortex, but each of us possesses a lower brain stem in which the mechanisms connecting us to other animals continue to reside and function.²⁰ At every moment we are prepared for flight or fight, although one is tempted to say, flight, fight, or fright. At every moment we may feel an urge to turn and run, or, conversely, stay and attack, even to the death. The slightest stimulus, science teaches, may ignite the hormones and neural mechanisms driving our instincts for flight or fight. Everything in the lower brain stem seems to teeter on a loving versus anxious classroom, a cozy versus agitated home, a genial versus acrimonious expression. Within moments, the brain scans the environment, makes sense of it as best it can, and then feels something about what it perceives and deduces. The lower brain stem works more quickly, eschewing the thinking part of the equation, and instead turning at once to fleeing or battling. The mere sight, or sound, or even smell of a particular child may activate intense fear or the desire to flee or attack. Suddenly, when the bully says it was the clothes “the kid” wore, or the way he combed his hair, or the smell of his soap, things begin to fall into place. After all, at the other end of the spectrum, we can be uplifted by the mere scent of a loved one’s perfume, or the sight of a cherished locket or broach.

Attachment to parents matters in the development of a child, but so too does the magical substance called cortisol, which, when it courses through the system, can make one feel intensely sad or combative.²¹ It is one of the reasons one often sees an agitated depression in young peo-

ple, and a sad streak in the soul of the bully. If the bully throws himself at the innocent victim, so too, in a sense, is he himself thrown. Literally he is being biologically driven by mechanisms and substances about which he understands nothing. All he may be left with are feelings, and sometimes even they don't come naturally to him.

One might argue that in order for one to maintain relationships with others, one must be assured that some fundamental, seemingly biological connection has been established and is firmly in place. The most difficult connections of all, perhaps, are those with people who appear different from us, or those who for reasons "known" only to our lower brain stems appear to exist as potential enemies or tormentors. (And when do we ever think of the victim as the tormentor of the bully?)

Under the skin, it is said, we are all alike, which of course is not scientifically wholly true, even though our chromosomal maps are shockingly similar. But many of us cannot get beyond the skin, the appearance, the solely physical, "the look." What we see tells us all we need to know. Perhaps, as part of our genetic coding, in examining, or in the case of the lower brain stem, merely reacting to, faces and skin, shapes and colors, we are compelled to hunt for a connection to those with whom we choose to identify, those with whom we (imagine we can) feel identical.

How many of us admonish our families that blood is thicker than water, or urge relatives to stick with their "own kind"? (Interestingly, the words "kin" and "kind" derive from similar roots.) Suddenly, home and neighborhood are where we expect to find people (exactly) like us, a fact appearing to comfort us. Wishing to belong, we seek out so-called peer groups to relieve us from a sense of alienation, detachment, aloneness, and individual uniqueness, the single human feature, ironically, we claim to treasure above all else.

If "inner city" becomes a code word for poor, then "community" may be the code word for people exactly like us; they become "our (kin and) kind." Think in this regard of how in some communities, and schools, there is a differentiation of areas into something called "turf," where occupants must look and act alike. The very notion of gang bespeaks identity, social purity, collective uniqueness, and solidarity. Think too of how human beings, even small children, driven in part by their notions of human connection and the engines of the lower brain stem, begin to perceive other objects as being not only of a different species altogether, but of a lower species, a subspecies, which in turn legitimates, at least in their own thinking, taking whatever action toward this subspecies that may strike them.

To begin, the self-proclaimed superior species sees nothing wrong in lording power over the perceived subspecies. More compelling, however, is the degree to which even the self-assignment of power appears

to legitimate the explosion of the most debasing human emotions and actions. One wonders what would happen if Zimbardo's famous Stanford study of jailers and the jailed were replicated, this time randomly assigning students to be bullies and victims. What would the bullies do to their fellow classmates? One suspects that the same sadistic behavior would result, the same sadistic behavior teachers witness every day in school corridors and on playgrounds. If nothing else, the Zimbardo experiment and the normal, everyday, peaceful comportment of the majority of children cause us to ponder just what it is that restrains our animal urges, our base instincts, our inhumane tendencies. What is it in our brains that prevents any one of us from engaging in aggressive behavior of any sort? Why does one behave morally even when no one is around to witness one's behavior?

Whatever its etiology, the felt sense of power over another, or the need to demonstrate it, may quickly ignite the fires of our instincts, what Freud called the id, the seat of sexually aggressive and demeaning acts. But there is that other factor at work. This is the matter of the bully's victim being perceived as a subspecies, and therefore vulnerable to as well as ripe for any sort of punishment or humiliation.²²

Simply put, in the eyes of the bully the subspecies is not entitled to humane treatment. In this context, philosophers speak of a moral circle.²³ Within the circle are those persons with whom we empathize, those to whom we demonstrate care and concern; we will lay down our lives for them. Outside the circle, however, are those receiving not a shred of sympathy or empathy.²⁴ Indeed, as Paul Bloom has recently written, these are people we hold in disgust, an emotion probably having its roots in the lower brain stem.²⁵ Thus, when it comes to ethical or moral behavior with them, all bets are off; we're free to encounter them any way we wish.

An ethological study conducted years ago which, for ethical reasons, could no longer be performed, demonstrates this notion of the moral circle and its role in behavior. A chimpanzee is placed in a cage, where it quickly learns that by pushing down a pedal it will receive food. In the adjoining cage, researchers now place a second chimp, a total stranger to the first chimp. Predictably, the first chimp depresses the pedal and receives his food. But this time he witnesses the second chimp suffering from an electric shock that has been administered. Almost at once, the first chimp ceases eating. Apparently, he cannot continue the task if a fellow chimp is in misery. Scientists label this behavior as empathy. And what happens if the second chimp is replaced by an animal of a different species? The first chimp not only resumes the pedal pushing; he actually seems to enjoy the suffering of the second animal.

It may be that these two phenomena stand as fundamental components of so-called bullying behavior. First, legitimate power in the absence of a moral presence unleashes the bestial instincts man and woman, and children, share with their animal ancestors. Second, when victims are perceived as a subspecies, sadistic behavior is readily justified, even likened by some to a mere stunt or game.

The culture may advertise its famous melting pot slogan, but everyone knows the true melting pot is the classroom and playground, where every variety of integration of turf and difference, not to mention every dynamic of the lower brain stem and cerebral cortex, has to be worked out. The fundamental principle of America's democracy is embodied in the school, where, irrespective of just who has decided to occupy the superior species, religious integration, sex integration, racial integration, and the inclusion of children with disabilities continue to be played out. And it will continue this way, whether people feel safe or not, until, ideally, in a world one can only imagine, all children will not only feel safe from the terrors of the outside as well as those of the inside; they will in fact be safe.

Notes

1. On this point, see R. Loeber and D. P. Farrington, editors, *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1998.
2. See R. Banks, *Bullying in Schools* (ERIC Digest No. EDO-PS-97-17). Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois.
3. See Judith Herman, *Trauma and Recovery*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
4. See Thomas J. Cottle, *At Peril: Stories of Injustice*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001.
5. See Martha Straus, *No Talk Therapy for Children and Adolescents*. New York: Norton, 1999.
6. See M. W. Klein, *The American Street Gang*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
7. See G. D. Gottfredson and D. C. Gottfredson, *Victimization in Schools*. New York: Plenum Press, 1985.
8. See Heinz Kohut, *Search for the Self*, Volume 3 (Paul Ornstein, editor). New York: International Universities Press, 1990.
9. On a related point, see Neal Postman, *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. New York: Penguin, 1986.
10. Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941; and *The Art of Loving*. New York: Harper, 1956.
11. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* (translated by Joan Stambaugh). Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1966.
12. See S. Dowrick, *Intimacy and Solitude: Balancing Closeness and Independence*. New York: Norton, 1991. See also R. M. Ryan and J. H. Lynch, "Emotional Autonomy versus Detachment: Revisiting the Vicissitudes of Adolescence and Young Adulthood." *Child Development* 60 (1989): 340–356.

13. A Boston television station (WCVB-TV) reported that as of January 1991, around 30 percent of men owing alimony and child support payments actually make these payments, and of this 30 percent, about one-half pay the full amount as ordered by the courts.

14. For whatever relevance it may have to this discussion, one notes that putting primates used for laboratory research in cages by themselves makes them more agitated and "less happy" than putting them together in groups. See Tina Adler, "Put Primates in Groups, a Scientist Recommends." *The APA Monitor* 22, no. 2 (February 1991): 10.

15. Felton Earls and Mary Carlson, "Towards Sustainable Development for American Families." *Daedalus* 122, no. 1 (Winter 1993): 93-122.

16. Fromm, *Escape from Freedom*.

17. Erik Erikson, *Childhood and Society*. New York: Norton, 1950; and *Identity, Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton, 1968.

18. Rollo May, *The Discovery of Being*. New York: Norton, 1983.

19. On this point, see John J. Ratey and Catherine Johnson, *Shadow Syndromes: The Mild Forms of Major Mental Disorders That Sabotage Us*. New York: Bantam Books, 1997.

20. See Steven Pinker, *How the Mind Works*. New York: Norton, 1997; and Rita Carter, *Mapping the Mind*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1999.

21. It should be noted that the increase of cortisol may also be caused by trauma. On this point, see B. A. van der Kolk, *Psychological Trauma*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Press, 1987; and B. A. van der Kolk, A. C. McFarlane, and L. Weisaeth, editors., *Traumatic Stress: Effects of Overwhelming Experience on Mind, Body and Society*. New York: Guilford, 1996.

22. See David Finkelhor, "The Victimization of Children: A Developmental Perspective." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 65 (1995): 177-193; and R. S. Atlas and D. J. Pepler, "Observations of Bullying in the Classroom." *Journal of Educational Research* 92 (1998): 86-99.

23. See Peter Singer, *The Expanding Circle: Ethics and Sociobiology*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1981.

24. See Martin L. Hoffman, *Empathy and Moral Development: Implications for Caring and Justice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

25. Paul Bloom, *Descartes' Baby*. New York: Basic Books, 2004; on disgust, see Martha C. Nussbaum, "Secret Sewers of Vice: Disgust, Bodies, and the Law." In S. A. Bandes, editor, *The Passions of Law*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Thomas J. Cottle is Professor of Education at Boston University. His books include At Peril: Stories of Injustice and most recently When the Music Stopped: Discovering My Mother.