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The 2006 controversy over Deborah Ellis’s *Three Wishes: Palestinian and Israeli Children Speak* focused public attention on attempts to influence and manipulate the production and consumption of Canadian children’s literature in Ontario. The request of the Canadian Jewish Congress to limit access to Ellis’s book, a nominee for the Ontario Library Association’s Silver Birch Award, resulted in responses and action from school boards in Niagara, Essex, Toronto, York, and Ottawa-Carleton (Eaton). The intentions and motivations of the various individuals and groups involved or caught in the controversy were fairly straightforward: these included the author, a literary and social activist collecting and disseminating...
the voices of Palestinian and Israeli children; Groundwood Books, which, according to its website, attempts to “tell the stories of people whose voices are not always heard in this age of publishing by media conglomerates” (“About Us”); the Ontario Library Association, selecting books to be read and voted on by children in grades four to six; the Canadian Jewish Congress, in this case speaking out as a pressure group against what it considered to be inappropriate material; Canadian parents and educators, acting as advocates for children (Hill); children defending their freedom to read the books they choose (Freedman); and the Writers’ Union of Canada decrying censorship (“Writers”). The responses of so many diverse players in the production, distribution, and consumption of this text reveal the extent to which defining “the child” is critical to an understanding of what constitutes children’s literature—and, more specifically, Canadian children’s literature.

The comments and agendas of the various individuals and organizations, while ostensibly formulated and promoted with the “good” of the child in mind, reflect the interests of those who are speaking “on behalf of” the child. Ellis’s actions deliberately place herself and her work in the political arena of social activism. She generously donates royalties to various organizations, including Canadian Women for Women in Afghanistan, Street Kids International, and UNICEF (“About Deborah”; Jenkinson). As a writer of children’s literature, Ellis is successfully and publicly grounding the words and sentences of humanism in the practical realm of humanitarianism, thus making a powerful connection between the word and the world. But these good intentions also raise uneasiness. The practice of fictionalizing and telling the stories of children in desperate situations in Malawi, Afghanistan, and Bolivia instigates uncomfortable feelings about the potential exploitation of the child’s situation and voice.1 Donating the profits from such stories to organizations that will benefit those whose stories are being told demonstrates to the reader and the public the material benefits and practical applications of literature. At the same time, however, the donations potentially free the author and reader from any discomfort or guilt that may arise as a result of consuming the miseries of the real children upon whom the fictional children are based. The recognition Ellis has received through the many awards and honours bestowed on her and her work, while well deserved, reflects a self-congratulatory “good” feeling of a public that believes it can vicariously make the world a better place through reading.2 There is no question that Ellis is an influential and sincere writer who raises passionate awareness in her readers and makes a difference. Nevertheless, I want to examine the relationship between character and reader as constructed and developed by her fiction in order to open up a more general conversation about the use of
the figure of the child in issues of social justice and political activism within Canadian children’s literature, culture, and politics. I begin by noting that Ellis’s work promotes the ideal of the globalized child, based on the problematic assumptions surrounding the supposed existence of the universal child.

Before elaborating on the ideal of the globalized child, however, I want to look briefly at earlier uses and depictions of the child in Canadian children’s literature. This figure has historically been constructed to both influence and reflect trends and ideals of national citizenship. In 1980, for example, Margery Fee noted the link between the image of the child and “that great Canadian obsession, the search for national identity” (46). The links joining the child, land, and nationalism, observed by Fee, were apparent as early as 1852 in Catharine Parr Traill’s *Canadian Crusoes*, and continued well into the 1970s. The use of the child figure and children’s literature to encourage and model national identity evolved, by the 1970s, into the blatant use of the genre to promote the official policy of multiculturalism. In her 1999 essay on Canadian multiculturalism and children’s literature, Louise Saldanha argues that “the discourses of children’s literature are always connected to national ideologies, and so one cannot ignore how official Canadian multiculturalism fashions compulsory normative frames that already situate so-called ‘multicultural’ children’s books within its institutionalized diversity” (168). According to Carole Carpenter’s 1996 *Mosaic* article, “Enlisting Children’s Literature in the Goals of Multiculturalism,” “one of the means employed” to promote multiculturalism in the 1970s was “the enlistment of children’s literature” (53). Carpenter argues that “an appreciation of how literature functions to colonize and politicize ‘minors’ can shed considerable light on the dynamics that inform the treatment...
of other ‘minorities’” (53). The attempt to create out of the individual and collective reader a desired and “ideal” citizenry reveals ways in which political will and public policy are imposed on minorities who lack power and voice, or are perceived as lacking them. As Carpenter explains, the attempt to promote the ideal “multicultural” Canadian citizen through didactic children’s literature naively assumes that children will enact what they read, are blank slates who passively receive culture because they have no culture of their own, and will automatically develop tolerance simply as a result of being informed (“Enlisting” 56–60). The premises are flawed because the available methods of politicizing and persuading the reader to embrace difference are problematic. Divisiveness arises when difference is privileged and recognized at the expense of commonality, and, conversely, essentialized universalism results when an emphasis on commonality diminishes and minimizes difference. The former draws attention to borders while the latter erases them.3

The dilemma of how to write and read cross-cultural or intercultural “tolerance” does not disappear as Canadian children’s literature moves from an inward-looking focus on multiculturalism to an outward view of the child’s role and place in a globalized world. Rather than reining in diversity within national borders, this more recent literature, such as that written by Deborah Ellis, moves outward to explore a diversity that is contained by nothing more than the circular boundary of the globe.4 The assumption that the intended audience/readership is Canadian or Western and the object/subject of the literature is “other” sets up a relationship that supposedly invites the young Canadian reader to identify and empathize with the child who lives in less-affluent and often desperate conditions. There are problems inherent in such assumptions of identification and empathy, the most disturbing being the ease with which the reader is supposed to negotiate and flatten difference. The dynamics of the fictional character as participant/actor and the reader as observer/witness make impossible demands on the Canadian reader, who may feel a responsibility to do something in response to the story, but is not given the agency to act because she is “simply” a child—and, even more confusing, a child sitting comfortably reading a book. Other dangers include the complacent response of the reader who feels fortunate and thankful that the book is not being read in a wartorn and famine-ridden setting. Instead of raising the desired “tolerance” (a less-positive word than its late-twentieth-century usage has implied), the story can promote complacency and insularity.

Part of the difficulty lies in the reviewer’s and media’s essentializing of the young audience as homogeneous simply because it is made up of novel-reading children, and in the presumption that insists on
forcing a variety of readers’ responses into a single and consolidated one. Assumptions about the child and childhood mean that groups of children are seen as single-minded and single-bodied rather than as being made up of specific and distinct individuals. The promotion of childhood as a “universal” category and the child as the most universal of human figures is seized upon and used, not only in the literary field, but also in various political and cultural movements that work to erase national borders in order to teach and promote equality and social justice. In particular, the child has been used in this way in order to raise awareness and aid during famine conditions and natural disasters.\(^5\)

Literary critic Lisa Hermine Makman convincingly argues that “childhood becomes the symbolic common denominator underlying global divisions” (296). Just as the 1971 multicultural policy, which on “July 22, 1988 became the law of the land” (Saldanha 165), and the 1982 *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* constructed the rhetoric and discourse that produced the singular and idealized Canadian child of cultural “tolerance,” so the 1989 *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* assumes the existence of the universal “globalized” child, who becomes a potentially powerful crosser and challenger of political borders, due to her perceived universal qualities and unformed identity. Articles 21 and 22 of the 1989 *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*, dealing with inter-country adoption and applications for refugee status, acknowledge the increased crossing of national borders by children in the late-twentieth century (United Nations). Such literal crossings by real children make more resonant the metaphoric and symbolic crossings of the figurative child, whose lack of national entrenchment and allegiance renders borders porous and minimal. The perception of
the child as a blank slate, with undeveloped loyalties and no identifiable culture, imbues her with the heavy responsibility of becoming the epitome and source of the ideal global citizen. In her 1995 Robarts Lecture, Carole Carpenter comments on the malleability of such a view of the child, arguing that the “general suppression of children as a cultural presence persists today, a circumstance that is by no means unique to Canada, though it certainly is characteristic of this country” (Image 12). Carpenter goes on to claim that children in Canada are “effectively perceived and hence treated as pre-cultural or proto-cultural beings and, therefore, because culture is a defining characteristic of human beings, as not fully human” (Image 15–16). Children are thus viewed as the raw material of humanity—the “potential,” the “possible,” the “promise”—or, to use Perry Nodelman’s terms from his discussion of children’s literature in conjunction with orientalism, “non-human[s] in the process of becoming more human” (32).

Despite the perception that the twentieth century, the “so-called ‘Century of the Child’” (Carpenter, Image 9), is demonstrating increasingly progressive attitudes, the child remains colonized and malleable, vulnerable to cultural and political use and exploitation. Roderick McGillis, in the context of previous work by Jacqueline Rose, Perry Nodelman, and James Kincaid, proposes that “adults are the colonizers and children are the colonized” (“Celt” 225). McGillis and Meena Khorana begin their introductory notes to the ARIEL issue on Postcolonialism, Children, and Their Literature with the declaration that “Children are the subaltern” (7), arguing that, notwithstanding the rising interest in children’s rights, “children remain the most colonized persons on the globe” (7). Similarly, Carpenter maintains that children “remain suppressed in spite of the post-colonial, feminist, multicultural, human rights movements of today” (Image 21), while Nodelman argues that adults continue to use their “knowledge of ‘childhood’ to dominate children” (31). Today, the frustration with thin promises and gestures is palpable, particularly with respect to the perceived “progress” in the area of children’s rights. So much of it seems to be tied up in words rather than actions.

In the Spring 2007 issue of Canadian Children’s Literature/Littérature canadienne pour la jeunesse, Elizabeth Galway discusses some of the recent global perspectives on childhood offered by Canadian writers and publishers. As in the case of the “multicultural” child, the question with respect to the globalized child is whether to privilege difference and therefore encourage tolerance or to minimize difference and promote empathy and identification. Both strategies are used in literature of and for the so-called globalized child. And both approaches are somewhat objectionable in that they depend for their effectiveness on emphasizing the unexpectedness of a universality that emerges despite the huge contrast and gap.
between privilege and oppression—between Canadian reader and Afghan subject in Ellis’s Breadwinner trilogy, for example—and generally between those who are portrayed as the haves and have-nots, the wealthy and poor, the fulfilled and needy. So the child is not viewed as easily universal, but as universal against all odds. The gap and contrast become useful—necessary in fact—in order to highlight the unexpectedness and resilience of shared characteristics and experiences.

But the benefit of the revelation of universality is one-sided—only the reader gets to experience this epiphany of commonality. As observer/witness, she reacts to the fictional child, gaining insight and “enlightenment” through her response as a reader. The fictional child seems to exist primarily to provide the impetus for the reader’s revelation. In her essay, “‘We are the World, We are the Children’: The Semiotics of Seduction in International Relief Efforts,” Nancy Ellen Batty demonstrates ways in which the media image of the suffering child “engage[s] us in an immediate and paternalistic relationship” (18) in international relief efforts. Such a paternalistic relationship between child reader and fictional character is possible, says Galway, who then dismisses the possibility by arguing that the invitation to the reader to “identify and empathize” (139) with the suffering character eliminates paternalism. I argue that the acceptance of such an invitation does not eliminate paternalism, but, through presumption, actually promotes it. The achievement of an easy and empathetic identity that closes the gap between reader and character is as problematic as the exaggeration and exploitation of the gap, particularly when the closing of the gap depends on the empathy of one side, based, in this case, on the movement of the reader as she steps inside the character and supposedly gets to know the “other.” Nodelman sees the insistence on the exaggeration of the “mysteriousness otherness” of childhood as a strategy to “observe yet more, interpret yet further” that which we perversely insist is foreign to ourselves (31). To close the gap, however, is also problematic, as McGillis warns in his assessment of “knowing” as a form of “cultural myopia” and colonial control (“Celt” 225). McGillis argues that “knowing” eliminates mystery and otherness in a process of “bringing under control, getting inside, and thereby using” (“Celt” 224). The response to the universality resulting from empathy and identification through such “knowing” is not a simplistic equalization of the reading and fictional child. An active response can place the child reader in the dangerous position of saviour of the child character, while a more passive response can simply use the text as therapeutic reading to alleviate guilt.

The child as saviour or redeemer has enjoyed a long history, as Margot Hillel makes clear in her essay, “‘A Little Child Shall Lead Them’: The Child as Redeemer.” Hillel argues that “while we normally associate the redemptive child with religious themes” of the past,
the figure still exists today with “the strongly religious elements found in earlier books” simply “usurped by secular ones” (57). The idea that children are “the most easily redeemed, after which they became the keepers of true values” (Hillel 63) is, according to Patricia Holland, still upheld by some in contemporary culture. Holland argues that such a perspective assumes that children, in their moral superiority to adults, both deserve and are expected to come up with a better world (Holland, What 93). The onus thus falls on the child to act in adult-like ways, says Hillel, who concludes that the “child as saviour” is “a figure that necessarily implies inadequate adults” (67). Inadequate adults and children who step in to take over appear frequently in Canadian literature, as Carpenter points out when she claims that the “child as redeemer, saviour is ever-present as third-generation figures in our [Canadian] immigrant literature” (Image 19). To what extent do family and society turn to the child as saviour and activist simply because “adult” solutions have failed?

Narratives, both fictional and non-fictional, about the victimized child supposedly translate into activism. Since contemporary Canadian children have been exposed repeatedly to images of the suffering child in media and literature, it is not surprising that they have found ways to respond in an immediate and practical manner. Consider the discourse and rhetoric that have inspired and underpinned such action. Brought up as the recipient and beneficiary of the policy of multiculturalism, the Canadian child is schooled in the profile of the Canadian people as “tolerant” of diversity and the nation as a peacemaker. In Ellis’s novel, Parvana’s Journey, for example, “the rumor that someone was in the camp to choose people to go to Canada” (177) provides hope for the Afghan families in the refugee camp and also inspiration and pride for the Canadian reader. The “Canada people,” who have the troubling
prerogative to actually “choose” those who will enter their country, never materialize, however, and Parvana loses out on the bread at the end of the more reliable bread lineup because she has opted to join the queue leading to the mythical Canadian contingent. While Parvana’s actions reflect the continuation of her faith and hope, as well as her admirable ability to value long-term as opposed to short-term solutions, the failure of the Canadians to deliver, or even appear, comments on and criticizes the disparity between reputation and action. The reader, like the character, is disappointed—possibly disappointed enough to translate that emotion into a determination to participate in the real-life, concrete activism that is merely a rumour and a mirage in the fictional text. Reading Ellis carefully at this point reveals criticism of any complacency surrounding Canada’s reputation for humanitarianism.

As far as “real” Canadian activism is concerned, Free the Children provides the best-known example of children saving children. The non-fictional narrative of the life and death of Pakistani child-labourer Iqbal Masih inspired Craig Kielburger of Ottawa to become an activist. At the age of twelve, he founded Free the Children in response to reading Masih’s story in the Toronto Star (Kielberger). Kielberger’s explanation employs terms of difference and commonality, allowing both to exist, but privileging the essence of the universal child, who manages to emerge despite differences: “I held his story up as a mirror against my own and realized the profound differences between the two. We lived in two different worlds, but we were both children who deserved to laugh and play, to go to school, and above all, be loved” (Kielberger). Kielburger’s organization provides the platform from which Canadian children can participate in the “war” against child labour and poverty throughout the globe. Makman explores the discourse of child as crusader and saviour as it constructs roles and identities of child hero, advocate, martyr, and victim. She argues that “the rise of Masih as an iconic martyr of child labour reveals our ongoing investment in the idea of childhood as sacred and as the source of the possible regeneration of adult society” (288) and points out the patronizing Christian overtones in the disturbing discourse of Masih as martyr/victim and Kielberger as saviour/crusader. Makman argues that in the construction of this relationship, the East, in its disregard for the “sacred institute of childhood” (295), needs to be saved by the “enlightened” West (295). Assumptions about the existence of a common “childhood” obviously involve the imposition of contemporary Western values as the basis for the ideal and standard of what should be saved and protected by the crusading saviour. In my assessment of such child-tied aid, the crusader empathizes with the labouring or needy victim, who tends to remain silent in his passive role as the “deserving” recipient of the activism. The crusader,
overflowing with good will, fills the supposedly empty child in an act that involves giving and sharing in order to ensure that the saviour does not have more than he needs, or at least has less than he did. In the process, he fills the child with his own perception of what is needed, thus forming or creating his ideal of what he is saving. The act of saving empowers, so the crusader has as much as the saved victim—or more—to gain.

Children saving children entrenches the dependent and colonial roles of donor and recipient, saviour and victim, in those seen by society as carrying the most potential and bearing the most suffering. As Batty argues, “a humanitarian discourse that relies heavily upon the image of the suffering, dependent Third World child reproduces and reinforces the discourse of colonialism itself” (29).10 When aid is carried by the “generous” child to the “needy” child, the donor receives recognition for actions that are deemed remarkable because they are uncharacteristically mature. A 2006 Kids Can Press book by Herb Shoveller, *Ryan and Jimmy and the Well in Africa that Brought Them Together*, tells the story of how six-year-old Ryan Hreljac from Kemptville, Ontario raised money and inspiration for a well to be built in Uganda. The child-orchestrated relief organization is publicized and promoted through “Ryan’s Well Foundation,” which uses the narrative and figure of the precocious and selfless child to continue fundraising for wells.

Child-to-child aid has perhaps been most familiar (from 1950 to 2006) in the trick-or-treater’s collection of money in orange UNICEF boxes on Halloween night. This activism did not depend on precociousness or heroism. For a number of reasons, donations in Canada are now made online and through “Trick or Treat for UNICEF” campaigns instead of being handed to actual children at

The concept of children saving children is viewed as special, if not sacred.
the door, thus removing the child from the physical transaction (“History”).\(^{11}\) The concept of children saving children is viewed as special, if not sacred. By taking on the role of donor and saviour, the Canadian reader, like the activist, challenges and emerges from her own colonization by adults, as she colonizes the fictional child into a dependence on herself as reader. The reader, through the recognition or revelation of commonality, provides the character with what is perceived as a desirable release from the restricted position of needy victim to the expansive space of universal and global child.

Literature about and for the globalized child aims to inspire empowerment, solidarity, and voice, as does Craig Kielburger’s Free the Children organization. Iqbal Masih, like the fictional characters, provides the reason for humanitarianism and the impetus for responses that form heroes, activists, crusaders, and advocates. The real child of oppression, like the fictional child, allows and inspires the Canadian child to don the costume, role, and language expected of him or her, which are those of saviour and peacemaker. The child takes upon herself the responsibility to save society through her potential as the “promise of the future,” a role that has come to be associated with both the real and the metaphoric child.\(^{12}\) The danger, of course, is the valorization, entrenchment, and prolonging of the role of the Canadian child as the enlightened donor, which requires, of course, the continued positioning of the “other” child as recipient.

These connections between child reader and child activist are worth thinking about. The adult-constructed phrases “the world’s children” and “children’s literature” both use the possessive apostrophe to designate ownership.\(^{13}\) The apostrophe denotes children belonging to the world and literature belonging to the child. Alternatively or additionally, the apostrophe comments on a world and literature for the child. In either case, the apostrophe marks a colonized and sanctified space, identified and segregated by its difference from a world and literature by and for adults. Until childhood is decolonized and included, it will continue to be exploited and essentialized, often with the best of intentions, but intentions that are riddled with assumptions and presumptions.

Deborah Ellis removes herself, to a great extent, as an intermediary or filter when she offers the actual voices of children in Three Wishes: Palestinian and Israeli Children Speak (2004), Our Stories, Our Songs: African Children Talk About Aids (2005), and Off to War: Voices of Soldiers’ Children (2008), thus eliminating the paternalism that can result from authorial constructions of implied relationships between characters and readers. Each of the papers in the forum following this essay laments the failure to include the child’s voice in academic research and in everyday life, where others tend to speak “on behalf” of children. It is not simply a matter of neglect;
accessing the direct voice is difficult. For example, because of the lack of historical records incorporating the child’s views and voice, historian Mona Gleason uses oral-history interviews, explaining that while she is aware that memories of childhood are removed from the actual experience, interviews still provide valuable information in an area where not much is forthcoming. Sociology research in Canada, as Patrizia Albanese points out, necessarily depends on the filter of “persons most knowledgeable” (PMKs). Shauna Pomerantz, writing through the lenses of feminist sociology of education and youth cultural studies, demonstrates how the girl is artificially constructed according to polarities, so that her voice is silenced when she is treated as an object and rendered shrill when viewed as a subject. Julia Emberley explores the possibilities of the child’s testimony, a politicized process accompanied by assumptions and expectations that interfere with the testifying voice.

Andrea Maxworthy O’Brien reports that Ellis’s “work has been translated into 17 languages.” The reader’s awareness of other cultural and linguistic groups reading and responding to the same text opens and establishes connections that can break down hierarchies that separate children into readers and subjects, saviours and victims, donors and recipients. The knowledge that the narrative can be translated and speaks to many audiences allows for the enactment, in a practical and non-didactic manner, of a shared relevance through diversity rather than despite diversity. This foregrounding of translation and multiple audiences broadens and expands the reader’s concept of narrative relevance by encompassing diversity and commonality through the process of reading. Canadian publishers and teachers of children’s literature should be encouraged to initiate, promote, and draw attention to translations and diverse audiences of narratives of and for children. But until the extremely defensive border excluding and sanctifying childhood is broached and the figure of the child as redeemer and saviour critically probed, there will be little movement or change to the artificial constructions and exploitations of the universal/globalized child, who is refused the much needed translation from child to person and from concept to individual.

Mavis Reimer persuasively situates Canadian children’s literature within a postmodern context in her argument that “the movement of child subjects from given bonds of filiation to chosen bonds of affiliation appears to align Canadian children’s texts with postmodern celebrations of mobile subjectivities” (2). Such a critical approach moves children’s literature from the margins into the main discussion. Including fictional children in the postmodern phenomenon of migrant wanderers renders them regular members of the globalized community rather than the impossibly idealized models or saviours of that society. Deborah Ellis’s non-fiction functions
in a similar manner by providing a space for those voices, ideas, and actions that tend to be colonized and treated with assumptions and paternalism in Canadian “multicultural” and “globalized” fiction, including her own. Ellis’s fiction includes the structure and discourse of child as saviour within the text as well as in the implied relationship between character and reader. Her attempt to minimize an authorial presence and interpretation in the non-fictional *Three Wishes: Palestinian and Israeli Children Speak* so that children can “talk about how the choices other people have made have affected their lives” (10) connects rather than separates children from the larger group, and renders this book, the one that caused all of the commotion, among the least problematic and controversial of Deborah Ellis’s work.

2 According to the Fitzhenry and Whiteside website, Ellis’s awards include, among others, the Governor General’s Award, The Jane Addams Children’s Book Award, the Vicky Metcalf Award, and the Order of Ontario (“About Deborah”).

3 Carpenter proposes “interculturalism” as a possible solution (“Enlisting” 70).

4 Global perspectives are offered by other Canadian writers, but many current texts are more “multicultural” than “global.” Elizabeth Galway, in her review essay, discusses global perspectives offered by Canadian publishers. Only four of the eight books under review, including Ellis’s Our Stories, Our Songs: African Children Talk About AIDS, are by Canadian writers (123).

5 See, for example, “The Fantasy of Liberation and the Demand for Rights,” and “Crybabies and Damaged Children” in Patricia Holland’s Picturing Childhood: The Myth of the Child in Popular Imagery.

6 And, of course, such a one-way gap refuses to acknowledge what obviously exists in real life but does not fit the fictional story—that is, needy Canadian readers and fulfilled Afghan subjects.

7 Mavis Reimer introduces a “gap of privilege” between fictional subject and reader with respect to culture and class in her discussion of depictions of “street kids” and homelessness in Canadian children’s literature. According to Reimer, “the young reader’s response” in this case “becomes a marker of his or her cultural place” (18).

8 Iqbal Masih was bonded by family debt at a very young age to labour in the carpet industry in Pakistan. With the help of the Bonded Labor Liberation Front of Pakistan, he managed to escape and become an activist against child labour, eventually becoming well-known throughout Europe and North America. He was awarded the Reebok Youth in Action Award in Boston in 1994 and was mysteriously murdered near his home in 1995. See also Makman, D’Adamo, Kuklin, Pezzi, and Shea.

9 Iqbal Masih’s active role is perceived as the exception, at least from the Western point of view, as he moved himself from the position of needy victim to political activist, thus saving himself. See Makman for a discussion of the Western construction of Iqbal Masih.

10 In the first endnote of her article, Batty explains her use of the term Third World.

11 See the Canadian Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF website, <http://www.trickortreatforunicef.ca/tot_history.html>, for an explanation of the changes in the UNICEF program.

12 Nancy Ellen Batty sees the “universal child,” who is “lacking specificity,” as a figure inviting “pure fulfillment” and “pure potential” (24), in her role as the promise of the future.

13 Makman discusses the phrase “the world’s children” (289).
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