DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 969 PS 007 481

AUTHOR Takanishi-Knowles, Ruby
TITLE Federal Involvement in Early Childhood Education (1933-1973): The Need for Historical Perspectives.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Day Care Services; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Legislation; *Federal Programs; Historical Criticism; Historical Reviews; Models; *Policy Formation; Political Issues; Poverty Programs; *Program Descriptions; Social Structure; Social Systems; Socioeconomic Influences; Working Women

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this paper is to examine recurring themes which emerge from past federal programs in early education and to identify potential areas where critical historical research is necessary. The author, after a brief survey of federal involvement in early education from 1933 to 1973, suggests that the historical perspective might provide a critical context for policy decisions in early childhood education if future historical research would shift from a descriptive to an analytic level of inquiry. Numerous examples of such an analytic historical method are provided in the text, along with a variety of suggestions for further historical public policy research, such as the impact of early education on: (1) the lives of American children, (2) the development of the professional organizations, (3) public attitudes regarding early education, and (4) on the development of private institutions of early education. The task ahead for a 'new history' of the federal presence in early education lies not so much in the questions which are raised but in the identification of alternative frameworks which organize the questions in relation to each other. (CS)

Federal Involvement in Early Childhood Education (1933-1973): The Need for Historical Perspectives

Ruby Takanishi-Knowles

Department of Education

Early Childhood Development

University of California, Los Angeles

FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN EARLY EDUCATION (1933-1973): THE NEED FOR HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Ruby Takanishi-Knowles[1]
University of California, Los Angeles

The history of early childhood education has been considered to be an insignificant aspect of the professional training of America's teachers of young children. Theoretical and research influences in child development psychology have dominated the field, especially in the last two decades.[2] In the past few years, however, there has been a resurgence of interest in the history of childhood and of the family[3] and in analyses of the use of early education as a means of broad social reform.[4] The compensatory early education programs of the sixties are compared with the child saving, Americanizing efforts of the kindergarten movement and philanthropic groups at the turn of the century.

So far, relatively little attention has been focused on the role of the federal government in programs of early education.[5] Several developments point to the need for historical perspectives in this area. During the sixties, there were large-scale federal programs in early education. This effort has been labeled a failure by many, and has led to disenchantment with federal government intervention in the lives of young children. There are influential groups who oppose government-supported child development schemes.[6] Among these groups are those who favor restricted federal involvement in social welfare strategies and social science researchers who favor allocation of resources to adolescence versus early childhood. There are at the same time equally

influential and diverse political forces that urge continued and expanded federal involvement in child development programs. These groups include feminist movements, child development researchers, professionals in early education, labor unions, policy planners who see programs as a means of welfare reform, and private industry which is either focused on providing care for children as a work benefit or providing care for profit.

Within the last seven years, there have been at least five national commissions working on policy for young children.[7] All of the reports could benefit from historical perspectives. The assumption is made by the reports that the federal government did not have a history of involvement in early childhood programs, and they fail to consider that an analysis of this past involvement might provide a critical context for policy planning for the future.

Within this milieu, a historical perspective can serve several functions. First, we need to examine the goals which were associated with each federal entry into early education as a means of appraising current and future directions. What has been the nature of the federal role regarding the goals of early education? Have those goals changed over time?

Related to the goals, we need to investigate the assumptions and motivations which led to federal intervention. Which individuals and groups supported or opposed the federal presence? What political and legislative strategies were enlisted among the forces of support and of opposition? What issues and value positions were evoked in the disputes? What were the anticipated consequences of federal involvement?

Finally, given federal involvement, what was its impact on the development of early education institutions and on parental and public perceptions of early education? The nature of historical inquiry is well-suited for research into the long-term social and cultural consequences of federal involvement in the lives of children. Central to these questions is the potential role of historical research in demythologizing assumptions and beliefs regarding the federal role.

The main purpose of this paper is a heuristic one--to identify and raise questions which hopefully will stimulate further, intensive historical inquiry into the federal role in early childhood programs. First, recurring themes which emerge from past federal programs in early education will be described. The focus, however, will be on identifying areas for historical research which critically examine the nature of the federal role.

A Definitional Aside

Before proceeding further, the term "early childhood education" needs to be defined. Historically, within American society, there has been a definite distinction made between the nursery school or preschool and the day care center. The nursery school typically provided an educational program for children of the middle and upper classes. The day care centers, on the other hand, were run by social welfare agencies, and provided all day "custodial" care for children with identified categories of "problems."

This distinction does not appear to be useful. First, centers labeled as day care do provide educational programs. Similarly, preschools sometimes function as baby-sitting centers. Second, early

education--whether in preschool or day care--is inseparable from early socialization. Contrary to the point of noted writers,[8] children learn values and acceptable modes of behavior in custodial units as well as in those which consciously provide an educational program. Third, day care is increasingly being characterized as being part of a total educational program in current federal legislation and in the official standards of the welfare agencies.[9]

Hence in this discussion, early education will refer to both preschool and day care programs which have been sponsored by the federal government.

Federal Involvement in Early Education (1933-1973): Recurring Themes

During the twentieth century, the federal government was involved in at least three national programs of early education: The Works Progress Administration (WPA) Nursery Schools (1933-1943), the Lanham Act Child Care Centers (1943-1946), and the Head Start Programs (1965-present). In examining these three programs, several themes reappear.

Federal involvement in early childhood education has been temporary in nature and responsive primarily to social, political, and economic crises. The WPA nursery schools--also called the Emergency Nursery Schools--were seen as a temporary means of employing people on relief. Once this situation was over, there was clearly no federal intention to continue the programs. The WPA adopted a demonstration policy for its educational projects: "As a demonstration of the public usefulness of nursery schools, we will assist the community in establishing and conducting this project. But the WPA aid cannot be promised beyond the fiscal year, and such aid will end entirely when large-scale unemployment

ends."[10]

The Lanham Act Centers were created to deal with a war-caused problem. Funds were distributed only to communities where war-related federal activity created a strain on existing community facilities. Funds for child care were clearly to be terminated at the end of the war. Furthermore, the temporary nature of the funding was stressed by its most ardent advocates and probably contributed to its political acceptance.

More recent compensatory early education programs such as Head Start originated out of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. In Section 205a of the Act which provided the funding for Head Start, the early education of the low-income child was not even mentioned. Head Start was seen as a program which was integrally a part of the Office of Economic Opportunity's community action strategy to reduce poverty.

Even these Head Start programs of the sixties were designed to eliminate the cycle of poverty within a given number of years.[11] The professional advocates who stood behind the War on Poverty argued that disadvantaged children needed a head start which would allow them to enter school on an equal basis with middle-class children. These children of the poor needed cognitive enrichment and acquisition of school-appropriate behaviors. Then the possibilities were unlimited--school failure common to minority students would be considerably reduced or eliminated. They would achieve in school, stay in school longer, have better jobs and incomes, and thus improve their own social and economic status in the society. Early education was seen as the primary antidote for social inequities; the vicious cycle of poverty in America would come to an end.[12]

Connected with its responsiveness to social and economic crises, federal aid has been targeted toward a narrow range of children--those presumed to suffer disadvantages which families themselves cannot ameliorate and/or which pose a potential threat to public safety. Simply, aid was not intended for the education and care of all children. The fact that recent legislation has been perceived as nontargeted has become the rallying point for those who oppose federal involvement. For example, the Comprehensive Child Development Bill of 1971, which would have made it possible for children from a wider range of income levels to participate than in previous ·eral programs, was characterized in the conservative press: "(It) is more than an antipoverty measure. It is blatantly a social experimental scheme to change the nature of American society by undermining the basic unit of that society: the family."

This targeting of federal aid is related to the theme of early childhood education as a means of social reform. Compare, for example, the announcement of the Emergency Nursery Schools in 1933, with the view of the Kerner Commission on the importance of early education. In announcing the Emergency Nursery Schools, Administrator Harry L. Hopkins noted: "It has been brought to my attention that young children of preschool age in the homes of needy and unemployed parents are suffering from conditions existing in the homes incident to current economic and social difficulties. The education and health programs of the nursery school can aid as nothing else in combating the physical and mental handicaps being imposed upon these young children." As part of the Kerner Commission's recommendations for national action: "Early childhood education is at the very heart to reconstruct the environment

they enter the school system."[16]

Marvin Lazerson has presented the argument that early education has been used as a substitute for broader social reform.[17] However, the origins of this reform strategy in American history remain unclear. But that this theme is a persistent one is indicated by the Kerner Commission's recommendation (cited above) which was made in the face of evidence suggesting Head Start programs were not accomplishing their compensatory objectives.

The association of federal programs with children of the poor, and the fact the programs were intended to serve economic and production needs may have seriously hampered future federal efforts to deal with a broader range of American children. Federal intervention in the lives of children has been considered appropriate only when it was judged that their families could not adequately care for them because of poverty or other extenuating circumstances. This viewpoint was integrally related to the longstanding federal policy that the family was critically important as an agent of early socialization.

In 1909, in a declaration of the First White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children, the position of the federal government vis-a-vis the family was articulated: "Home life is the highest and finest production of civilization. It is the great molding force of mind and character. Children should not be deprived of it except for urgent and compelling reasons. Children of parents of worthy character, suffering from temporary misfortune, and children of reasonably efficient and deserving mothers who are without the support of the normal breadwinner, should as a rule be kept with their own parents, such aid being given as may be necessary to maintain suitable homes for the

rearing of children."[18]

Even during the war period when woman-power was so critically needed in defense-related industries, policies emanating from the federal agencies expressed official reluctance regarding the employment of mothers of young children. Mothers who remained at home to care for their children were seen as "performing an essential patriotic service in the defense program."[19] The policy announcement of the War Manpower Commission on the Employment of Women on August 12, 1942, read: "The first responsibility of women with young children, in war as in peace, is to give suitable care in their own homes to their children. In order that established family life may not be unnecessarily disruptive, special efforts to secure in industry women with young children should be deferred until full use has been made of all other sources of labor supply."[20, 21]

Furthermore, in legislation which has been brought before Congress regarding federal involvement in the care of young children, a dominant theme has been the fear of the federal government as child rearer. Proposed federal legislation today still reflects the primacy of the family, specifically the mother in the case of their children. For example, several welfare proposals have recently been forwarded for family-income maintenance plans which would enable low-income mothers to stay at home to care for their children. The thrust of this legislation is very close to those principles espoused at the 1909 White House Conference. In the Comprehensive Head Start, Child Development, and Family Services Act of 1972, the bill begins: "The Congress finds that child development programs must build upon the role of the family as the primary and the most fundamental influence on the development of

children, and must be provided only to children whose parents or legal guardians request them."[22] Sixty-five years of experience has not altered our basic national attitude.

These, then, are the common themes in federal programs of early education:

1. Federal programs for young children have been created in response to immediate social, political, and economic crises. Related to this mode of crisis intervention, programs are planned to be temporary in nature.

2. Federal programs are targeted toward special groups of children, specifically those designated to be in distress.

3. Federal programs of early education have been used as a means of b'oad social reform.

4. Federal policy has been intensely concerned with the primacy of the nuclear family as an agent of early childhood socialization.

These common themes are related to the general one which has characterized federal involvement: programs were temporary in conception and would be phased out by improvements in economic and social conditions for poor and/or distressed families.

The most salient characteristic of historical research in this area is that it has not taken a sufficiently analytic stance regarding the federal presence. Most of the research has been directed toward descriptions of programs and their official goals; how programs were implemented, and the outcomes from the perspective of individuals who were closely involved in the day-to-day functioning of the programs. The following table illustrates the descriptive versus analytic distinction.

Table 1

Descriptive Versus Analytic Historical Inquiry Into the Federal Role--Early Education as an Example

Descriptive Statement	Analytic Question
Federal programs are responsive to crisis; programs are temporary.	What have been the effects of this mode of federal involvement on future programs? What does it tell us about how the child and family are perceived? Did the programs have their intended effects? Why was early education part of a crisis intervention program?
Programs are targeted toward special groups.	How has the targeted nature of programs influenced its acceptability and adoption in the public and private institutions of child care and education? Have these special target groups benefited in the long term from federal entry?
Federal programs are means of achieving social reform.	Why have early childhood education programs been viewed as a means of large-scale social reform?
Federal policy reflects intense concern over the role of the family.	What has been the impact of federal programs on the family as a socializing agency? Have they strengthened or weakened the role of the family in the child's life?

In addition to the need to shift from the descriptive to the analytic level of inquiry, there are important facets of the federal role which remain obscure. The history of federal involvement in early education is devoid of the people and groups who supported and opposed the programs during each period of federal involvement. The goals and political resources of these groups remain obscure. The individuals who administered and who implemented the programs, their relationships with professional and other groups in the community are missing even from the descriptive accounts. The dynamics of federal early education program creation and the issues involved have not received serious consideration. Finally, the study of the impact of federal involvement along a number of dimensions needs exploration. It is in these areas that new historical perspectives are needed.

In the remainder of this paper, historical inquiry into aspects of the federal role in early education will be explored. The discussion is intended to stimulate further historical and public policy research in this area. As such, the discussion can be viewed as an agenda for research into the federal role in the lives of young children.

AN AGENDA FOR HISTORICAL RESEARCH:

SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EARLY EDUCATION

A. THE DYNAMICS OF FEDERAL PROGRAM CREATION

Very little historical inquiry has been directed to the processes by which programs were created. Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of this current research thus far is the awareness that past programs were

not created by legislative action of the Congress. Rather, the programs originated out of staff and administrative decisions in the federal bureaucracies. The implications of this pattern of program creation and implementation on the fate of federal programs once funding was withdrawn demand further exploration.

The WPA nursery schools started in 1933, when the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) administrator authorized the expenditure of work-relief funds for the employment of teachers in nursery schools serving children from low-income and unemployed families. The nursery schools were placed under the jurisdiction of the public school system. In 1943, when federal funding ended, few were adopted by the public school system.

The Lanham Child Care Centers received funds under Title II of the 1941 Community Facilities Act (Lanham Act) which read: "Title II: Defense Public Works. As used in this title, the term 'public works' means any facility necessary for carrying on community life substantially expanded by the national defense program, but the activities authorized under this title shall be devoted primarily to schools, waterworks, sewers, sewage, garbage and refuse disposal facilities, public sanitary facilities, works for the treatment and purification of water, hospitals, and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, and streets and access roads."[23]

The Act became a major source of funding for child care centers in a decision made in 1943, by the House Committee on Building and Grounds from which the Act originated. However, there were congressmen who firmly believed throughout the war that the Lanham Act was never intended to provide for child care.[24]

On February 17, 1943, President Roosevelt transmitted a supplemental estimate of appropriations to enable the Office of Defense, Health, and Welfare Services (functions subsequently referred to the Federal Security Agency) to provide "payments to the states for expenditure in accordance with state plans for the care and protection of children of employed mothers."[25] At this point, both houses of Congress expressed the need for enabling legislation as the basis for appropriations for a program of such fundamental importance to the children of the Nation."[26] Senator Hayden, then acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, introduced a bill providing legislative authorization (S. 876) which was referred to the Education and Labor Committee. After consideration in this Committee, Senator Elbert Thomas submitted S. 1130 to replace and strengthen the original Hayden bill.

This was the first time in the country's history that there would be hearings and congressional debate over a bill whose stated intent was to provide for the group care and protection of children. It is noteworthy that at the time when the hearings were taking place, child care was being funded by the Lanham Act in the amount of $9,000,000.[27] These funds were being administered by the Federal Works Agency (FWA) and were direct grants to local sites.

Thus the central issue was not whether to fund child care centers, but whether federal activity in child care "should be covered by definitive legislation of Congress prescribing the scope and basis of federal participation in the field."[28] A related issue was whether the two existing federal agencies which had traditionally been involved with children--the Office of Education and the Children's Bureau--would

administer the programs through established State agencies, thus recognizing the states' rights in matters related to the education and care of children.

On June 8, 1943, a hearing was held before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on S. 1130. While the bill received support from diverse sources, it was singularly opposed by the Federal Works Agency which was then administering the Lanham funds. Mrs. Florence S. Kerr, assistant to the administrator of the FWA, testified before the committee and revealed important aspects of the Lanham method of federal assistance. She reported: "First, funds are allotted solely as a war emergency measure in order to facilitate the employment of women needed in the war industries. We are not subsidizing an expanded educational program nor a federal welfare program, but we are making money available to assist local communities in meeting a war need for the care of children while their mothers are engaged in war production."[29] Some features of the Lanham funding included decentralized responsibility and no federal interference with respect to operating standards especially in relation to local school officials.[30] Thus these programs varied greatly in quality and community acceptance.[31]

A supporting statement revealing the underlying philosophy of the Lanham child care program was offered by Major General Philip B. Fleming, Administrator in the Federal Works Administration, in a letter to Senator Elbert Thomas. He cautioned the senators: "A program of this kind should have its primary emphasis on emergency and wartime aspects rather than on techniques and standards. ...I do not feel that this Congress is anxious to set up a wartime program of child care in the permanent machinery of federal aid with the emphasis on standards

and regulations. The job is being done already and the children are not forgotten."[32]

S. 1130 would have vested administrative responsibility in the Office of Education and the Children's Bureau which would have then developed with the states education and welfare services for children. Thus the bill would have superseded the FWA, but more importantly it would have the clear directive of providing nonemergency education and welfare services which were negated by the Lanham funding pattern.

S. 1130 passed the Senate on June 30, 1943, but it remained in the House Education Committee where it slipped into obscurity. The hearings and debates, however, provide a context for examining the controversies surrounding the federal role which continue to the present.

The bogeyman of federal control of education has a long history,[33] and it is especially potent with respect to the education of young children. The debates and fate of S. 1130 indicated some legislators preferred emergency, even though massive financing of child care centers with little federal control over local operations to the alternative possibility of creating permanent federal agencies and federal-state channels of regulations and funding.

Ad hoc administrative arrangements were clearly the preferred means of federal intervention during World War II. The Lanham Centers were operated by local agencies, usually public school systems, which set up their own standards and selection of personnel. There was minimal federal control, although the federal government provided approximately two-thirds of the operating costs. This was a federal operation which was not run by the existing federal bureaucracies which would have the greatest interest at stake, but by a temporary federal agency whose

stated goal was to "retire completely and irrevocably from the child care fiel ' once the war was over.[34]

There were senators who feared that the creation of an agency responsible for child care and education would create its own pressures for self-perpetuation even after the war period. In the Senate debate over S. 1130, Senator George remarked: "I am apprehensive that it is the beginning of a very widespread program of child control.... I have the very strong feeling we are embarking on a program which we shall not be able to abandon when the war is over." [35] The Lanham Act continued to finance child care during the war, and funds were terminated on February 28, 1946. In only one state (California) did the centers continue functioning by means of state funding.

This brief examination of S. 1130 points to the need for more research which examines the history of child care and education legislation, and the dynamics of program development. Examination of current child care legislation indicates the history of S. 1130 is not an isolated case. The Child Development Bill of 1971, for example, was amended to Office of Economic Opportunity legislation. This tactic of attaching the bill as an amendment to extend the life of OEO consequently precluded the possibility of extensive debate and examination of the bill on its own merit.

The strategy by which bills are introduced, the opposition and support which they receive, and the resulting legislation and programs which finally emerge during a given period should be an important agenda item for future inquiry. What does the nature of the legislative strategy and debate tell us about how the young child is perceived and valued in the society? What do the dynamics of program creation reveal

regarding the nature of the federal commitment to early childhood programs?

B. THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT

One assumption under which every federal entry into early education occurred was that it would provide an impetus and models for future efforts in the field. During each period of federal involvement, optimistic writers extolled the virtues of the nursery schools and child care centers and their contributions to American society.[36]

Educational evaluation and formal evidence have dominated the assessment of the compensatory programs of the sixties focusing on primarily their cognitive, and to a lesser extent on their affective outcomes in children. However, there is a paucity of studies which exist on the impact of federal entry into early education along a number of other equally important dimensions. These omissions include:

1. The impact of federal programs on the development of early education as an institution in the lives of American children and their families.

2. The impact of federal programs on the development of the professional ranks of early educators; how they were trained and the growth of the professional organizations.

3. The impact of federal programs on public awareness of the value and need for institutions of early education.

4. The impact of federal programs on private institutions of child care and education.

1. Early Education in the Lives of American Children

Given the federal effort, what impact did it have on early education as an institution in the lives of American children? There are at least two methods for answering this question. The first is by reading narrative accounts of the intended benefits of the programs. Second, the use of census and other record-keeping data give us some quantitative fix on the development of the schools. Both types of data--the narrative and the census--enable us to ask questions regarding the manifest and latent objectives of the programs. That is, what did the official planners of the programs say the programs intended to produce; were they, in fact, the outcomes? What might be the unexpressed, but important objectives, and what might be the unanticipated outcomes of the federal effort?

Table 2 presents the intended outcomes of the three national programs. Although the emphases differ, the outcomes show remarkable similarity even in the language used by the reporters. Each of these goals need to be examined in detail. However, for purposes of illustration I will deal with the contribution of the programs to the number of early education institutions and the kinds of children they served.

Survey data on enrollment of children under six were gathered by the U. S. Office of Education in 1930, 1936, and 1942. At this point, it is only possible to make hypotheses regarding the impact of federal entry on the numbers and kinds of schools because of difficulties in the manner in which the survey data was collected and compiled for existing reports.

Table 3 shows the dates for the establishment of nursery schools in

Table 2

Three Federal Programs of Early Education

Goals	WPA Nursery Schools	Lanham Centers	Head Start
Social and Economic	To provide work for individuals on relief during Depression	To provide child care for mothers employed in war industries during World War II	To provide programs to deal with conflict over race and poverty in context of urban unrest and minority militancy
Child	"Health services, nutrition, good physical, social, and mental development."[37]	"Direct contribution to child life and the prevention of physical and emotional wreckage."[38]	"Improving the child's physical health and abilities; helping the emotional and social development of the child. . . ."[39]
Parents	Parent education programs	Parent education and enabling mothers to work	"Strengthening the family's ability to relate positively to the child and his problems."[39]
Public Schools	Increased opportunities for public schools to realize the value of nursery schools for adoption into the public system	"Opportunity for public school to incorporate preschools into its system."[38]	To prepare children for the public school experience

Table 3

Dates for the Establishment of Nursery Schools in Operation in 1942[40]

Years	Nursery School	
	Number	Percent
1880-1900	13	1.6
1901-1910	9	1.1
1911-1920	37	4.5
1921-1930	215	26.2
1931-1940	481	58.6
1941-1942	66	8.0

operation in 1942. Between the years 1921 and 1930, 26% of all nursery schools were organized. This was also the greatest period of growth of "college laboratory nursery schools," 42% of which were organized during the period. The next ten-year period, 1931-1940, brought the greatest expansion with 59% of the nursery schools opening during the decade. This was the time in which the WPA nursery schools were organized. Taking the period 1931-1940 and comparing the numbers of nursery schools by group type allows us to speculate on the kind of children who were served (see Table 4).

Major increases were made in the numbers of schools during the period 1930-1942. In 1930, the distribution among the group types was somewhat even. Tuition schools declined during the Depression period, but constituted one-fourth of the preschool centers in 1942, or 64% of all the nonfederal programs. Thus it appears that while the WPA schools served large number of low-income children during the period 1933-1942, public school nurseries which were expected to be a consequence of federal funding experienced the least growth during the period. Meanwhile, middle class tuition nursery schools increased steadily, a trend which continued after the war.[42]

But what about the postwar period and the middle sixties when the federal government re-entered the early education realm on a national scale? Here there exists a critical gap in the data. It appears that the federal government stopped collection of preprimary enrollment data during this period, presumably because of its noninvolvement. A search is currently underway to obtain enrollment data for this period from other sources.

In 1934, H. H. Anderson observed "nursery education is now avail-

Table 4

Comparisons of Numbers of Nursery Schools by Group Type, for the Period 1930-1946 [41]

Group Type	1930		1936		1942		1944	1945	1946
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent			
Tuition	73	36.0	144	8.0	622	26.0	-	-	-
College	74	36.4	77	4.0	122	5.0	-	-	-
Philanthropic	43	21.2	53	3.0	156	6.0	-	-	-
Special	--	--	--	--	35	1.0	-	-	-
Public School	13	6.4	11	1.0	30	1.0	-	-	-
Federal Programs	0	0.0	1,500	84.0	1,500	61.0	3,100	2,800	1,497

Numbers for first five group types for years 1944, 1945, 1946 are not available.

Numbers on the last day of the program, February 28, 1946.

able only for the very rich and the very.poor."[43] The U. S. Office of Education data cited above provided some evidence for his statement. Was there a similar situation during the sixties when large-scale federal programs were aimed at poverty groups?

It would be premature to draw any firm conclusions at this point because of the difficulty in obtaining needed data. During the Head Start period, however, the National Center for Educational Statistics produced yearly reports on the enrollment of children under six based on the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey. These reports are revealing on the entry of the federal government with the target of affecting the preschool education of "disadvantaged" children.

Based on the October 1965 Survey, Samuel Schloss reported: "Project Head Start, the federal preschool program for needy children, which was carried out so successfully in the summer of 1965 apparently has little effect on the size of nursery and kindergarten enrollments when the regular school year began in the fall."[44] The critical point which appears consistently in later reports of the Center is that attendance at each age level greatly favored children who came from middle-class and from above family backgrounds than children from "poverty" backgrounds.

Based on the October 1967 Survey, there was a continued upward trend in preschool enrollment based on the period 1964-1967. Diane Gentler of the Center reported: "Increase in percentage of children enrolled at each year of age was larger for children in the two lower income groups (Under $3,000, $3,000-$4,999) than for families with $5,000 or more. However, it did not close the gaps between enrollment rates of 3-5 year olds in the lowest income categories with those of

upper income ($7,500-$9,999, $10,000 and above).[45]

There is much more research needed to answer the question of who benefits in the long term from early education programs especially under conditions when federal funding tends to dwindle after the peak of crisis. While the Head Start programs did temporarily benefit low-income families, the aid was not sustained. In 1970, five years after the debut of Head Start, the National Center survey indicated at each age level, private schools served a significantly larger proportion of preschool children than did publicly financed ones.[46]

In their survey of day care and preschool services, Ronald Parker and Jane Knitzer conclude: "A two-pronged pattern reflecting economic and racial stratification has evolved. Proportionately fewer poor children are enrolled in any kind of service than are children from affluent families. White children are more likely to be enrolled in preschool programs, and minority group children are more likely to be enrolled in day care programs. Federal involvement in preschool and child care is directed primarily at serving children of the poor. In actual numbers, only a small percentage of this group is reached."[47]

2. Impact on the Development of the Professional Organizations

Early education has two points of reference with respect to its American origins. First, around the turn of the century, kindergartners under the influence of Margaret and Rachael McMillan who worked in nursery school settings with slum children in London, were involved in establishing similar projects in the large American cities.[48] Through the kindergartners, the early care and education of children had its roots in the philanthropic, child-saving orientation of the settlement

houses. The second point of origin was found in the laboratory schools which were associated with institutions of higher education and which served middle- to upper-class children.

Little work exists on the role of these two interest groups in the early care and education of young children. Each developed into a separate professional group with an established territory of care for children. During the Second World War, both groups very often worked in the same settings and in the same community groups centered about child protection. At the end of the war, they developed separate agendas and went separate ways.[49] Current proposed federal legislation merges early education with the care and protection of children. However, legislative language and child welfare standards do not necessarily insure such a merger will take place in the delivery of services. Historical inquiry is needed on the social welfare and early education professional ranks, their past relationships with and perceptions of each other, and the conditions under which cooperation occurred.

A fascinating narrative is still to be written about the individuals involved--most of whom were women--and their influence on the development, both in numbers and in character of the professional organizations. There is a literature on the growth of professionalization among the teaching ranks. However, the field of early education has its unique problems. Lucy Gage, complaining "the slow growth of professionalism" in 1942, noted in this respect: "It was even more difficult to pry loose a large group of genteel unmarried women from the emotional satisfaction they enjoyed in a kind of vicarious sentimental motherhood found in daily association with children."[50] "It is particularly tempting in the field of daily

association with children two, three, four, and five to be personal rather than professional."[51]

A related question is how the way professional organizations evolved as well as how their philosophy affected their orientation toward governmental involvement in early education, and the political strategies which they used to influence decisions. Margaret Rosenheim has distinguished between two themes of child legislation in the United States. The first is the "deviancy control" approach or the reform of individuals, and the second is called "structural reform" or direct manipulation of public institutions.[52] Like most distinctions, neither of these exists in pure form, but both are potentially useful as a framework for examining strategies in early education, and their implications for the state of the field at present. From its beginnings, the National Association of Nursery Education (now National Association for the Education of Young Children) had a legislative specialist. The individual was to keep the membership informed regarding the status of legislation affecting early education. A close examination of the nature of the strategies is needed as well as an assessment of the impact of the organization on the fate of federal legislation.

In 1946, after the termination of federal funds, NANE joined other groups to form the National Committee for Group Care of Children. The work of the committee is described and reveals the nature of their strategy: "(The committee) did not promote any particular bill or pattern of governmental aid nor did it attempt to outline or establish an all-inclusive program for children. The committee felt it would be most effective if it published a series of bulletins which would serve

as a clearinghouse of concrete suggestions for methods of mobilizing community forces on the state and local levels to meet the needs of children." At the same time a grass roots strategy was being advocated, the local child care councils in communities were disbanded along with the defense councils near the end of the war. "With no Office of Civilian Defense to stimulate the once active child care committees to life, their resurrection presumably will have to be spontaneous unless some other national agency, either public or voluntary, enters the picture with such a purpose."[53]

Thus the approach that NANE took was an information dissemination approach. Handbooks and bulletins would be written in the national office. These would become the basis for local community action for early education. By the choice of this approach, the organization shyed away from the rough and tumble of political activity, lobbying, and the creation of organized pressure groups. It is unclear how or why this choice of strategy was made. The effects of this approach, however, are unmistakable. Even moderate activity in support of public early education did not materialize.

The question of the role which the various organizations played in the formulation of programs and legislation also needs more scrutiny. The impression is that early educators enter the scene <u>after</u> the programs have been authorized. Thus they often work under regulations/program requirements in which they had no part in formulating. The consequences of noninvolvement in policy development are clear in the area of personnel training. For example, at the beginning of Head Start in the summer of 1965, there was no group of early education specialists who were prepared to deal with the target

population of "disadvantaged" children.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children has currently adopted a "Children's Cause" strategy which encourages active lobbying and coalitions with other organizations for the promotion of its goals. The evolution of and the factors which led to the adoption of this activist strategy within the organization needs further exploration.

3. Impact on Public Attitudes Regarding Early Education

Another question, given what we have previously described as characteristics of the federal role and policies, is how these have influenced the public mind regarding early education. In a discussion of the acceptability of nursery schools in public education, Professor J. Norton, Teachers College, noted in 1945, that past federal policies in the establishment of nursery schools may have produced consequences that would hinder their expansion: "They will fix in the minds of people certain principles which are unsound for ultimate adoption. The emphasis has been and is on the production by adults and employment of adults rather than the education of children. The establishment of federal nursery schools has been limited to areas where the foregoing ends could be furthered. When they are established for noneducational purposes and financed by funds obtained outside the educational budget, nursery schools tend to grow up as separate agencies rather than as part of the continuous, free, public education system to which the United States has been long committed."[54, 55]

Although this is an area for much more intensive inquiry, my research suggests that opinions differed by groups in the society. The

different viewpoints of people in different positions is a vehicle for understanding the multiplicity of motivations and assumptions with which the programs were viewed.

The writings of the early educators indicated that one of the more important outcomes of the programs was on public and especially parental awareness of the value of early education. However, the impact of the federal programs on parents' expectations and desires for early education is not clear. The Lanham funds were extended for a year because of a deluge of parent protests across the country.[56] However, it was only in one state (California) where the Lanham centers continued to be financed on a year-to-year basis for 13 years until it became permanently part of the State Department of Education. This achievement is partially attributable to a strong and organized parent group.[57]

A number of surveys taken during 1945, indicated that mothers intended to continue working and needed the services of child care institutions.[58] In Los Angeles and Cleveland, 60% of the women sampled planned to continue their work. Eighty percent of the women in Detroit reported they would continue; 55% of these women indicated that they had to assume partial or entire responsibility for family support.

What appears to emerge after World War II is the growth of private centers and parent cooperatives.[59] The former would have placed a financial burden on those women who worked to support their families, and the latter were not designed for mothers who worked long hours. Thus it appears those who would have benefited most from continued federal funding were left out in the cold.

In 1945, the Nation's Schools, a journal for school administrators, conducted an opinion poll on the future of child care services. Four

hundred eighty school administrators were selected from the nation at random; 40% of those who were mailed questionnaires returned them. To the question: Who should assume responsibility for administering a program of day care for children of working mothers, the school administrators replied:[60]

Welfare	36%
School	38%
Industry	25%
Parents	1%
Combination	3%
No Answer	2%

To the question: Who should pay for the program of child day care, the results were:[61]

Parents	34%	Industry + Parent	9%
Federal	22.5%	Industry + Parent + Federal	3%
Industry	9%	Parent + Federal	3%
State	4%	Parent + State + Federal	2%
Community	1%	Community + State	2%
		State + Federal	2%
		Other	7.5%

What the results indicate is that among schoolmen there was no consensus for administration of the programs, although a small plurality (38%) indicated the schools should play a role. The responsibility for the financing of the programs, however, is revealing. The burden was placed squarely upon parents and the federal government, and to a lesser extent on industry. The results of this opinion are also consistent with the state governors' reply to FWA administrator Phillip Fleming's

1946 inquiry regarding state funding of day care in 1945. All the governors replied that they saw the Lanham programs are purely a wartime undertaking and hence solely the responsibility of the federal government.

A related question is why the impetus for child care faltered after federal funds were terminated. The answer is important because the federal effort in early education has never been a long-term commitment, but more intended to provide models which then presumably are adopted at the private, state, and local levels. There are great problems involved in federal withdrawal, the most prominent being that of financing. The examination of these problems sheds light on problems still faced today by proponents of early education, especially in the public domain.

What is beginning to emerge is a sense of the social, political, and economic conditions which led to and sustained federal disengagement from early education for approximately 20 years. Following World War II, women continued to work in large numbers. Private companies which had provided models of excellent child care, such as the Kaiser Industries, withdrew their support from the programs partially because it was not economically advantageous to continue them. For the schoolmen, the shifting population caused by the war resulted, in many places, in overcrowded school facilities. Many child care facilities built during the war period under the Lanham Act were projected to be elementary school buildings once the war was over: "When the job of winning the war is finished and mothers exchange their war plant slacks for kitchen aprons, this building will provide elementary school facilities in a community that boomed to 15 times its prewar size in the war industry efforts."[62]

As early as 1939, George Stoddard, then Director of the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, identified "shackling concepts in nursery education" which are still very much alive today.[63] Ten years later, then as president of the University of Illinois, he presented the same arguments to the World Organization of Early Childhood Education in August 1949. "Resistance to nursery schools, like war, begins in the minds of men; presently in the mental habits of the male administrative animal."[64]

Blocking No. 1: I got along without nursery school and kindergarten. Why can't the children of today?

Blocking No. 2: The worst home is better for the child than the best institution.

Blocking No. 3: What can a child of three, four, five learn?

Despite a body of research into early learning and development to the contrary, there are individuals who argue that early learning may be harmful to young children.[65] A similar line of argument is presented by those who gather evidence that early childhood is not the "prime time" for learning to take place.[66] The new style of opposition depends heavily on the citation of "research evidence," and obscures the implicit value positions which are taken by the authors.

Blocking No. 4: Aren't mothers better off if they stay at home and take care of their children instead of visiting nursery schools or attending parent education meetings?

This theme has a long history. Namely, mothers who do not care for their children on a full-time basis are shirking their primary responsibility as women. To which Stoddard's reply was appropriate: "There

is no joy in the sense of captivity."[67]

Blocking No. 5: Educational services for young children will cost too much. We can't afford them.

Financial and space considerations continue to be primary obstacles. Early childhood education is expensive. And with a crunch on school budgets throughout our history and no enduring commitment to put funds where rhetoric reigns, this issue promises to be with us for some time.

Stoddard believed that the lack of response on the part of administrative and political leaders was because nursery schools were perceived as a need of women: "What men want, they tend to get, whether it be liquor, tobacco, or armaments. What women want in the way of educational and social help tends to be discounted by administrative and political leaders who are not in the habit of lending a serious ear to such people on such questions."[68]

The political context of early education at the end of the war also needs further examination. In many cities, community groups were organized.[69] There were also statements of support from the professional groups such as the Educational Policies Commission, Research Division of the NEA, National Society for the Study of Education, American Association of School Administrators, as well as labor and parent groups.[70] The extent to which these groups transformed organizational pronouncement into active political influence needs further exploration. The existence of this potential base of support makes consideration of why they did not have a greater impact an intriguing one in relation to the problem of effecting change in educational policy and practice.

One strategy adopted by early educators favored general grants-in-aid to the states which would then be pressured to provide for nursery

schools versus the aid from the federal government aimed specifically at nursery education. The issue of specific versus general aid has a long history in the federal-state education relations. The implications of the adoption of this strategy by the early education groups needs more exploration. Another line of analysis already suggested in this paper is the need for examination of the structures at the state and local levels created by the pattern of federal funding. The hypothesis is that the manner in which federal involvement occurred and the patterns of administration and funding which emerged may have limited the efficacy of organized groups and governmental agencies in pressuring to continue the programs once the emergency was over. The critical issue here is whether institutional change occurred--in this case, in the public schools--which would be conducive to the continuation of the programs. Goodykoontz, for example, suggests that the emergency-relief nursery schools did not change the conditions for acceptance of such schools in the public school system for two reasons.[71] First, the funding required local sponsoring committees to be set up which evolved as separate policy-making bodies from the public school system. Second, the efforts to maximize employment created large staffs at the nursery level and thus militated against eventual adoption.

On the other hand, Goodykoontz argues, the nursery schools established as part of extended public school services had a greater probability of being adopted as part of school units. She cites the cases of Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, California, New York, and Massachusetts. It is also important to note that these were also situations in which there existed strong parental or professional groups or both.

Finally, it is possible that federal support of child care may have

actually hindered the continuation of the programs once the funding sources were withdrawn. The targeting of federal funds on specific groups may have contributed to the lack of a broad-based constituency for child care. New York City, for example, was not designated a defense area, and hence did not qualify for Lanham funds. In her reflections about day care in New York City, Cornelia Goldsmith, a noted early educator and child advocate, assessed the nonavailability on federal funds on the status of day care programs in New York City once the war was over: "The broadly based support from both public and private organizations and active community involvement in the program proved to be a greater and more lasting asset in the long run than the temporary Lanham Act funds alone could possibly have achieved. The community was aroused. . . In most large cities across the country. . . the withdrawal of Lanham Act funds at the close of the war terminated their federally supported child care center programs. In New York City, forced by circumstances to work out its own day care destiny without federal assistance, day care had gained sufficient strength, know-how and community support to survive at the end of the war."[72]

4. Impact on the Development of the Private Sector

Another area of historical inquiry relates to the impact of federal programs on the development of private institutions of early education. This particular line of inquiry is important in order to assess the long-range effects of federal programs which were intended to be short range and targeted toward "needy" children in terms of the question, "Who benefits?"[73] Private nursery schools flourished after the war. But it is likely that these programs did not serve needy children, but became resources for middle- and upper-income families. This inquiry is

also important in light of the potentially large "day care industry" or poverty-education complex. What historical precedents do we have for child care provided by industry and supported by government?

During World War II, a large program of early education was provided by the Kaiser Shipbuilding Corporation for children of mothers who were working in the Portland shipyards. The Kaiser Child Service Centers were mainly financed by the Kaiser Company. However, the buildings were financed by a grant from the U. S. Maritime Commission. Many of the key participants, the administrators and teachers, have settled since into careers within the early education field. The position taken by Kaiser was that an industry which needs the labor of women must shoulder responsibility for the children of these women. The centers were located in easy access to the shipyards, were open 24 hours a day, and flexible for the schedules of individual parents and children. The emphasis was on "meeting needs."[74] Thus the centers provided meals, take-home dinners for families, mending services, shopping services, drop-in centers to enable mothers to devote attention to their children after work.

The Kaiser centers were seen as models for postwar nursery schools: "If this demonstration has been successful so that all levels of education learn that the job is to meet needs, this lesson may outrank the nursery school's good care of children as a wartime contribution."[75] A careful examination of the Kaiser Child Service Centers would be useful for examining the role of industry versus the federal government in the provision of early child care.

Finally, the impact of federal policies on the emergence of franchise day care ("Kentucky Fried Children") needs careful

examination. The expansion of franchise day care programs has been aided by federal funds to care for children of welfare mothers (e.g., Title IV-A and IV-B of the Social Security Act-1967). The issue of control of day care programs is related to both the mode of financing and the quality and nature of the services which are provided.

Themes Shared With Other Federal Educational Programs

The ongoing research on the federal presence in early education suggests common themes are shared with other inquiries into the federal role in American education. The policies and programs appear responsive to social, economic, and political crises outside the field of education itself. It would be perfectly safe to conclude that no federal bill on early child care and education has yet been passed without an economic rationale or as a rider on another nonchild related bill. Ruth Andrus, in the middle 1940's, noted this characteristic of federal legislation for children which continues to this day: "We have unlimited resources for building the engines of war and for developing postwar machines and gadgets, but when money is appropriated children may become only secondary considerations as exemplified by the most recent appropriation for school lunches which went through as a rider to a bill giving federal money for fertilizer and pest control."[76]

The federal role in early education can be characterized by a piecemeal approach reflecting a lack of comprehensive social policy and the formation of temporary policy in times of crisis. This particular feature makes any research in this area an extremely frustrating and elusive one. Examining the federal presence is particularly complex when viewed in relation to other countries which have centralized plan-

ning, coordination, and delivery of services for children.[77] In the United States, there are at least three different levels of government as well as private agencies with overlapping spheres of influence all engaged in the care and education of young children. Within the federal level there are bureaus and agencies which are involved in a series of uncoordinated programs which may or may not have relationships to agencies at the state level.[78] Furthermore, different agencies of the federal government may have different goals for childhood programs which may be in opposition. This situation was summed up by Edward Ziegler, then head of the Office of Child Development during the debates on the Comprehensive Child Development Act: "This administration is having a heck of a time in coming to grips with what its philosophy is on day care."[79] Furthermore, the manner in which programs were developed and implemented cannot be subject to the traditional means of examining legislative records. As we have seen, national programs of child care and education were funded by bills in which there is no specific mention of children. It is also revealing that there are no existing studies on federal expenditures for programs for young children.

Many decisions to begin federal involvement were made by administrators in the federal agencies. As such, records of decision-making processes are not readily accessible. Information may be in memoranda in special libraries or special collections. The history of programs as remembered by the individuals involved still remains the single most untapped resource. George Counts noted: "Always at the point where an educational program comes into being, definite choices are made among many possibilities. And those choices are made, not by the gods or the laws of nature, but by men and women--men and women moved by all these

considerations that move them in other realms of conduct--by their knowledge and understanding, their hopes and fears, their purposes and loyalties, their views of the world and human destiny."[80] Many of these men and women are still active within the professional organizations and with childhood legislation. Their reflections and recollections comprise valuable data for historical research.

Federal programs related to the early childhood years raise age-old questions regarding the role of the family vis-a-vis the state in the care and education of young children. In examining the role assigned to the family versus the state in the United States, comparative, cross-national historical research is important given the critical role that ideology plays in determining the acceptability and quality of extra-familial institutions in early childhood.[81] In America, we have evolved a child protection doctrine that the removal of a child from the family is a last alternative. This has been reflected in decisions about who receives early education in this country and the kind of programs that are developed. Hence, the origins of the ideology of the family in American social and cultural history is an important area for inquiry.

Although the importance of the family in relation to the state has shifted slightly during the twentieth century, the prominence of the family has remained strong.[82] Within the past year, the nation's most faithful advocate of children, Senator Walter Mondale (D-Minnesota) has conducted hearings on the impact of federal policies on the welfare of American families.[83] The thrust was to determine the extent to which government policies strengthen or weaken the family, and what changes need to occur in areas of work, mobility, taxes, welfare, and housing.[84] For example, welfare reform plans which coerce low income mothers to

work in exchange for custodial day care may have the potentiality of undermining parental influence especially if the programs are not controlled by parents.

What was the impact of federal preschool programs on the families whose children participated? The assessment of "family impact" is an important aspect of understanding the state versus the family. To what extent has the family been "undermined" as the opponents of the programs have claimed? In each of the three national efforts, parent involvement and education was an important expressed objective, because it is assumed that parent involvement in programs mitigates problems which are attributed to federal involvement in child care. However, the extent to which parent involvement was actually implemented and affected the lives of parents and their children remain unclear. A history of parent roles in the federal programs remains to be written.

Another persisting theme has been the fear that federal funding would result in governmental child rearing which allegedly homogenizes political and social values of children. J. J. Kilpatrick, echoing earlier opposition, called the Child Development Bill of 1971, "the boldest and most far-reaching scheme advanced for the Sovietization of American youth."[85]

The record of past federal programs does not support this view. If anything, community or site control was preeminent. Variations among local sites plagued evaluators who assumed they were more homogeneous than was actually the case.[86] In a National Advisory Council of Education of Disadvantaged Children report, it was noted that, "for the most part...projects are piecemeal, fragmented efforts at remediation or vaguely directed 'enrichment.' It is extremely rare to find

strategically planned comprehensive programs for change."[87] It was unlikely, given the past nature of federal involvement in early education, that it could dictate guidelines or even programs. Local communities and individuals ruled the day.

An examination of the role of child development data and evaluation studies on the content of federal policy programs and the eventual allocation of resources is critical. This proposed line of inquiry is somewhat different than that completed by Sheldon White and his associates on federal programs for young children. A primary goal of their comprehensive review was to ascertain whether child development research and evaluation of federal programs <u>can</u> provide the basis for future policy. The question being raised here is: What influence <u>did</u> these studies have on policy formation? What positions and evidence were used or not used? Related, how were existing data interpreted in support or opposition to federal efforts? What was the role of researchers in the federal policy process? The issue of the utilization of scientific evidence in the service of early education policy is a complex one. Suffice it to say that the same evidence can be used to support opposing views, and it is at this point that the examination of value positions which guided the use of evidence is crucial.

Conclusion

At several points in this paper, I suggested that the historical perspective might provide a critical context for policy formation in the future. In order to provide this context, historical research into the federal role in early education must shift from the descriptive to the analytic level of inquiry. Conceptual frameworks which link levels of

analysis are needed. Some potential frameworks include Matthew Miles' analyses of educational innovations which illustrate linkages among the nature of specific innovations; their introduction, installment, and eventual fate; and the individuals and groups involved at different stages.[88]

Another fruitful approach might be that of social policy paradigms which are described by Martin Rein as "a curious admixture of psychological assumptions, scientific concepts, value commitments, social aspirations, personal interests, and administrative constraints."[89] Our brief examination of the federal role in early education illustrated all of the above components. What was missing from our examination was how federal policy paradigms in early education were developed and changed, the individuals and groups who were involved in their development and implementation, and the social context in which their activity took place. It is in this area of federal policy paradigms that social historians must begin to work.

In conclusion, the task ahead for a "new history" of the federal presence in early education lies not so much in the questions which are raised but in the identification of alternative frameworks which organize the questions in relation to each other. Within the frameworks there must be room for the impact of different ideologies, strongly held assumptions about childhood, the family, and the role of government in the lives of children. In the final analysis, the federal role in early childhood programs is a political issue and will reflect the complex political factors which operate in policy and program development.

RTK:TA

FOOTNOTES

[1] I would like to acknowledge the research assistance and personal support of Dr. Louis L. Knowles in the preparation of this paper. Dr. Edith M. Dowley, Director of Bing Nursery School, Stanford University, provided me with documents and personal contacts related to the period under study. Dr. Norma D. Feshbach, Dr. Sol Cohen, Dr. Marvin Lazerson, Dr. David Tyack and Dr. Dowley provided critical reviews of drafts of this paper. Responsibility for the final version of this paper, however, is solely that of the author.

[2] See the contents of the following National Society for the Study of Education Yearbooks related to early education: Preschool and Parent Education, Twenty-eighth Yearbook (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1928); Early Childhood Education, Fourth-sixth Yearbook (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947); Early Childhood Education, Seventy-first Yearbook, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972).

[3] A new journal has emerged from current interest in the history of childhood, The History of Childhood Quarterly.

[4] Marvin Lazerson, "Social Reform and Early Childhood Education: Some HIstorical Perspectives," Urban Education, 5 (1970), pp. 83-102.

[5] Since the research and writing of this paper were completed, Sheldon White and his associates have published a four-volume series on federal programs for children. One chapter presents an historical discussion of the development of public programs. See Sheldon White and associates, Federal Programs for Young Children. Vol. I: Goals and Standards of Public Programs for Children (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973), Ch. 2, pp. 15-79. This paper comes to similar conclusions regarding recurring themes in federal programs. However, a substantial part of this paper is directed toward an agenda for historical inquiry into areas which are not covered in the White and associates chapter.

[6] "Emergency Committee for Children Gaining Steam," Human Events, October 3, 1971, p. 845.

[7] These committees were: The Presidential Task Force of 1967; Gorham Committee of 1967; Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children (1969); and National Research Council Advisory Committee on Child Development (1972). An analysis of these reports and their impact on policy is yet to be undertaken.

[8] Carl E. Bereiter, "Schools Without Education," Harvard Educational Review, 42 (1972), pp. 390-413.

[9] Child Welfare League Standards, 1969.

[10] Final Report on the WPA Program, 1935-1943 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1943), p. 60.

[11] Bettye Caldwell recalls this period of optimism: "So excited we were many of us by the possibilities of Head Start that we did not go on record to protest that a six-week summer program could not hope to do all that it was being requested to do--develop a positve self-concept, produce new levels of language competence, discover and correct an accumulation of five years' work of medical and nutritional problems, and convince parents that education was the solution to all their problems. Plus many other miracles." See Bettye Caldwell, "Consolidating our Gains in Early Childhood," Educational Horizons, 50 (Winter 1971-1972), p. 57.

[12] J. McVicker Hunt, "The Psychological Basis for Using Preschool Enrichment as an Antidote for Cultural Deprivation," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 10 (1964), pp. 220-240.

[13] "Report on Proposed 'Child Development' Program. Radical Federal Plan," Human Events, October 13, 1971, p. 902.

[14] Marvin Lazerson, Urban Education, 5 (1970), pp. 83-102.

[15] H. L. Hopkins, "Announcement of Emergency Nursery Schools," Childhood Education, 10 (December 1933), p. 155.

[16] National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), p. 446.

[17] Marvin Lazerson, Urban Education, 5 (1970), pp. 83-102.

[18] Quoted by E. O. Lundberg, "Public Aid to Mothers with Dependent Children," Children's Bureau Publications, No. 162 (1928), p. 1.

[19] U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau, Conference on the Day Care of Children of Working Mothers, August 1, 1941, Bureau Publication No. 281, 1942.

[20] U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau, Defense of Children Series, No. 2, 1942.

[21] Contrary to their past practices, many industries hired married women under the assumption that when the emergency was over, they could be discharged more easily than single women.

[22] U. S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Comprehensive Head Start, Child Development,and Family Services Act of 1972, Bill text and section-by-section analysis, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972, p. 1.

[23] U. S. Statutes, 55, Chapter 260, pp. 361-363.

[24] U. S. Congressional Record, 78th Congress, 1st Session, 1943, 89, Part 5, p. 6791.

[25] U. S. Senate Reports, 78th Congress, 1st Session, 1943, 2, Report No. 363.

[26] Ibid., p. 2.

[27] Testimony of Mrs. Florence S. Kerr, Assistant to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, in U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearing on Wartime Care and Protection of Children of Employed Mothers, 78th Congress, 1st Session, June 8, 1943, pp. 33-45.

[28] U. S. Senate Reports, Report No. 363, p. 1.

[29] U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearing on Wartime Care and Protection of Children of Employed Mothers, 78th Congress, 1st Session, p. 34.

[30] Ibid., p. 35.

[31] K. Close, "After Lanham Funds--What?" Survey Midmonthly, 81 (1945), p. 145.

[32] U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Education and Labor, Hearing on Wartime Care and Protection of Children of Employed Mothers, 78th Congress, 1st Session, 1943, p. 45.

[33] See, for example, D. Hales, Federal Control of Public Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia, 1954), pp. 89-122.

[34] Seventh Annual Report of the Federal Worka Agency, 1946 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947).

[35] U. S. Congressional Record, 78th Congress, 1st Session, 1943, 89, Part 5, p..6792.

[36] Grace Langdon and I. J. Robinson, "Nursery Schools Plus," School Life, 26 (1940), pp. 48-51. Grace Langdon, "Facts About Emergency Nursery Schools," Childhood Education, 11 (March 1935), p. 258. Mary D. Davis, "Emergency Nursery Schools," Childhood Education, 10 (January 1934), p. 200.

[37] Ruth Salley, Some Factors Affecting the Supply and Demand for Preschool Teachers in New York City (Bureau of Publications: Contributions to Education, No. 870, New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1943), p. 54.

[38] Dorothy Baruch, "When the Need for Wartime Services for Children is Past--What of the Future?" Journal of Consulting Psychology, 9 (1945), pp. 45-47.

[39] Report prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity by a Panel of Authorities on Child Development, Robert Cooke, Chairman, 1964.

[40] Adapted from Table 11 in Mary Dabney Davis, "Schools for Children Under Six," Office of Education Bulletin, 1947, No. 5 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 42.

[41] Ibid., Table 7, p. 38. "Children of Working Mothers Still Need Day Care." The Child, Vol. II, 3, September 1946, p. 56; Fifth Annual Report of the Federal Works Agency, 1944.

[42] E. Prescott, C. Milich, and E. Jones, The Politics of Day Care, Vol. I (Washington, D. C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1972), p. 8.

[43] H. H. Anderson, "Emergency Nursery Schools," Childhood Education, 11 (October 1934), p. 11.

[44] Samuel Schloss, Nursery-Kindergarten Enrollment of Children Under Six, October 1965 (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1966).

[45] Diane B. Gentler, Preprimary Enrollment of Children Under Six (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1968), p. 3.

[46] Preprimary Enrollment of Children Under Six, October 1970 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1971).

[47] Ronald Parker and Jane Knitzer, Day Care and Preschool Services: Trends and Issues (Atlanta: Avatar Press, 1972), pp. 18-19.

[48] Edith M. Dowley, "Perspectives on Early Childhood Education," in As the Twig is Bent: Readings in Early Childhood Education, Robert Anderson and Harold Shane (Eds.), (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., 1971).

[49] K. Close, "After Lanham Funds--What?" Survey Midmonthly, 81 (1945), pp. 131-135.

[50] Lucy Gage, "Introduction to the Slow Growth of Professionalism," Peabody Journal of Education, 20 (1942), p. 153.

[51] Ibid., p. 156.

[52] Margaret K. Rosenheim, "The Child and the Law," Review of Child Development Research, Vol. III, Bettye Caldwell and Henry Ricciuti (Eds.), (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), pp. 515-520.

[53] K. Close, "After Lanham Funds--What?" p. 135.

[54] J. K. Norton, "The Place of Nursery Schools in Public Education," Childhood Education, 21 (January 1945), p. 215.

[55] In the intervening years in which faith in the public schools has faltered, the question is now posed: Should early education be part of an educational system which has failed children?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[56] A survey taken a month after the final termination of the Lanham funds indicated that the number of centers and children were not adversely affected. However, such figures are not adequate evidence for long-term effects. Further inquiry of a census sort is needed to look at the fate of these center.

[57] E. Prescott, C. Milich, and E. Jones, The Politics of Day Care, p. 7.

[58] "Children of Working Mothers Still Need Day Care," The Child, 11 (September 1946), p. 563.

[59] Op. cit., p. 8.

[60] "What About War Nurseries?" Nation's Schools, 1943, 1943, p. 17.

[61] Ibid., p. 17.

[62] School Executive, January 1945, p. 37.

[63] George D. Stoddard, Address at the Biannual Conference on the National Association of Nursery Education, New York, October 25, 1939.

[64] George D. Stoddard, "The Tasks Which Await Us," World Organization of Early Childhood Education, Report on the 2nd World Conference held at UNESCO House, Paris, August 24, 25, 26, 1949, p. 12.

[65] R. S. Moore, R. D. Moon, and D. R. Moore, "The California Report: Early Schooling for All?" Phi Delta Kappan, (1972), pp. 615-621.

[66] William D. Rowhrer, Jr., "Prime Time for Education: Early Childhood or Adolescence?" Harvard Educational Review, 41 (August 1971), pp. 416-341.

[67] George D. Stoddard, "The Tasks Which Await Us," p. 14.

[68] Ibid., p. 16.

[69] New York Times, October 25, 1946, p. 30.

[70] Bess Goddykoontz, Mary Dabney Davis, and Hazel F. Gabbard, "Recent History and Present Status of Education for Youth Children," Early Childhood Education, Fourth-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), pp. 44-49.

[71] Ibid., p. 50.

[72] Cornelia Goldsmith, Better Day Care for the Young Child (Washington, D. C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1972), p. 16.

[73] J. S. Berke and M. Kirst, Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? Who Governs? (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1972).

[74] Kaiser Child Service Centers Pamphlets for Teachers. No. 2, Meeting Needs: The War Nursery Approach.

[75] Ibid., p. 4.

[76] Ruth Andrus, "Liberalizing the Program for Preschool Children," American Education in the Postwar Period, Fourth-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), p. 6.

[77] Nancy J. Robinson and Halbert D. Robinson, "A Cross-Cultural View of Early Education," Early Childhood Education, Seventy-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), pp. 291-316.

[78] Lazar describes over 200 federal programs for young children. I. Lazar, Federal Programs for Young Children (Washington, D. C.: Appalachian Regional Commission, 1970).

[79] Quoted in Margaret O'Brien Steinfels, Who's Minding the Children? (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), p. 190.

[80] George Counts, Education and the Promise of America (New York: Macmillan, 1945).

[81] Nancy J. Robinson and Halbert D. Robinson, "A Cross-Cultural View of Early Education," pp. 300-302.

[82] For an analysis of the family as portrayed at the White House Conferences on Children, see Rochelle Beck, "The White House Conferences on Children: An Historical Perspective," Harvard Educational Review, 43 (November 1973), pp. 653-668.

[83] U. S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Children and youth of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Hearings, American Families: Trends and Pressures, 1973, 93rd Congress, 1st Session, 1973.

[84] Ibid., p. 2.

[85] Human Events, October 30, 1971, p. 851.

[86] Marshall Smith and Joan S. Bissell, "Report Analysis: The Impact of Head Start," Harvard Educational Review, 40 (1970), pp. 51-104.

[87] National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. House Report No. 188, 90th Congress, 1st Session, Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1967, Report of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives together with separate and individual views to accompany HR 7819.

[88] Matthew Miles (Ed.), Innovation in Education (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia, 1964).

[89] Martin Rein, "Values, Knowledge, and Social Policy," Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations, Vol. III, Appendix IIID, Sheldon White and Associates (Eds.), (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 6.