A SYMPOSIUM

ON THE

NEW HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

Bulletin 1933, No. 3

D STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR - *Ray Lyman Wilbur*, Secretary

OF EDUCATION - - - - - - - - - - - - - *William John Cooper*, Commissioner

D STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE - - - - - - - - - - - - WASHINGTON: 1933

by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. - - - - - - - - - - - - Price 10 cents

CONTENTS

[1] Deceased.

[The drawing on the title page was designed by F. Burns, a student in the Chicago Academy of Fine Arts.]

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., February, 1933.

SIR: One of the seven objectives of education adopted by the committee on the reorganization of secondary education was "worthy home membership." Adoption of this objective has led to a reexamination of provisions for homemaking education. I have called a number of regional conferences at which educational leaders and scientists in various fields of knowledge have considered the problems of the home and homemaking education. In order that the many persons who were not able to attend these conferences might have the benefit of the discussions, the addresses representing various points of view have been digested in the following Symposium on Homemaking Education. I think that an entirely new course in homemaking education may result from the philosophies advanced in these papers. Consequently, I recommend that this manuscript be published as a bulletin of this office.

Respectfully submitted.

WM. JOHN COOPER,
Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

FOREWORD

At the call of the United States Commissioner of Education, six homemaking conferences were held during the past two and a half years. The first of these, national in character, was held by the Office of Education in Washington, D. C., on December 6–7, 1929. This gathering recommended "that the United States Commissioner of Education be requested to call a series of regional conferences in other parts of the United States to consider further the place and function of home economics in American education, the curriculum content of home economics in the schools and higher institutions, and that small selected groups of representative administrators and home economists be invited to attend the conferences."

Complying with these recommendations, Commissioner Cooper called the first regional conference at Cincinnati, Ohio, March 21–22, 1930. This conference was attended by leading educators from Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia. Their deliberations are briefly reported in Office of Education Circular 16, 1930. And the June, 1930, number of SCHOOL LIFE contains the address by Robert N. Chenault, director of the Richard Harding Memorial School, Richard City, Tenn., on "How Home Economics Improves Home Life."

On November 10–11, 1930, at the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Ames, in cooperation with the University of Iowa, the second regional conference was held with the West North Central States—Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North and South Dakota, Kansas, and Nebraska. Four of the major addresses of this conference were published in Office of Education bulletin entitled, "Home and Family Life in a Changing Civilization." The demand for this bulletin soon exhausted the supply, and the issue is now out of print.

In April, 1931, the third regional conference of the Inland Empire States, including Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, was held at Spokane, in cooperation with the State College of Washington and the State University of Idaho.

On May 2–3, 1932, 350 leading educators of the New England States, including the six State commissioners of education, gathered at the Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass., to discuss "The Place of Homemaking in a Program of Education."

The worth of these regional homemaking conferences is aptly expressed by the following New England commissioners of education:

Dr. Walter E. Ranger, Rhode Island Commissioner of Education, in opening the discussion of the New England homemaking conference, said:

Homemaking can not be confined to a careful arrangement of subject-matter and different methods used in the various schools. The needs of our youth and people should serve as a basis for determining our homemaking efforts and projects. . . . Perhaps education and the press have shown less respect for the home than for the school, and that we have thought less of ourselves than of others. In homemaking there is an opportunity to conserve the integrity of the home by bringing about a greater honor for it. This respect for one's home is basic to State, national, and world loyalty. In fact, it is the very genesis of patriotic citizenship, and therefore the school curriculum should give to household arts a larger place, just as we hope that the school will provide a larger practical education.

Dr. Ernest W. Butterfield, Commissioner of Education, Connecticut, chairman of the committee to submit some significant suggestions of the New England conference and their subsequent outcomes, reported:

We express to Doctor Cooper, United States Commissioner of Education, our appreciation of a well-planned, effectively organized, and productive New England conference on homemaking.

We declare to Doctor Thatcher, President of the Massachusetts State College, that we have enjoyed his hospitality and that of his institution of learning.

This conference further recommends that at the State conferences proposed, we, the members of this conference, define and declare the scope and the extent of school courses and educational instruction that we hold essential for adequate homemaking.

This conference also recommends that its members, in their public addresses, in their private discussions, and in their conferences with those who direct the financial and administrative policies of our public schools and other educational institutions, declare that, in a changing civilization of all educational offerings the social sciences are most important, that we may live together well; next in importance are the arts, the skills, and the recreations, that we may live happily; then the vocations, that we may live prosperously; and last, the academic subjects, that we may live traditionally.

Dr. Payson Smith, Commissioner of Education of Massachusetts, in closing the New England homemaking conference stated:

The one blessing I would like to have come to the schools of Massachusetts this year is not the blessing of money, rather that the resources tied up in our teachers might be released.

How rich the work of our schools would be this year if the resources of our teachers might be fully realized; and I say that too of our homes. There is no laboratory anywhere so promising as the laboratory of the home itself. We ought to cultivate a faith in education as it is related to that institution. We believe that education can change social conditions, that it can bring about better human relationships, provided that confidence and hope can be added to it. Then, there is nothing that we may not achieve.

My word to Doctor Cooper is one of appreciation for the suggestions as to what we ought to be doing; for filling our hearts with hope and confidence that we may move forward to improve that most basic of all institutions, the home.

As a result of the recommendations made by Doctor Butterfield's committee, two New England States have already held homemaking conferences with representatives from their respective educational, civic, and welfare organizations to consider the place and policies for the new homemaking education.

This conference was followed by one held at Minneapolis, with the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, on May 16. Home economics representatives from the Federal departments, the American Home Economics Association, public schools of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., and the University of Minnesota presented to parents, representative of America, their philosophies of homemaking education, which appear in the volume entitled "Homemaking" published by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

The aim of this bulletin is to set forth some of the views on the needs for homemaking education as expressed by those attending the various conferences, and who are laboring with the educational, economic, and social problems surrounding present home life, with the hope that the constructive suggestions made by these experts will lead to the building of a homemaking program which will develop in boys and girls alike an appreciation for, and a desire to participate in, the daily activities of home life, as well as an intelligent understanding of the factors involved in sound home life.

The Commissioner's challenge to those responsible for the homemaking program is vigorously supported by leading social scientists in their clear-cut analyses of the forces now at work which are bringing about serious changes in present home and family life, if perhaps not disintegrating influences that are bearing down upon the Nation's institution fundamental to its future security. These pronouncements are met by proposals from school administrators, home economists, and two outstanding parents for educational adjustments imperative to the achievement of a comprehensive educational program for better home life in America.

EMELINE S. WHITCOMB,
Senior Specialist in Homemaking Education.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE NEW HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

THE CHALLENGE.

Needed: A Comprehensive Educational Program for Better Home Life in America

I. AS THE UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION SEES IT

WILLIAM JOHN COOPER

If homemaking is to justify its place in the curriculum, it must prepare young men and young women to make homes. This it does not do fully now, nor does it reach hardly any of the men. I am thinking of courses that will involve the fundamental sociological principles underlying the making of homes, of those principles which underlie a very happy married life, and of those facts which are necessary for one to know if he would raise children successfully.

To embody all of these things in courses of instruction will take much planning. It is in the interest of doing this sort of thinking that we are holding these conferences. Your help and enthusiasm are invited. If we can only make a successful beginning of this work I feel that it will be worth doing, at least on trial, to show the way in which it can be done.

The change in the economic position of women has brought many new problems, some of which affect men as well as women. The attitude of the average man toward marriage and the home must be changed if we are to retain permanence in the home life with the economic influences gone. A happy marriage now is largely a question of psychology.

I know that some have abandoned the home-economics philosophy which devotes most of the time to teaching skills in food and clothing, but I fear that there is still in most schools too much time spent in the development of skills. This is not true only of home economics but of other school subjects. In our teaching, we have failed to realize that, in the last decade or two, society has undergone great changes. Teachers are not alone in this. Periods of unemployment come because business men lack the vision to see and understand economic and social changes. Large-scale production and increased efficiency in all lines of industry must eventually be followed

by shorter working hours—a shorter day or shorter week—or by prolonged periods of unemployment unless foreign trade can be developed to utilize this surplus for other goods.

It is to improve our vision and change our ideas, and not to give a specific program, that regional conferences on home economics have been called.

The time is here when education must part from its hard and fast division of subjects and attack projects. I know of no reason why the project method should not have a determining effect toward parenthood later. If this is done, it will be necessary to make over homemaking education. Instead of being considered a fad or frill of the curriculum, to be dismissed when hard times come, it will become one of the last things to be dispensed with.

When homemaking education ministers to boys and girls, and to 100 per cent of them as work in which they must all participate, then it will be an indispensable subject. We are looking forward to that day, and it is toward that end that we are holding regional conferences to see what we can get from you who are working in the field. Many of you are anxious to do these things, and we are hoping that your curriculums will come to the point where they will take in the whole family and will include subjects which are necessary for the boys as well as for the girls. To justify its existence in the school curriculum, homemaking education must teach young men and women how to make homes.

II. AS SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS SEE IT

WORTH MCCLURE

Superintendent of Schools, Seattle, Wash.

Education is not something inflicted from without. It is something that buds from within, as I shall show in the following illustration:

Tony was assigned to the parental school by the juvenile court with his older brothers. They had been caught more than once stealing coal and grain from the freight cars in the railroad yard. Tony's father was vociferous in his denunciations of his wayward sons, just a bit too vociferous, but the juvenile authorities could not prove that he sold the coal and fed the grain to his chickens and ducks, so they did the next best thing, which was to take the boys away from him and send them to the parental school.

When Tony was 11, he was released to go home one Monday morning. On Wednesday he was back at the school. He liked it better than home, he said, but he was sent home again regardless of his protestations. After another couple of days he was back again. "I can't stand it at home," he said, "It's so dirty there. They throw their garbage out in the back yard and the ducks and chickens come right into the kitchen, and it smells so I can't eat. I get sick to my stomach. Honest, I'll run away if you don't let me stay here!" Tony was allowed to stay. When he finished the eighth grade, he was a big strapping fellow and he was given a job to work for his board and room while he attended high school. Dur-

ing vacations he had the double job of driver and timekeeper for a road-building contractor, and under the guidance of the parental-school superintendent, Tony put his money in the bank. At high school he played on the football team, coming "home" every night to the parental school, where he did his chores for his board and room. Strangely enough, Tony began to be invited out to parties in the neighborhood in spite of his parental-school history. He was a good looking chap—clean-built and clean-spoken. Mothers of girls told the parental-school superintendent they had no fear of Tony's being anything but a gentleman.

Tony finished high school and is now at college. He plans to be a teacher and an athletic coach. Every summer he comes back and works for his contractor friend and puts his money in the bank. A year ago he had an offer to play semi-professional baseball. He wrote home to the parental school that he could use the money all right, but as a future teacher he "didn't care to do the things those guys did," so he guessed he would build roads again.

Tony's case emphasizes the importance of the home life as an educational factor. What made Tony "sick to his stomach" amid the ducks and hens of his south Seattle home? The arithmetic he had learned? What made him decide he didn't care to play semiprofessional baseball? The geography and history he had studied? Nobody would seriously say so.

Rather was it the life he had led—the regular hours, the well-cooked food, the frequent shower baths and the plunges in the lake, the wholesome play, the thoroughgoing work, the clean linen, the interest of friendly teachers, the ambition to be one himself—these things made Tony a new boy. He was getting arithmetic and geography and history at the regular day school he first attended, but the school's influence was slight when compared to the influence of the filth of the ducks and hens, and of the nightly trips to the railroad yards for coal and grain.

The fact is that the school is only one segment, can hope to be only one segment, of the total cycle of the educational experience of the child. Any scheme of education will fail that does not connect the school with the other segments, that does not take into account the other educative agencies in the child's life—the home first, the church, the streets and playfields, the theaters, the news stands, and all the rest; but the greatest of these is the home, for it, in a measure, controls all the rest.

CHARLES A. RICE

Superintendent of Schools, Portland, Oreg.

Home economics should be in the course of study of every girl. It should be considered a part of her education. Every girl needs training in sewing and cooking, and in better and more healthful living. She needs a knowledge of practices enabling her to live more intelligently, to rear children more wisley, and to adjust herself to the community with a maximum of efficiency.

Too few of our girls are enrolled in home-economics courses in high school. The numbers have been increasing slowly in our own school system in recent years. We often wonder why the number is not larger. Is it because home economics is a required subject for all girls in the seventh and eighth grades and, when these pupils get to high school, they desire to leave behind the things they had in grade school and take something new and different? Are they "fed up" on cooking and sewing? Are girls who take these subjects in high school considered by other students too domestic and left outside of the group who are considered "society" in the school? Or is there some other reason? Our task is to locate the reason and try to remove it.

Classroom instruction in home economics should keep pace with the changing order of things in the world about us. No longer can the schools proceed with a smug complacency, considering only things inside the classroom—the textbook, the course of study as an abstract guide, or the program of recitations, disregarding the moving, changing world outside. Even if we train in a definite, practical way for functioning now, when the student leaves school the procession will have moved so far forward that he will be several steps behind. Frequent adjustments are therefore necessary.

The home no longer furnishes the odd jobs and chores that formerly kept girls employed and gave training in habits of industry. As a result, to-day leisure time hangs heavy and idle hands find mischief to do. A century ago the home in which the girl was reared transformed the raw materials of clothing and food into the finished product for the wardrobe and table.

Regardless of these changes in the duties of the home to-day, there are the same former home responsibilities that some one must carry—spending wisely for the necessities of the family, caring for the health of its members from day to day, promoting correct and wholesome relationships among them; in short, providing training which was formerly given by the wise mother. These tasks, and others, can not be neglected if we would pass on to each succeeding generation those things that make civilization better and more refined.

Constant adjustments are necessary in home-economics training to set right standards, give a sense of values, reach into the poorest home and through it help the parent toward things that are higher and better, and realize that home is more than an aggregate of shelter, food, and clothing. Progress rests largely on home standards, and home economics is a most important factor in setting the standards of the home.

There is unrest and confusion in the world to-day. Society is more complex than it has ever been. Production exceeds consumption. Either we have too many workers or not enough consumers, or the consumers do not have needs and wants enough. Their

buying power is too limited. Since uncertainty and unrest exist outside of the home, anything that the schools can do to make the homes of the Nation orderly, systematic, contented, efficient, and attractive is very much worth while.

The future depends largely on our young people. If they are trained properly they will play their part courageously and their genius will help solve many of the most intricate problems that society has ever faced. The first requisite of a human life is the need to be fed and clothed, to be healthy, and to be clean. The health and happiness of the household are largely in a woman's hands, be she mother, wife, sister, or daughter. Is it too much to hope that some day household economics will no longer be an elective subject but will be required of every girl who is graduated from high school?

III. AS COLLEGE PRESIDENTS SEE IT

ROSCOE W. THATCHER

Former President, Massachusetts State College, Amherst

Collegiate training is preparation for living, in homemaking education, as truly as in any other type of education. Preparation for living involves living with others, not merely the performance of daily routine tasks. The acquisition of handicraft skill in the latter ought not, in my judgment, to constitute any major part of the time or effort of a college student. Preferably, it ought to precede the college course, but if this is impossible it must be done in postgraduate days, much as is required by the medical interneship.

Collegiate education in home economics ought to be on the same level as collegiate education in any other field. It should be based on sound fundamental training in the physical, biological, and social sciences, with the application of this to the vocation of homemaking shown by special home-economics instructors, whose vocational or professional pride will insure high standards of approach and of technique in their courses. The professional side of the problem involves the preparation of teachers and research workers for advancing the field of knowledge and the levels of instruction in home economics. I believe that the time has come when this should be recognized as on the same basis of preparation and standards as any other field of vocational education and requires provision for graduate school work which shall afford high-grade preparation for professional workers in the field of home economics.

In short, vocational education in homemaking has a distinct place in the educational program of our country at every level from the short course of the trade school to the graduate school of a university. While it may be a little time yet before it is classed as one of the

"learned professions" it certainly has arrived at the place where it is one of the "pursuits of life" for which the Morrill Act of 1862 intended to establish a "liberal and practical education."

JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY

President, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

Whatever the profession of college graduates, an overwhelming majority of them, men and women, are going to be homemakers. They are going to be married and are going to establish homes and rear families. It is the time when boys and girls are thinking of marriage and the establishment of a home, and it is a wiser age in which to bring such questions to the fore than in the high-school age.

Certainly it is true that if the people who are not immediately concerned with the school profession are going to have any concern about educational matters from the standpoint of sound home life, the college graduates of to-day are the ones who are going to give that leadership of to-morrow.

The more we can suggest to young people that the establishment of the right kind of relationships between husband and wife, and between child and father, without religious or moral dominance, the better it will be for all of us. I regret the freedom of modern youth to-day, but the open frankness with which boys and girls can discuss such matters is vastly better than the smirk which used to go with a morbid attitude toward sex. I think we are making real progress, and that is going to help us with the problem of training.

The girl of to-day is as well educated as the boy she marries. She is also economically independent. The day is gone when a woman looks to her husband for an economic status. A man is not conferring a great favor on a girl when he asks her to marry him. There is a partnership that goes into marriage to-day which is vastly different from that of yesterday.

These are days of great opportunity, of challenging responsibility for all of us, whether as fathers or mothers, or as teachers in schools or in colleges, to help these boys and girls who are going to be the founders of what should be the very best of homes to-morrow.

I believe increasingly, the college, as I know it, is conscious of the need of training, or trying to do something along that line. College is a preparation for life—for marriage and for making a home—rather than for the making of a living. Much time should be devoted to education at the college level for marriage, parenthood, and family life. Women's colleges are doing much more along this line than men's colleges at present. The departments of physiology, hygiene, psychology, physical education, and sociology can contribute much to this important field of education.

Modern life has radically changed marriage. One of the most potent tests in the eyes of society at large was the kind of a home that college graduates were going to have. If the home does not bear testimony to the kind of broad training for social responsibilities which they should have attained from the college experience, something is radically wrong in the way in which the college is discharging its responsibilities. The ideal home and family is one in which two elements are mingled—the element of emotion and the element of brains. The type of marriage where you pick out your mate by the scales lays a very poor foundation for a relationship for life that mingles the emotions as much as the finest type of marriage does. Fundamentally, this problem simmers down to an individual need, and recognition of the fact that there is a responsibility and opportunity of helping boys and girls of college age to achieve for themselves, with the help of older people, the establishment of their own homes and families.

155503°—33——2

THE FORCES AFFECTING HOME LIFE ANALYZED BY SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

I. THE ECONOMIST

KARL E. LEIB

Professor of Commerce, University of Iowa

A. FAMILY SATISFIES HUMAN WANTS

If we approach the study of the effect of recent economic changes upon home and family life by first asking what wants of human beings home and family life tend to satisfy, we have at least set up a definite method of approach to our problem.

In speaking of home and family life, this paper refers to a cooperative organization, socially approved and sanctioned, having among its primary purposes the rearing and protection of children; the gratification of the need for affection; and the provision for comfort, protection, and seclusion. Such an organization may also secure economic advantage for its members, facilitate the winning of social favor, lead to sympathy and assistance in common interests, and provide an agency for education or training. . . .

The next question to be considered is: What changes, for the purpose of our discussion, may be considered as having recently taken place within the United States? It will perhaps be best to select those which show a significant shifting of conditions affecting the family, whether the shift has been taking place over a period of several generations or whether it has become noticeable within the last few years.

B. CHANGES AFFECTING HOME AND FAMILY LIFE

The survey of recent economic changes which was completed under the auspices of the National Bureau of Economic Research in February, 1929, represents the opinion of a carefully selected committee, headed by Herbert Hoover, and composed of business men, educators, economists, statisticians, Government officials, and representatives of the more prominent associations and learned societies. Their studies were carried on under unusually favorable conditions. From their conclusions have been selected certain changes whose nature, effect, and significance in their relation to the family may now be considered.

1. POWER-DRIVEN MACHINERY

We readily accept the statement that we are living in a period in which production is based upon an increasing use of power, but it is

doubtful whether we as yet can fully grasp the implications of such a situation. Since 1850 we have been engaged in the process of substituting power for labor. We have been transferring skill from the man to the machine. By such devices as the drilling jig, the drill press, and the automatic lathe, we have made possible the production of thousands of units of output where but one was possible before. Accuracy of measurement within millionths of an inch has made possible interchangeability of parts which has centralized production and minimized delay in making repairs.

In order to provide the capital necessary for large-scale production it has been necessary to change the form of the business organization from the individual enterprise to the corporation and thus to make possible the utilization of even small savings for the furtherance of business. The capitalization of the average steel industry in 1850 was approximately $50,000. To-day the United States Steel Corporation has a capitalization approximating $2,000,000,000 and the Supreme Court of the United States has held that this tremendous organization is not a monopoly in a sense which would justify its dissolution in an action based upon the Sherman Antitrust Act, because it controls less than half the output in its own line of business. Other great businesses familiar to us are of almost equal importance in our organization for production.

Through the growth of corporate activity, management has been gradually separated from ownership of capital, and the majority of the owners of common stock in many of our great enterprises have neither voice nor interest in the direction of the affairs of the business, so long as the dividends are regularly paid. The management and direction of industry are rapidly evolving into a specialized and highly technical profession for which years of intensive study and training as well as practical experience seem likely to be necessary within the near future.

The introduction of electrical machinery since 1900 has pushed out the margin of the territory to which power may be transmitted from the source of generation. From a local use the distance advances to 50, 100, 200 miles and more as modern methods of insulation and improved apparatus are introduced. The power of the waterfall in the mountain is transmitted to the city on the plains and people congregate and build their dwellings about the centers of production and transportation.

The occupation of the people changes. The proportion of total population to be found in the cities goes, by 10-year periods, from 29 per cent in 1880 to 35 per cent in 1890, 40 per cent in 1900, 46 per cent in 1910, 51 per cent in 1920, and 56 per cent in 1930. People tend to group themselves near those locations where employment is to be had. Consequently cities spring up at centers of production or dis-

tribution. Power is increasingly substituted for the simpler forms of labor and people become makers, tenders, and supervisors of machines. Production of goods to satisfy human wants has become predominantly a machine process and the groups of machines used for production are located in such a manner as to secure the best possible balance between the cost of securing raw materials at the factory and transporting finished products to the consumer. Production and transportation centers complement each other and a New York, a Chicago, or a Philadelphia becomes a beehive of industry and a congested center of population.

This substitution of power for labor and concentration of labor in centers of production and transportation have had their effect upon production. Power is equivalent to a greater supply of labor. The division of labor and the supervision of machines by men would have increased production even though there had been no change in methods or technique, assuming the existence of an adequate and remunerative market. Along with the increase in available labor has come an improved technique of management, however, which has enormously increased the possible effectiveness of labor. The achievements of Taylor and of the students of management who followed him have now become so well known that it is unnecessary to recount them. It is sufficient to say that practically every great nation which is interested in manufacturing has made a study of modern American methods and has to some extent adopted them.

It therefore becomes possible to create tremendous quantities of manufactured goods in a remarkably short period of time. Annual production increased from $1,000,000,000 in 1849 to $11,000,000,000 in 1899 and $63,000,000,000 in 1925. The value of income from crops and animal products on farms in the United States was estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture at about $12,000,000,000 in 1925. The occupation by which most of our wants are satisfied is now closely and unavoidably related to manufacturing activity.

2. GROWTH OF MARKETS

Increased markets were necessary to absorb the tremendous output which improved methods of production had made possible. Various methods of stimulating wants and providing increased purchasing power were developed. Stimulated by the needs of an expanded productive organization and increased wealth, as well as by the necessity for increased credit, our banking system grew in power and resources. With the introduction of the Federal Reserve System new forms of currency were made possible and the purchasing power of a gold dollar in the vaults of the Federal Reserve banks may be multiplied considerably by the time it takes the form of loans made to customers of the Federal Reserve member banks.

Through bank credit it has become possible to procure ready cash without being compelled immediately to dispose of other forms of property in which money may be invested, and it is also possible to utilize future income before it has actually been realized.

The development of installment buying, whereby goods of reasonably long life and stable value may be purchased and payment spread over a considerable period of time, has been one of the interesting developments of the past few years. We may regard with apprehension the possibility that inexperienced buyers may be misled by ill-founded delusions of wealth and may consequently make injudicious purchases, but if experience up to the present time can be relied upon, there are at least some fields in which such a system of credit may be useful.

3. IMPROVED MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

Along with accumulation of wealth and increased buying power there has been a development of improved means of communication. Railroads, automobiles, paved highways, and even airplanes have made possible greater and greater increases in the speed with which commodities may be moved to market. The increased speed and facility with which raw materials may be assembled for purposes of manufacture and new processes by which perishable commodities may be preserved during transportation have helped to push out the boundaries of possible markets. It should be remembered in this connection that the area which can be included within marketable distance of a given point increases not as the direct proportion involved in the increase of speed, but rather as the proportion between the squares of the original and the increased speed. The real significance of the transition from the ox team to the silk train and from foot travel to the airplane is greater than is generally realized. It is true, of course, that the consuming power of a market does not increase in direct relation to its area; but within areas of more or less equal density of population and relatively constant earning power the effect of increased speed of transportation would be great.

An interesting feature of an increasingly mechanized civilization has been the development of what may be termed "mass services." The committee on recent economic changes of the President's Conference on Unemployment mentions the application of the philosophy of large-scale production to service functions and gives the following as illustrations: Travel, entertainment, education, insurance, communication, and the facilities of hotels, restaurants, delicatessen stores, steam laundries, and public libraries. This development is interesting in that it provides an occupation for many persons who find themselves displaced by machine processes and perhaps significant in that many of the functions now carried on as organized services were formerly incidental to home and family life.

4. RISE IN THE STANDARD OF LIVING

With an increasing real wage and increasing public expenditures for social services it seems clear that the standard of living or quantity and variety of goods and services which are within the reach of an ordinarily capable and industrious person has also increased. Hours of labor are likely to be less in industry than on the farm, the 8-hour day has become general, and talk of the 5-day week is more frequent than in times past. With the increase in the value of electric household appliances [1] from $38,748,242 in 1919 to $72,933,274 in 1927, with 4,303,388 washing machines sold from 1923 to 1927, inclusive, with $82,000,000 worth of electric refrigerators (estimated) sold in 1927, and 21,630,000 automobiles registered in 1928, it would seem easier to argue that men are freed from drudgery by machines than that men are being enslaved by machines.

The fact that Bureau of Commerce figures showed 7,500,000 radio sets in use in homes on January 1, 1928, indicates a standard of living and possibilities of leisure which the idealized laborer of an idyllic agricultural civilization might have found it interesting to contemplate.

Our newspapers and even the much-abused movies have done much to spread the desire for such a mode of life to less fortunate peoples. China, Malaysia, and India—to say nothing of more modernized nations in South America and Europe—have had opportunities to see and envy the possessions of what they believe to be the typical American. It is true that at the same time they have been given impressions which are not so flattering to our character and mode of life, but a demand for the good things of life is being created which must in time be felt and reckoned with.

5. UNBALANCED ECONOMIC SYSTEM

The vast extent of present-day markets and the tremendous scale of modern production have brought about a degree of interdependence in our national life which is still hard to realize. One manufacturer of low-priced automobiles decided not so long ago to make a decided change in model. For months, pending the production of the new car, his factories were closed while new machinery was being installed and new processes prepared. The result was that the total freight-car loadings for the whole United States fell off to a marked degree and dealers all over the country were left with money invested in showrooms in which there were no cars to show and sales forces who had nothing to sell. Employment in Detroit was seriously curtailed and markets for raw materials were affected.

---

[1] Under household appliances are included vacuum cleaners, flatirons, domestic ranges, air heaters, percolators, toasters, waffle irons, and grills.

A change in the style of women's clothing, resulting in the use of less material, has seriously affected the market for cotton and threatened the continued existence of the present form of organization for production in the woolen industry. The farmer alone has preserved something of his former independence, but the farmer without modern machinery, automobile, radio, or mail-order catalogue would lead a troubled life. The prosperity, and even the comfort, of each of us has come to depend upon the soundness and prosperity of our whole productive system.

If this be so, it behooves us to look to it that no pains be spared to maintain that prosperity. What progress are we making in that direction? Intelligent guidance of such a complicated system requires a better understanding of its characteristics. Not only does it seem probable that a new profession, that of business management, must be evolved, but better education of the public in general is necessary if the skilled manager is not to find his efforts balked through lack of understanding and sympathy on the part of the general public. The increased sums which are being spent on education, increased enrollment in our schools and universities, and the development of schools and colleges for the intensive study of business and of our economic system are steps toward a planned control of production and a more intelligent adaptation of effort to needs which should ultimately lead to increased welfare for all.

Desirable as this end may be, it will be necessary to have a more exact knowledge of the consuming habits of the public and a more definite control of production than has been possible up to the present time in order that definite purposes and standards may be set up and that they may be supported by popular sentiment.

6. CHARACTERISTICS OF CHANGED ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Thus we find ourselves in a civilization which is remarkable for the kaleidoscopic variety and rapidity of its changes. Almost before we have adjusted ourselves to one set of surrounding conditions another is upon us with new problems and conditions to be met; and yet in this dynamic system with its constantly forming new combinations certain continuing tendencies are apparent. From the rural independence of the pioneers we shift to specialization and interdependence; from the farm and the accompanying small-scale units of production we change to the factory and the large city with its congested population; from simplicity to scientific complexity. The institutions—economic, political, and social—which had their inception in an agricultural society with a comparatively stable and widely distributed population are carried on in a period of industrial production by an extremely mobile and intensely concentrated population.

7. EFFECT OF ECONOMIC SYSTEM ON HOME AND FAMILY

Against these two backgrounds, agricultural and industrial, let us project our conception of home and family and judge, if we can, what conditions gave rise to such a grouping of individuals, what values were to be found in it, whether these values are now to be found to the same extent, and, if they are not, what new values have arisen or what old ones may be expanded and accentuated.

At this point it might be well to repeat the warning that the family here discussed is the family as it exists in our own homes or those of our neighbors. It is composed of a man and a woman with perhaps one or more children. It is of value in so far as it aids them in more satisfactorily living out their existence or in so far as such an existing relationship is desirable from the point of view of other individuals who compose the society of the age in which they live. It is not an emotional concept evolved out of wishes, imagination, and romance as depicted by the poetry of the Victorian age. Its desirability is modified by the nature and attitude of the individuals who compose it, and by the surrounding circumstances in which they live.

In the past, the family was strengthened by the fact that it was the customary form of organization for production and that the home was in many instances the workshop. In an agricultural civilization the wife performs part of the labor in the fields when necessary, cares for many of the domestic animals, prepares the meals, maintains the home as a place of shelter and rest, and rears the children who are potential laborers. She is a partner in the actual work of production and her disabilities growing out of her sex have a minimum effect upon her value as a worker in the common endeavor. This same condition seems to have been true during the earlier industrial development when weaving was done in the home and even the wife of the miller commonly operated the mill during the sickness or absence of her husband. In the early craft guilds, wife and husband were both members, and in case of the husband's death the wife and not the heirs succeeded to the management of the business. In fact, it would seem that only in comparatively recent years has it been possible for women of the working classes to confine their activities to housekeeping and childbearing.

8. THE STATE'S INTEREST IN THE FAMILY

The State had a twofold interest in the maintenance of the family during this period. In the first place, the family was essential to the system of production by which the wealth of the State was produced. In the second place, a large population was desirable not only for its labor value but also in order to provide adequate man power for large armies which were essential for national protection. For centuries, a wealthy nation without a powerful army would have been an irresist-

ible source of temptation to its neighbors. Hence it was perfectly natural that the concept of the State as a third party to the contract of marriage should be advanced and that legal safeguards should be placed about so important a relationship. Penalties were placed upon irregular relationships. The disintegration of a marriage was permitted only with reluctance, and alimony not only provided safeguards for mother and children, but came dangerously close to being invoked as a penalty.

Before the growth of a power industry the home was also the medium through which certain services were rendered to the child, which are now to a great extent provided by other agencies. Food was produced and prepared, clothing was created from wool produced by the family flocks, and the child was nursed and treated for most of its illnesses by the mother. Such education as it received in trade or craft skill was largely imparted at home until the growth of the apprenticeship system. The home was also the agency through which the customs of society were transmitted.

Under former conditions, certain economic advantages were associated with the foundation of a home. The social and legal system was such that the husband was in fact, as well as in theory, the head of the family. In many instances his wife brought with her a gift of property which became his. He was both manager and owner of wealth produced by their joint efforts. The manner of life was such that little expense was connected with bringing children into the world and the children themselves contributed material services to the family business at a very early age. The father either made use of the children as laborers or apprenticed them to others and received a large part of their wages. Expense for food and clothing was relatively small.

9. THE COST OF RAISING CHILDREN

At present the father exercises much less control over family property and little more than moral suasion over conduct. Dowries have gone out of fashion and in many cases, either by law or by mutual consent, the wife retains her separate property. Children come into the world at considerable expense, contribute little or nothing to the family income, and under modern standards and at present price levels for food and clothing represent a serious outlay of capital. The cost of rearing a child to maturity varies greatly according to its position in life, but $5,000 would certainly be a modest figure and one father has estimated that each of his daughters, at the close of her college career, represented an investment of $20,000. The advantage secured at the age of 50 by the single man who saves his money and puts it out at compound interest is perfectly apparent and helps to explain how the family, from the dollars and cents point of view, may be regarded as a liability rather than an asset. Where

agriculture remains the chief occupation of the people there is no need to worry about race suicide, but the factory worker, living in an apartment, finds the problem worthy of consideration.

The home is no longer the workshop. The old cottage industries, such as weaving, lace making (perhaps as common to the nunnery as to the home), cheese making, and shoe making and repairing, have been taken to industrial plants where motors and machines duplicate the work of human hands. From the production point of view the home bids fair to become a luxury rather than a necessity. Just as ownership and management of capital tend to become separate functions in large-scale production, so the work place has been taken out of the home and has been enlarged and built up into the factory.

Nor is this all. Because of the tremendous importance of the home in an agricultural system, social attitudes and legal provisions were developed which punished the individual severely for variations from ideal home-minded behavior. As a practical matter, alimony became almost a matter of course if a marriage were broken and the wife happened to be minded to demand it. In many instances some social stigma followed the dissolution of a marriage relation which had become unbearable and an actual source of danger to the health and sanity of the contracting parties. Children as well as parents had to bear their share of this burden. Both husband and wife found their social contacts and their activities and modes of recreation seriously restricted because of the relation which had been assumed. However justifiable such restrictions may have been or may be, the fact remains that any person intelligent enough to realize their existence will weigh them before assuming them.

10. HOW VALUABLE IS THE HOME TO-DAY?

Does the fact that the home no longer bears its old relation to economic life, that some of its functions have disappeared or have been taken over and developed by other agencies, or that certain disadvantages and sacrifices may be associated with its maintenance indicate that it has become of doubtful value? Those who see only the apparent increase in the divorce rate, the decreasing birth rate, and other signs of what they consider increasing moral laxity are inclined to view it with alarm, but there is another side to the picture.

The young people of to-day are sometimes accused of being iconoclasts, without courtesy, modesty, or reverence. If there be weight to the accusation, nevertheless there is a certain wistful idealism beneath the skepticism with which their inexperience and distrust of cliques is concealed. The whole world has passed through an experience during the last two decades in which many of our accepted standards were overthrown or reversed, and what had been right became wrong and what had been wrong became right. Add to this the fact that with increasing education we are taught to attempt to

think out questions which the ignorant must leave to authority; that science has taught us that many things which we held to be accepted facts are not even tenable theories; that modern improvements are daily displacing outworn processes; and it is not to be wondered at if questions be raised which to an older generation in a more static environment seemed sacrilege.

It is not the truth, however, which need fear investigation and it may be that in the end the questioning of previously accepted canons will bring a more complete understanding and a more intelligent appreciation of the values upon which home and family have survived. Romantic conceptions must not be allowed to interfere with the intelligent analysis of conditions nor to set up false standards which help to beg the question. It is no service to man or woman to build up an expectation of happiness based on misrepresentation of human nature and the basic conditions of existence. It is not as a dreamer, seeking compensation for his own heartbreak, which should be our goal. Rather it should give us an intelligent appreciation and, if possible, a happy adaptation to what Jack London called the hard, irrefragible facts.

Management engineers have developed a tool known as the "job analysis." It involves the scientific determination of purpose and an equally careful study of the simplest and best way of directing energy to the achievement of that purpose. Such a study of home and family life at the present time with the proper resultant modifications of our social, legal, industrial, and educational systems would be of tremendous value in our national life.

C. SOCIAL VALUES RESULTING FROM HOME AND FAMILY LIFE

What values, then, remain to make home and family worth the effort and sacrifice by which their existence is achieved?

In the first place, here is a tried and proved method of relationship between man and woman which would seem to involve fewer possibilities of harm or danger than any which has yet been evolved. No temporary association will give the community the interest, the confidence of status, the freedom from distraction, the conditions that make for physical and mental health, and the possibility of mutual understanding and sympathy that can be found in the best types of home and family. In view of the training and standards of conduct which the majority of us have accepted, no other relationship can be maintained with the same assurance of continuing self-respect. In this field, as in any other, moderation and self-control have their values, and a series of emotional pyrotechnics may be an unsatisfying and dangerous substitute for a clearer and steadier flame.

If the rearing of children be considered as a worthy or gratifying activity and not a mere incident, there is as yet no agency which

can operate as efficiently as a properly organized family. Judges and heads of charitable institutions have testified that more seems to be necessary to the proper development of a child than mere provision for its physical wants. Interest, affection, appreciation, and intimate understanding can be more freely supplied by even ignorant parents than by the most intelligent and efficient of professional nurses. Affection may degenerate into indulgence, but artificial affection never passes current for the real article. Our schools and nurseries may guide, direct, and educate, but there is a human relationship possible in the home which it is surprisingly difficult to generate elsewhere. The home has a clear purpose in contributing to the rearing of healthy, intelligent, and well-adjusted children.

1. HOME AS A PLACE FOR REST AND RELAXATION

The increasing complexity and the nervous wear and tear and intense competitiveness of our modern industrial system would emphasize the value of the home as a possible center of rest and recreation. Here may be given the opportunity for recuperation which must be had if the human mechanism is to stand the strain of changes in diet and conditions of life. Relaxation of tense nerves, opportunities for quiet study and planning, hobbies which vary the monotony of some types of occupation, proper diet and exercise for the maintenance of physical efficiency, all these give possible developments in usefulness which the home may provide. The argument that the presence of children does not favor such conditions and that the apartment hotel may give the same advantages without the disadvantages is common enough. But no hotel or restaurant gives the individual dietary service which the home may provide. A plan for proper care and development of children without unnecessary pain and distraction for adults is surely not beyond attainment.

Even though some of the economic advantages of a home have been lost in the development of a new type of organization for production, some benefits remain. Two may not be able to live as cheaply as one in a modern home, but there is good reason to believe that two may live in a home more cheaply and much more satisfactorily than in two entirely separate establishments furnishing anything near the same degree of utility and comfort. Combination of certain items of expense for food, light, space, and heat should surely make possible a decrease in the total expenditure. The benefits of efforts during leisure time which result in an increase in living comfort may be shared by two as easily as they may be enjoyed by one.

2. THE NEED FOR MORE THAN SATISFACTION OF ECONOMIC WANTS

It is undeniable that something more than the mere satisfaction of economic wants is vital to a well-rounded and happy existence. There are human needs which must be met, and in the home lies the

opportunity for the creation of the essential gratification of these most important cravings. Here may be provided recognition for the qualities which outsiders may be slow to appreciate. Honesty, kindliness, gentleness, and trustworthiness may be held at their true worth and the little triumphs of outside life may be doubled in value by the fact that they are perceived and shared by those whose good opinion is of value. Affection should be found here and certainty of understanding and sympathy. If these values are not present, we need more knowledge of the reasons which prevent their development and of the technique by which their existence may be favored and promoted.

New experience and some of the greatest adventures of life are surely to be found in the home. The man or woman who has known the unquestioning faith and loyalty of a child or who has faced death or seen it patiently and bravely risked knows that those who live for themselves alone live incompletely. These experiences are facts of life and not romantic fictions. How far does education go in fitting us to bring out in a home the best of which we and it may be capable?

Here lies the challenge to our knowledge and abilities. There seems little question that with the further development of industry we may greatly increase the sum total of goods which may be produced for the satisfaction of human wants. Millions of people are still unsatisfied. There is room in our productive system for utilization of the efforts of every individual if that effort be properly planned and intelligently directed. Women in greater and greater numbers are seeking to find again their places in the productive system, from which in the earlier development of the machine age they were temporarily ousted. There is no reason why they should not again assume a position calling for the exercise of their utmost abilities and permitting them some choice as to the direction in which they will exercise their capacities. If they find happiness in devoting their entire time and attention to home and children, they should have that opportunity. If, on the other hand, they find that under modern conditions many of the functions formerly inevitably connected with the home are now better cared for by outsiders, that children are not the chief interest in their lives, and that childlessness leaves them free for other interests, or that an appreciable portion of their life span is still available after the duties of child bearing and rearing have been performed, then they should not be thrust aside from modern activity under a pretext of gallantry or with a contemptuous reference to home as the woman's sphere. It seems quite probable that there will be not only room for them but also need for them in the economic world.

In office work, as statisticians, as dietitians, in the professions, the work of women is daily becoming more essential. In work calling for

delicate manipulation, such as the handling of small machine parts, in the artistic and literary world as well as in science and education, their services are needed. Our institutions must adapt themselves to this need. The problem of maintaining home values and yet permitting other interests and occupations should not be unsolvable.

D. EXTENSION OF HOME-ECONOMICS TRAINING

If the profession of homemaking can be studied with the same intelligence that the problems of industry are approached the future would seem more certain. If the home of the future can be based upon the voluntary cooperation of independent and self-respecting persons rather than upon social coercion and if the purpose of a home and the attitudes and methods which seem best fitted to the attainment of that purpose can be carefully studied and understood, we may hope to give real education for homemaking.

II. THE SOCIOLOGIST

ANDREW G. TRUXAL
Assistant Professor of Sociology, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

A. WHICH POSITION?

In any consideration of the family as a social institution, we might take one of three positions. We might join with those who think that they have sung the swan song for another venerable and at one time necessary social institution. The family is going, they say, and we might just as well recognize the fact. These critics, thinking they have stripped this institution of all the functions which at various ages have been claimed for it, say that unless we can find additional services that the family can perform, some more effective agency might well be substituted for it. In the second place, there are those conservative-minded folk who, shutting their eyes to the changes that have been occurring around them, strike out in all directions with vague and meaningless shibboleths, like "the sanctity of the family," "The family is the rock of ages upon which our civilization has been erected," "The strength of America lies in its homes: Destroy the home and you can destroy the foundation of our social structure."

If we had to choose between these two positions, I, for one, would certainly choose the former with all its fantastic reasoning to the latter with all its sentimental and meaningless dribble. But, there is no necessity for us to accept either of them. We can choose the third position, which is to follow the reasoning of those who in a realistic fashion face the multiplicity of changes that have brought about our present society and the concomitant changes that have occurred in the family with the idea of accepting the changes and

making such adjustments to them as seem, in the nature of the case, to be inevitable.

In human society, almost all conceivable types of marriage have been tried at one time or another under varying circumstances. We have plenty of anthropological and ethnological evidence for all variations in the form of the family from the most temporary to the most permanent varieties of union. Whatever the form, however, there has always been marriage in human society, as contrasted with mere mating among the animals, and there has always been some kind of family, however transient and temporary.

B. FUNCTIONS OF THE FAMILY

Just what have been and are the functions of the family? In a supercritical age, when all human institutions are being called before the bar of a pragmatic test, and accepted or discarded on the basis of the results of that test, it seems highly desirable for us to ask the question. To answer it, however, we must look at the family not merely as it is but as it has been. To begin with, the family has performed an economic function. There are those like Sumner, Starcke, and others who would maintain that this was probably the original primary reason for marriage. "Woman becomes indispensable to man 'not on account of an impulse (sex attraction) which is suddenly aroused and as quickly disappears, but on account of a necessity which endures as long as life itself, namely the need of food.'" Marriage is primarily a form of cooperation in self-maintenance and its bond is tighter or looser according to the advantages of the partnership under existing circumstances.[2]

No one will question the rôle that economic cooperation has played in marriage and the family. But, with the old household functions of the woman removed by the mechanization and standardization of life, the economic functions of the woman in the home as complementary to those of the male have disappeared. Not only has the patriarchal conception of the family disappeared in this age of woman's rights, but woman has taken her place alongside man in the factory, the trades, and the professions. She has declared not merely her personal independence but her economic independence as well. "Woman's entry into industry, the trades, and the professions increased from 14.7 per cent in 1870 to 24 per cent in 1920. For married women the percentage employed in 1890 was 4.6 as compared with 9 in 1920. In the professions alone, there were 13.3 per cent of the women and girls engaged in all nonagricultural pursuits as compared with 6.4 per cent in 1870."[3] And this is a movement which will doubtless continue, if anything, with accelerating speed.

---

[1] Sumner, W. G., and Keller, A. G. The Science of Society. Vol. 3, Yale University Press, 1927. pp. 1805–1809.

[2] Lindquist, Ruth. The Family in the Present Social Order, p. 10.

The home as a self-sufficing economic unit in which the father, the mother, and the children performed mutually complementary, economic functions is gone. Furthermore, woman is no longer necessarily an economic liability—there is no longer any economic necessity for her to enter the marriage bond. However, it is still true, among certain classes at least, that the wage earnings of both father and mother are necessary in order to maintain higher and higher standards of living, to give the children the most in educational opportunities. Especially is it true that the earnings of the woman prove to be extremely valuable in the case of factory workers to tide over periods of unemployment, sickness, or accident, or any other of the exigencies of modern industrialism to which the male worker is susceptible. Granted that this is not a desirable situation, the fact remains that the work of man and woman is still economically complementary, although in a different sense than under a former agricultural state of society, as a mere cursory reading of a study like Lynd's "Middletown" will reveal.

Suppose we grant that the economic foundation and function of the family have disappeared. Does anyone want to see a return to a home where the wife and mother is a household slave, or a fellow worker in the fields with her husband? There are some few people who yearn for a return of the home as a self-sufficing economic unit. But even those like Borsodi conceive of that situation not as a return to the soul-destroying labor of a previous era but a home thoroughly mechanized, making use of every available household labor-saving machine. But if a Borsodi home is to be the home of the future, we fail to see the trend.

A second important function which the family has performed in social evolution is that of the reproduction of the race. No attempt is being made through our discussion to differentiate sharply between the interwoven problems of marriage and the family. When we speak of reproduction we are thinking of two things: The sex relation and, incidental to it, the production of offspring. In the whole of man's social development, marriage has had the effect of creating a form of union of the sexes which has operated to canalize and regulate that extremely powerful human urge, the sex drive. If we did not have marriage, and the Western World understands that to mean monogamic marriage, we should certainly have to invent or create an institution to regulate the relationship of the sexes and to keep within some limits the expression of the sex drive. To be sure, the institution we have has been far from perfect in this regard. The volume of extramarital sex relationship is large, when we consider that reliable estimates place the number of venereally infected people as high as 10 per cent of the total population, most of which infection results from what society regards as illicit sex relations. But the larger

question is not how inadequately has marriage canalized the sex drive but how great would be the socially harmful effects of not having such an institution.

The second aspect of reproduction is the production of offspring. The human race is bisexual; offspring are the result of the relation between the sexes. Whether or not there is a biological basis for a so-called parental instinct, or whether it is the end product of habit growing out of association, the fact remains that there exists a tie between parents and offspring which is at the basis of the family. One might grant on rational grounds that this means of reproduction is an extremely wasteful, even silly, method of continuing the race. But the hopes of science to simplify the process by artificial processes of fertilization of ova and the growth of the embryo in artificial media, with the possibility, according to Aldous Huxley, of producing 96 identical products at the same time, such hopes are about as chimerical in the present state of knowledge as the far-better known, synthetically prepared foods which have been promised to us in convenient pellets. Such convenient means of securing physical sustenance would indeed be a great boon for our millions to whom the soda-fountain lunch counter has become an inevitable part of daily routine—a decided disaster for those to whom eating is still a ceremony and an art.

But suppose again that we grant that the relation of the sexes and consequent reproduction of the race do not of necessity imply the existence of a family. A third service which the family has performed is that of being the primary group, to use Cooley's well-known phrase, in which the child gets his earliest education and socializing habits. In simpler societies this was an extremely important service. The tendency in modern societies has been to take these functions away from the home and family. At the beginning of our national history, the home was the usual place for receiving the elementary instruction. The public-school system as we know it to-day is an American achievement of the nineteenth century. Three hundred years ago the institutional education of children began with the college. The age has been steadily pushed downward. First, the Latin or grammar school, then the public elementary school, then the kindergarten, and finally, now, the nursery school. Thus has much of the educational function, together with the socializing function of the family, been taken from the home.

Other traditional functions of the home and family have been disappearing, to use the words of Lawrence Frank:

> The care of the sick and the maintenance of health have become institutionalized in hospitals, sanatoria, and clinics, aided by visiting nurses and related personnel who render the care formerly given by members of the family.

Childbirth is increasingly taking place in hospitals, and the care and nurture of the child is likewise moving outside of the home to the clinic, nursery school, kindergarten, summer camp, playground, and youth organization. . . .

For recreation and leisure-time activities, the home has already yielded to the theater for plays and moving pictures, to clubs and associations and commercialized amusements of all kinds. . . .

The provision against the proverbial rainy day is being cared for by social and governmental schemes of pensions, allowances, and tax-supported services.

In the religious sphere, the home and the family are becoming an increasing object of concern on the part of church leaders, while the old-time intimate religious life of the family appears to be fading out or losing much of its former importance and significance.[4]

And Mr. Frank has by no means catalogued all the other functions which have been previously or are now associated with the family. One very important one has been the alliance between marriage and the family and property. We have passed the stage when woman was regarded as property; many European peoples still cling to the bride price and the dowry. With us, the whole problem of inheritance of property, the property rights of woman and children are tied up with the family.

Then there are other functions, such as the less tangible and concrete ones as the affectional and romantic functions of marriage and the family, the gratification of one's vanity, the feeling that one belongs to an intimate group.

Margaret Mead, the authoress of that delightful book "Coming of Age in Samoa," insists that the one universal function of the family is the status-giving, child-rearing function.

When modern writers say that the family among us has lost its function, they merely mean that the western European patriarchal family, which was once a social-economic and industrial unit of a high degree of self-sufficiency, is breaking down, that its disciplinary and educational functions have been taken over by the State and its industrial functions preempted by modern machine production. But all of these are merely functions of the family in our own immediate history—not inalienable functions of the family in human society. . . .

It is worthy of note that were State responsibility for children to be substituted for the present family organization, we would again obtain a type of guaranty for children which the present weak bilateral family fails to give.[5]

After such a lengthy and doubtless tiresome analysis of the functions which the family has performed, it would seem as though the present American family had lost its chief reasons for existence. Yet people are still marrying and founding families. From 1890 to 1920, the percentage of the population 15 years and over that was married increased 4.6 per cent. In spite of all reasoning to the contrary to demonstrate that the function of marriage and the family have one

[4] Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March, 1932. The Modern, American Family. p. 97.

[5] Ibid. The American Family. pp. 27-28.

by one been stripped from it, people go on marrying and establishing families.

Accompanying this increase in the proportion of the population married has been another trend, namely, increase in the divorce rate, or a growing number of family breakdowns. Much has been made of the American divorce rate as compared with other nations. Our divorces are increasing three times faster than our population. We feel ashamed of our record in this regard—and yet with a rapidly changing society, with increased rights for women—with the disappearance of the economic dependence of woman on man—with marriage a completely voluntary act, and above all, with our complete and almost total disregard for *education* for *marriage* and *family making*—I say, with these things in mind, we might have expected a rising divorce rate.

Failure has dogged our footsteps in attempts to solve this problem through more stringent divorce legislation. With the exception of States such as Nevada, Arkansas, and Idaho, the general trend in State divorce legislation during the past generation has been not toward more lax divorce laws, as is popularly supposed, but toward more restrictive legislation. There are some who would have us pass a Federal amendment unifying and standardizing our divergent State divorce laws. Yet the problem of divorce can not and will not be solved by legislation. The hope for its solution lies not in the prohibition of the break-up of families which have already broken up and just await social sanction for the collapse—the hope lies in preventing the causes of the original breakdown. Perhaps one reason why we lead the world in divorce rates is that as individuals we are more ready to admit that our marriage has been a failure and to experiment anew. But always it is a blind experimentation. Through our educational system, we provide little guidance for marriage and family life. We would think a man an idiot who went on an Arctic expedition without making the most thorough and painstaking preparation possible, by consulting all the charts, guides, helps, etc., that were available. Even so, we might brand as idiotic a society that allows its members to marry and establish families (a life expedition) without giving the slightest thought to preparation for the venture. The remarkable fact about this situation is not that many families break down in our present complex society—rather is it remarkable that so many succeed!

C. PRESENT POSSIBILITIES FOR THE AMERICAN FAMILY

The creation of a family and the setting up of a harmonious home in our generation is a more difficult task than has ever been faced before by the human species. So long as the primary motive for marriage and the family was economic interdependence, there was a

bond that could not be broken except at considerable sacrifice to all concerned. So long as the family was the center of child education and nurture, the only recourse in case of illness or old age, the center of recreational activities, the home was necessarily more permanent to start with. But, with many of these functions performed in other ways, what happens to the family? To me, just this happens to the family. For the first time in human history, and by that I mean the entire life of man on earth, we to-day have an opportunity to make of the family that which has never been possible in any previous culture. We can make of this institution a harmonious primary group, giving status to parents and children alike. If there is one fact that is self-evident to all students of human society, it is that man is by nature, or has become, a social being. Man can no more live without his fellows than he can without food and sustenance. "The Man Without a Country" is a pure figment of the imagination—for such a man is no longer a human being. Not only does the group mold the individual in every aspect of his personality so that, in a very real sense, man may be said to be a product of society; but man also depends upon his social groupings, he exalts his social bonds to the point where he is willing to sacrifice himself for the sake of the group. The family has been, and I venture to make the prediction that it will long continue to be, one of the most important, if not the most important, socializing and status-giving agencies that man in his development has been able to devise.

I fail to follow the arguments of those who say that some other group or institution can take the place of the family. Can the play group, the neighborhood group, the fraternal order or club, the State or the Nation, act in the capacity of pater to its members? Can they replace the intimate, face-to-face contacts that in the family take a nonmoral, biological, nonsocial creature and begin the tedious process of transforming it into a moral, social, and, if you permit me to use the word, spiritual being? Personally, I think not, and the whole weight of the experience of social workers, physicians, psychiatrists, and juvenile judges would seem to bear out the contention that a home, even though it be a foster one, is infinitely superior for the making of socially acceptable behavior to any institutional or larger group device that we have as yet tried out.

In the next place, I think we have an opportunity to make of the family an institution in which some of the finer qualities of life can be passed on to the children. I mean simply this, that now in our society, with mechanical slaves to do our work, it is theoretically possible for us to divert more and more of our energies to the cultivation of what older civilizations than ours tell us are the products of mature cultures, namely, the stimulation of interest in the artistic and esthetic sides of life, the broadening and deepening of our intellects, the cultivation

of a genuinely spiritual outlook as opposed to a crassly materialistic. For this function the home seems admirably adapted. Here is the earliest and most important source of not merely the child's social values, for here the initial stamp is put upon his emerging personality. With the energies of parents increasingly freed for attention to their children, think of the possibilities of inculcating in the minds of the children an appreciation of some of these finer aspects of human life. What chance in a society where the main function of the family was an economic one, where the father and mother were engaged all day in slaving for self-maintenance, and where the children as soon as they were old enough joined the working procession—what chance in such an institution for the development of these higher qualities?

To be sure, such a conception of the family relationship requires an intelligent viewpoint concerning this institution. It requires a higher order of forethought and preparation than was demanded in any previous society. Individuals can not enter such a family without the requisite training. But where are they to get such training? Unfortunately, because we have either been blind to a changing society around us, or we believed that things would right themselves without any outside interference, and we simply held tenaciously to an institution because it was sanctioned by milleniums of tradition, we have not made the adaptations that are necessary to make possible such a family. We have not provided in our educational system or anywhere else for an adequate training for marriage and family life. But we are beginning to appreciate this lag and we are making some attempts to face the problem.

Social work agencies are making some efforts to meet this problem by combining their knowledge of family problems with the expert advice of psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers to assist in the program of education for marriage and the family. Motivated as their work is by the best intentions, most of their contacts with the situations come just before or after the crises in family relations have been reached, so that as a preventive measure, it falls short. In some of our larger cities, clergymen, with the help of professional workers, are conducting premarital classes and giving invaluable help to those contemplating marriage in such problems as sex life, parent education, keeping a family budget, etc. Parent education has made considerable strides both in and outside academic circles. Home-economics departments in our colleges are facing the problem squarely and adjusting their curricula to the needs of young men and especially young women. Of course, mere theories will not do. What we need in this field is a competent body of knowledge to act as a guide. Just as every individual differs so every attempt at setting up a home and family has its own peculiar problems. However, if we can get a sufficiently large body of knowledge on the basis

of case studies and experiences, we shall be able to generalize effectively enough to reach conclusions that will be universally applicable.

Perhaps the Family Relations Institute of Los Angeles has pointed the way in the short year of its existence. In an organized attempt to provide guidance to marriage and family life, it has accumulated some very valuable data. On the basis of its work so far it has come to the tentative conclusion that the two greatest needs in education for marriage and the family are the sex and economic problems. This would seem to bear out the contention that has frequently been made by judges of domestic-relations courts and others that most marriages collapse on these two issues. To provide for education along these lines not only in our colleges but in our whole public-school system would then seem to be an imperative necessity if we are to rehabilitate the family and to refine its functions.

Several years ago a student of mine asked me if he might have the privilege of writing his major thesis for the department in the field of "sex and married life." Had I not known him so well, I might have suspected that he had some morbid interest in a topic of that kind, but appreciating the fact that he was contemplating marriage, I saw that here was a boy who had arrived at his senior year in college and nowhere in all his educational work had he received what he felt was going to prove absolutely necessary information if he were to embark intelligently on the marriage venture. I encouraged him in the project, and he wrote a very excellent and intelligent paper. I suppose that you would say that is the way all education should progress, through interest to investigation to conclusions. However, it would be idle to say that we have reached a point where we can expect that individuals contemplating the creation of a family will of their own free will make a thorough investigation in advance of the problems that will have to be met. We must provide avenues of guidance which will open up in a thoroughly objective fashion ways to the goal we have in mind.

No, the family is not sacrosanct; it is a very human institution. No, the family is not about to disappear as a social group. But no one who looks at the matter realistically will deny that many of the functions previously associated with the family are no longer performed by it. This simply makes it possible for us to utilize this very valuable institution for the promotion of still higher and more socially valuable ends. But such a conception of the family demands, if it is to succeed, a type of education for marriage and family life which we have not as yet generally provided. As I see the purpose and meaning of this conference, your meeting will be to no end unless you are willing to face squarely this ever-growing need for providing the necessary agencies for training and education leading to harmonious family life.

III. THE HISTORIAN

BERTRAM E. PACKARD,
Commissioner of Education, Maine

THE INFLUENCE OF THE NEW ENGLAND HOME

The typical New Englander has always been characterized by a firmness and vigor of opinion amounting at times to well-nigh sheer obstinacy. He has never been hesitant in advancing his ideas upon all occasions. Whatever his opinions may have been, they have been accurately reflected in his home life. The New England community was ever a religious community, the New England home a religious home.

We must recall that there were in those early days no magazines and newspapers and very few books. The minister and the school teacher were important personages in the community. Frequently they were one and the same person. The clergy were, as a rule, men of learning and of lofty character, and they were held in high social esteem on account of their character and scholarship as well as their clerical position. The long sermon, doctrinal in type and bristling with quotations from the Bible or from famous books of controversial theology, afforded in the long winter evenings the occasion for lively debate in every household. The Bible itself was read in the majority of homes, and prayers daily ascended to the Throne of Grace. Other subjects were thoroughly discussed, especially the political questions of the day. Theaters were unknown, strict observance of the Sabbath was enjoyed, public and private morals were regarded with jealous care, and dancing and card playing were not tolerated.

Every New England farm home was a veritable little world in itself, large families of children were the rule and every household was a beehive of industry. There was no place for selfishness and the children naturally learned the rough-and-ready lessons of give and take. Each home was largely sufficient unto itself. There was little need for money, as outside of the small expenditure for taxes and groceries—tea, coffee, and spices and the like—practically everything was produced on the farm. All the cereal grains, vegetables, beef, mutton, and pork were produced at home. From flax and wool all the clothing was carded, spun, knitted, and woven. The women and girls of the household baked, brewed, knitted, sewed, spun, and wove. Every farm home embraced a carpenter shop, blacksmith shop, cobbler shop, and much of the furniture was homemade. There was no thought of going abroad for any necessity that could be produced or made at home. *Because of these activities the boys and girls became independent, resourceful, and self-reliant. No better training for homemaking could be found than in these early New England homes.* Because

of the lack of such home training in modern days, we find the reason for the introduction into our school curriculum of practical courses in home economics and manual training.

Up to the close of the eighteenth century, the founders of New England thought their own thoughts and went their own ways in a very remarkable seclusion. During the nineteenth century, we find the New Englander and his family, first and foremost at every frontier in the making of America. We find them streaming over the Alleghany Mountains into the central plains. Like a resistless tide we find them swarming across the Rockies, and their westward march was only stayed by the broad expanse of the Pacific. Wherever they went they multiplied their numbers and created new communities patterned after those of their native New England. Always in their wake we find the village church and the village school. So to-day we may find innumerable communities throughout the broad reaches of the West, which are more typically New England even than anything we can find at home. Nearly every little New England hamlet has sent forth its sons to play honorably their part in the making of our Nation. I am taking the liberty to cite one rather interesting example: From a farm home in Maine, still in the possession of the family, where the father was a farmer and country storekeeper, and the mother had been a school teacher, five sons went forth and gained unusual distinction and honor. Simultaneously 1 was Governor of his native State, 2 were members of Congress, 1 from Illinois, and 1 from Wisconsin, and 2 represented the United States Government as ministers to foreign courts. At the same time, their own cousin, native of a little village only a few miles distant, was Vice President of the United States.

In its vital aspect New England and the homes of New England have changed during the years. Economic conditions have so brought it about that our families may no longer be characterized by their size. The admixture and amalgamation of other nationalities have had their leveling effect. More liberal and tolerant religious faiths have leavened the stern orthodoxy characteristic of an earlier day. The fundamental law has removed the teaching of religion from our public schools. Religious education, if it be accomplished at all, must be accomplished in the church and the home. In these days the impulse is under way, a tendency which is bound to grow stronger in the future, that character education must become a part of our public-school curriculum. Of this we may be sure, our children may attain their highest intellectual, moral, and religious development only by the sympathetic and constant cooperation of the home, the church, and the school. No one of these agencies alone can successfully accomplish the task, but through united effort no task can be impossible.

IV. THE HOME ECONOMIST

EMELINE S. WHITCOMB
Senior Specialist in Home Economics, United States Office of Education

Homemaking is in the school curriculum because it contributes to the community educational services dealing with the primal necessities of life, namely, food, clothing, shelter, and the social values of home and family life. *At present* no other school subject is as well prepared to administer these services to the child, the home, or to society in general, as is the homemaking program. This fact is not always clearly understood by all school patrons, or even by all the school officials, as is sometimes shown in such extraordinary times as these when retrenchment is universally considered. We are hearing that in some rural communities, and even in a number of fairly large cities, the home-economics program may be swept out of the school curriculum, or else be very much curtailed. Such action would probably not take place if the indispensable services homemaking education may contribute to the well-being of the home and the child were better understood.

Since the onset of this depression, the emergency services contributed by the home-economics departments throughout the Nation are of notable magnitude and worth.

A. EMERGENCY SERVICES

During the depression period, the hot lunches furnished the children of the unemployed; the instruction offered to children in the grades even as low as the sixth on low-cost dietaries planned for the entire family; and the clothing renovated and made fit by home-economics classes and contributed to children who otherwise would have been denied school attendance have gone far in maintaining family morale, and probably in preventing riots. In some school systems, the entire home-economics program is built around the food and clothing needs for families without breadwinners. In fact, the slogan of the home-economics departments throughout the land is "Let us make the most of what we have."

It is almost the rule that such relief contributed to the needy by the home-economics departments in our public education receives little, if any, publicity, and the value of such services is often minimized instead of extolled.

Everywhere communities are facing the problem: "What shall be the guiding nutritional principles in the present emergency?" In other words, "What best to do with an inadequate amount of money to realize the highest nutritional returns?" This problem challenges the most expert nutritionist and certainly should not be left to the untrained.

To provide, in the diet of the growing child, the nutritional essentials of which a shortage tends to permanent injury, even at the cost of other features in the dietary normally desirable, but not absolutely essential, is a responsibility which if neglected opens the way to infections and life-long injuries to health, happiness, and working efficiency. A child may not grow fat on bread and milk, some fresh fruit and vegetables, but these foods make for sound bone and muscle upon which to build in better times.

B. FOOD AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP

We were told by the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection that, in normal times, 6,000,000 of our children are malnourished. This condition, according to Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur,[6] is due to ignorance rather than lack of food, to misfeeding, not knowing how, and doing the wrong thing. Doctor Wilbur pointed out that:

> The Nation carries enormous burdens in supporting the insane, the feeble-minded, the imbeciles, the sick, and the handicapped. The children's diet determines to a larger extent than is realized what side they will join—whether it will be the ranks of the fit, where they can care for themselves, or the unfit, where they will have to be taken care of.

He further stated:

> There is a close relationship between food and *good citizenship* and food and *bad citizenship*. Food has a good deal to do with the way we behave, and with the way we resist disease. . . . When the child is dependent upon conditions in which he finds himself, it is worth our while to look over these conditions. . . .
>
> If it is true that ignorance is the greatest difficulty in the United States, isn't it about time for all of us, with all of our schools, all of our experts, to get a distribution of this knowledge so that it will reach all of our children? . . . For, properly nourished children of to-day will not have the bad joints and become the handicapped people of the future. They will be better citizens as they grow. They will resist not only diseases of civilization but the instabilities of various types, the tendency to take drugs, alcohol, morphine, and the like. All may come if the nutrition is bad. In a sound properly fed child, the nervous system does not crave that sort of thing. If the child feels well and is strong and happy, that is the test. The thermometer of good nutrition in children is happiness, for healthy children are happy children, and the kind that are not happy should be studied from the standpoint of nutrition as well as from other standpoints. . . .
>
> Nutrition also has a large function to play in the security of the future government, therefore good nutrition is the most basic of all our human responsibilities.

This, from a scientific scholar of highest rank, who has given years of study to the subject, would indicate that the school's first responsibility is to offer instruction in adequate nutrition *to all* the children from the preschool period through the high school, a first step in realizing a comprehensive program in homemaking education.

---

[6] "Food and Good Citizens," article by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, in June, 1932, number of Practical Home Economics. Abridged from paper given before Department of Supervisors and Teachers of Home Economics, N. E. A., February, 1932, in Washington, D. C.

It is fully appreciated that there are a number of school activities which can materially contribute to the health and the happiness of the school child. Conspicuous among these is the school lunch, the possibilities of which are sometimes meagerly recognized.

C. THE SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SCHOOL CAFETERIA

The school cafeteria might well become the integrating social laboratory for the entire school system, a place where school departments, other than homemaking, can make a worthy contribution. For example: English, art, economics, business, general science, civics, and physical education have much to offer.

The lunch hour for the Nation's school children should be not only a happy occasion but one of high social significance, and not a place where one "grabs a sandwich," "bolts his food," and "hurries out with an ice cream cone in one hand and a 'weenie' in the other."

The lunch room should express the best efforts of the art department in creating an environment appealing to children. It should be a place where civics is practiced, not preached; where children like to meet their associates for friendly exchanges in courtesies and hospitality; and where children enjoy the nutritious and appetizing food which may be had for the choosing at a nominal sum.

Such aspirations for what too often is a commonplace school activity make certain demands on cafeteria directors. Among these are: First, a thorough training in foods good for growing boys and girls; second, the ability to produce such foods in an attractive form; third, the genuis to sell adequate nutritional ideas to boys and girls; fourth, to help them establish sound nutritional habits; fifth, imagination, cooperative abilities, and interests in the happiness of boys and girls, as well as to keep lines moving in orderly procession, and accounts balanced.

The job of making available to all the school children the present known nutrition facts most naturally falls to the departments best prepared to render such services, and these at present on the whole are the departments of homemaking. They, in cooperation with all the other existing allied school agencies, should assume the leadership for seeing to it that all the children and not just those in home-economics classes receive nutrition instruction. This responsibility home economists are willing to assume if given an opportunity.

D. CLOTHING, THE SECOND PRIMAL NEED

The second primal need is clothing—which makes a notable contribution to the happiness and comfort of the individual. As yet, we have little definite knowledge as to the specific relationships of clothing to health. That is, we know very little about the physiological effects of clothing. But some psychological effects are fairly

evident. Aside from the comfort and economic aspects, clothing instruction furnishes useful and unique opportunities for artistic expression. Whether the child plays with paints, clay, marbles, wood, or cloth, really does not make so much difference just so he has an opportunity to express his creative abilities. In the case of clothing, the child's training may be utilized earlier than his training with the other materials by putting this instruction to useful purposes such as helping to keep his own body clothed as well as that of other members of the family, and later, in using his clothing experiences in earning a livelihood. For, aside from the appreciational, economic, social, and health values inherent in the food and clothing programs, the gainful opportunities have hardly been explored.

E. SHELTER

The third primal need is shelter. President Hoover, in opening his Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, stated, "Next to food and clothing, the housing of a nation is the most vital social and economic problem. . . ." The wealth of material, based upon the experiences and knowledges of experts, resulting from this conference will offer anyone a liberal education on every phase of the housing problem.

Home economists have long offered courses on the house, including its location, plans, and sanitary aspects; on home furnishing; on interior decoration; and on home management. Many cottages, bungalows, houses, and apartments have been furnished, from the basement to the attic, by home-economics students. These projects have had the cooperation of other school interests, especially the boys' classes in industrial education. The boys in such classes have built outright or have remodeled dilapidated small buildings, changing them into attractive little homes. All of this is most laudable. The activities afford excellent examples for developing right attitudes of citizenship and thrift, as well as judgment in buying.

But, when one reads in the February, March, and April, 1932, numbers of Fortune, that America has the worst slums in the world, that we not only have the kind of slums they have elsewhere; but the spectacular improvements of our own, such as the unholy mixing of races, the overcrowding of the land, and the construction of tall tenements which shut off the air and sunlight; and as one learns from Mr. Barry Parker, English architect of the two most important model towns of England, that he has seen the slums of South America and of all the great European cities, but nowhere has he found conditions which were not preferable to tenement conditions in our big cities, one realizes that, fine as the courses now offered in the departments of home economics are, the most important problems concerning housing have not yet been touched.

According to Dr. Edith Elmer Woods' book, entitled, "Trends in American Housing," less than half the homes in America measure up to minimum standards of health and decency.

According to the President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, good housing is dependent first of all on good surroundings. No matter how good the design, if it is in a slum or factory district, if it lacks privacy, quiet, or sunlight, running water or sewers, if through traffic endangers the lives of its children, if ugliness is all about it, if no parks or playgrounds are within walking distance it is not good housing. The foregoing faults are common to many American homes, and neighborhoods, and there can be no effective improvement of our housing standard until they are removed.

The study made by the committee on the delinquent child, of which the late Judge Cabot was chairman, gives us the facts concerning the forces at work in a slum district making for delinquency; and in the April, 1932, number of Harper's Magazine, appears an autobiography of a girl delinquent, age 16, written in a State penal institution. This story reveals the processes through which boys and girls in slum areas in our cities are educated in crime from an early age.

According to the Harvard School of City Planning, 26 per cent of our population can not aspire to own homes costing more than $2,400.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1929 placed the cost of the single family dwelling in 85 large cities at $4,902 exclusive of land.

Is it possible to build profitably for the $2,000 and under income class? Even in times of prosperity, the incomes of 65 to 75 per cent of our Americans is less than $2,000 a year.

The housing problem is one that challenges all of us—the building industries, other industries, observers of contemporary science, and educators, including those offering homemaking—in helping to develop a social conscience that will not tolerate slums—the crime schools for many boys and girls.

High-school boys and girls should be taught the facts concerning home finance, taxation, slums, large-scale housing, decentralization, home ownership, income and types of dwelling, and house design, construction, and equipment. This information should not be gleaned from the highways and byways but should be an organized body of knowledge if boys and girls are to know how to cope with the disintegrating forces that seem all about us.

THE PROPOSALS

I. BY CURRICULUM MAKERS

A. GENERAL SUGGESTIONS

R. D. Russell

Director of Curriculum, State Department of Education, Boise, Idaho

The homemaking curriculum should provide education for prospective homemakers along three major home functions. These are education for: A. The social control of sex impulses; B. The perpetuation of the race; and C. Children and adults.

1. THE SOCIAL CONTROL OF SEX IMPULSES

Improved methods of transportation, communication, the crowded conditions of cities, apartment houses, opportunities for gainful occupations for women, and the rise of science, are some of the things which are affecting the stability of the family as a social institution. Along with this has come the abolition of the double moral standard and an increase in social diseases.

With these changes in our mode of living, it is impossible "to retire into the sanctified defenses of sex and family taboos of earlier generations." The obligation rests upon the school for that type of education which will help the family to perform more effectively this function, or will help society to formulate a substitute. The home as an institution can not furnish the power for its own regeneration. The school exists specifically for this purpose. The homemaking program in our schools which neglects thorough-going training in social conditions of family life, sex hygiene, and sex pathology is failing to help the home perform one of its most important functions.

The writer recently asked 120 boys in the senior class of an Idaho high school regarding the sources of their information concerning sex problems. One hundred and thirty-nine sources were mentioned, including repetitions. Mother was mentioned 29 times; father, 36; "here and there," 12; friends, 26; experience, 15; reading books, 26; teachers, 13; doctors, 5; R. O. T. C. course, 2; Y. M. C. A., 4. It is obvious that so far as boys are concerned, the school is not functioning very effectively. Biology courses which are offered in many schools are obviously not functioning as well as they might. Approximately 150 girls were asked the same question. Two hundred and nineteen sources were mentioned, including repetitions. Mother was mentioned 104 times; Dad, 15; "here and there," 7; friends, 27; boy,

friends, 4; girl friends, 12; experience, 7; literature, 23; doctor, 2; Y. W. C. A., Camp Fire, Girl Scouts, 9; minister, 1; sisters, 2; brothers, 2; not answering, 9. In the case of girls the school was not mentioned at all as giving any instruction in sex hygiene. Most sources of information on this important topic are of a haphazard nature. The important problems that we all must face in life seem to be the ones most neglected by the home and the school.

Is it not possible for the home-economics course of study to incorporate in its curriculum instruction in social conditions of family life, sex hygiene, and sex pathology? It does seem that it should be a function of the home-economics department to use its influence with other related departments for meeting this need. It is almost inconceivable that courses of this type are not required in a home-economics course of study.

2. THE PERPETUATION OF THE RACE

At the present time the conditions which have been basic for the evolution of the race through natural selection are being removed. Improvements in the medical field, hospitals, clinics, and health resorts are tending to prohibit the elimination of the weak. Moreover, the largest families are found in those homes of lower intellectual and economic levels. Although this problem may be thought of as pertaining particularly to the field of sociology and biology, yet the perpetuation of the race is a family function, and when it is obvious that the home is functioning in such a way as to limit racial evolution it should be a matter of grave concern to those who are teaching in the field of home economics.

3. EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND ADULTS

Education in the tool subjects was once the sole responsibility of the home. The mother, father, or a tutor employed by the parents was the teacher. The consequence was, of course, that the great mass of people were practically illiterate. Ideals of democracy demanded a school which would raise the level of intelligence of the great mass of people. The result was the elementary school. It has reached such a stage of efficiency that teachers encourage parents to make no attempt at education on this level. In many schools children are not allowed to take their books home, thereby completely relieving the home of any responsibility which was once almost entirely its own. Among the important emphases which should be made in education are those concerned with:

Vocational education.—Mr. Ordway Tead, editor of business books for Harper & Bros., in a speech before the convention at Detroit, gave the following points in this connection:

(1) The important thing in vocational education is not learning the tricks of the trade, but learning the proper approach to problem solving.

(2) The school must teach about jobs and industry rather than perfection in routine skills.
(3) The tendency in industry is toward offering to employees life rather than a mere job.
(4) Jobs are not so minute as they once were. The new changes in industry are away from high specialization. Attitudes, ideals, ambitions, working qualities, and general outlook on life are the important things in selecting employees.
(5) Guidance is therefore life-realization guidance rather than job guidance in our schools.

It is obvious from this tendency in industry that the kind of vocational training possible in the home is not adequate to meet the social complexities of industry at the present time. Outside of perfection in the routines of homemaking the school will have to bear the burden. Education for the broader and more fundamental aspects of all vocations will have to be provided by the school. In the case of the home it is the same. This institution can provide the routine but not the broader problems until parents are educated in the fundamentals of home life.

The use of leisure hours.—The responsibility of parents in planning for the leisure hours of their children is becoming greater if the home is to have the influence it should. In a questionnaire given to approximately 250 high-school seniors in Idaho, it was revealed that they are absent from the home approximately half the evenings. When away from home they are usually at a picture show, visiting friends, attending parties, or car riding. This is probably one of the strongest disintegrating forces of the institution.

Mental and physical hygiene.—In the field of mental and physical hygiene, the weakness in our home-economics curriculum is probably most pronounced. An examination of 14 State courses of study reveals that more than five times as much time is given to clothing selection and care as to health and home nursing and hygiene, and four times as much time is given to the construction of clothes. Almost ten times as much time is given to foods, cooking, and meal planning as to health and hygiene. The emphasis given to child development is approximately the same as that of health and nursing and hygiene. It is obvious that mental and physical hygiene receive very secondary emphasis, although health is considered to some extent in connection with clothing and cooking.

Wise management of income.—Buying of foods, clothing, furniture, fuel, and so forth, has not been sufficiently stressed in home-economics courses of study. The average homemaker is not able to judge values. A study of food budgets shows an ignorance of the ability to select foods in order to secure the largest returns in food value for the money. Cheap foods having high food value such as beans, peas, cheese, cocoa, oatmeal, are underconsumed. Expensive foods like pork, beef, coffee,

and tea are overconsumed. Approximately a fourth of the food budget is for meat and the lower the income the greater the expenditure for this expensive item.

In the field of patent medicines the great mass of American people are victims of advertising. There are approximately 45,000 patent medicines, not more than 50 of which are really necessary in the treatment of disease.

These illustrations are adequate to show the need in homemaking curriculums of emphasis on buying based on values. The making of clothing and cooking can not be overlooked, but clothing must be bought before being made. It is questionable, moreover, whether or not, except for individuality of style, the making of clothing should be emphasized if it is at the expense of the effective performance of more fundamental functions. The home-economics course of study is not complete without a scientific study of foods, nutrition, purchasing, housing, rent, building materials, lumber, paint, leather, fuels, lighting, heat, clothing, fabrics, and clothing articles. These topics are of course as broad as life itself and unlimited time could be spent on them, but it is unthinkable that emphasis on the many routines of home life should limit the opportunity of studying these topics.

ORVILLE C. PRATT

Superintendent of Schools, Spokane, Wash.

What are some of the practical provisions for extending homemaking education to boys as well as to girls? What subject matter, points of view, and activities might both boys and girls engage in to their better conception of the importance of the home, its relation to the happiness of its occupants, and to their present worthy home membership?

WHAT A HOME SHOULD BE

The first objective might well be an appreciation of what a home should be, an emotional ideal of its possibilities. To this objective the information and activities should be supplementary. Closely related to this chief objective is the second: A conception of the give-and-take essential to successful living with other people. The breakdown of the home, when it occurs, is not due primarily to a lack of things but to a lack of ideals, particularly to the lack of the ideal of service. The central problem is that of harmony on the spiritual plane. What the school should strive to cultivate is the ability to get on with other people. There is no other one ability which contributes more to successful living outside the home as well as in it. The best preparation which the school can give is

the actual practice in harmonious cooperation which extracurricular activities afford.

CONSUMERSHIP

A third suggestion is that homemaking in the school, if it is to be effective, must carry over the ideals children now have into present application in the homes. In citizenship we have come to the viewpoint that it is not something to be applied after the children are voters, but that children in every other respect except voting are citizens of some kind, good or bad, here and now, in the home, the neighborhood, and the school. Similarly, children are now members of homes toward which they already have attitudes of some kind, harmful or helpful. To as great a degree as is possible the knowledges, attitudes, and skills taught in homemaking should find immediate application in the child's present home.

In short, instruction in homemaking should shift from the objective of production as it was in the form of cooking and sewing to that of consumption as in selecting foods in relation to health, table manners, and standards of social conduct. Homemaking should be aimed at the improvement of life as it exists in the home of to-day.

Following are some school adjustments which would help in the attainment of homemaking as outlined above:

1. Homemaking clubs for boys should be among the recognized extracurricular activities. Such clubs, where organized, have functioned with much interest and benefit to boys.

2. Electives in home economics should be planned to meet the needs of students with a wide variety of interests. The work should not be limited to those taking the home-economics course. For instance, a class in "social relations" would be valuable for every student and one in "personal problems for commercial girls" would be worth while for every girl taking commercial work.

3. Single period classes should be scheduled for home economics wherever feasible. This would greatly extend the work in any given school without additional cost. The shift in emphasis in home economics makes this recommendation feasible.

4. The changed objectives of the homemaking work should be carefully explained to teachers, parents, pupils, and administrators. I mentioned teachers because, unless they have taken home-economics courses in recent years, they are quite as apt to have a mistaken idea of present objectives as are the others mentioned. The first essential is that teachers shall have the correct conception of homemaking work.

5. Carefully planned correlation with other departments will strengthen home-economics courses and at the same time will extend home-economics education through these courses. For example, the trained home-economics teacher may teach "budgeting" in the

commercial department; "clothing selection and interior decoration" in the art department; "food principles" in connection with general science; etc. Such cooperation will eliminate unnecessary duplication and will allow for careful checking of subject-matter taught.

Quite as important is the avoidance of duplication in home economics as presented in the elementary, junior, and senior high schools. The course of study should be carefully correlated throughout. There is nothing more deadening to interest or wasteful of time than to have duplication of subject-matter in the high school which has already been well covered in the grades. Such duplication is inexcusable because it is so easy to avoid. All that is required is a little cooperation and a reasonably detailed course of study.

6. The attention of parent-teacher associations might well be directed to the social, economic, and psychologic aspects of home life. If the home under modern conditions is to be something more than a parking place or a filling station, more thought must be given to its spiritual values.

7. Less emphasis on athletics and more on health would react to the advantage of homemaking. There is statistical evidence to the effect that poor health is the outstanding cause of dependency and that ignorance in regard to personal hygiene, nutrition, and sanitary home conditions are the chief causes of poor health.

FREDERICK G. BONSER[1]
Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

Persons responsible for homemaking education in our secondary schools should undertake to develop and refine present homemaking courses to meet the needs for better home life in America.

This responsibility, among others, demands:

1. Exploration of the immediate interests boys and girls have in home life and provisions for fostering those interests.

2. Clarification of the newer conceptions and purposes of homemaking education.

3. Enrichment of courses in terms of thought content and experience to such a degree that they will have adequate liberalizing validity and respectability to be rated as worthy of credit toward high-school graduation and college-entrance requirements to afford a basis for work in college more advanced than that required for beginners.

4. Production of textbooks and other forms of home-economics materials on the high-school and college levels to provide basic source content adequately without attempting to establish such limits or standardization as will inhibit continued readjustment to new dis-

[1] Deceased.

coveries, inventions, and wholesome modes of living in an ever-changing world.

5. Orientation of school administrative and supervisory officers such as superintendents, principals, and advisers of boys and girls in the needs, possibilities, and educational validity of home-economics work in high schools.

6. Education of parents and the public generally in the meaning, content, and values of the larger conceptions of home economics adaptable to the interests and needs of high-school boys and girls.

7. Determination of the costs of equipment and supplies for present forms of appropriate work to enable school administrators to see that the necessary expenditures for home economics are reasonably low and neither excessive nor extravagant.

8. Elimination of the impression that home economics is a losing field in the high schools by making available the facts of growth and progress in the work.

It is essential that school officers, academic teachers, parents, and students generally understand the breadth, larger purposes, and values of the work of the home-economics field at its present best. It should be made clear that the field includes consideration of the whole problem of the business of being a girl or a boy, and the business of being a woman or a man, each in its place, in a wholesome, well-rounded, efficient, and satisfying career, with a frank and discriminating study of the problems of work, leisure, responsibilities, and adjustments, and the compensations of personal and home life.

B. PROBLEMS RAISED

1. IN CITY SCHOOLS

AGNES HOUSTON CRAIG
Supervisor of Home Economics, Springfield, Mass.

Problem I.—One of the most difficult tasks is to acquaint educational authorities and the general public with the meaning and scope of home-economics education. Melvin Brodshaug, in his book "Home Economics in Secondary Schools," points out that "Many administrators and teachers have failed to follow the trend and still conceive of home economics in terms of manual training." Such persons still speak of our work as "sewing and cooking," "domestic science," "shop," etc., although from a professional standpoint, these trends have been obsolete for a number of years.

The term "home economics" is the accepted designation of our work. It is not a course of study, or shop work, or a subject for girls only. It is a field of interest for both boys and girls and men and women. Home economics is an applied science and art belonging to the same class as "education," "medicine," "agriculture," or "engineering."

Like them, its practices tap many fields of knowledge at some time or at some point. Many of the principles of biology, sociology, economics, psychology, chemistry, bacteriology, physics, and art are in active daily use in any modern home.

In industry, the engineer has been called the "world's greatest civilizer," because he applies the discoveries of pure science to material problems. Quietly, but persistently, home economists have done precisely this to the economic and social problems of the home and the family. They are social engineers, so named for their successful application of scientific principles, based upon research, to the improvement of health by the proper use of food, nutrition, clothing, and housing.

Further, the social engineers have developed the important studies of human relationships, of economics applied to consumption, of vocational guidance and training for women, thereby opening up a greater variety of professional opportunities for women whose trained talents in scientific, economic, and art phases pay salaries ranging from $1,000 to $15,000 and more a year.

Problem II.—It is important that home economics be recognized as an organic part of the elementary and secondary school program. Most children are fond of skilled handwork, and in their early years can not do abstract thinking, but may be led to solve problems in constructing some useful article for themselves or their homes. If the proper activities are selected, they give children better insight into the world's work than any amount of theory or reading can possibly afford.

Variety of handwork makes pupils versatile with their hands and may help them in learning various types of handwork when later the machine makes their trade obsolete. This is a vital point for workers to-day, as well as educators in planning the school program.

Our basic industries are concerned with the production of food, shelter, and clothing. Home economics appreciates the consumer's problems in utilizing these fundamentals in relation to the welfare of family members, especially children in the home. Therefore, our work can not be lightly designated as a frill in education as is done so frequently. For the masses, home economics is more fundamental than any other school subject, and therefore should be recognized as an organic part of any educational program in helping to solve the problems of the present machine age.

Problem III.—We need to adopt the point of view that family problems have a place in the training of boys as well as of girls. To illustrate: Every child has a right to be born with a sound body and mind, to have intelligent care and training until, as a responsible person, he can preserve and increase his own endowment. Dr. E. V. McCollum assures us that "Food is the one single most important

factor in health." Home-economics-trained people have more sound scientific knowledge and experience in the field of food and nutrition than any other known group of school people on the elementary and secondary levels. Many of the home-economics teachers have studied foods and nutrition in a scientific manner intensively from two to six years.

Every home must be financed. It is a cooperative problem for men and women. Both need to know something about how to direct the income. In the United States, 45 per cent of the wealth is owned and controlled by women; and, as consumers, they spend from 75 to 90 per cent of the family income or more than 50 billion dollars a year. Few girls have any training in the economics of consumption. Both boys and girls need practical work of this kind, yet almost the only school training offered is to girls in home economics.

The behavior of individual members of the family makes the home either the "abiding place of affections" or "the center of conflict." Homes are usually one or the other. If homemakers were equipped with the most elementary principles of psychology, mental hygiene, and the primary techniques of child training, innumerable human tragedies in divorce, warped lives, and broken homes would be avoided. Parent responsibility, and not responsibility of social agencies is important in the home situation. In fact, when we consider the youth of the United States, it is humiliating, to say the least, that we depend so much on public social agencies to solve our family problems. In this respect, education has failed to do its duty. We ask, "Is such an important task a 'frill' in education?"

President Hoover has pointed out that "adequate housing goes to the very roots of the well-being of the family . . . it has the important aspects of health and morals, and education and provision for a fair chance for growing childhood."

How many men would be willing to write their letters by long hand or visit schools by means of the horse and buggy? Yet, to-day the majority of women are obliged to use antiquated methods in the management of their homes. More attention needs to be given to the invention of household equipment from the viewpoint of what women want and need than from the viewpoint of what manufacturers wish to sell.

Problem IV.—Home-economics laboratories should be moved from dark basements and stuffy attics to clean, sanitary, and attractive quarters. These laboratories should be examples of the best standards for practice in health, sanitation, and technical operations in keeping with the times and the average income of American families. They should be examples of the application of art to the everyday common affairs of life.

The practice house is an accepted type of laboratory in the United States. Brodshaug says, "There is a sound philosophical basis back of the use of the home-economics cottage; because it simulates life situations more adequately than other plans." Where the practice house is impracticable, the homemaking apartment should be provided.

Problem V.—The home-economics department should not be regarded a dumping ground for all irregular and handicapped children. In planning the home-economics curriculum, provision should be made for the following: Courses of general importance to both boys and girls such as foods, nutrition, home engineering or home mechanics, human relationships, child care and training, and economics of the household; courses especially designed for girls such as clothing construction, art in everyday living, home planning and furnishing, and housekeeping; special courses for retarded children; and those leading to the vocations.

2. IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MARY E. PARKER

Director of Household Administration, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

It was an outstanding professional woman, Ida Tarbell, who, 20 years ago, wrote, "I doubt if there is a more disintegrating influence at work—one more fatal to sound social development—than that which belittles the home and the place of the woman in it." That influence, under many guises, has been diligently at work during these 20 years and society knows to its sorrow what it has wrought.

Realization of the menace to the future and faith in the power of education to develop a counter influence have led to the calling of this and similar conferences. The elementary and secondary schools can obviously reach the larger number, but the greatest opportunities for leadership are on the college level. The need for some consideration of the practical phases of the problem was never so great as at the present time, but the general field must be thought of as homemaking with all its economic, social, and psychological bearings.

Colleges can not yet be said to have organized their offering with this in view. Most of the traditionally accepted liberal-arts colleges have concerned themselves almost exclusively with preparation for academic pursuits and for "careers." The inference which one naturally draws is that the responsibilities of home life are not deemed sufficiently important or the problems sufficiently challenging to warrant their consideration in a college program. The introduction of any courses looking toward home life has furthermore been regarded until recently as a form of disloyalty to the pioneers who worked to

open the doors of colleges to women. And yet the graduates of these colleges have married and at present the proportion of those who do marry is larger than of those who do not. In the face of this fact, one wonders why intensive study of things remote from everyday life, and preparation for professions outside the home should to such a degree make up the program of the average student in the liberal-arts colleges and why these colleges exclude what President Eliot called "the arts and sciences that can be applied day by day in the conduct of the family."

On the other hand, the colleges and universities made possible by the Morrill Grant, and a few on private endowment, have seen as clearly as did the great president of Harvard University that "the object which should be kept before young women in their colleges" may well be "the acquisition of the powers which will enable a woman to discharge her main function in life not only with accuracy and justice but with enjoyment, bringing forth happiness for herself as well as for her family." These colleges have also been keen to discover new ways in which their work may function in schools, hospitals, and other fields in which special training enables a young woman to be economically independent. The development has been of enormous value to young women and through them in many ways to society, but adequate preparation such as is required involves a higher degree of specialization than is consistent with breadth of outlook.

A broad conception of homemaking education.—Education for any mode of living must obviously concern itself first and primarily with the individual; for what the man or woman brings to any undertaking in personality, mental resource, and potential character is manifestly more important than any specific guidance that can be given. The correlation between mental resource and family happiness may not be perfect but it is probably very high and we have all about us evidence that it is on the higher levels, fundamental in human companionship. The broader conception of homemaking for the college woman connotes the ability to participate, whether as mate or parent, in the thoughts and activities of a broadened environment and the ability to interpret current conditions and movements more truthfully and to find in the beauties of literature, nature, and art more inspiration. It connotes also the ability to contribute more effectively to human welfare outside the home than would have been possible without the advantages which the college offers. A broad, satisfying, and effective preparation for homemaking can not be realized without the incorporation of much which the traditionally accepted liberal-arts college offers. Lacking breadth of vision and a body of fundamental principles, too many women lose the stimulation which comes from an interest in the larger issues of life outside the home, magnify the

details of their housekeeping, and lose their sense of relative values. One wonders, however, why colleges so confidently aim to prepare for academic pursuits in which a relatively small number of their graduates spend their lives, and leave to a combination of instinct and "the trained mind" the solution of the problems involved in the life of the family. Many graduates, especially of recent years, who have observed the comparative ease with which home-economics women have adapted themselves to difficult financial conditions, have expressed their regret that their own college program had given so little to help them to meet the practical problems of everyday life. Furthermore, the undergraduate student to-day, in spite of the weakening of the bonds which hold families together and also in spite of richer college offerings and vastly increased opportunities for economic independence, are frankly saying, many of them, that they believe their own greatest happiness is going to lie in home and family life. The attitude of by no means an inconsiderable number of undergraduate women was expressed recently by a liberal arts senior, a Phi Beta Kappa student, who wrote, "Colleges have not yet succeeded in taking the woman entirely out of her home. She wants her college career, perhaps a few years of earning money to feel that she is getting definite returns for what she has put in; and then she wants her home. The greater number of years and the most of her energies are spent in this home. She wants to make it successful for she has not only her own satisfaction to consider but she has a responsibility to her husband and her children—to keep them healthy and happy. If that is woman's big task, she should be prepared to undertake it. And why not receive that preparation while in college?" We await a satisfactory answer to that question.

A broad conception of education.—An unbiased evaluation of the contribution which home-economics departments make to the realization of a broad conception of education for homemaking would place that contribution upon a higher level than is now accorded it because it would judge it more fairly. It is doubtless true that in the early years of the teaching of the subject, the work was not always on the college level. Subject matter was lacking and there was not adequate reference material in any of the phases of this complex subject. Young women coming into the field to-day from graduate study marvel at the courage of the pioneers who were obliged to work not only in the face of difficulties, misconceptions, and prejudice but also with scant materials. Theirs was the day of small things but to them we owe the beginnings of a movement of great social significance, one which does not "belittle the home and the place of the woman in it."

An unprejudiced study of the history of this movement would reveal the fact that there has been an enormous change both in secondary

schools and in colleges in the direction of added emphasis upon scientific background and social outlook. A study of the teaching to-day would reveal weaknesses, to be sure, but it would also reveal the use of extended bibliographies, the requiring of a degree of reasoning as to cause and effect, the application of fundamental principles, and an amount of independent thinking which one does not in every case find in accepted academic courses in which a retentive verbal memory is a major asset. Courses which are directly applicable to the needs of daily life are based upon objective facts, fundamental principles, and a body of information built up through a sequence of prerequisite college courses. Courses in normal nutrition and in the feeding of infants and children, for instance, follow prescribed study of physiology and chemistry identical with that required as a basis for academic specialization. The same holds true for most of the work in this field.

All home-economics courses are often cavalierly dismissed on the ground that they consist only of the teaching of "skills, techniques, and devices"; are therefore outside the pale of education; and should be classified as training. That represents, of course, a misapprehension which can be explained usually by lack of acquaintance with facts; but at any rate, one is tempted to inquire why the manipulation of materials in chemistry, biology, and physics is thought so essential and the manipulation of food materials and textile fabrics should be altogether discredited. A good many pragmatically minded young women to-day are asking that very question and wondering why the ancient Greek scorn for productive work with the hands should persist in a country like ours and in times like these.

Constructive work with concrete materials has for years been regarded as a valuable therapeutic agent in the treatment of nervous disorders but its value for the normal mind has only recently been recognized. Work with her hands, especially in the service of her family, has confessedly helped many an adult woman to keep her balance mentally and emotionally in a world of conflicting ideas and emotional overstrain, and one might possibly question the wisdom of excluding it altogether from the education of the girl in her later adolescent years when she is trying to meet the exacting demands of her college work and at the same time to reconcile conflicting purposes in her own life. It would not seem that the human race has yet reached the stage of evolution in which people live at their best in a world of symbols and abstractions, even for a 4-year period.

In the light of the foregoing, it may not seem altogether dogmatic to state that the broadest conception of education for homemaking can not be realized without a recognition of the value of courses in home economics and the inclusion of some of their material which bears directly upon the problems and responsibilities of home life.

A forecast.—The next step in preparation for homemaking will probably be a study of human relations in the intimate circle of the family. The stress and strain of modern life have made adjustments in family life more and more difficult and failures too easily condoned. In the teaching field it has been found possible to develop appreciations and techniques which save a young woman from unnecessary mistakes and which bring her earlier to the realization of her powers, to greater usefulness, and to greater happiness; and it seems reasonable to expect that we may also in time find equally acceptable appreciations and techniques which will render a similar service in preparation for home life—an undertaking fraught with greater possibilities for success or failure—and more dependent upon a clearly conceived philosophy of life than teaching can possibly be.

Courses in "the family" are already offered by departments of sociology in many colleges and are exceedingly valuable, but as a rule they treat the family historically and as an institution rather than as an intimate group in which the interaction of personalities is probably the major consideration. These courses have done much to stimulate thinking and to bring to the student a realization of the important place which the home occupies in society, and it is only natural that young people of the present generation are asking that they may have as the next step some analysis of successful and happy married life and the philosophy upon which it depends. There is much to learn from failure, but there is a growing recognition in all of the social sciences that the time has come for both preventive and constructive work. There is also a growing appreciation of the need for preserving mental health, for better ways of making personality adjustments, and for the early recognition of desirable or undesirable tendencies.

Analysis of success in married life is undoubtedly more difficult than a similar analysis of its failures. A man's house is his castle and more inviolate than his house are the happy intimacies and loyalties of family life. Furthermore, the families whose lives are the happiest are likely to be most reticent; but if we define our problem as the study of the interaction of personalities within the family group, we have reason to hope that highly trained men and women in sociology, psychology, ethics, and psychiatry, with the cooperation of men and women happily married, can discover a system of values valid for the guidance of young men and women in their intimate personal relations. There have been notable contributions in recent years which lend themselves to the making of courses of substance. Experimental courses are being offered in some of the home-economics departments in State universities and are conducted by broadly trained women. The cooperation of specialists in different fields has been secured and although the public hears nothing of this work, and it is still the light under the bushel, we are perhaps war-

ranted in predicting that this will be the next step in the realization of a broad conception of education for homemaking. It represents the beginnings of a highly significant movement, and the response of the students themselves argues for its timeliness and value.

The realization of a new viewpoint.—There are many other encouraging signs of the times. Many of the traditionally accepted liberal-arts colleges, which until recently have been distinctly hostile, have taken a highly important step in the establishment of nursery schools and have put the seal of their approval upon the study of the child and his development. Vassar College has not only her nursery school and the integration of courses represented by euthenics, but also the flourishing summer Institute of Euthenics. Back to the college campus go young married women, practically all of them college graduates, who put their little children into the nursery school and themselves become students learning much that as homemakers they need to know, and that we hope will in time be available to the undergraduate student. In many ways, the development of euthenics at Vassar College represents the most significant step in college education for women in recent years. In the universities and colleges in which home economics is taught, the work has passed through the earlier stages of inadequacy, and has reached the level of the college standard, a fact that deserves wider recognition than it yet receives.

II. BY PARENTS

C. C. McCracken
President, Connecticut Agricultural College, Storrs

Education for parenthood involves many fields of learning.—Parenthood involves many intricacies which do not develop within a few months and education for parenthood is a long vital process. The secret of this process has been sought through all the ages and is still only partially known. Occasionally scientists have given us glimpses of what seems to be the best procedure through well-established biological laws. The theologians and moralists have given us certain prescriptions and the lawmakers have laid down definite controls of social actions. Psychologists have studied the emotions and the mental processes involved and have offered much advice. The educators have assumed great responsibility in acting as parents and guardians to our children and in attempting to guide them to successful and happy parenthood.

Dr. L. P. Jacks, of Oxford, England, in speaking to a community group under the auspices of the National Recreation Association, commented on the practice of taking children to the movies and talkies, as follows: "How many of our places of amusement, how many of our pleasure resorts, how many of the movies and the talkies might well write up over their doors, 'Empty Barrels Filled Up Here.'"

This view seems very significant. The child, in a sense, is a barrel to be filled with reliable knowledge, proper purposes, correct ideals. Education for parenthood must begin as soon as the child begins to take cognizance of its surroundings—in other words, at birth.

The young parents and particularly the young mothers are at the mercy of physicians in attempting to decide upon a proper diet and daily regimen for the child. . . . The medical profession has become so highly specialized that it is necessary for parents to visit from one to a dozen specialists in order to gain a fair knowledge of what should be done for the child. . . . The advancement in medical science has been wonderful, but there are times when the parents wish that a revised family doctor might return. As the child progresses through the years to adolescence, trial and error enter into the picture very largely, because the child is thought of analytically and not synthetically. With the changes occurring in the early adolescent period come troubles that need very sympathetic understanding and treatment. The physician may advise but he can not do certain things that a wise sympathetic mother can do for her daughter or a father for his son. . . .

Too late, oftentimes, the parents or the school attempt to instruct the child about the factors involved in parenthood or they neglect the matter altogether. The physical man or woman has developed to maturity without a knowledge of basic physiological and hygienic laws. He or she may have been kept well and healthful, which means a great deal, but without knowing the whys and wherefores. Parenthood suffers a severe handicap when the individual is ignorant of his physical self.

A. THE PLACE OF THE CHURCH IN THE CHILD'S EDUCATION

In the past, the church has exerted in many cases a very direct influence by surrounding the child with high ideals and uplifting environments. One of these ideals for which the church has stood valiantly is the sanctity of the marriage vow. Certainly, when a book has maintained its prominence for as many centuries as the Bible, there must be something vital in its teachings. . . . As soon as the child can listen to the simplest story, Bible instruction can be begun and continued as long as the child lives. When the church does this it will establish in the mind of the growing child principles and ideals that have been basic in all ages in education for parenthood.

B. THE RIGHTS OF THE STATE

Basic principles must be engrained in the fabric of everyday living. We first have the idea, and then trial; permission follows and if the majority approve, the provision becomes mandatory. Lawmaking is a process of writing into statutes what the people desire. . . . Our

laws and our ordinances are, in general, written to protect us from conditions which are contrary to satisfactory parenthood. For example, companionate marriage is very generally condemned. . . . Our laws for the protection of the child growing into maturity will certainly never be written to favor physical disability and wantonness, prostitution, or moral instability. Whether the laws are to be enforced is again to depend on our citizenry. While there are many discouraging conditions to-day, these certainly can and will be remedied. Law must, and undoubtedly will, be conducive to inculcation of the ideals for which this Nation has stood in the past. An understanding of and respect for the law should begin as soon as the child has companions, and should develop each year. . . .

The State says that the child must go to school; and the State thereby supersedes the parent. The child must be educated and, moreover, educated as the State prescribes. The parent may supplement what the State prescribes, but must not omit any of the required subjects. In the last analysis, the law of the State is supreme and can control the fate of the individual for the welfare of the majority. My child *must* go to school, *must* study certain subjects, *must* do this, and *must* do that.

That the State is willing to assume this responsibility is quite a relief to many parents. Where both father and mother must work to make a living, it is convenient to check the baby at the nursery school in the morning and claim it again in the evening. As the child grows, the checking process becomes unnecessary, but the principle remains, for the child is assigned to the school or the playground for the day and oftentimes part of the night. Parents and children grow up almost strangers to one another. There is little or no common bond. The school has taken over many of the functions of the home.

Possibly this is best, you say. The school physician will guard the physical development of the child. The psychologist will test his mentality, his emotions, and his aptitudes, and issue educational prescriptions accordingly. The biologist will teach the essential facts of sex. Certain departments inculcate proper social practices through organized plays and games and student government. The religious element must be omitted, lest someone's prejudices be trampled on. If it is introduced it must be done clandestinely or in the community. In short, the child is the creature of the State as the State prescribes. The State has become the parent and the teacher the instrument of the State. Society tends to become institutionalized.

C. THE TEACHER'S PLACE

The teacher in the American public school merits great respect and confidence. She must be all things to all people. The education

of this teacher deserves a place in the universities of to-day. A knowledge of biology, sociology, psychology, and other sciences and arts must be gained to cope with this complex problem. It is unfortunate that so large a percentage of these teachers come from homes where the family income is too low to permit a more general education than the time and finances allow. . . . The teacher must act the part of the parent, but oftentimes without the maturity that parenthood assumes to have. The teacher attempts to be father, mother, and intellectual adviser. The success which our teachers are meeting in this colossal attempt is little short of marvelous. Parenthood comes from the conglomerate, but not always in commendable form.

D. IDEAL EDUCATION FOR PARENTHOOD

With all due respect to all these agencies, it seems to me that in them does not lie the ideal in education for parenthood. . . . The best education which a boy or girl can secure for parenthood comes through a close companionship with good parents. . . .

If we, as fathers and mothers, are willing to make the effort and take the time to be good companions to our children we *can* do it. If the teachers are failing to accomplish the task, we as parents can supplement their work. If we as parents do not understand the biological processes, the school can help us in teaching these principles. If the child needs oversight in play, we as parents can learn to play without policing *if we will*. The Greeks were able to accomplish it. So can we, *if we will*.

Although cooperation of other agencies is vital, responsibility for education for parenthood devolves primarily upon the home. It is not an easy task to perform. But the most fundamental factor in the solution of the problem is a close, sympathetic understanding between the parent and the child from the birth of the child until he becomes a parent. On such a foundation, we can build all the other elements involved.

WILLIAM JOHN COOPER
United States Commissioner of Education

In Harper's Magazine for December, 1931, there is a very interesting article entitled "Parents as Children See Them." These parents are nearly all mothers. Rarely ever does a child of 7 to 11 years, which represents the age of the 61 children concerned, give much thought to father. The women are all what one would call "upper middle class." They are wives of well-to-do business and professional men. How do such people appear in the eyes of their own children? Each child was asked to write a composition on "grown-ups" and was told that the compositions would be regarded entirely as con-

fidential. In general, these children resented the "bossiness" of the parents. One child regarded the matter of growing up as an inevitable state. She wrote, "I should hate to be a grown-up, but I guess I will have to be one some day unless I die. I think I will stab myself or commit suicide when I am almost 20 years old."

The chief offense of which these children, if they are typical and I think they are, accuse us grown-ups is of unnecessary interference in children's affairs. Too much attention to their appearance, for instance, is condemned. Such comments as "Women always make me wear a million sweaters and coats when the wind is a little cold. I think that you could have much more fun if women grown-ups would stop thinking about what they look like and get some exercise outdoors. If they would go out and play baseball and those games, they would get some color that was much prettier than rouge." This matter of exercise is connected in the child's mind with appearance, for perhaps the next most commonly made charge against the grown-up is that she uses too much lipstick, powder, and rouge. The care with which this operation is performed also seems to arouse the comment of children who at this age despise it.

One does not need lectures like this, however, if he stops and thinks of his problem as a parent. There are everyday questions which require a large body of information to understand. Such questions as, "Where do I come from?" "Why am I here?" are problems which nearly every parent has to meet sooner or later. The day of evasion and lying to children is passing. We must be honest and frank and yet be so without the sheer openness which leaves its mark on the child.

In fact, one's education to-day has to consider the entire personality. We began with a little intellectual work, and eventually we added to that some physical-education work. We are now beginning to see that courses in mental hygiene are as important as courses in physical hygiene. When we get a complete education we will have a chance to answer such problems. Those of us who have been through the schools and college have really mostly an intellectual slant with a little physical work. We have practically no mental hygiene. Consequently it may be necessary in an adult school somewhere to begin to work on this problem. If we go to Russia we are told that the educational work of what would correspond to our schools from the eighth year of life to the twelfth is organized in "complexes"—that is, one gets his reading and writing and arithmetic incidentally to the work in connection with a "complex." The latter may involve one's calling in life or some aspect of one's occupation as a member of the family group. I am wondering if as our educational system approaches completeness and effectiveness it will not be given in the form of "complexes" or projects. Already some of our experimental schools

have gone a long distance in this direction. When this time comes a child will not be given an artificial training outside his home but the school will be the real supplement of his home and family life will be the normal condition of any young person.

To-day a child is fortunate if he has an unbroken home. With divorces rating approximately one in six, many children come from homes in which the family is disrupted, and it is remarkable that our child life is as good as it is. The family in which the child is growing up is anything but static. Changes in the environment must affect it. The period of unemployment through which we have been coming has been exceedingly hard on some families. Many of these have been undernourished and are not likely to recover from some of the evils due to it. If by chance a child does have both a father and a mother it is hardly to be expected under present conditions that they will be in agreement and if these disagreements are known to the youngsters they must work an evil. Consequently we can say that there are comparatively few homes in which children to-day are growing up with the training which they should receive. In fact, some 300 mothers who were college graduates were asked by Miss Ruth Lindquist what they felt they needed most. Seventy-seven per cent of them expressed the need for educational child training; one-half for child psychology, which probably was merely another way of expressing a feeling of need for child training; and 15 per cent felt the need of more educational work.

But assuming that a child is in the more fortunate position of having parents who are agreed upon how it shall be trained, upon what it should be as it develops, think of the environing factors other than the family which tend to counteract this influence. Under these conditions one can readily realize what the handicaps are. If, then, we have a course in college which regards the child as the object of study, where shall we begin? It seems to me that we must begin with babyhood and infancy. One of the first needs is security.

> For every child a dwelling place safe, sanitary, and wholesome, with reasonable provisions for privacy, free from conditions which tend to thwart his development; and a home environment harmonious and enriching.[8]

Another problem will be the young one's attitude toward money. Children have usually very badly twisted ideas about the sources and values of money and yet before they are in school they feel the need of it. There should be a course in the economic independence of the family in which all of its members should participate. Such a course has been well worked out under Miss Florence Barnard in the schools of Brookline, Mass., and a similar course is optional in the State of New York. It is now being proposed by Mr. Orrin C. Lester, vice-

[8] White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. The Children's Charter, No. VII.

president of the Bowery Savings Bank, as a national institution. To know how money is earned, what it is worth, and how it can be effectively saved is very valuable information for a child to have. Such a course, if it is to succeed to-day, need be taken first of all by the parents and then by their children.

As a child proceeds from very early childhood into adolescence there will be questions of sex. It is exceedingly difficult for the school to-day to do very much with the problem. There are now existing courses in natural science which give all of the sex information possible with regard to birds and animals. Probably there would be less trouble in this regard if parents were a little more frank than they have been. It is also needed that children be given some advice in the selection of a mate and in the foundation of a home in order that there may be a time when some of these difficulties will come to an end. At the same time that instruction in founding a home is given, time will be allowed for the consideration of home beautification and other aspects of domestic art. For the home, which is around about the child from his early beginnings until he himself mates, is the interpreter of the ideals for which his parents stand.

If educational work is to be successful in this field, it must take a child from the beginning through until he is himself ready for parenthood, meeting all of his problems with the best educational advice, and at the same time that the course is being administered for children and for their parents it will be advisable to have further study going on in such research centers as the Universities of Iowa, Minnesota, California, Columbia, Yale, etc., and in such institutions, as the Merrill-Palmer School.

O