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INTRODUCTION


7. Education Commission of the States, Early Learning: Improving Results for Young Children (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 2000), 4, ECS Archives.

8. Due to its focus on preschool programs, the present analysis devotes limited attention to the history of kindergartens in the United States. Kindergartens are an important chapter in the story of early learning, but they currently fall outside the domain of “preschool” due to their integration into the public school system. Several superb studies examine the emergence of kindergarten as an educational innovation in the late nineteenth century and/or its relationship with the public school system (Beatty 1995,
9. This book uses several terms interchangeably. It refers to preschool education, child development programs, early childhood policy, and prekindergarten. These terms reflect the changing rhetoric of those who favor greater public investment in educational programs serving young children (Russell 2011; L. White 2004). They also reflect preschool service providers’ contemporary diversity.

10. Programs serving infants and toddlers also fall outside the scope of the present analysis. Beatty (1995, xi) asserts that it is “historically correct” to distinguish between preschool education and child care. Several scholars focus on child care in the United States and examine some of the policies and programs that appear in this book (Beatty 1995; Cohen 2001; Michel 1999).

11. These cost estimates include both preschool and child care programs. Focusing solely on child care centers highlights the role of the private sector. In 1990, according to one analysis, about 90 percent of American child care centers were private. Two-thirds of the private centers were nonprofit, and one-third was for-profit. The nonprofit centers included 25 percent that were independent, 15 percent that were sponsored by religious organizations, 8 percent that were run by large nonprofit organizations, and 9 percent that were run by Head Start providers (A. D. White 2005, 17).


15. In addition to complaints about the general shortcomings of the contemporary preschool system, many observers lament the poor quality of individual preschool and child care programs (Barnett and Hustedt 2003; Henry, Gordon, and Rickman 2006).

16. The historical and contemporary political conflict surrounding preschool education is multidimensional. This book focuses on the interplay between the public and the private sector and between the national government and the states, but questions of program effectiveness, appropriate curricula, and teacher certification requirements have also proven controversial. Those debates lie beyond the scope of this analysis but have been examined elsewhere (Beatty 1995; Vinovskis 1999a).

17. A “political analysis” seems especially constructive because, in the words of one scholar, “far too many ‘historians’ of particular childhood policies are insiders with axes to grind” (Sealander 2004, 181).

18. A recent comparative analysis of “family policy” concludes that fewer significant policy changes since the mid-1990s have occurred in the United States than in such countries as the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Australia (Daly 2010).

19. Many other public preschool programs are modeled on Head Start, especially in terms of their clientele and their comprehensive programming.

20. *House Committee on Ways and Means, 1990 Green Book: Background Material and Data on Programs within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, 101st Cong., 2d sess.* (Committee Print, 1990), 840.

21. This growth is impressive, but not all claims are based on preschool-related expenses. Claimants become eligible for the tax credit based on the expenses they incur for
children who are thirteen years of age or less. The substantial growth in claims is based on data from 1988, when the Family Support Act significantly tightened eligibility for the tax credit. It required that taxpayers provide the correct name, address, and taxpayer identification number of the dependent care provider. It also lowered the age at which a taxpayer identification number had to be submitted for children for whom the credit was claimed, from age five to age two. These more-onerous reporting requirements lowered the number of claimants from nine million in 1988 to six million in 1989. See House Committee on Ways and Means, 2004 Green Book: Background Material and Data on Programs within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, 108th Cong., 2d sess. (Committee Print, 2004), 13–43.


23. This dynamic is not unusual. Third-party providers in the private sector are often the “core societal advocates” of tax expenditures because there are no interest groups that represent their nominal beneficiaries (Howard 1997, 7).

24. Head Start remains in existence nearly five decades after its creation, and its long-term political impact has exceeded that of either the emergency nursery schools or the wartime child care centers. It was created, however, as part of the broader War on Poverty, which, if successful, would not be permanent.

CHAPTER 1

1. Encouraging the involvement of the market and private sector in social provision is a distinguishing feature of liberal welfare states, of which the United States is an “archetypal example” (Esping-Andersen 1990, 27). Some comparative analyses of early childhood policy compare American programs to those in other liberal welfare states (Michel 1999; L. White 2002, 2004).


4. One might posit that public opinion represents such a mechanism. However, most studies of the relationship between public opinion and public policy suggest that public opinion sets the general ideological direction of policy but does not spur elected officials to comply with specific demands (Erikson, Wright, and McIver 1993; Stimson, MacKuen, and Erikson 1995).

5. Comparative scholarship on social policy often examines interest group politics through the lens of power resources theory, which emphasizes the significance of organized labor and social democratic political parties. Power resources theory offers valuable insights into the politics of the welfare state, but several scholars have questioned its applicability to early childhood education and care (Bonoli and Reber 2010; Morgan 2006).
11. The decentralization of political authority set forth in the Constitution has been exacerbated by Progressive Era reforms and changes in congressional operations (Steinmo and Watts 1995).
12. Federalism has been characterized as a “necessary condition for the development of American exceptionalism” (Robertson 1989, 261).
13. Federalism scholars describe an increased willingness among national officials to preempt policy decisions that were made at the state level (Zimmerman 1991).
14. Political historian Julian Zelizer (2004) argues that the complex world of political actors described by political science scholarship might help political historians develop fresh approaches and frameworks for the study of the policymaking process.

CHAPTER 2

1. Several authors examine the early history of early childhood programs in greater detail than will be pursued in this chapter. See Beatty 1995; Cahan 1989; Michel 1999; E. Rose 1999.
2. School attendance data suggest that approximately 80 percent of all three-year-olds in Massachusetts were enrolled in school as late as 1840. Attendance then steadily declined until 1860. See Kaestle and Vinovskis (1978) and May and Vinovskis (1977) for more on Massachusetts, the state for which the best data on infant school attendance are available.
4. Eliot, “Nursery Schools Fifty Years Ago,” 211.
7. Cravens (1993) examines the emergence of child development as an established science and profession in the American scientific and academic system, focusing on the history and impact of the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station. Some of the Iowa scientists, most prominently George D. Stoddard, were actively involved in political debates over the appropriate role of nursery schools.
8. Local control led the schools to take on a variety of forms. Some were connected to colleges or universities, others were part of high school home economics departments, and others were administered by local community agencies. See Sue C. Wortham, Childhood, 1892–1992 (Wheaton, MD: ACEI, 1992), 36, ACEI Archives, acc. 99–116, box 8.

11. This particular estimate may overstate peak enrollment in the emergency nursery school program. In a 1972 interview, someone who was on the faculty of the Child Development Institute at Teachers College at Columbia University when the program began claimed that the peak enrollment was in 1934–35, when seventy-five thousand children attended nineteen hundred nursery schools (Hymes 1979, 20).


13. Elizabeth Rose (1999, 145) uses language that is more flexible, explaining that the nursery schools provided services to children whose families were “on relief or near relief.” Her description confirms the targeted nature of the program.

14. Children attending WPA nursery schools represented only 5 percent of children aged two to five years who were attending school. Most of the others enrolled in kindergartens in public schools, and school attendance was higher in urban areas than in rural areas. See Mary Dabney Davis, *Schools for Children under Six: A Report on the Status and Need for Nursery Schools and Kindergartens*, bulletin 1947, no. 5 (Washington, DC: Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, 1947), 23, ACEI Archives, RG V, series 1, box 10.

15. *Federal Aid for the Day Care Program*.

16. *Federal Aid for the Day Care Program*, 44.


18. Some observers portrayed female employment as an economic necessity for individual families who had been affected by the war, arguing that the stipends received by the wives of men in the armed forces were “utterly inadequate” (*Wartime Care and the Protection of Children of Employed Mothers: Hearing on S. 876 and S. 1130 before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor*, 78th Cong., 1st sess. [1943], 91).


25. *Federal Aid for the Day Care Program*, 46–47.

26. *Federal Aid for the Day Care Program*, 47.

27. Many WPA nursery schools were converted into wartime child care centers by lengthening their hours and limiting their enrollment to children of working women. By May 1943, “1,150 of the 1,700 WPA nursery schools were operating in war-disrupted areas serving children and families regardless of income” (Cahan 1989, 42).


29. *Federal Aid for the Day Care Program*, 46.


31. *Nursery Schools Vital to America’s War Effort*, School Children and the War Se-
ries, leaflet no. 3 (Washington, DC: Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, 1943),
12, ACEI Archives, RG V, series 1, box 10.
33. *Children in a Democracy*, general report adopted by the White House Conference
on Children in a Democracy, January 19, 1940, 36, ACEI Archives, RG V, series 1, box 14.
34. *Who Will Need a Post-war Nursery School*, Kaiser Child Service Centers, Pam-
phlets for Teachers, no. 3, 12, ACEI Archives, RG V, series 1, box 10.
35. Letter from Henry L. Zucker, chairman, Ohio State War-Time Child Care Com-
mittee, Ohio State Council of Defense, to Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas,
June 5, 1945, Carl Albert Center, Helen Gahagan Douglas Collection, box 17, folder 4a.
36. Association for Nursery Education of Southern California, Mail Survey of the
Families of the Children Enrolled in the Ninety Los Angeles Child Care Center Nursery
Schools, Carl Albert Center, Helen Gahagan Douglas Collection, box 17, folder 4b. The
memorandum describing the survey is undated but reveals that it was mailed on July 15,
1945.
37. “Letters about Day Care,” Day Care News (Committee on Day Care of Children,
Wayne County Council of Defense) 20 (April 1945), Carl Albert Center, Helen Gahagan
Douglas Collection, box 141, folder 1.
38. Letter from Alice T. Dashiell, field secretary, Child Welfare League of America, to
Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, June 4, 1945, Carl Albert Center, Helen Gah-
agan Douglas Collection, box 141, folder 1.
40. James L. Hymes Jr., “The Road Ahead for Nursery Schools,” Understanding the
41. “Child Care,” resolution adopted at the Convention of the International Union,
United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, At-
lantic City, New Jersey, March 23–30, 1946, Carl Albert Center, Helen Gahagan
Douglas Collection, box 17, folder 4b.
42. A similar campaign occurred in the United Kingdom, where the National Society
of Children’s Nurseries pressed for nurseries to become a permanent feature of the Brit-
ish social service system. Legislation passed in England in 1944 and in Scotland in 1945
made “the provision of fully equipped educational centers obligatory upon all local Edu-
cation Authorities for children from two years of age and up.” According to that legisla-
tion, “Parents are not required to send their children but the school authorities are re-
quired to provide suitable facilities” (Russell, “With Books and Magazines,” 59; emphasis
in original).
43. Congress continued to support centers for poor children in Washington, DC,
until 1953 (Beatty 1995, 192).
44. Hymes, “Road Ahead for Nursery Schools,” 36.
45. H.R. 2362, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (March 4, 1947); H.R. 793, 81st Cong., 1st sess.
(January 5, 1949). In 1949, Senator Claude Pepper (D-FL) introduced companion legisla-
tion in the Senate: S. 1216, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (March 9, 1949).
47. Dorothy W. Baruch, Evangeline B. Burgess, and Dorothy Blumenstock Jones,
*How to Start Publicity for Nursery Education in Your Community* (Iowa City, IA: National
Association for Nursery Education, 1940), 13, ACEI Archives, RG V, series 1, box 10.
48. Four states (California, Massachusetts, New York, and Washington) allocated state funds for child care immediately after the Second World War. California was the only one whose allocation preserved a large proportion of its centers (Reese 1996, 568).

49. For Every Child a Healthy Personality: A Digest of the Fact Finding Report to the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth ([Washington, DC]: Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950), ACEI Archives, RG V, series 1, box 14.


51. Michel (1999, 150) argues that the largely unsuccessful attempts to extend public funding for early childhood programs provoked a “broad-ranging debate about motherhood, paid employment, and child care that eventually led to the formation of a national child care movement.” For example, postwar protests in Philadelphia illustrated mothers’ “new sense of entitlement” to publicly funded care and eventually led the city to fund centers through the 1950s (E. Rose 1999, 6). While important, these debates and developments had a limited effect on national enrollment patterns.


55. Proponents also linked the tax deduction to the Korean War and other policy initiatives. They contended that “women’s labor was necessary to the nation’s economic and security interests, claimed that the deduction would help promote rapid mobilization in a wartime emergency, and insisted that child care was as legitimate a business expense as entertainment, travel, and country club membership” (E. Rose 1999, 196).


57. This discussion of Head Start draws heavily on three excellent accounts of its emergence and early years: Vinovskis 2005, Zigler and Muenchow 1992, and Zigler and Styfco 2010.


60. During his 1964 presidential campaign, Johnson discussed education and poverty at length but did not mention preschool specifically (Vinovskis 2005, 58).


66. Becker, “Pre-School Education.”


72. “Follow Through,” undated program summary, 1, National Archives, RG 12: Records of the Office of Education, Office of the Commissioner, Office Files of the Commissioner of Education, 1939–80, A1, entry 122, box 485. The summary includes estimates of “new obligatory authority,” the number of children served, and the number of programs for fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970. These estimates and the document’s reference to the “initial stages” of Follow Through suggest that it was published shortly after the program was launched in 1967. Follow Through was created as a temporary demonstration program, but it lasted for twenty-five years, despite a checkered history and disappointing results (Vinovskis 1999a, chap. 4).


74. The Coleman Report and a research monograph by Albert Jensen also placed Head Start supporters on the defensive. The former argued that schools could do little to reverse the educational disadvantages induced by poverty, and the latter emphasized the impact of genetics and heredity (Zigler and Muenchow 1992, 56–73).

ment was one of three enclosures that accompanied a letter of June 2, 1969, from the secretary to Head Start grantees.


86. Senn, interview with Phillips, 4.

87. These two approaches are best thought of as ideal types, as no early childhood program is exclusively custodial or educational.

88. Senn, interview with Zigler, 3.
89. Senn, interview with Zigler, 31.
90. The research of Hunt and Bloom was influential, but the two scholars were not the first to challenge the notion that physical and mental development were predetermined. From the mid-1930s to the early 1950s, the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station was “the leading challenger of the field’s twin theses, the maturation theory and the idea of the fixed IQ” (Cravens 1993, 110).
92. Wortham, Childhood, 50.
93. Zigler described himself as a skeptic who believed that the environment affected motivation more profoundly than it affected intelligence. He participated in several heated debates with Hunt that “were advertised somewhat like competitions between rival evangelists” (Zigler and Muenchow 1992, 13–14).
97. The “laboratories of democracy” metaphor can be traced to a dissent by Supreme Court justice Louis Brandeis in New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann, 285 U.S. 262 (1932).
100. Several historians provide more-comprehensive accounts of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. See Bailey and Mosher 1968; Graham 1984; Sundquist 1968; Thomas 1975.
104. Undated and untitled draft, 17, Minnesota Historical Society, Manuscripts Collection, Albert H. Quie Papers, “House Republican Task Force on Tax Credits for Higher Education Files, 1965,” box 56, 146.1.12.11B. The draft appears in a folder with several documents from the first few months of 1965. It may be “A Preschool Program for Republicans,” which is referenced by another document in the folder but does not appear in it.

105. Rosenberg, Day Care Facts, 3.


CHAPTER 3


5. Education for the Urban Disadvantaged: From Preschool to Employment (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1971), 17, Carl Albert Center, Carl Albert Collection, Department Files, box 93, folder 15. The statement endorsed universal enrollment while placing special emphasis on access for “disadvantaged” children.

6. Milton J. E. Senn, interview with Dr. Julius Richmond, July 12, 1972, 47.


8. Malone, Federal Involvement in Day Care, 10–11.

Secretary, Office File of Jule Sugarman, First Director of the Office of Child Development, 1967–69, entry 34, box 2.


21. “Day Care Programs Authorized by H.R. 12080,” memorandum from Lawrence C. Feldman, executive director, National Committee for the Day Care of Children, to staff, Senate Finance Committee, undated, 2, Carl Albert Center, Fred Harris Collection, box 193, folder 15.


26. Due to tight state budgets, a lack of personnel, and a lack of physical facilities, this provision spurred “relatively little new day care” (Malone, *Federal Involvement in Day Care*, 35–36).

27. *Day Care and Child Development in Your Community* (Washington, DC: Day
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Care and Child Development Council of America, 1969), 13 (emphasis in original), Carl Albert Center, Fred Harris Collection, box 193, folder 15.
35. The Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor held hearings on a similar bill with the same title during the Ninetieth Congress.
38. The bills profiled in this paragraph do not provide a comprehensive list of legislation with implications for early childhood policy but highlight the bills whose objectives resonated with those of the Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971.
41. Milton J. E. Senn, interview with Carolyn Harmon, September 14, 1972, 3.
42. Senn, interview with Harmon, 2–3. Harmon did not join the Office of Child Development until July 1970, but she explained that upon joining the agency, she had been told about Sugarman’s activities and how they had been perceived.
43. Senn, interview with Harmon, 4.
52. Senn, interview with Edelman, 5.
54. Milton J. E. Senn, interview with Judy Assmus, September 14, 1972, 8.
55. Senn, interview with Assmus, 8.
56. Milton J. E. Senn, interview with Dr. Donald Cohen, November 1, 1972, 2.
57. The coalition also included Common Cause, the League of Women Voters, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the National Organization for Women, and organizations representing Latinos and Native Americans (Senn, interview with Johnson, 4).
58. Senn, interview with Assmus, 2–3.
59. Senn, interview with Assmus, 3.
60. Senn, interview with Johnson, 5–6.
61. Senn, interview with Johnson, 5–6.


71. Letter from Wilma Scott Heide (president) and Mary Ann Stuart (Child Care Task Force) of the National Organization for Women to secretary of health, education, and welfare Elliot Richardson, November 1, 1971, Carl Albert Center, Fred Harris Collection, box 231, folder 17.

72. Letter from Roy Wilkins, Ralph David Abernathy, Dorothy Height, Vernon Jordan, A. Philip Randolph, Bayard Rustin, Harold Sims, and Andrew Young to President Richard Nixon, November 24, 1971, Carl Albert Center, Cornelius Gallagher Collection, box 21, folder 5.

73. Milton J. E. Senn, interview with Lisbeth Bamberger Schorr and William Smith, April 23, 1974, 12. Schorr made the observation about the political strength of programs for low-income families.

74. Senn, interview with Edelman, 8.

75. Senn, interview with Edelman, 3.

76. Senn, interview with Edelman, 4–5.

77. Senn, interview with Edelman, 9.


79. Senn, interview with Edelman, 10.

80. Letter from Roy Wilkins et al. to Nixon (emphasis in original).


82. Senn, interview with Edelman, 8.

83. Milton J. E. Senn, interview with Judy Miller, October 12, 1972, 14.

84. Senn, interview with Edelman, 4.

85. Senn, interview with Harmon, 9.


89. Only New York senator James Buckley, representing the Conservative Party, at-
tacked the basic philosophical foundations of the bill. Buckley characterized it as “one of the most radical pieces of legislation ever contemplated by Congress” (McCutchen 1981, 111).

96. “Statement of Senator Fred R. Harris (D-OK) on Child Development Act,” February 10, 1971, 1, Carl Albert Center, Fred Harris Collection, box 231, folder 20.
99. “Child Care: Top Priority for Women’s Rights Movement,” Voice for Children (Day Care and Child Development Council of America) 3, no. 8 (September 1970): 1, 8, Carl Albert Center, Fred Harris Collection, box 185, folder 19.
101. Senn, interview with Phillips, 32.
102. Letter from Agnes T. Marks, coordinator of the Legion of Mothers, to Carl Albert, June 10, 1971, Carl Albert Center, Carl Albert Collection, Legislative Files, box 132, folder 11.
104. Letter from John L. Grady, mayor of Belle Glade, FL, to Cornelius Gallagher, December 8, 1971, Carl Albert Center, Cornelius Gallagher Collection, box 21, folder 5.
106. Senn, interview with Johnson, 11–12.
110. See, for example, “Statement of Congressman John Brademas on the National Radio Networks (CBS, NBC, ABC, Mutual, Public) as Spokesman for the Congress in Responding to the Network Address on Education Made by President Nixon One Week Ago,” March 30, 1974, New York University Archives, John Brademas Congressional Papers, “Speeches: Education Response to President Nixon,” box III:12, folder 23. The date of this particular reference illustrates how advocates cited the presidential message throughout the Nixon presidency.
111. Senn, interview with Assmus, 4.
112. Senn, interview with Johnson, 8.
118. Senn, interview with Harmon, 12.
120. Senn, interview with Johnson, 8.
121. Senn, interview with Harmon, 12.
123. “Brief Legislative History of Significant Child Care Proposals,” memorandum from Earline Anderson to Walter Campbell, August 10, 1971, 2, Carl Albert Center, Fred Harris Collection, box 231, folder 18.
124. Senn, interview with Harmon, 11.
125. Senn, interview with Schorr and Smith, 16. Smith made this observation about the lobbying campaign.
126. Senn, interview with Edelman, 10.
130. Senn, interview with Johnson, 14.
131. Letter from Richardson to Brademas. The quotation appears on the third page of the enclosure accompanying the letter.
134. Senn, interview with Johnson, 13.
136. Senn, interview with Miller, 13.
137. Letter from A. Sidney Johnson III to Urie Bronfenbrenner, September 7, 1971, Minnesota Historical Society, Manuscripts Collection, Walter F. Mondale Papers, “Sub-committee on Children and Youth,” box 32, 13.3.0.3B.
140. Senn, interview with Miller, 3.
141. A family could be charged no more than 10 percent on annual incomes between $4,320 and $5,916 and no more than 15 percent on incomes between $5,916 and $6,960. Under this formula, the annual fee for a family of four earning $6,960 would be $316.20 (Congressional Quarterly 1972).
142. Senn, interview with Johnson, 14–15.
144. Letter from Lucy Wilson Benson, president of the League of Women Voters of the United States, to Carl Albert, November 30, 1971, Carl Albert Center, Carl Albert Collection, Legislative Files, box 132, folder 12.
147. Senn, interview with Assmus, 5.
156. Senn, interview with Assmus, 6.
157. Senn, interview with Johnson, 15–16.
158. Senn, interview with Assmus, 6. See Cohen 2001, chap. 2, for a more expansive discussion of the debate within the Nixon administration over the legislation, the veto, and the press conference that followed the veto.
159. Senn, interview with Harmon, 18–19.
161. Senn, interview with Miller, 10.
162. Senn, interview with Edelman, 12 (emphasis in original).
164. Milton J. E. Senn, interview with Albert Quie, April 25, 1975, 13.
165. Senn, interview with Johnson, 16.
166. Senn, interview with Harmon, 22.
167. Senn, interview with Assmus, 11.
168. Senn, interview with Edelman, 11.

**CHAPTER 4**
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