



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 119

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1973

No. 142

Senate

HEARINGS ON "AMERICAN FAMILIES: TRENDS AND PRESSURES"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this week the Subcommittee on Children and Youth, which I chair, has been holding overview hearings on "American Families: Trends and Pressures."

During these hearings we have received extremely valuable testimony from a variety of individuals and groups concerning the needs of families and children in America, the extent to which governmental policies are helping or hurting families, and what kinds of support systems should be available.

In order that these recommendations be available to the Congress and to the public, I ask unanimous consent that the prepared statements of the witnesses who appeared at the first day of our hearings be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Today the Subcommittee on Children and Youth opens three days of hearings on the trends and pressures affecting American families.

Our hearings are based on a very simple belief: Nothing is more important to a child than a healthy family.

During my nine years in the Senate, I have probably devoted more of my time to work with the problems of children than to any other issue. I have seen many ways in which public and private programs have helped children . . . and many other ways in which they can and should help them. But as good as some of our public and private institutions can be . . . and we have some excellent schools and foster homes, for example, . . . it has become increasingly clear to me that there is just no substitute for a healthy family . . . nothing else that can give a child as much love, support, confidence, motivation or feelings of self-worth and self-respect.

Yet, it is also clear that we tend to take families for granted . . . seldom recognize the pressures they are under . . . often give too little consideration to the role they can play in the prevention and solution of children's problems . . . and frequently ignore the implications of changes like the recent increase of one parent families.

The 1970 White House Conference on Children called this "a national neglect of children and those primarily engaged in their care—America's parents." And we are paying a high price for this neglect:

Teenage alcoholism and drug abuse are growing problems;

Suicide among young people is increasing geometrically to the point where it is now the second ranking cause of death for Americans between the ages of 15 and 24;

Juvenile delinquency is becoming so widespread that according to predictions one out of every 9 youngsters will have been to juvenile court by the time he reaches age 18.

And now we are discovering how pervasive this problem of child abuse is—a sickening sign that something is seriously wrong.

If we expect to deal successfully with these problems we must begin paying more attention to the needs of families. And we must start by asking to what extent government policies are helping or hurting families, and what kinds of support services should be available.

These hearings are designed to encourage exactly that kind of re-examination: they seek to explore how government policies in areas such as work, institutionalization, mobility, taxes, welfare and housing influence the lives of American families. Though the hearings, we hope to find answers to some of the following questions:

How does unemployment affect family stability? Do part-time or flexible work opportunities enhance the lives of families and children? Should children and youth be provided with more work opportunities, and more opportunities to observe and participate in the work experiences of their parents and other adults?

To what extent has family dissolution been caused by unnecessary institutionalization of children; premature removal of children from their families for placement in foster care; unnecessary incarceration of juvenile offenders; and requirements of hospital treatment for illness in order to qualify for insurance benefits? Do we provide enough alternatives such as day care, homemaker services, community based corrections programs or outpatient medical coverage? To what extent do these offer more promising results for children and families?

How does mobility—particularly forced mobility—affect families? Are there ways to deal more successfully with whatever problems result from mobility decisions?

How do welfare policies affect families and children? Do they provide a disincentive to stable families?

What is the impact of the tax system on families and children? Does it contain incentives or disincentives for family stability? Does it provide adequate deductions for the cost of raising children?

What has been the impact of urban renewal on families and children? What has been the impact of public housing regulations that require families to move once they earn above a certain income? Do zoning practices unnecessarily restrict the location of community based programs such as nursing homes in residential areas?

The task of considering the impact of policies on families and children will not be easy. Value, jobs, lifestyles and needs vary widely. To envision a single model family or a single way to raise children would do great damage to the pluralism and diversity that makes our country strong; would be beyond the legitimate concerns of government; and could produce at least as serious problems as ignoring altogether the impact of policies on families.

Our goals will be to identify and seek changes in arbitrary policies that place hardships on families with children; to develop policies that provide alternative ways of strengthening families; and to determine how we can provide the options and choices that families need to do their best job.

If we can make some progress toward these goals, and help make the question of how governmental policies affect families a larger part of the decision-making process, I believe we will have taken an important step toward increasing justice and opportunity for the children and youth of our nation."

STATEMENT OF MR. VINCENT P. BARABBA,
DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Mr. Chairman I appreciate your invitation to appear before this Committee, to provide you with information on recent changes in the composition and characteristics of American families.

The family has been described as an institution that is essential to the perpetuation of society, as a demographic institution with the prime function of assuring biological and social continuity. The functioning of families underlies the dynamics of population, as the numbers of births and deaths and the volume of migration emerge out of family dynamics. Statistical data collected by the Bureau of the Census in decennial censuses and current population surveys provide some essential information on recent changes and the current status of American families.

The "typical" family undergoes numerous substantial changes during the cycle of married life, from marriage through childbearing, children leaving home, and the eventual dissolution of marriage with the death of one spouse. The typical family itself has changed greatly over the past 20 years because marriage is now occurring about a year later, couples are having approximately one less child,

and more couples are surviving jointly for a longer time after their children marry. Many more unmarried persons, especially young people and the elderly, have been establishing or continuing to maintain separate living arrangements apart from relatives.

Types of families.—The Bureau of the Census defines a family as a group of two or more related persons who live together in a house or apartment. Most families include a married couple who maintain a household, and two out of every three of the couples have children or other relatives sharing their living quarters. Statistics on families thus defined are available for dates back to 1940. Ever since 1940, close to 85 percent of all families were of the "husband-wife" type.

Thus, in 1940 about 27.0 million of the 32.2 million families were of this type, and in 1973 the corresponding figures were 46.3 million husband-wife families out of the total of 54.4 million families.

Although the number of families with a female head has constituted only about 10 to 12 percent of the families since 1940, these families are of special interest in the context of the problems of children and youth, and their numbers have been increasing rapidly during the last few years. During the 1960's these families increased twice as much as they had increased during the 1950's. In fact, during the 1960's they increased by a million (from 4.5 to 5.6 million), and by 1973 they had increased another million (to 6.6 million). The increase has been concentrated largely among families of divorced or separated women. Among white families in 1973, only 10 percent had a woman as the head, whereas among Negro families, 35 percent of the heads were women. Thus, the problem of female heads of families is disproportionately a problem of Negro families. Moreover, divorced women are twice as numerous as separated women among white female heads of families, whereas the situation is the reverse among Negro female heads.

The substantial increase in the number of families with a female head is related to many factors, including the sharply upward trend in separation and divorce during the 1960's and early 1970's, the rapid rise in female employment during the 1960's, the absence of many husbands from the home for service in the Armed Forces, and the continued increase in unwed motherhood.

Along with the increase in families with a female head has come an increase during the 1960's and 1970's from 8 percent to 14 percent in the proportion of persons under 18 years of age who were living with their mother only. This inevitably has meant that the proportion of young children living with both parents has been declining. Among Negro children under 18 years of age in 1973, the proportion living with both parents was only 52 percent, whereas 38 percent were living with their mother only, and 10 percent lived apart from their mother. Among whites, 87 percent were living with both parents. The sharp decline in the birth rate since 1960 has brought a corresponding decrease in the proportion of all children in the home who are of preschool age and an increase in the proportion who are of school age.

The older children are of an age which makes it easier for the mother to care for them while she works in order to maintain a separate home for herself and the children.

Size of family.—Two interpretations can be given to the "average size of family": (1) the average number of children a woman bears during her lifetime and (2) the average number of family members who live together in a household including parents, children, and other relatives. According to the first interpretation, the average number of children per family among the children who were growing up around 1900 was four (about 4.3). By 1940 the average had dropped all the way down to two children (about 2.3), but by 1960 it had risen again to three children (about 3.3). The decline in fertility during the 1960's and early 1970's has once again lowered the average number of children to two per woman (approximately 2.4). These numbers include all children born alive dur-

ing the woman's reproductive period, including any who may have subsequently died or left home.

The second interpretation of the size of family cannot be traced back to 1900. However, in 1940 the average number of persons related to each other and living together as one household was 3.8 persons. This figure declined by 1950 to 3.5 as the consequence of changes that occurred during the years of World War II and the immediately following period. By 1960 it had risen slightly to 3.7 as a consequence of the baby boom and remained at about that level throughout the 1960's. However, the effects of the declining birth rate in recent years has caused the average size of family, in this second sense, to fall once again by 1973 to 3.5 persons (3.48). Thus, the average number of family members has fluctuated since 1940 within the rather narrow range of 3.5 to 3.8 persons.

Ages and relationships of family members.—An important consideration in family analysis is the distribution of members between three age groups: the dependent young members, members in the main productive age range, commonly accepted as 18 to 64 years old, and the elderly. In 1973, the average number of members per family was 3.5, of whom 1.3 were in the young group, 2.0 were in the intermediate group, and 0.3 were in the elderly group. Actually, about four out of every ten families either had not yet had any children or their children had all reached 18 years of age. Therefore, if the focus is limited to those families with some children under 18, they had a larger number in the home, on the average, 2.2 children. About three-tenths of the children under 18 were under 6 years of age—preschool age—and the remainder were 6 to 17—school age.

As youths mature they generally leave their parental home to attend college, to obtain employment, and/or to marry. The median age at (first) marriage is now 23 years for men and 21 years for women. This is nearly one year older than the corresponding ages in the mid-1950's. Since men are usually older than women at marriage, they usually leave home at a slightly older age. Yet for both sexes combined, approximately one-fourth of the children 15 to 19 years of age have left home, and a large majority of those who have left home must be 18 or 19 years old. Only one-tenth of the children living with their parents are over 20 years of age, and the majority of them are 20 to 24 years old. Besides the family head, his wife (if any), and their children (if any), there are sometimes other relatives sharing the home. These other relatives constitute only 8.7 million, or less than five percent, of the 182 million family members in the United States at the time of the 1970 census. Of the other relatives, 2.5 were grandchildren of the family head, 2.3 million were parents of the head or wife, 2.1 million were brothers or sisters of the head or wife, one-half million were sons- or daughters-in-law of the head, and the remaining 1.3 million were uncles or aunts, cousins, etc.

Households with and without families.—The term "household" is used by the Bureau of the Census to mean the entire number of persons who occupy a house or apartment that constitutes separate living quarters. Most households have a family as the core members, but they may include partners, lodgers, or resident employees, and, again, they may consist of one person living alone. With the aging of the population, the expansion of social security benefits, and the increasing availability of housing, the number of elderly persons who maintain a household after all of their relatives have left the home has increased quite rapidly in recent decades. Moreover, an increasing number of young unmarried persons have been maintaining a home apart from relatives. Consequently, the number of these "primary individuals" with no relatives sharing their living quarters has increased from 10 percent of all household heads in 1940 to 20 percent in 1973.

Because the rate of household increase has exceeded the rate of population growth since 1940, the average size of household has declined. In 1940 the average size of household was 3.7 persons; by 1960 it was 3.3, and by 1973 it was only 3.0 persons. This decline reflects the net effect of changes in the birth rate and the decrease in doubling up of married couples with their relatives as well as the large increase in the number of one-person households among both the young and the elderly.

Particularly impressive has been the rapid rate of increase over the past decade in the number of young adults who have been maintaining their own households apart from relatives. The number of women under 35 years old living thus increased by one-fourth in the 1950's, and then the number doubled in the decade of the 1960's and increased an additional 40 percent since 1970. Meanwhile, the number of men under 35 years old maintaining an apartment or house apart from relatives has more than doubled each of the past two decades and increased 60 percent more since 1970. The recent rapid growth of apartment dwelling on the part of young "unmarrieds" has occurred at a time when

college enrollment has been rising but college dormitory dwelling has decreased; and when more and more young people have been postponing marriage until after they have had a few years of work experience away from their parental home. The total number of these persons under 35 in 1972 who maintained a household apart from relatives was 2.8 million, three out of four of whom have never married.

The young family head of today is better educated, the median number of years of school completed by adults being 12.3 years in 1973 as compared to 9.3 years in 1950. The wife's task as a homemaker, with smaller families and modern appliances, is easier, and she has more education to prepare her to be a more stimulating parent and to help her to accept greater responsibilities outside the home.

Migration.—Most of the people who change their residences move as family groups or in connection with the formation or dissolution of a family. Every year about 20 percent of the population moves to a different residence. However, from 1948 to 1971, there has been little change in the pattern or percent of persons who report having moved in the preceding year, except for some recent decline in local movement. With minor fluctuations, of the 20 percent of the population who move to a different house, about 12 percent moved within the same county, 3 percent moved to a different county in the same State, and 3 percent moved between States.

Moreover, the percent of the total population born in the State where they currently live has remained relatively stable since 1850. For the country as a whole, this percentage has fluctuated between a low of 64 in 1860 to a high of 70 in 1940. Since 1940 there has been a slight but steady decrease of about 2 percent per decade to 65 percent in 1970.

The likelihood of moving is related to age. Typically, peak mobility rates occur among persons in their early twenties—the age when children normally have left or are leaving their parental homes and are in the process of finding employment, marrying, and setting up households of their own. Between March 1970 and March 1971, the residential mobility rate for persons 22 to 24 years old was 44 percent (48 percent if movers from abroad are included). After this peak is reached, mobility rates generally decline with increasing age. Persons who first married during the year had, as might be expected, an extremely high residential mobility rate of 83 percent.

Blacks have a higher residential mobility rate than whites. The residential mobility rate was 20 percent for blacks and 18 for whites between 1970 and 1971. The higher mobility rate reported by blacks, however, was due to greater local mobility, that is, movement within counties; 17 percent of the black population moved within the same county, but only 11 percent of whites made such moves. The migration rate, or movement between counties, was 7 percent for whites and 4 percent for blacks. Whites had higher rates of migration to other counties within States and between States.

Among men there is a clear relationship between employment status and mobility status. Both the local mobility rate and migration rate are higher for unemployed men than for employed men. Similarly, of men who were employed in 1970, both rates were higher for men who worked less than 50 weeks in 1970 than for men who worked 50 weeks or more.

Migration is also related to a person's class of work and occupation. The wage and salary workers are about twice as likely to move within a year as the self-employed workers, 19 percent and 10 percent, respectively. Self-employed farmers are among the least mobile and wage and salary farm workers are among the most mobile.

Families in which the wife works are more likely to undertake short-distance moving and slightly less likely to undertake long-distance migration than families in which the wife does not work. The wife's employment has a greater effect in raising the family's local mobility rates than in lowering migration rates. The migration of husbands interferes substantially with their wives' career development and in this way contributes to explaining why women earn less than men at the same age, occupation, and educational level.

Education also has a consistent effect on the migration rates of men. Among men 25 years old and over, those who had completed four or more years of college had higher migration rates than those who had completed only high school. Men who were high school graduates, in turn, had higher migration rates than men who had completed only elementary schools. On the other hand, men who were not high school graduates were more likely than better-educated men to make moves within the local community.

Married couples without young children are more geographically mobile than those with such children. Among husband-wife couples with children, ages of children exercise a consistent mobility differential; within families classified by age of the head, families with children under 6 years old

families with children under 6 years old only are the most mobile both within and between counties, followed by those with both children under 6 and 6 to 17 years old, and followed in turn by families with children 6 to 17 years old only. Female family

heads with children are generally more geographically mobile than male family heads (wife present) at the same age and with the same number and ages of children present.

Frequent moving impedes progress in school for children whose parents are not college graduates. For children of college graduates frequent moving does not seem to hinder normal progress through the school system. Thus, children who have made several interstate moves are less likely to be behind in school than less mobile children simply because frequent interstate migration is most likely to characterize well-educated parents and well-educated parents tend to have children who do well in school. The predominance of the well-educated among long-distance movers and among those who settle in new residential developments may offer a partial explanation of the fact that growing communities tend to have children of above average scholastic ability.

Urban and rural residence of families.—The exodus of rural population to the cities has been largely a movement from farms to nonfarm areas over the last several decades. Farm families constituted one-third of all families in 1900, one-fifth in 1940, and only one-twentieth in 1970. However, there has been no absolute change of significance between 1940 and 1970 in the number of rural families—including the rural-nonfarm as well as the rural-farm families. In 1940, there were 14 million rural families and in 1970 there were also 14 million rural families. Thus, all of the increase in families between 1940 and 1970 has occurred in urban areas.

Employment of family members.—An important recent trend that has influenced the pattern of American family life has been an increasing number of multiple-worker families. In 1962, there were 16.1 million husband-wife families in which both the head and at least one other family member were in the labor force. This constituted 45 percent of all husband-wife families in which the family head was working. By 1972, this proportion had increased to 55 percent and the number had grown to 21.3 million families.

The primary contribution to this increase in multiple-worker families has been the growth in labor force participation among married women. For example, in 1950 less than one-fourth of the wives in the United States were in the labor force and for those women with children under 6 years of age the labor force rate was only about 12 percent. However, in 1972 over 40 percent of all wives were in the labor force, and even among those with children under 6 years old 30 percent participated in the labor force.

Several developments have contributed to making work in the marketplace more possible and more acceptable for many women. The expansion in employment opportunities for women is probably the most important factor leading to their increased labor force participation. One relevant development has been the growth in the service sector of the economy in general. Another has been the expansion in such fields as teaching and clerical work and also in retail trade (with its flexible hours and opportunities for part-time employment—characteristics important to married women, especially those with children). Also, there have been more opportunities to work as trained nurses and in other health fields which have been traditional enclaves for female employment. So important, in fact, have new openings in the service and white collar industries been to women that virtually all the increase in female employment between 1960 and 1971 was in one or the other of these two sectors, continuing patterns established between 1947 and 1960.

Other developments that have encouraged women to enter the labor force include increases in the earning potential of women resulting from better education; changes in attitudes about women participating in the labor force in general and in certain occupations in particular; efforts through legal and social means toward greater equality of opportunity for women in the labor force; and declines in the fertility rate.

Income of family members.—A particularly valuable socioeconomic indicator in the United States is the average amount of money income received by families. The different levels of income received by the various segments of the U.S. population can best be represented by median family income—a dollar value which divides the distribution of income received into two equal groups—half of the families having incomes below the median and the other half having income above it. The Bureau of the Census has published family income statistics annually from the Current Population Survey since 1947 and in reports of the decennial censuses since 1950. During the last two decades (1952-1972), median family money income in the United States has nearly tripled and even after accounting for the effects of inflation over this period, it has still

3

doubled, resulting in higher levels and standards of living for the American family.

One of the main reasons for this overall increase in family income is the fact that more and more wives are going to work to supplement the family income and thereby taking advantage of increasing opportunities to achieve more comfortable levels of living.

In March of 1973 nearly 41 percent of the wives in husband-wife families were in the labor force, whereas twenty years earlier in March 1953 only 26 percent of the wives were working. The median income in 1952 for husband-wife families with the wife in the labor force (\$4,900) was about 29 percent higher than the median income of families with the wife not in the labor force (\$3,810), but between 1952 and 1972, this difference has widened in both absolute and relative terms. The median income of the husband-wife family with the wife in the labor force (\$13,900) was 32 percent greater than that of the family with a nonworking wife (\$10,560). Statistics from the Special Labor Force Report Series published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the years 1958 through 1970 support the observation that the wife's contribution to family income has climbed steadily in recent years. These data show that in 1958 the wife's earnings accounted for about 20 percent of total family income, but by 1970 her earnings accounted for 27 percent.

Although the Bureau has not produced any statistics on the contributions of family members other than the head or wife to family income, data have been published annually since 1948 on the distribution of family income by the number of earners in the family—including the head, wife, and other relatives with earnings. In 1948, only 10 percent of all families reported three or more earners but the corresponding proportion in 1972 had risen to 15 percent. In 1948 the median income of families with three or more earners (\$5,210) was 80 percent higher than that of families with one earner (\$2,900), but by 1972 the median income of families with three or more earners (\$17,930) was 89 percent greater than that of families with one earner (\$9,490). Thus, the proportion of total family income that was contributed by additional earners has risen somewhat over the last twenty-four years.

This, then, is a brief summary of what our statistics tell us about the American family. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to answer any questions.

AMERICAN FAMILIES: TRENDS AND PRESSURES (Opening statement by Dr. Edward Zigler)

I would like to thank you for the opportunity of testifying before this committee. I, as a long-time admirer of your efforts on behalf of children and youth, feel that your activities are especially critical at this particular juncture in our nation's history of social concern inasmuch as the consensus among astute observers of our social milieu is that we have entered a fallow period in regard to any meaningful new initiatives on behalf of children and families. There seems to be a moratorium on any large and bold efforts to solve the problems plaguing many of our families. But for the fact that a few older programs, some of debatable value, are still in operation, the current attitude toward the crisis of the American family is one of benign neglect. This apathy, which has even overwhelmed once forceful advocates for children and families, can be traced to a number of causes.

In recent years, we have seen the two initiatives most critical for determining the quality of family life fail to become law: the Administration's Welfare Reform Plan and the Child Development Act of 1970. The considerable amount of effort and energy expended on these two pieces of legislation appears to have made people weary and to have given rise to a "what's-the-use?" attitude. In addition, a scholarly, but nevertheless questionable, literature has developed asserting that children's destinies reside in their genes, that admired preschool programs such as Head Start are failures, that variations in the quality of schooling make no real difference, and that a variety of recommended intervention efforts would probably be failures if implemented. This undue pessimism of the early seventies is greatly at odds with the optimism of the sixties, but, nevertheless, has fallen on receptive ears as it can so readily be adopted as the intellectual rationale for the apathy which seems to have infected so many of our decision and opinion-makers. The hearings which you will conduct here on the American family will serve as an antidote to the nihilism that I have been describing.

Whatever the attitudes or actions of decision-makers may be, the lives of America's families go on. In many instances, these families know exactly to what unreasonable pressures they are being subjected and which problems must be solved if their lives are to become more satisfying. The problem is as equally obvious to the family whose breadwinner works full time and whose salary is still below the poverty level as it is to the more affluent family which, because of inflation, is no longer able to meet its expenses. The working mother who cannot find satisfactory child care arrangements for her children at a fee she can afford to pay knows exactly what the problem is. No further

analyses are necessary to illuminate the problems of Indian families whose children are sent to distant boarding schools or of families with severely retarded children whose only recourse is to institutionalize them in settings known for the dehumanization of their residents.

In other instances, many families experience a sense of malaise or a lack of self-actualization due to forces too subtle or too huge for them to fully comprehend. What must be noted here is that the family is but one institution in a complex ecological system consisting of a variety of other institutions. The family is in many ways unique since it lies at the intersect of all of the other institutions in our society and is therefore continually influenced by the policies being pursued by such institutions as government, industry, schools, and the media. When the government concerns itself with the movement of cars from place to place and uproots neighborhoods in the process, this has impact on American families. When industries pursue a policy of moving their personnel every three or four years, or when they convert to a four-day work week, this has impact on American families. When schools decide to treat parents as hostile outsiders or when they determine that day care for school age children is not within their legitimate charge, this affects American families. And when the media inundate our young and our not-so-young with the message that smiling good is the essence of social success and that families should be judged by the amount of things they possess, this, too, affects the American family.

I am in agreement that the American family is the foundation stone of our great nation. However, I am also aware that how well a foundation stone does its job is determined by the soundness of the material of which it is comprised and by the pressures to which it is subjected. I agree with many others who feel that a variety of historical, economic, and social factors as well as current pressures make family life in America more difficult today than it once was. I refer here to the decline of the extended family, to the extremely important phenomenon of the ever-increasing numbers of working mothers, to the increased mobility which has come to characterize the American people, and to those types of urbanization and suburbanization that tend to isolate American families one from another. All of these phenomena have taken away supports that families once relied upon. The wisdom of grandparents, aunts, and uncles is no longer readily available to young families. The children of working mothers are without an essential nurturant figure for many hours of the day. The life of a mobile family is burdened with discontinuity and upheaval. Our communities are likewise in a continuous state of flux, so that families once able to rely on the immediate neighborhood for assistance in child rearing or crisis intervention find that they are no longer able to do so.

If all of this sounds unrealistic, I would invite any among you to ask yourselves if you know the names of the children living in homes three doors away from your own, and if the adults in those homes know the names of your children. Indeed, even within families there has been a demarcation of activities across age lines, so that parents no longer interact with their own children to the degree that they once did. We find more and more that children are socializing one another, to their own detriment and to the detriment of the quality of family life. The materialistic emphasis in our society is such that a father thinks that he is doing more for his family by obtaining a second job than he does by devoting time to his own children. Both long-standing male chauvinism and current excesses of the women's liberation movement have led to a devaluation of the role of the woman as mother and homemaker. We have deluded ourselves into believing that women contribute little to our nation's productivity by remaining within the home, although homemakers and economists alike know better. Unfortunately, such myths are translated into our social policy; note, for example, the feature of HR-1 which required mothers of children as young as three years of age to enter the work force if they were to receive benefits.

What we need now is not more rhetoric or empty platitudes concerning the importance of the American family but, rather, a close examination of families as they exist in their major current forms and a course of action directed at enhancing their viability. This is so obvious that one immediately wonders why no such effort has been systematically and continuously implemented by the federal government. The answer is simple and unfortunate. Unlike other democracies, America has never committed itself to a coherent family policy. We have avoided coming to grips with this problem by taking refuge in the view that the American family is so sacrosanct that the government should not meddle in its affairs. The fact of the matter is that the policies of the government, as well as all of the other institutions in the family's ecology, inject themselves into the affairs of families every day. These effects, as a totality, thereby constitute a national family policy by default, and it is my view that these effects are as often destructive as they are constructive to healthy family functioning.

Families are the constituencies of the elected members of both the executive and legislative branches of our government and, therefore, there is an attitude that families are everybody's business. However, in social policy making, when an institution is everybody's business, it becomes essentially nobody's business. Who in government speaks for families and advocates in their behalf on the basis of sound analysis? The one agency that could play such a leadership role in developing an explicit family policy is the Office of Child Development, providing that its mandate were enlarged and that it were to become both in name and in mission the Office of Child and Family Development. When I speak to you of a coherent social policy, I am not raising the spectre of family policies found in certain nations where authorization governments massively invade the everyday lives of the nation's families. There is no one at any point on our nation's political spectrum more opposed than I to this sort of governmental intrusion. When I speak of a family policy, I am speaking of a phenomenon not only in keeping with the American ethos, but with the best values and traditions of that ethos.

The construction of a family social policy at the national level would have three facets. First, it would involve identifying what major problems interfere with sound family functioning and determining what solutions to these problems are available, assessing the cost effectiveness of the various solutions that are suggested, and assigning priorities to the specific policies to be implemented. Secondly, a family policy would entail the continuous analyses of the impact of other governmental policies for their effects on family life, so that any cost benefit analysis of these policies would include in its equations the factor of whether the policy in question helps or hurts American families. Finally, a national family policy would make use of the regulating, taxation, research, and moral powers of the federal government in order to persuade other institutions to adopt policies conducive to healthy family life. Again, I wish to avoid the vision of the federal government acting as Big Brother. What I have in mind with respect to this third facet are such possible activities as providing tax credits to industries that provide day care, government-sponsored research to examine the effects of the four-day work week on family life or the value to both industry and families of tailoring the length of the work day to coincide with the length of the school day, and informational and technical assistance to schools willing to do more to strengthen family life.

I am aware that formal family policy construction will come slowly to America and I am certainly not here to present any highly-polished, final product. Rather, it is the purpose of my testimony to make this committee, and through it, perhaps, the nation, aware that we have no such policy and that we are operating instead with the aforementioned family policy by default. Your hearings will be successful if they do indeed produce an awareness on the part of the American people that the federal establishment seems to be less concerned with formulating a well-articulated family policy than with formulating an agricultural policy or a military policy. Then, at least, a dialogue could commence over exactly what role the American people would like to have the government pursue in regard to issues that affect how well the family functions.

There has, of course, never been a dearth of general suggestions as to what might be done to improve the lives of children and their families. Professionals, lay people, and even federal bureaucrats regularly convene to make policy recommendations. Within the past five years or so, we have all had access to the deliberations and recommendations of the Presidential Task Force of 1967, chaired by J. McVicker Hunt, the Goreham Committee of 1967 which brought together persons from federal agencies dealing with children, the Joint Commission of Mental Health of Children of 1969, and the White House Conference on Children of 1970. The Office of Child Development will soon have available the report of the Advisory Committee on Child Development which was commissioned by OCD through the National Academy of Sciences and chaired by Harold Stevenson. The recommendations made in these various reports, though well thought out, have never received adequate response from either the executive or the legislative branches. One reason for the minimal impact of past reports is that there is something of the laundry list about them, with everything and anything that might help families included. If each and every recommendation had been acted upon positively, America's families would indeed be experiencing a modern utopia. Unfortunately, it is much easier to create paper utopias at conferences than it is to get a single piece of legislation with some minimal, but nonetheless obvious, benefits for families enacted into law. The fact of the matter is that our committees and commissions do not deal sufficiently with the economic and political feasibility of the many recommendations with which they present us. Furthermore, the producers of the plethora of recommendations that we have all examined are not sufficiently aware of the fact that social policy construction essentially involves establishing priorities and selecting among alternatives. This is, of

course, not to belittle the efforts to which I have been alluding. As a body of work, this collection of recommendations comprises a conscience which the nation can employ when dealing with the problems of children and their families. Furthermore, it represents the raw materials that any administration or legislative body can utilize in the construction of a coherent national-family policy.

Perhaps as a result of my two years of service in Washington, I am now so aware of economic and political realities that I cannot come before you to champion the frequently heard recommendations for improving family life, such as a guaranteed annual income of \$6,000 for a family of four, and universal developmental day care available free to every family in America. If such phenomena ever become realities, it will probably be generations hence and therefore of little use to American families who need help now. I have much more modest aspirations for the actions that could be taken by this committee. I cannot help but think of an incident that occurred when, as Director of the Office of Child Development, I was informing an audience of the high quality of day care that was to be provided in the President's Welfare Reform Plan. A member of that audience asked why, if OCD was so concerned about the quality of day care, it was not doing more to improve the quality of day care already being provided through Title IV of the Social Security Act. Unfortunately, I had no very satisfying answer to this query and therefore did little more than waffle in the best, or probably worst, bureaucratic tradition. The point of this story is that, while this may not be the time for large new initiatives, it is certainly time for decision-makers to examine extant social policies and practices important to families so that we might at least correct those policies which are, at one extreme, thoughtless and uneconomical, and, at the other, involve the government as a co-conspirator in the abuse of children. It also behooves us to examine existing social policies for those features which are so valuable as to demand their greater implementation.

In dealing with current problems of the American family, certainly a government responsive to family needs must come to grips with the issue of day care for America's working mothers. This is a problem of immense proportions and one for which a solution is not attainable overnight. Its magnitude and difficulty of solution are so great that it appears more politic to ignore it than to engage in efforts that would be helpful to a relatively small percentage of families needing day care. What the nation really needs is a 20-year plan for a child care system that would involve realistic increments in public and private funding as the development of facilities and personnel warrants. Good quality day care was given the number one priority at the last White House Conference on Children. In a needs assessment carried out to develop a state plan for children in Texas, 60% of those queried spontaneously listed day care for their children as their most pressing need. While I think that the real solution of the day care problem can only come from careful long-term planning, there are several things that can be done immediately to improve the day care situation in our nation.

Approximately a billion dollars was spent in the last fiscal year by the federal government for child care, with the bulk of this money going to two programs: Head Start, administered by OCD, and the Title IV day care program, administered by the Community Services Agency within SRS. It should be noted that approximately one-third of the Head Start monies is being spent for day care for working mothers. There has been no real coordination between these two sizable programs, and the rules, regulations, and philosophy of each of the two programs are at odds with those of the other. Were these two programs combined and operated by a single agency, some order as well as new economies could be brought to the child care effort which the federal government is already funding. Indeed, such a combined program would finally give the nation at least an embryonic national child care system providing parents with a variety of child care services including the all-important service of day care for working mothers. Such a unified system could be held responsible for ensuring the quality of child care that is necessary if children are not to be harmed by programs mounted and funded by the federal government. I think that Head Start has been sensitive to the quality issue while the Title IV program has not.

When we think of day care, we often think of centers serving 30 or more children. This accounts for only a small percentage of the day care funded through Title IV. A much larger percentage of these funds is paid by local welfare agencies to unlicensed family day care homes which typically serve six or fewer children. Some of these homes are good, but others are ghastly and, thus, we are witnessing federal funds being spent to place children in circumstances detrimental to their development. If combining the Title IV and Head Start programs into an organized and unified child care system strikes you as a too demanding task, then I would suggest to the Committee members that they

at least direct their attention to the problem of implementing and enforcing some minimum standards for every kind of day care that is subsidized by federal funds. Such a set of enforceable and realistic standards was developed under my direction at OCD and, after a close analysis by others within HEW, was approved by the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, The Honorable Elliot Richardson. These standards were then sent to the Office of Management and Budget over a year ago and, to the best of my knowledge have never again surfaced. Until such standards are promulgated and enforced, children will continue to experience the horrors documented in the Council of Jewish Women's report, *Windows on Day Care*. Even within the present framework, day care can be improved and made more available. Family day care can be of good quality and should continue over the years to be an important component of the total day care picture. It is necessary to provide day care mothers with training and general support by those equipped to give it. We have available to us common-sensical and practical models of how to do this. One good example of this is the Pacific Oaks model in which family day care homes are tied into a network with a central training and technical support facility.

The present day care picture also suffers from a serious lopsidedness in which concern is almost totally limited to the preschool-age child. The fact of the matter is that two-thirds of the children in this nation who require day care are of school age and need adult supervision before and after school and during vacations. Because of our slowness in developing day care models for school age children and inducing schools and other institutions to employ such models, we are now witnessing the national tragedy of over a million latch-key children, cared for by no one, with probably an equal number being cared for by siblings who are themselves too young to assume such responsibilities. The human cost of this situation to families and to the nation as a whole is great indeed. While there is an escalating concern over rising juvenile delinquency figures, few have forcefully pointed out the relationship between the growing phenomenon of young children socializing one another and the rise of delinquency. If this nation is interested in preventing the delinquency rather than punishing it, a major component of such an attempt would be an expanded school-age day care program.

Another child care problem that can and should be dealt with immediately is that of the need for personnel. Our nation simply does not have an adequate cadre of appropriately trained individuals to care for even the present number of children in our child care systems. The development of such a cadre should have top priority and should consist in large part of personnel whose salaries can be met without making day care costs astronomical. OCD moved forcefully into this area by creating a new child care profession in America, namely, the Child Development Associate. The national implementation of the Child Development Associate concept is now in the hands of a consortium consisting of major early childhood education associations and associations representing a variety of consumer and child advocacy groups. A key feature of this new thrust is that accreditation and certification would occur through demonstrated competency rather than on completion of academic programs. However, if this program is ever to produce child care workers in sufficient quantity, it will require the infusion of some new federal money, probably in the neighborhood of 10 to 20 million dollars. This is a relatively small amount of money when one thinks of the annual billion dollars being spent, much of which is buying poor day care primarily because well-trained people who can be employed at a reasonable cost are simply not available. While funding to the CDA program has, to my knowledge, been a feature of two bills, neither have been passed into law.

Let me now turn my attention to other problems facing children and families that are of such magnitude that they constitute a national disgrace. The foster care system in this nation is in need of a major overhaul. Often, the failure of this system can be traced to lack of money. In other instances, the problem rests on our commitment to questionable procedures and our failure to utilize the know-how readily at our disposal. We find children taken from their homes because no homemaker services were available to aid the family through relatively short periods of crisis or stress. Such mother's helpers are readily available in nations such as Sweden and England, and it may be noted that this service is 13 times more available in England than it is in the United States. When children are placed into the foster care system, it is not unusual for them to be lost in its maze, being transferred from social worker to social worker, from family to family, without ever experiencing the stability, affection, and sense of belonging so necessary for normal development. In many cases, foster children are never returned to their biological families and, in view of the cost to the state of raising a child to maturity, estimated to be between \$40,000 and \$60,000, one might ask why such children are not permitted to be adopted by families who can provide them

with the emotional environment they so badly need. The answer resides in controversial policies of our state social welfare agencies. For instance, in New York, a foster child cannot be placed for adoption if the biological parents do so much as send one post card per year to the child.

What is tragic about this state of affairs is that much of it can be avoided. I would refer you to a demonstration project funded by OCD's Children's Bureau and conducted in Nashville, Tennessee. This project, involving comprehensive emergency services for children, is now beginning its third year. As a result of its activities, whereas 322 children were placed in children's institutions in 1969, only 22 had to be so placed in 1972. In 1969, almost 200 of these children were less than six years of age. During the past six months of this program, not a single child under six was institutionalized. The Nashville program is an excellent one and there is no reason that it cannot be implemented in every community in America.

This nation must do all it can to help children out of institutions. It has become all too apparent that the typical large institution, be it a state hospital for the emotionally disturbed, a school for delinquent boys, or a state school for the retarded, is destructive to the lives of children and a source of despair for these children's families. This situation was made abundantly clear in the impressive documentary entitled, "This Child Is Labeled X." While we should do all we can to avoid institutionalizing children and to remove from institutions children who do not belong there, some children absolutely require institutionalization.

Given my own 15 years of professional activity in this field, I am particularly concerned with the lives of institutionalized retarded children. The Willowbrooks, the Rosewoods, the state schools of Alabama, are all too representative of what our institutionalized retarded children experience. This committee is to be commended for the light it has shed and the action it has taken regarding the problem of parental abuse of children. However, if our nation is concerned about child abuse, it must take immediate action on the legalized abuse of children in our state institutions. These institutions invariably receive federal funds which makes the national government a co-conspirator in the abuse to which these children are subjected. A national effort involving the co-operation of the federal and state governments should be immediately begun to correct the national disgrace of our treatment of institutionalized children. My own research as well as the experience of the Scandinavian countries indicates that humane institutionalization constructive to the child's development is possible if we would simply commit ourselves to such a policy. Given the numbers involved, I would give first priority to the problem of institutionalized retarded children.

Finally, I would propose a much expanded effort related to education for parenthood. A small program has already been initiated by OCD and the Office of Education which makes available to schools and youth organizations model courses in parenthood prepared for an adolescent audience. An important feature of this program is that it allows adolescents to work with younger children in Head Start and day care centers as part of the curriculum. We must convince schools and other institutions that they must provide increased support for family life. Teaching young people about the most important role they will ever assume, namely, parenthood, is one such effort. Others should also be undertaken. Schools could become involved with families long before children reach school age. They can provide needed information to mothers beginning with pregnancy and become a meeting center in which mothers and fathers can learn from one another by exchanging knowledge concerning cognitive and emotional development that can be most helpful to young parents in their child rearing tasks. Model programs of this type are already underway in the Brookline, Massachusetts, and Little Rock, Arkansas, school systems. Child support centers need not be confined to schools; a number of effective non-school models are also available needing only greater implementation. I am thinking here especially of the Parent and Child Centers administered by the Office of Child Development and certain more experimental programs being conducted at the University of Florida, University of Illinois, and Syracuse University. I also see great promise in the experimental Child and Family Resource Program recently initiated by the Office of Child Development. This program has created centers which provide a wide array of needed services to children and their families.

Let me conclude by saying that it is my conviction that we can spend the money that we already have at our disposal more effectively. We certainly know how to do much more than we are presently doing. Frequently, relatively small expenditures will result in the correction of many practices which currently are detrimental to family life. Perhaps we cannot reasonably expect at this point major new commitments, but we can and should demand the rejection of apathy and negativism and expect a renewed commitment to the proposition that

families are indeed important and that it is the federal government's role to reduce the stresses and to meet the problems confronting families. Such a renewed commitment would at least constitute a first step in developing a real family policy for America.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT COLES, M.D.

Since 1960 I have been working with a range of American families: rural black families of the South; white families from the region's small towns and cities; migrant farm workers' families; Appalachian families; white and black working class families who live in our Northern and mid-Western cities, or to their near suburbs, so-called "streetcar suburbs"; Chicano and Indian families out west; Eskimo families in Alaska. I have also visited the very well-to-do families whose lives intersect with these people—the plantation owners, farm owners, factory owners who hire and fire, issue orders and expect compliance. As a child psychiatrist, my particular interest has been the children of these families: how do boys and girls grow up under the swiftly changing circumstances of our time—a momentary crisis in this nation's history? But no one can speak with children long without coming into contact with their parents and grandparents, their grown-up next door neighbors. So, the three volumes of *Children of Crisis* I have to this date written (Volume I: *A Study of Courage*

and Fear; Volume II: *Migrants, Sharecroppers and Mountaineers*; Volume III: *The South Goes North*) give one observer's view of how certain American families are managing, often in the face of severe stress; I hope to complete the series with two more volumes: Volume IV: *Chicanos, Eskimos, Indians*; and Volume V to chronicle the way children grow up who belong to families from the upper middle class world.

Rather obviously one can single-mindedly study the difficulties certain children have, the economic forces that exert themselves on certain workers, the pressures certain mothers have to deal with as they try to get a good education or proper medical care for their children. But in each instance there is something larger at stake—workers or housewives or children belong to families, and what is experienced by one person in a family soon enough affects others who belong to that family. We tend to think of a child with problem A, a man who is going through dilemma B, a woman who faces struggle C; in fact, it is entire families which rather quickly have to respond to the various impasses or quandries particular individuals have to deal with. Perhaps the only thing I can do before this subcommittee is indicate some of the pressing issues I have witnessed American families facing in recent years—often with little or no help from others.

To start, there are families headed by fathers who can't find work. Today many claim to be tired of hearing about the poor—or picture them hopelessly their own worst enemies: lazy, indifferent, wasteful, given to bad habits. Yet, I think of Kentucky or West Virginia counties I have worked in, where one meets in town after town, and up hollow after hollow, tall, sturdy, decent and honorable men, yeomen descendants of people who came to this country centuries ago, explored it and helped build it—and those men are idle not by choice or out of personal inadequacy or wrongdoing, but because there is no work. The same situation holds in other counties in other regions of this nation—and the effect upon thousands of families is the same: fearfulness, anxiety, sadness, a sense of desperation and futility. A jobless man's situation becomes a wife's mood, a child's feeling about what is in store for him or her, too—all of which is the purest of common sense. Yet, I fear we sometimes don't want to notice what is thoroughly obvious and evident.

Then, there are families where the father works alright, and maybe the mother, too. I think at this point I had best let a factory worker speak: "Work: I have plenty of it—so much that it's my whole life. I work my regular shift, then I work over-time—whether I want to or not. Like I say to my wife: it's a bind, because we need the money, just to keep our heads above the water, but it means that I practically never get to see the kids, except on Sunday, and then I'm so tired I can barely do anything but sleep and eat and get ready for the next week. My wife is working too; she has to—or else we'd be drowning in bills. As it is, with the two of us working, we're still in trouble. The money just pours out, as soon as it comes in: food and the mortgage and clothes and the dentist for the kids' teeth and the doctor for my girl—every week. My brother, he doesn't work over-time, but the poor guy had to take a second job on Saturday, or else he told me he'd be borrowing from me. 'Don't try,' I told him: I have none to lend anyone.

"I feel like a guy running hard just to keep in the same position. And let me tell you, it makes a difference at home: my wife feels it, so do the kids, when you're living like that. The other day I went with my wife and daughter to the doctor's. He wanted to see both of us. I had to call in 'sick'; you don't get days off in my plant without a month of red tape—only that two week vaca-

tion once a year. We went to the doctor's office, and then we went over to the hospital and we met another doctor; he's a bone specialist. Then I took my wife and daughter to lunch. I decided to splurge—a restaurant instead of the hospital cafeteria we're used to. We were sitting there and I was trying to have a good time and so was my wife, and our girl. She was in seventh heaven. But every once in a while my wife would look at me and I'd look at her and we'd both look back at the prices on the menu, and I'd swallow so hard I was afraid I was choking.

"But we tried to be cheerful for the sake of the kid, and I kept reminding myself that I could always go and get an odd job on a Sunday, if worse came to worse. So, we kept talking and I told my daughter she could have anything she wanted. But she is such a good kid; she said, 'Daddy, just a hamburger, and I hope it's not too expensive.' I told her no, no. Then I sat there, and the next thing, she and her mother went to the ladies' room, and I was sipping my coffee and wishing it was a beer, and all of a sudden I hear these guys behind me talking. They're arguing, only they're laughing at the same time: 'No, I'll take it,' one says, and 'No, I'll take it,' another says, and finally there's a third guy and he says, 'Look, it'll all come out of the United States Treasury, so why should we argue over the check!' For a second I didn't even know what they were talking about, but all of a sudden it dawned on me: they're having their lunch on me, that's what. They skim off all that tax money from me every week, and who has the time or money or know-how to get back even a small amount for deductions? Meanwhile, these guys are writing off their lunch, and tomorrow they'll have another 'business' lunch, and God knows what else they're writing off. Can I write off the money I spend taking my kid every week into the hospital; the bus and subway both ways, the lunch she has with her mother, or this time with both of us? You can live off the fat of the land in this country and the ordinary wage-earner, he's the one who pays for it with his taxes. They have the oil-depletion allowance. We're so tired by Sunday with work and over-time and odd jobs now and then and my wife's work—we'll be running out of oil ourselves!"

He lives in a neighborhood of working-class families west of Boston, and as I think of the problems I have met up with that his family and others like them face, I can only contrast the attitude our society has toward those families—as measured by laws passed, money expended, institutions supported—with the eagerness we have shown to support other elements in our society. There are dyslexic children, one in ten of all our children, plagued by a medical and educational difficulty which becomes for thousands of families a prolonged and bewildering crisis: what is wrong that my child, apparently so intelligent, can't read, and what can I do—to whom can I turn? To whom, indeed? How many cities or towns have the doctors and teachers who know how to diagnose and come to terms with this widespread difficulty? (Again, it affects whole families, not just the child.) There are runaway children and youth—living symbols of troubled families. A horrible story in Texas crosses our television screens, and for a moment we are appalled; something ought to have been done! But what—and by whom? What are the parents of runaways to do, to whom are they to go, and with what hope of getting the kind of help they need? The police say it is not their problem. Teachers have their own field to plow. Doctors are too busy or too expensive or too few in number—and on and on. Then there are "battered children" whose bruises, inflicted by parents, unfortunately make up only the more apparent evidence of family disorder. Or the plight of families that have a retarded child, an emotionally

distressed child, a child plagued by severe or chronic illness, a child who is blind or deaf. Do we need yet additional studies to document the inadequate facilities or professional help or the overwhelming financial burden such children or their parents, such families have to sustain?

Nor only are the poor or working-class people up against hard-to-solve family problems. In the course of my work in the Southwest I talked with a man who manages a factory just outside of Albuquerque. He was proud of his company's policies toward Spanish speaking people—and it was on that account that I was seeing him: to find out how some of the Chicano people I knew were getting along at work. "They're doing fine," he told me. "We have some problems, but mostly it's fine." A while later he gave the conversation a dramatic shift: "I wish someone would worry about my family. Everyone worries about the minorities. My wife says she's sick and tired of hearing it: the minorities this and the minorities that. Everyone here worries about Mexican-Americans or Indians. Back East it was the blacks. Life is no picnic. I think someone ought to go study us. Look at my family—first I was in the army, moved about from base to base; then I got out, and I started working my way up in the company. It's been one move, then another. My children know how to smile and tell everyone they love it, they just love it, because they

see the country, the whole world. But I hear them giving to the city we are in the name of the city we were in, and I hear them telling their mother that they miss so-and-so, and somebody else—and I stop and ask myself: for what, that's right, for what is all this moving about? To rise, to make more and more money? That's fine—but there comes a time when you begin adding up the costs, and you get a sick feeling in your stomach: you're paying for 'success' with your family's blood! You mentioned those migrant workers a while back; well, we're migrant workers, too. I'm not asking for anyone's pity, mind you. I love my work. I'd do it again, if I had a choice. I just want to go on the record: no one has a complete monopoly on problems!"

One can only agree. One can only warn, too, against the danger of quickly conceived "solutions," however generous and well-intentioned. The family, poor or middle-class or exceedingly well-to-do, stands in the midst of dozens of "forces," private and public, neighborhood or emanating from far off Washington, D.C. Laws affect families; customs do; and needless to say, economic cycles. Then, there are social upheavals, wars, court decisions: a boy goes to war, abortion is declared legal, mortgage rates spiral upward, a company lays off workers, a new tax law goes into effect, school desegregation begins or a new bussing program to ensure it starts—those are just some of the more obvious "events" which for millions become intimate family matters. I would hope that American families get close and sustained scrutiny from this committee and elsewhere. Many of the families I visit are for one reason or another in some difficulty; but for the most part they are working hard, or trying to, each member in his or her own way. Often they are isolated from other families. Often they have small or no contact with schools, never mind the other institutions which affect them—a city hall, a medical center, a tax or transportation or communication "authority". To call upon the worker I quoted earlier: "Who asks us anything? Do they really go out to us, try to let us know in advance what they're thinking of doing in the schools, or about a road they're building, or about the kind of television our kids are going to be looking at? You hear all the time that people don't care, they're apathetic. But it takes two: the companies and the government—do they really want to get a lot of people down their backs, speaking up with their ideas? I doubt it. It's easier just to go

ahead and start something, then take on the few people who complain! Sure I'm tired, and how many hours do I have left each day, when I come home? But if there was something really important going on—some meeting or program that affected my wife and kids, that really meant something to us, I'd try to find the time."

Hopefully without being presumptuous, one is entitled to be a touch skeptical. Just as some youths, whatever the government suggests or offers or prompts—through a Peace Corps or a Vista—show little interest in idealistic social or political activities, so a good number of families are quite insistent that, whatever their troubles, they and they alone will come to terms with them. On the other hand, there are many youth who do indeed want to exert themselves on behalf of others, but find no real opportunity to do so; and there are many families who know full well what they and others like them need and might respond to: new and stimulating ties with schools, with hospitals, with certain governmental agencies, with regulatory agencies of various kinds—sanctioned and encouraged rather than sporadically allowed in response to some crisis: a highway to go through a neighborhood; an airport being enlarged; a court order for desegregation; a new curriculum, emphasizing sex education.

I want to be cautious at this point, to be people in the families I visit have no interest in being subjects of yet another "social experiment"—with bureaucratic red tape, a new army of "professionals," all too sure of themselves, and maybe brazenly intrusive when it comes to others. Enough rights of enough citizens have been violated in this country over the years without subjecting families to well-intentioned laws which may, finally, render them increasingly vulnerable to the political power of the state. It behooves people like myself, anxious for various social changes, to remember that federal authority, especially when directed at something as ultimately individual, and one hopes, private as a family must be carefully wielded indeed. But equally important is the almost crying need one hears over and over again for various kinds of help or direction on the part of particular members of various families. And there are the questions; over and over they get repeated as one becomes a regular visitor to homes: What is happening to this country—with the ever rising delinquency in middle class neighborhoods, never mind the ghetto? How can we deal with the drug problem—as a family, and before a legal problem develops? What do we want our children to believe in—apart from winning or succeeding or getting ahead? What should they learn in school, apart from "reading, writing, arithmetic"? Who can one turn to—in this enormously complicated and increasingly impersonal society? Those are the ac-

tual questions of parents I have known, and there are others: why do I have to move, just when I have settled in? Why do I have to move, just because I'm making a little more money, and they say I don't belong here, in the "project"? Why do I have to move—because it's "company policy", they say, just like they used to say, when I was in the army, "because Uncle Sam says so!" Why do I have to stay away from my husband, in order to get welfare money? I mean, he can't find a job, and I have children to feed, and isn't it a job, taking care of children, bringing them up, so why do they come here, the welfare people, and make me feel like two cents, and my kids, too? Why do they tell me one thing about my child, then another, call him "sick" or a "severe delinquent", then take him away, then bring him back; I mean, why don't they sit down and try to teach me, so I can help my boy and help the rest of the family, and not always be appearing in court with him?

Perhaps some of those questions are plaintive or self-pitying. Perhaps there is little the federal government can do to supply answers to them. Yet, it is the federal government which writes tax laws, earmarks funds for schools, courts, hospitals, housing projects. It is the federal government which helps build roads and airports, which licenses television stations, sends men from military post to military post, influences in all sorts of ways various business and economic policies. And it is the federal government, through what it does or does not do, which affects family life in America intimately: by a failure to help through tax legislation the worker I quoted from, whose wife makes a weekly trip with their daughter to a doctor's office and then a hospital, the government is making a judgment about this aspect of family life in America. I hope this subcommittee will spend a good deal of time listening to various American families and to those who work with them and try to be of help to them—and eventually, perhaps, find itself in a position to make some judgments of its own about how more American families might live what they feel to be less harassed, calmer and surer lives.

TESTIMONY OF DR. JAMES J. O'TOOLE

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee: This morning I should like to make a few brief remarks that are a distillation of the report on *Work in America* and this last summer's Aspen workshops on Education, Work and the Quality of Life. For the record, I would like to submit documents from these two projects as extensions of my remarks.

I shall confine my comments here to some of the national labor and welfare policies with which you are concerned, and particularly to how these policies relate to family life in America. My testimony is in three parts. First, I shall present some evidence about what work means to the life of an individual. Specifically, I will focus on the effects on family structure of either the lack of work or of work that offers insufficient financial, social or personal benefits. Secondly, I shall present an illustrative framework with which one might view the impact on the entire generational spectrum of Americans of the way we allocate work opportunities. Finally, I shall present an argument for a reformulation of national work and welfare policies in order to strengthen family ties among the poor.

I. WORK AND FAMILY STABILITY

Work is a word that is overworked by politicians, news commentators, educators, clergy and parents. That we use it indiscriminately and incorrectly in common speech is of little consequence to the subcommittee, but that we define work narrowly and carelessly in the creation of federal policies and programs should be of prime importance to these investigative hearings. In almost all federal programs, work is equated with paid employment. Using housework as an example, we can see the harmful social, economic and psychological consequences of the current definition. A housewife, by this definition, does not work. But, ironically, if her services are replaced by a housekeeper, a cook, or a babysitter, these replacements are defined as workers because their salaries contribute to the Gross National Product.

It is clearly an inconsistency to say that a woman who cares for her own children is not working, but if she takes a job looking after the children of another woman, she is working. The economic consequences for mothers and their children of this logical inconsistency are seen in the eligibility requirements for federal programs in welfare, child care and social security, to name only a significant few. In social and psychological terms, this equation of work and money has produced a synonymy of "pay" and "worth." Accordingly, work that is not paid is not considered to be as valuable as paid work. One wonders what the effects of this denigration of unpaid work are on the current, apparent unwillingness of some mothers and fathers to devote time to the proper care and upbringing of their children. As a society, we may have dangerously downgraded the most important work a human can perform.

For the sake of our children—and the future of our society—an alternative definition of work might, therefore, serve as a better guide to policy makers in the Congress and in federal agencies. The *Work in America* task force suggested that, for official purposes, work should be considered as "any activity that produces something of value for other people." This is more than a semantic quibble; we shall see the operative importance of a redefinition of work when we come to our discussion of welfare policies.

Now that I have offered that it is useful to view work as an activity that produces something of value for other people, I would like to call attention to the things that work produces for the worker himself. The first personal function of work is economic. We work to provide food, clothing, and shelter. There are also several less obvious psychological purposes or functions of work:

1. Work contributes to self-esteem—Through the mastery of a task one builds a sense of pride in one's self. The job tells the worker that he has something of value to contribute to society. The work place, then, is the major focus of personal evaluation.

2. Work is also the most significant source of personal identity—We identify who we are through our jobs. We say, "I am a college professor" or "I am a housewife" when someone asks "who are you?" A consequence of this work-connected identification is that welfare recipients and the retired become nobodies.

3. Work is a prime way for individuals to impose order, control or structure on their world. From this perspective, we see that the opposite of work is not free time or leisure; it is being victimized by disorder or chaos.

In short, work offers the individual self-sufficiency, status, identity, self-esteem and a sense of order and meaning. Consequently, if the opportunity to work is absent, or if the nature of work is not sufficiently rewarding, severe repercussions are likely to be experienced by the individual worker and his or her family. To document this relationship, I should like to refer to findings from several major studies of family life and employment:

1. Loss of work has been found to produce chronic disorganization in the lives of parents and children. Among the long-term unemployed, attitudes toward the future and towards the home and community, have been shown to deteriorate. Family life loses its meaning and vitality for these individuals.

2. The children of long-term unemployed and marginally employed workers uniformly show poorer school grades.

3. Despite the popular notion that unemployed people fill their free time with intensified sexual activities, studies show that the undermined egos of former breadwinners lead to diminished libidos.

4. The physical and mental health of the unemployed tends to deteriorate. For example, there is a clear correlation between unemployment and the onset of schizophrenia.

5. There is a demonstrable relationship between a family breadwinner's work experience and family stability. Sociologist Frank Furstenberg reviewed 46 separate studies of work experience for the *Work in America* project and concluded that "economic" uncertainty brought on by unemployment and marginal employment is a principal reason why family relations deteriorate."

6. Sociologists have attributed the high rate of illegitimacy among poor people to the occupational uncertainty of men. Lee

Rainwater found expectant mothers rejecting marriage if their sexual partners were unemployed or had poor occupational prospects.

7. Manpower economist Michael Piore has developed a Dual Labor Market Theory that helps to explain the relationship between the nature of employment and the ability to sustain a nuclear family. He describes a secondary labor market that is distinguished by low wages, poor working conditions, considerable variability in employment, little security, harsh and arbitrary discipline and little opportunity for upward mobility. Poor people are drawn to this market because they do not have the social or skill characteristics required for employment in the primary market. What is significant for these hearings is that Piore has shown that the secondary market does not meet the social and economic requirements of those who wish to establish a stable family.

8. Anthropologist Elliot Liebow has found a relationship between the frequency and nature of employment of men on the one hand, and their willingness to form stable, nuclear families, with the mothers of their children on the other. Liebow's landmark research among ghetto dwellers in the District of Columbia offers the most poignant evidence we have of the correlation between mother-headed families and the underemployment and unemployment of street corner men.

9. My own research in Watts in Los Angeles and among the non-white population of Cape Town, South Africa reveals a striking similarity in family structure in these two geographically distant communities. In both Watts and Cape Town, there is a high percentage of mother-centered families found among the poorest people. In both communities, mother-centered families are more frequent when the father is chronically un-

employed, employed irregularly or employed in a job that will not permit him the social and economic dignity and security needed to assume the breadwinner's role in his family.

10. Divorce and separation rates for the poor are not greatly different than the rates for the middle class. Significantly, however, the remarriage rate among the poor is considerably lower than among the middle class. Poor women, once they have been the victims of an unsatisfactory marital experience, tend to be unwilling to repeat the experience with another high-risk mate. For this reason, and not looser morals, statistics for mother-headed households are higher among the poor. Unemployed or underemployed men simply are not seen as good remarriage material.

In summary, the evidence is overwhelming that unemployment and underemployment among breadwinners is the primary factor leading to continued marital instability among the poor. The absence of work, or work that fails to fulfill the function of economic security, self-esteem, identity and a sense of mastery over the chaos of one's environment, will not provide the stable basis required to build a lasting familial relationship.

II. ACCESS TO WORK

Although the work and family problems of the disadvantaged deserve the lion's share of our attention because these problems are so terribly damaging to human development, it is still worth a moment to analyze the way we allocate access to work across our entire population—if only to put the problems of the poor in sharper focus. This not terribly sophisticated perspective, illustrated on the chart I have posted, serves to point up differences in sex, race and generational access to work and helps us to identify some of the possible effects these differences might have on family life. In looking at the chart, we should keep in mind that most of the major pieces of federal social legislation either are responsible for the divisions and problems

that we find here, or they were designed to support existing divisions.

I should like to make three preliminary points about the uses of the chart. First, the way in which our society is now structured promotes a particular canonical path through life for its individual members. The ways in which we are supposed to attach meaning to life, to develop opportunities, and to generate our senses of societal purpose derive their sanction from the architecture of our culture.

Second, certain of our social structures do not do very well what they are meant to do. What I wish to emphasize here is that even the established and approved ways of living are difficult to come by.

Third, probably no one passes successfully through life along the prescribed canonical path. There is nevertheless the likelihood that those of us who do not proceed down the mainstream do so with a lively awareness of the tension between our own choices and the path which is supposed to be encouraged. Although few approach the norm, it is the norm against which people measure themselves.

The chart helps us to visualize the canonical path that begins with an infancy of two or three years, during which the family is the controlling presence. As in traditional societies, the family is the basic unit which embraces living, working, and learning. There follows a period of childhood, when peer groups, the school, and, especially recently, the various media compete in influence with the family. During the period of youth—which is more and more being prolonged—it is the institution of education that becomes a controlling presence: today, the structure of our society prescribes that youth means schooling, mostly formal. Here, too, but growing less common, may be located some first passes at trial employment.

Freed from the educational institution, the new adult embarks abruptly on his career. His work occupies most of his time, and it is sharply set off from his two other prime concerns: leisure (the whole nexus of entertainment, social and civic and recreational activities, and whatever amount of continuing education he decides to engage in), and, most importantly, family. And at the end of his working life—which is more being shortened—the adult enters a period of retirement. Free time, either voluntary, enforced, or some combination of the two, becomes the key motif. His dependence increases as he becomes older, and finally he may be placed in an institution at the approach of death. Viewed in this manner, life becomes a kind of maintenance path along which we are expected to slide irreversibly.

For which groups is society not prepared to ease the passage along the linear progression? An obvious group—suggested by the fact that we use the masculine pronoun when we describe the canonical path—is women. In spite of our egalitarian motives, girls and boys do not receive the same kind of socialization and education. Nor, perhaps, should they. Nevertheless, girls' expectations of life are different because they are taught to stake different claims on life. Sex stereotypes and the role which they play in encouraging widely divergent life choices have only re-

cently begun to be understood. On the whole, it is still very much the case that the careers which girls are supposed to pursue are meant to be secondary to the careers that men do pursue. John will grow up to be a lawyer, Jill his secretary.

And the labors in the home and with their children that adult women engage in are not "really" work, because they are not rewarded financially, as I have said. And a lifetime of housework does not provide eligibility for retirement.

Disadvantaged minorities, too, are not well served by the canonical path. They receive inferior educations, and they experience difficulty in entering and staying in the work world. At the end, they often find themselves without adequate retirement funds. Other outgroups—the insane, the chronically ill, the involuntarily unemployed—spend their lives in warehouses designed to contain them. Adulthood, for them, is not a period of earning which follows education. It is not a period in which work supports family and leisure activities.

What this chart helps us to do, then, is to identify certain problems associated (a) with the ways we divide the time of our lives, (b) with the ways we provide access to institutions like work and the family that validate our legitimacy as contributing members of society and (c) with the ways our national programs and policies support the current structure. Let us further examine four of the problems.

1. THE SEGMENTATION OF LIVES

As I have said, most working Americans follow a monolithic path through life in which education is synonymous with youth, work with adulthood, and retirement with old age. Several problems result from dividing life into these discrete, age-graded functions:

Work, "the badge of adulthood," is the only fully legitimate activity of maturity. There is "something wrong" with someone who is not working: the adult non-worker is considered to have and to be a social problem. Women who take care of their children, the unemployed and the underemployed, the dropout, the elderly—none have full "working identities." They suffer both economically and psychologically from their second-class status, and so are excluded from some of society's rewards. If one were to place a transparent overlay on our chart that listed the major federal programs and the age groups they were designed to serve, we would find that the programs encouraged this segmentation of lives and did little to help the groups excluded from the mainstream. For example, almost all of our educational expenditures go to the age group between six and twenty-six. Our approach to the excluded is to build warehouses—jails, mental institutions, youth and age ghettos—rather than to integrate people into the community through providing them with jobs.

Family activities are segregated from other activities. In the middle years of life, particularly, the worker is separated from his family for many hours during the day. Often, workers must choose between their jobs and their families—and many men (and, now, increasingly, many women) choose to sacrifice their families for their jobs. Indeed, it is not overstating the case to say that many children today are raised by one parent only—during crucial stages of growing up, the fathers of these children are too occupied with career matters to take an active or significant role in their upbringing.

2. THE SEGREGATION OF GENERATIONS

Education, the activity of youth, occurs at schools, which become youth ghettos. Work, the activity of adulthood, is performed in similarly age-segregated institutions. Retirement, the activity of the aged, occurs increasingly in "leisure communities" cut off from the rest of the world, both spiritually and physically. As a result the segregation of generations becomes a corollary to the segmentation of lives.

Young people seldom, if ever, see adults at work. As James Coleman and Urie Bronfenbrenner have noted, this leaves youth improperly socialized to the work world and prolongs their adolescence. Such problems as campus unrest and drug cultures may result from this age segregation.

Cut off from older generations, from aspects of the essential guides of experience, tradition, and history, young people face a special difficulty in coping with important value questions in our rapidly changing society.

3. ACCESS TO WORK

One of the clearest social problems in the society is the scarcity of jobs due to the national choice of low inflation over low unemployment. But this scarcity does not run evenly across the demographic groups of society; indeed, for middle-aged white males the problem is minimal. To keep the problem at bay for this group, we have kept young people out of the labor market until they are older and retired workers at an earlier age. To create employment for middle-aged women in answer to recent demands, we have increasingly excluded the young, the old, and minority men from the work force.

4. INSTITUTIONAL FLEXIBILITY

Most jobs are organized in an authoritarian fashion built upon the ethic of conformity and obedience learned in the schools. They follow a model of set and simplified tasks, rigid schedules, and tight discipline and control. This has significant consequences for family life. Shift work, for example, has been shown to have a devastating effect on marital stability. More important, perhaps, research shows that adults who work in authoritarian settings impart a sense of inadequacy to their children. These children tend to adapt poorly to change and to have trouble succeeding in school.

Most of us work from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. for fifty weeks a year. These forms apparently suit many individuals. Increasingly, however, workers—particularly the young—are demanding greater flexibility on their jobs: in scheduling, in educational opportunity, in clothing, in personal autonomy and in job design. From the point of view of family life, it has been suggested that we need more half-time jobs so that mothers and fathers can each have a paying job and can each spend half a day with their children. Alternatively, if one parent wishes to devote himself or herself full-time to child care while the other works half-time jobs will offer the opportunity for work during school hours when the child grows up.

I have offered here only a partial catalogue of problems related to family and working life. As a society, we can organize the blocks of time on the chart in any way we see fit. What appear to be natural divisions are actually the artifacts of one particular society. For example, the length of adolescence is as arbitrary as what we eat for breakfast. It comes as a surprise to many Americans that adolescence does not exist in many cultures. But I assure you that that is as true as the fact that not all peoples eat eggs and bacon for breakfast.

But that we can change these blocks of time around at will does not argue that we should. Indeed, great questions of personal values and individual freedom are involved in meeting any of the problems that I have outlined. Given the myriad alternatives before us, and the lack of consensus in favor of any one alternative, I would argue that we should concentrate our national efforts on eliminating the gravest injustices of our society in this area, rather than scattering our resources and energies on problems that are real, but cause little pain and suffering. For this reason, I offer you only one policy suggestion: you should write legislation that would provide work for those who want it.

III. A FEDERAL WORK AND WELFARE STRATEGY

The conclusions of *Work in America* on the question of welfare illustrate—if nothing else—the unrequited role of the intellectual in national policymaking. Almost every researcher who has studied the problem of family disorganization in the ghetto has

come to the same conclusion: The causal factor is most probably the lower-class father's inability to get and to hold the kind of employment needed for a stable family life. The solution to the "welfare mess" then is to provide good, steady jobs in order that the men who are the fathers of welfare children can have the same marriage and remarriage opportunities as middle-class men, and so that poor women can have the same kind of reduced economic risks in marrying and remarrying as middle-class women have.

Although many of these studies have been prepared specifically for our national leaders, welfare proposals and programs still ignore the relationship between the underemployment and the unemployment rates of ghetto men on one hand, and the numbers of women and children on welfare on the other. Even the latest welfare proposals unfortunately offer only punitive measures designed to force welfare mothers (not the fathers of welfare children) to work. This approach contradicts much of what we know about work and welfare: 1) we don't have to force people to work—almost all people will choose to work because of its economic, social, and psychological rewards; 2) welfare mothers are already working—they are taking care of their children; 3) to forcibly remove the mother from a home where the father is already absent is to invite further costs to society in delinquency, crime, drug abuse, and remedial education; and 4) the lower-class ethic calls for the man to support his wife and children—and any other arrangement is cause for the disintegration of the family bond.

Because of these facts, *Work in America* called for increased employment opportunities for the fathers of children who are on welfare (men who probably are not on the welfare rolls themselves) as the long-range solution to the "welfare mess." In effect, we offered an indirect, macro-economic solution instead of a direct, transfer payment solution contingent upon mothers taking jobs in the secondary labor market.

In conclusion, I urge this subcommittee to create a federal work and welfare strategy that will aim at creating jobs for all who want to work. There is plenty of work that needs to be done in our nation, we need only

create the jobs to do it.

In *Work in America* we suggested that the jobs can be created in the private sector, that they can be good jobs, and that anti-inflationary measures can be taken at the same time.

The existence of a job will be sufficient in most cases to get people to work—the importance of work to life obviates the need for compulsion. There will remain some for whom the availability of work is not enough—they will need training. Again, motivation not coercion should be sufficient to bring people into training programs. Finally, there will remain those who cannot work (for physical reasons) and those who choose to care for their young instead of taking jobs, and these people will require maintenance assistance. This three-pronged federal work strategy establishes the primacy of employment policies and leaves income maintenance as a truly residual category—a fallback for family support.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

I wish to acknowledge the contributions of *Work in America* task force members William Herman, Harold Richman and Elliot Liebow to the chapter on "Federal Work Strategies" that follows. Liebow is the primary author of the last section on "Work and Welfare." The excerpt is from *Work in America* M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, 1973.

The chapters on education and work are from a draft of a report on a series of workshops held this summer at the Aspen Institute, Aspen, Colorado. I wish to acknowledge the contributions of Martin Kaplan, John Sunderland and William Harrison to the report. The workshops were sponsored by the Aspen Institute, the Educational Testing Service, the Institute for Educational Development and the Academy for Contemporary Problems.

Further documentation will soon be available in the form of a collection of papers commissioned by the *Work in America* task force. This book (James O'Toole, ed. *Work and the Quality of Life*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge 1974) will contain the following relevant selections on work and welfare: Frank Furstenberg "Work Experience and Family Life," Lee Rainwater "Work, Well-Being and Family Life," Thomas Thomas "Work and Welfare."

September 28, 1973

HEARINGS ON "AMERICAN FAMILIES: TRENDS AND PRESSURES"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this week the Subcommittee on Children and Youth, which I chair, has been holding overview hearings on "American Families: Trends and Pressures."

During these hearings we have received extremely valuable testimony from a variety of individuals and groups concerning the needs of families and children in America, the extent to which governmental policies are helping or hurting families, and what kinds of support systems should be available.

In order that these recommendations be available to the Congress and to the public, I ask unanimous consent that the prepared statements of the witnesses who appeared at the second day of our hearings be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. MARGARET MEAD

I wish to congratulate Senator Mondale on his forward-looking recognition of the changes that are going on in the United States and the overriding importance of the well-being of the American Family.

Our people are in a parlous state; millions are undernourished, three million drop step children roam the country with no one responsible for them, our small fragile defenseless families are breaking up, lacking support, or protection from neighbor, kin, community or the nation, our old people are ending their lives in squalor and misery. Those on whom a country must rely for its well being, the hundreds of thousands professionally engaged in caring for and teaching children, helping families, finding meaningful career paths for youth, and giving meaning to the life of the elderly, are in despair. They have watched us steadily deteriorate from a people who came out of the Depression and World War II more determined than we had ever been that no child would ever go hungry, no sick person unattended, no youth without someone accountable, no working father unable to care for his children, no abandoned mother with no way of caring for her children while she worked, no grandparent left with empty hands. Beginning with the Depression the nation had steadily assumed responsibility

for every man, woman and child, within our borders.

And for twenty-five years we have watched ourselves sliding into a pit of deterioration, corruption, apathy, indifference and outright brutality towards the weak, the sick, the young and the poor.

But as more children went hungry, more old people uncared for, more families broke up, there were also thousands of efforts, at local, state and federal level to do something about our cities falling into ruins that breed crime and misery, our alienated young people, our disappointed minorities, our rural poor. Each new effort brought hope that some solutions would be found. But the efforts at amelioration often made matters worse, raised expectations that could not be fulfilled, cancelled each other out. We looked back on the great reform efforts of the early quarter of this century and watched them go sour, as children's detention homes, meant to rescue children from prisons, proved training grounds for crime, as junior high schools meant to relieve the pressure of mammoth senior high schools instead isolated together children least fitted to be together, and as the move of parents to the suburbs—for their children's sake—ended in the destruction of the city and the loneliness of the suburbs where friendless young mothers went into post partum psychosis, and the children of the affluent took to drugs and petty thrill-producing crime.

Whether the efforts came from small communities or from federal initiative, they bred both hope and despair, for there was still a sense that something was happening, that there might be now towns that were communities, schools where children were not placed on a single ladder where all who did not fit were branded as failures, efforts to recompense the culturally disadvantaged for homes where no one had time to talk to them.

Then came 1973, and we saw the whole system of Federal provision for people, for people who were poor, or unfortunate, for children and young families and the lonely, old, impoverished being dismantled almost overnight. And the dismantling had echoes within every matching state and local program, compound of uncertainty about what revenue sharing meant, and inability to deal with the results of inflation. Welfare limits were raised. Before all the children who should have had school lunches ever got them, recent cuts will reduce the rolls of hungry children—it is estimated—by 800,000. Hundreds of thousands of eager workers, who have been recruited in the new belief in community participation and para-professionals, have lost their jobs. Students who had planned to go to college find no way to go. And families, families that are absolutely crucial to the health of the nation, crumble under burdens too great to bear; housing programs that force men to desert their wives so their children won't go hungry, welfare that degrades, prisons filled with those who have never been found guilty but cannot furnish bail, while money and research goes not to new ways of finding unpolluting energy for our homes, but to more rapid ways of devastating our landscape, not to a better understanding of children but to better ways of suppressing the symptoms of despair which our policies have evoked, by training more police and providing new methods of surveillance.

The country is in terrible disarray. Richest and strongest of nations we may be, but we seem to have lost any concern for those who are young or weak, old or poor.

Out of this debacle there must come something new, some new recognition of how we can strengthen and support our families, rebuild our communities, bring the old people back into the community to be useful and warm to the young, provide many kinds of education instead of only one, stop giving priority to miles and miles of cement above the well being and safety of our children.

It will not be enough to humanize the new "Federalism," to invoke help in the courts to get us back where we were before the dismantling began, before more babies began to die, and old people gasp and choke to death with our polluted cities. Because where we were was not good enough; where we were very ill befitted our wealth. Our steadily rising GNP dimly matched our steadily rising rate of meaningless imprisonments for the young and the poor, the black and the brown, steadily rising divorce, steadily rising number of children irretrievably and irreversibly mired by malnutrition in infancy.

Out of the depths into which our Nation concern for people has sunk, we may now begin to face a need that has been recognized for a quarter of a century, but for which we may now be ready, the need as Dr. Zigler expressed it yesterday, for an overall policy on the family, the need for some kind of family well being impact statement.

In 1944, I visited an exhibition of new well designed kitchen equipment, highly approved and backed by the Home Economic Departments. But within these white and convenient fixtures there was no place for a baby, nowhere to hang it up, sit it, or let it lie down. I asked why and the answer was revealing. "Because there is no Bureau

of Family Life within the United States Department of Agriculture." And so, there was no place for the baby. Unless there is a central spot from which the well being of the family, the impact on the family of every piece of legislation every program . . . there will indeed be no place for the baby—neither in federal programs, now in the concern of the nation. Such a statement of the impact of federal legislation and programs on the well being of the American family would have enormous consequences. On the one hand, we could look at things like urban renewal that breaks up communities and makes thousands homeless, at freeways that cut communities in half and leave once happy homes abandoned and burning, tax laws which bear unfairly on young families and on women who have to work, provisions for medical care that tangle the elderly and less educated up in bundles of red tape. And we would look also at the benevolent legislation—when such legislation is revived—to evaluate whether we had not been taking too many children out of their homes into institutions, rather than providing support for frantic, desperate families from which adolescents run away, and within which little children are abused. We can now take into account both the dreadful consequences of valuing balancing a budget more than caring for people and cutting services to human beings to save funds for oil subsidies, strip mining, more and more deadly weapons. And we can take account of criticisms which have been leveled against our schools, our hospitals, our housing programs, our youth hostels, our rehabilitation centers, our half way houses, our day care centers. While things seemed to be going in the right direction, those who cared deeply for the fate of the mothers and infants were loathe to attack many practices which they felt were undesirable. But now, when hope is almost dead, we need not be afraid that criticism will damage the dying programs. Instead we can start to plan in a much more coherent and responsible way, placing the family and its needs at the center, scrutinizing every kind of legislation, every kind of program for what it will mean to the well being of the family.

We can ask, is there anything about this proposal that will force young people to marry too early or prevent them from marrying at all, that will hinder their finding a home in which to raise their children, that will help or hinder each young man who wants to learn to do some kind of work, that will penalize or help a working woman left with the care of her children, that will help or hinder early diagnosis of handicap, that will provide or reduce the possibility for every child's adequate nutrition, that will create, or destroy, communities within which families can be given support and help, that will mean better schools, more diversified schools, or schools which force all children into the same mold. We can start now to develop a national policy on the family which will be far better than anything that we as a nation have ever done—knowing that as the family goes, so goes the nation.

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

(By Urie Bronfenbrenner, Professor Human Development and Family Studies and Psychology, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.)

SEPTEMBER 25, 1973.

Mr. Chairman, two years ago, at the first hearings conducted by this Subcommittee, I presented evidence of what I viewed as a disturbing trend in the position and prospects of the American family and its children. I then went on to speak with some optimism of policies and programs—some already in force, others clearly on the horizon—which could counteract the trend, and perhaps even reverse it.

I appear before you today a more sober man. The disturbing trend to which I called the Committee's attention has increased, and so has the evidence for its course and its consequences. But I can claim poor credit as a prophet, for the policies and programs that I saw on the horizon have turned out to be not a rising sun, but a falling star, barely perceptible by its now cold, reflected light.

I speak today, perhaps not with optimism, but yet with hope. For as we have gained more knowledge about our growing problems, we have learned more as well about their possible solution. Some of these solutions lie within the purview of the Federal government, not only directly through its legislative and executive powers, but also indirectly through its influence as a voice of national leadership and, I would add, by example, as the nation's top employer and administrator.

But first, I will speak to the broader issue to which these hearings are addressed: trends and pressures affecting American families.

The winds of change

The most important fact about the American family today is the fact of rapid and radical change. The American family of 1973 is significantly different from what it was only a quarter of a century ago. Witness the following statistics:

In 1971, 43 percent of the nation's mothers worked outside the home. In 1948, the figure was only 18 percent. The greatest increase has occurred for mothers of preschool children. One in every three mothers with children under six is working today. In 1948 the figure was one in eight. Now there are more than 5,600,000 children under six whose mothers are in the labor force. This figure represents over a quarter of all the nation's children under six years of age.

As more mothers go to work, the number of other adults in the family who could care for the child has shown a marked decrease. For example, fifty years ago in the state of Massachusetts, 50 percent of the households included at least one other adult besides the parent. Today the figure is only 4 percent.

The divorce rate among families with children has been rising substantially during the last twenty years. The percent of children from divorced families is almost double what it was a decade ago. If present rates continue, one child in six will lose a parent through divorce by the time he is 18.

In 1970, 10 percent of all children under six—2.2 million of them—were living in single parent families with no father present in the home. This is almost double the rate for a decade ago. Moreover, almost half of the mothers in single parent families are now in the labor force, and a third of them are working full-time.

In 1970, the average income for a single-parent family with children under six was \$3100—well below the poverty line. Even when the mother worked, her average income of \$4200 barely exceeded the poverty level. Among families in poverty, 45 percent of all children under six are living in single-parent households; in non-poverty families, the corresponding figure is only 3.5 percent.

Of the 5.6 million preschool children whose mothers are in the labor force, one million live in families below the poverty line (e.g. income below \$4000 for a family of four). An additional one million children of working mothers live in near poverty (income between \$4000 and \$7000 for a family of four). All of these children would have to be on welfare if the mother did not work. Finally there are about 2.5 million children under six whose mothers do not work, but where family income is below the poverty level. Without counting the many thousands of children in families above the poverty line who are in need of child care services, this makes a total of about 4.5 million children under six whose families need some help if normal family life is to be sustained.

The situation is especially critical for the families of Black Americans:

Of all Black children, over half (53 percent) live in families below the poverty line, the corresponding figure for Whites is 11 percent.

Of all Black children, almost half (44 percent) have mothers who are in the labor force; the corresponding figure for Whites is about a quarter (26 percent).

Of all Black children, over 30 percent live in single-parent families; the corresponding figure for Whites is 7 percent.

The census does not provide comparable information for other groups living under duress, such as American Indians, Mexican Americans, Whites living in Appalachia, etc. If and when such data become available, they are likely to show similar trends.

Among families that are intact and well-off economically, and, of course, predominately White, research results indicate that parents are spending less time in activity with their children.

For example, a survey of changes in child-rearing practices in the United States over a 25-year period reveals a decrease in all spheres of interaction between parent and child. A similar trend is indicated by data from cross-cultural studies comparing American families with their European counterparts. Thus in a comparative study of socialization practices among German and American parents, the former emerged as significantly more involved in activities with their children, including both affection and discipline. A second study, conducted several years later, showed changes over time in both cultures reflecting "a trend toward the dissolution of the family as a social system," with Germany moving closer to the American pattern of "centrifugal forces pulling the members into relationships outside the family." (Rodgers, 1971)

THE ECOLOGY OF FAMILY AND CHILD

Although the nature and operation of these centrifugal forces have not been studied systematically, they are readily apparent to observers of the American scene. The following excerpt from the report of the President's White House Conference on Children summarizes the situation as seen by a group of experts, including both scientists and practitioners.

In today's world parents find themselves at the mercy of a society which imposes pressures and priorities that allow neither time nor place for meaningful activities and relations between children and adults, which downgrade the role of parents and the functions of parenthood, and which prevent the parent from doing things he wants to do as a guide, friend, and companion to his children . . .

9

The frustrations are greatest for the family of poverty where the capacity for human response is crippled by hunger, cold, filth, sickness, and despair. For families who can get along, the rats are gone, but the rat-race remains. The demands of a job, or often two jobs, that claim mealtimes, evenings, and weekends as well as days; the trips and moves necessary to get ahead or simply hold one's own; the ever increasing time spent in commuting, parties, evenings out, social and community obligations—all the things one has to do to meet so-called primary responsibilities—produce a situation in which a child often spends more time with a passive babysitter than a participating parent. (Report to the President, 1970, p. 242)

The forces undermining the parental role are particularly strong in the case of fathers. For example, although in one interview study of middle class families fathers reported spending an average of 15 to 20 minutes a day playing with their one year old infants (Ban and Lewis 1971), an observational research revealed a rather different story:

The data indicate that fathers spend relatively little time interacting with their infants. The mean number of interactions per day was 2.7, and the average number of seconds per day was 37.7. (Rebelsky and Hanks, 1971, page 65)

Another factor reducing interaction between parents and children is the changing physical environment in the home. For example, a brochure recently received in the mail describes a "cognition crib" equipped with a tape recorder than can be activated by the sound of the infant's voice. In addition, frames built into the sides of the crib permit insertion of "programmed play modules for sensory and physical practice." The modules come in sets of six, which the parent is "encouraged to change" every three months so as to keep pace with the child's development. Since "faces are what an infant sees first, six soft plastic faces . . . adhere to the window." Other modules include mobiles, a crib aquarium, a piggy bank and "ego building mirrors." Parents are hardly mentioned except as potential purchasers.

Although no systematic evidence is available, there are indications that a withdrawal of adults from the lives of children is also occurring outside the home. To quote again from the report of the White House Conference:

In our modern way of life, it is not only parents of whom children are deprived, it is people in general. A host of factors conspire to isolate children from the rest of society. The fragmentation of the extended family, the separation of residential and business areas, the disappearance of neighborhoods, zoning ordinances, occupational mobility, child labor laws, the abolishment of the apprentice system, consolidated schools, television, separate patterns of social life for different age groups, the working mother, the delegation of child care to specialists—all these manifestations of progress operate to decrease opportunity and incentive for meaningful contact between children and persons older, or younger, than themselves. (Report of Forum 15, page 2)

This erosion of the social fabric isolates not only the child but also his family. In particular, with the breakdown of community, neighborhood, and the extended family, and the rise in the number of father-absent homes, increasingly greater responsibility has fallen on the young mother. In some segments of the society, the resulting pressures appear to be mounting beyond the point of endurance. For example, the growing number of divorces is now accompanied by a new phenomenon: the unwillingness of either parent to take custody of the child. And in more and more families, the woman is fleeing without waiting for the mechanism of a legal or even agreed upon separation. Increasing numbers of married women are being reported to police departments as missing. Although no national statistics are available, news media have reported a "quantum leap" in the number of runaway wives whom private detectives are hired to retrieve by the fathers who are left with the children.

Systematic data are at hand, however, to document an increase in a more gruesome trend.

The killing of infants under 1 year of age—infanticide—has been increasing since 1957. Although the number of infant homicides accounted for only 2.2 percent of the total homicides in 1964, the rate of 5.4 deaths per 100,000 population was higher than that for all persons aged 55 years and over. The 74 percent increase from 3.1 in 1957 placed infanticide in 1964 at the highest level recorded since 1945. (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967.)

This increase may, of course, be partly due to more accurate registration; no tests of the extent of underreporting of this cause of death have been made. It should be noted that the rate of increase of such deaths is significantly greater than for all other age groups.

A similar pattern appears for less violent forms of child abuse involving bodily injury. A recent survey of over 1300 families (Gil 1970) estimated 2 to 4 million cases a year, with the highest rates occurring for the adolescent age group. More significantly, over 90 percent of the incidents took place in the child's home. The most severe injuries occurred in single parent homes and were inflicted by the mother herself, a fact which reflects the desperation of the situation faced by some young mothers today.

Even in intact families the centrifugal forces generated within the family by its increasingly isolated position have propelled its members in different directions. As parents, especially mothers, spend more time in work and community activities, children are placed in or gravitate to group settings, both organized and informal. For example, between 1965 and 1970 the number of children enrolled in day care centers doubled, and the demand today far exceeds the supply. Outside preschool or school, the child spends increasing amounts of time solely in the company of his age mates. The vacuum created by the withdrawal of parents and other adults has been filled by the informal peer group. A recent study has found that at every age and grade level, children today show a greater dependency on their peers than they did a decade ago. A parallel investigation indicates that such susceptibility to group influence is higher among children from homes in which one or both parents are frequently absent. In addition, "peer oriented" youngsters describe their parents as less affectionate and less firm in discipline. Attachment to age-mates appears to be influenced more by a lack of attention and concern at home than by any positive attraction of the peer group itself. In fact, these children have a rather negative view of their friends and of themselves as well. They are pessimistic about the future, rate lower in responsibility and leadership, and are more likely to engage in such anti-social behavior as lying, teasing other children, "playing hooky," or "doing something illegal." (Siman 1973.)

The roots of alienation

What we are seeing here, of course, are the roots of alienation and its milder consequences. The more serious manifestations are reflected in the rising rates of youthful runaways, school drop-outs, drug abuse, suicide, delinquency, vandalism, and violence documented in charts and tables specially prepared for the White House Conference on Children (Profiles of Children, pp. 78, 79, 108, 179, 180) and more recent government publications (Report of the New York State Commission, 1973). According to these data the proportion of youngsters between the ages of 10 and 18 arrested for drug abuse doubled between 1964 and 1968; since 1963, juvenile delinquency has been increasing at a faster rate than the juvenile population; over half the crimes involve vandalism, theft, or breaking and entry; and, if the present trends continue, one out of every nine youngsters will appear in juvenile court before age 18. These figures index only detected and prosecuted offenses. How high must they run before we acknowledge that they reflect deep and pervasive problems in the treatment of children and youth in our society?

What is the ultimate source of these deep and pervasive problems? Where do the roots of alienation lie? Scientific studies of human behavior have yielded few generalizations that are firmly grounded in research and broadly accepted by specialists in the field. But there are two answers to the foregoing questions that do meet these exacting criteria. Moreover, the two conclusions are directly relevant to the concerns of this Committee.

1. Over the past three decades, there have been literally thousands of investigations conducted to identify the developmental antecedents of behavior disorders and social pathology. The results of these researches point to the almost omnipresent overriding factor—family disorganization.

2. Many of these same researches also reveal that the forces of disorganization arise primarily not from within the family itself, but from the circumstances in which the family finds itself and the way of life which these circumstances, in turn, impose.

Specifically, when these circumstances, and the way of life which they generate, undermine relationships of trust and emotional security between the family members, when there is no support or recognition from the outside world for one's role as a parent, and when time spent with one's family means frustration of career, personal fulfillment, and peace of mind—it is then that the development of the child becomes adversely affected. The first symptoms occur in the emotional and motivational sphere and are manifested in disaffection, indifference, irresponsibility, and inability to follow through in activities requiring application and persistence. In less favorable family circumstances, the reaction takes the form of anti-social acts injurious to both self and society.

Finally, for children who come from environments in which the capacity of the family to function has been most severely traumatized by such destructive forces as poverty, ill health, and discrimination, the consequences for the child are seen not only in the spheres of emotional and social maladjustment, but also in the impairment of that most distinctive human capacity—the ability to think, to deal with concepts and numbers even at the most elementary level. The extent of this impairment in contemporary American society, and its roots in social disorganization, are reflected in recent studies conducted at national and state levels. Two reports from the National Health Survey describe intellectual development and school achievement as a function of demographic and socioeconomic factors in a probability sample of over 7000 children 6-11 years of age. Differences were assessed across region, race, size of place of residence, degree of educational mobility, income, and parents' education. Although substantial variation was found across each of these domains, the most powerful predictors of school achievement were parental education and income.

Proficiency in two skills—reading and arithmetic—was most strongly associated with educational level of the children's parents and nearly as closely with their family income. These relationships are both substantially greater than that found with race. If the racial and regional influences are removed, the degree of association of school factors is reduced only slightly. (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 1971, page 26.)

Confirmatory results are available from a New York State survey. In a study of over 300 schools, 58% of the variation in student achievement was predicted by three socioeconomic factors—broken homes, overcrowded housing, and education of the head of the household . . . When the racial and ethnic variables were introduced into the analysis, they accounted for less than an additional 2 percent of the variation. (New York State Commission on the Quality of Education, Vol. 1, p. 33.)

And there is a secular trend. One of the most striking phenomena in the achievement score data is that over time more and more children throughout the state are falling below minimum competence. (Idem.)

How are we to reverse this debilitating trend? Again, the evidence indicates that the most promising solutions do not lie within the immediate setting in which the child is found, in this instance, the classroom, the school. An impressive series of studies, notably the studies by Coleman and more recently by Jencks (1972) demonstrate that characteristics of schools of classrooms, and even of teachers predict very little of the variation in school achievements. What does predict are family background characteristics, particularly those which reflect the position of the family in relation to the larger social contexts in which it is embedded—the world of work (e.g., occupation, income), neighborhood and community.

The crucial question thus becomes: can our social institutions be changed, can old ones be modified and new ones introduced in such a way as to rebuild and revitalize the social context which families and children require for their effective function and growth?

A proved strategy for conserving human potential

Mr. Chairman, as my first answer to this question, I ask your indulgence to repeat a statement I made to this subcommittee two years ago. At that time I testified as follows:

"We now have the knowledge and the know-how to increase significantly the ability and competence of the next generation of children to be born in this country.

"We know what is needed, we know how it can be done. All that remains is to do the job. At least a dozen nations are doing the job better than we do it now." (Hearings, Subcommittee on Children and Youth, 1971.)

What I can add today, Mr. Chairman, is that we in America not only have the know-how, we have now applied it, and know that it works effectively and on a massive scale. We tried, we succeeded, and, just as we were beginning to avert tragedy for thousands of American families, the effort was abandoned—precisely at the level with which these hearings are concerned—Federal policy and Federal action.

I know the members of this subcommittee are well aware of the problem to which I refer, but perhaps not of the evidence for its practical solution. America, the richest and most powerful country in the world, stands thirteenth among the nations in combating infant mortality; even East Germany does better. Moreover, our ranking has dropped steadily in recent decades. A similar situation obtains with respect to maternal and child health, day care, children's allowances, and other basic services to children and families.

But the figures for the nation as a whole, dismaying as they are, mask even greater inequities. For example, infant mortality for

nonwhites in the United States is almost twice that for whites, the maternal death rate is four times as high, and there are a number of southern states, and northern metropolitan areas, in which the ratios are considerably higher. Among New York City health districts, for example, the infant mortality rate in 1966-67 varied from 41.5 per 1000 in Central Harlem to 13 per 1000 in Haspeth, Forest Hills.

Ironically, of greater cost to the society than infants who die are the many more who sustain injury but survive with disability. Many of these suffer impaired intellectual function and behavioral disturbance including hyperactivity, distractibility, and low attention span, all factors contributing to school retardation and problem behavior. Again, the destructive impact is greatest on the poorest segments of the population. It is all the more tragic that this massive damage and its subsequent cost in reduced productivity, lower income, unemployability, welfare payments, and institutionalization are avoidable.

The way to the solution is suggested by a paradox that emerges when the medical data are analyzed in the socio-economic terms. The relation between birth complications and subsequent impairment of psychological development is indeed substantial for families in poverty, but is much smaller for middle-class samples. The analyses show further that the same prenatal complication has substantially more serious sequelae for a child born in a low income family than a middle income family. In other words, the consequences of prenatal injury depend less on the injury itself than on the treatment the child receives. And the treatment in turn depends on the circumstances in which the family live.

This same sequence is reflected by the results of the two-stage analysis carried out by Dr. Harold Watts for the Advisory Committee on Child Development of the National Academy of Sciences. First, Watts demonstrated that 92% of the variation in infant death among the 30 New York City health districts is explainable by low birth weight. Second, he showed that 97% of the variation in low birth weight can be attributed to the fraction of mothers who received no prenatal care or received care only late in their pregnancy, and the fraction unwed at the time of delivery.

Confirmatory evidence is available from an important and elegant study, published just this year, on the relations between infant mortality, social and medical risk, and health care (Kessner et al. 1973). From an analysis of data in 140,000 births in New York City, the investigators found the following:

1. The highest rate of infant mortality was for children of Black native-born women at social and medical risk and with inadequate health care. This rate was 45 times higher than that for a group of White mothers at no risk with adequate care. Next in line were Puerto Rican infants with a rate 22 times as high.
2. Among mothers receiving adequate medical care, there was essentially no difference in mortality among White, Black, and Puerto Rican groups, even for mothers at high medical risk.
3. For mothers at socio-economic risk, however, adequate medical care substantially reduced infant mortality rates for all races, but the figures for Black and Puerto Rican families were still substantially greater than those for Whites. In other words, other factors besides inadequate medical care contribute to producing the higher infant mortality for these non-white groups. Again these factors have to do with the social and economic conditions in which these families have to live. Thus, the results of the New York City study and other investigations point to the following characteristics as predictive of higher infant mortality: employment status of the breadwinner, mother unwed at infant's birth, married but no father in the home, number of children per room, mother under 20 or over 35, and parents' educational level.
4. Approximately 95% of those mothers at risk had medical or social conditions that could have been identified at the time of the first prenatal visit; infants born to this group of women accounted for 70% of the deaths.

What would have happened had these conditions been identified and adequate medical care provided? The answer to this question has recently become available from an analysis of data from the Maternal and Infant Care Projects of HEW which, in the middle 60's, were established in slum areas of fourteen cities across the nation and in Puerto Rico. In Denver, a dramatic fall in infant mortality from 34.2 per 1,000 live births in 1964 to 21.5 per 1,000 in 1969 was observed for the 25 census tracts that made up the target area for such a program. In Birmingham, Alabama, the rate decreased from 25.4 in 1965 to 14.3 in 1969, and in Omaha from 33.4 in 1964 to 13.4 in 1969. Significant reductions have also occurred over the populations served by these programs in prematurely repeated teenage pregnancy, women who conceive over 35 years old, and families with more than four children.

Mr. Chairman, It is because of our distorted priorities that these programs are currently being dismantled, even though the proposed replacement of support through revenue sharing is not even visible on the horizon. As the statistics I have cited indicate, phasing out these programs with nothing to take their place will result in a return of mortality rates to their earlier higher levels. To speak in human rather than purely statistical terms, more babies will die, and more mothers as well.

IS EARLY INTERVENTION EFFECTIVE?

New information is available as well in a second problem area substantially affected by Federal policy. In connection with my work as a member of the MRC-MAS Advisory Committee on Child Development, I had the responsibility of preparing a report evaluating the effectiveness of so-called intervention programs that have been conducted with thousands of preschool children over the past decade (Bronfenbrenner 1973). As the Committee knows, these programs were introduced in an effort to counteract the destructive impact of poverty on the development of the young. In a number of instances, children were followed-up for three to five years after completion of intervention in order to assess long-range effects. The scientific interest of these studies is enhanced by the fact they employed strategies varying in the degree to which they involved the child alone, solely his parents, or some combination of both. Specifically, four types of intervention were examined:

1. *Parent education.* Here the immediate and direct focus of attention was the parent, usually the mother. The program typically took the form of a lecture or discussion, usually accompanied by printed materials. Also included were parent education efforts presented entirely via mass media (press, radio or television).
 2. *Group preschool programs.* The target of intervention was the child in a group setting, with a ratio of at least four children to one adult.
 3. *Home-based tutoring.* A tutor visited the child in his home on an individual basis.
 4. *Parent-child intervention.* This approach involved working with parent and child simultaneously, usually in the home.
- Each of these approaches was evaluated for its influence on the child's cognitive development. From this perspective, one strategy—that of parent education—proved generally ineffective. There was no evidence that informational programs directed solely at the parent had any appreciable impact on the child's intellectual function or academic performance.

Both group programs and home tutoring produced gains in cognitive development (as measured by intelligence and achievement tests), but the effects were temporary only. By the first or second year after completion of the program, sometimes while it was still in operation, the children began to show a progressive decline and, by the third or fourth year, the once-substantial differences between experimental and control groups became negligible or nonexistent. In contrast, parent-child intervention produced substantial improvements in intellectual function which were still evident three to four years after termination of the program. In addition, beneficial effects were observed not only in the target child but also his younger siblings.

An analysis of research on conditions underlying impairment of development and failure of intervention efforts with particular individuals or groups led to a general conclusion with important policy implications: Any force or circumstance which interferes with the formation, maintenance, status, or continuing development of the parent-child system in turn jeopardizes the development of the child.

Such destructive forces may be of two kinds. The first and most damaging are externally imposed constraints, such as inadequate health care, poor housing, lack of education, low income, and, under certain circumstances, the necessity for full-time work, all factors which prevent the parents from doing what they might be quite able and willing to do given the opportunity and the knowledge. Second, there are social forces and educational arrangements that diminish the status and motivation of parents as the most powerful potential agents for the development of their child.

Evidence in support of these conclusions comes from several sources:

1. The children who showed the greatest initial impairment of psychological development were those from the most deprived social and economic backgrounds. Especially relevant in this regard were such variables as the employment status of the head of the household, the number of children in the family, the level of parent's income and education, and the presence of only one parent in the home.
2. The children from these same backgrounds were also those who profited least from intervention programs provided for them, and showed the earliest and most rapid decline. Conversely, children benefitting most compensatory effects were those who came from the least deprived social and economic conditions.

3. The success of intervention efforts was positively correlated with the degree to which parents were accorded high status and actively involved in the program. When primary responsibility for the child's development was assumed by professionals and the parent relegated to a secondary role, the intervention was less effective, particularly with respect to long-term effects.

4. Although group programs per se did not have lasting impact, exposure to parent intervention during, and especially prior to, enrollment in preschool or school resulted in greater and more enduring gains achieved in the group setting.

5. Families willing to become involved in intervention programs tended to come from the upper levels of the disadvantaged population. At the most deprived levels, parents were so overburdened with the tasks and frustrations of sheer survival that they had neither the energy nor the psychological resources necessary to participate in an intervention program designed to benefit their children.

The foregoing findings indicate that for children from the most deprived environments no strategy of intervention is likely to be effective that focuses attention solely on the child, the preschool, or the parent-child relationship. The critical forces of destruction lie neither within the child nor within the family but in the desperate circumstances in which the family is forced to live. Accordingly, what is called for is intervention at the ecological level, measures that will effect radical changes in the immediate environment of the family and the child. Such measures include provision of health services, adequate housing opportunity for employment, and an income sufficient to sustain life and growth. It is significant that the H.R.C. Committee could find no research bearing on the effects of ecological intervention of this kind on the development of children. It is conceivable that a program which provides the family breadwinner with a job, guarantees an adequate income, supplies needed nutrition and health services, or furnishes better housing, may produce greater and more enduring gains in cognitive development than are presently achieved by strategies directly aimed at this objective. We do not know whether this is so, but could easily find out simply by adding well designed research components to a number or existing Federal, state, or local programs.

The studies I have been discussing document the importance of what I have called family support systems for increasing the development in the preschool years. What about the school-age child? Does the family, and its supportive systems, still play the critical role in the child's development?

Breaking down the wall between home and school

I believe it significant that in review of research, I was able to find only one study that examined the relation of parent involvement to the child's learning in school. The project, carried out in Flint, Michigan, involved approximately 1000 children from low-income families, most of them Black, attending two public elementary schools (Smith 1968). Children of similar socio-economic background in another elementary school were selected as a control group. The effort involved parents in activities both at home and in the school.

On the home front, parents, including fathers, were requested to read aloud to their children, listen to their children read, read regularly themselves in the presence of their children, show interest by looking at the child's work, and give encouragement and praise as needed and deserved. In addition, parents were asked to provide a quiet period in the home for reading and study. During this time the television or radio was to be turned off, telephone callers were asked to phone back later. Parents were requested to occupy the attention of younger children. The parents were not asked to help the child with homework; instead, they were informed that the teacher would be checking with them on whether the child did his work rather than how well the task was done. "Every child could therefore be successful, provided that his parents were giving the needed support at home." (Smith 1968, p. 97.) A children's dictionary was also made available to each family with a child in grades four through six. Families were asked to write their names in the dictionary and encourage its use. Many other innovations were introduced to provide support in the home for the child's activities at school.

The program also brought the parents into the school. This was accomplished by a group of thirty volunteer mothers who assigned themselves specific blocks in the school district and made a personal call on every family inviting the parents to a program "to learn what they could do to help their children achieve better in school." (Smith 1968, p. 95.) In addition, parents and other residents of the neighborhood who held skilled jobs were asked to visit classrooms in order to explain their work and to indicate how "elementary school subjects had been important to them in their lives." (Smith 1968, p. 102.)

The results of the program are reflected by the gains in achievement test scores in

reading made during the year by the experimental groups. For the first time in their school career, the children attained and, in some grades, surpassed the national norms.

Real children and families in the school curriculum

The relation between family and school has significance in yet another quarter. It is a commonplace among educators to affirm that the task of the school is to prepare the child "for life". Yet there is one role in life which the overwhelming majority of all children ultimately take, but for which they are given virtually no concrete preparation. I am referring, of course, to education for parenthood. In our cross-cultural observations we

were struck by the differences between American children and adolescents and those from other societies in the ease with which they could relate to infants and young children, engage their interest, and enjoy their company. This reflects the fact that with the important exceptions of certain minority groups, including Blacks—many young people, especially males, never have experience in extended care and activity with a baby or young child until they have their own. A solution to this problem, which speaks as well to the need to give young people in our society genuine and consequential responsibility, is to introduce into the regular school curriculum functional courses in human development. These would be distinguished in a number of important ways from courses or units on "family life", as they are now usually taught in the junior high school, chiefly for girls who do not plan to go on to college. The material is typically presented in vicarious form; that is, through reading, discussion, or at most, through role playing, rather than actual role taking. In contrast, the approach being proposed here would have as its core responsible and active concern for the lives of young children and their families. Such an experience could be facilitated by locating day care centers and Head Start Programs in or near schools, so that they could be utilized as an integral part of the curriculum. The older children would be working with the younger ones on a regular basis, both at school and at home. They would thus have an opportunity to become acquainted with the younger children's families, and the circumstances in which they live. This in turn would provide a vitalizing context for the study of services and facilities available to children and families in the community, such as health care, social services, recreation facilities, and of course, the schools themselves. Obviously, the scope of responsibility would increase with the age of the child, but throughout there would have to be adequate supervision and clear delineation of the limits of responsibility carried by older children in relation to the young.

Critical contexts for the future of the American family

Health services and education are two of the many institutions which must serve as support systems for the family. Others include day care, the world of work, mass media, transportation, architecture, and urban planning. I have touched on most of these matters in testimony before this subcommittee two years ago. More recent developments in these areas are discussed in an article published last year, entitled "The Roots of Alienation", a copy of which I would be happy to submit as an addendum to this report. There are one or two aspects of these matters which because of their controversial or novel nature merit specific mention here. The first of these is day care.

Day care

Day care is coming to America. The question is: what kind? Shall we, in response to external pressures to "put people to work", or for personal considerations of convenience, allow a pattern to develop in which the care of young children is delegated to specialists, thus further separating the child from his family and reducing the family's and the community's feeling of responsibility for their children? Or, shall our modern day care be designed, as it can be, to reinvolve and strengthen the family as the primary and proper agent for the process of making human beings human?

The answers to these questions depend on the extent to which day care programs are so located and so organized as to encourage rather than to discourage the involvement of parents and other non-professionals in the development and operation of the program both at the center and in the home. Like Project Head Start, day care programs can have no lasting constructive impact on the development of the child unless they affect not only the child himself but the people who constitute his enduring day-to-day environment in the family, neighborhood, and community. This means not only that parents must play a prominent part in the planning and administration of day care programs, but

that they must also actively participate in the execution of the program as volunteers and aides. It means that the program cannot be confined to the center, but must reach out into the home and the community so that the whole neighborhood is caught up in activities in behalf of its children. From this point of view, we need to experiment in location of day care centers in places that are within reach of the significant people in the child's life. For some families this means neighborhood centers; for others, centers at the place of work. A great deal of variation and innovation will be required to find the appropriate solutions for different groups in different settings.

Fair Part-time Practices Act

In my previous testimony I presented a proposal for an act prohibiting discrimination against parents who sought or held part-time jobs. Today I should like to enter into the record the instructive experience of one state legislator who attempted to put through such a bill, the Honorable Constance Cook, Assemblywoman from New York. Mrs. Cook sent me a copy of her Bill as introduced in committee. It began "no employer shall set as a condition of employment, salary, promotion, fringe benefits, seniority, ..." etc. the condition that an employee who is parent or guardian of a child under 18 years of age shall be required to work more than "forty hours a week". Yes, Mr. Chairman, you heard me correctly—forty hours a week, which, of course, is full time. Mrs. Cook informed me that there was no hope of getting a bill through with a lower limit.

It turned out that even forty hours was too much. The bill failed of passage even in committee. The pressure from business and industry was too great. They wanted the right to require their employees to work overtime.

There is, however, a ray of hope. It is my understanding that a critical issue in the present strike against the Chrysler Corporation, and one on which the union is taking a strong position is precisely this question of compulsory overtime.

Families and neighborhoods

I should also like to enter into the record the results of a research conducted in Germany which sheds light on the influence of the neighborhood on the lives of children and families. The study compared the actions of children living in 18 new "model communities" with those from youngsters living in older German cities. The research was conducted by the Urban and Planning Institute in Nuremberg in collaboration with the Institute of Psychology at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. The following are excerpts from a special bulletin to the New York Times (May 9, 1971):

"In the new towns of West Germany, amid soaring rectangular shapes of apartment houses with shaded walks, big lawns and fenced-in play areas, the children for whom much of this has been designed apparently feel isolated, regimented and bored . . .

"The study finds that the children gauge their freedom not by the extent of open areas around them, but by the liberty they have to be among people and things that excite them and fire their imaginations . . .

"Children in the older cities seemed enthusiastic about their surroundings, painting a great amount of detail into a variety

of things they found exciting around them according to those who interpreted their art

"The children in the model communities often painted what were considered despairing pictures of the world the adults had fashioned for them, depicting an uninviting, concrete fortress of cleanliness and order and boredom."

The implications of the research are self evident. In the planning and design of new communities, housing projects, and urban renewal, the planners, both public and private, need to give explicit consideration to the kind of world that is being created for the children who will be growing up in these settings. Particular attention should be given to the opportunities which the environment presents or precludes for involvement of children with persons both older and younger than themselves. Among the specific factors to be considered are the location of shops and businesses where children could have contact with adults at work, recreational and day care facilities readily accessible to parents as well as children, provision for a family neighborhood center and family oriented facilities and services, availability of public transportation, and, perhaps most important of all, places to walk, sit, and talk in common company.

It is perhaps fitting to end discussion of this matter with a proposal for nothing more radical than providing a setting in which young and old can simply sit and talk. The fact that such settings are disappearing and have to be deliberately recreated points both to the roots of the problem and its remedy.

The evil and the cure, lie not with the victims of alienation but in the social institutions which produce it, and their failure to be responsive to the most human needs and values of our democratic society.

What are the implications of these kinds of considerations for the work of your committee? I offer my recommendations in the form of a document entitled the "American Family Act of 1974: Suggested Principles and Provisions". The date and the substance, Mr. Chairman, represent a compromise between desperation, realism, and hope.

THE AMERICAN FAMILY ACT OF 1974 SUGGESTED PRINCIPLES AND PROVISIONS

A. Principles

1. The family is the most humane, effective, and economical system of child care known to man. The first aim of any child care program, therefore, should be to strengthen the family and enable the parents to function as parents for their children. This can be best accomplished by providing a variety of support systems for the family in the home, neighborhood, place of work, and community.

2. All programs should be family-centered rather than merely child-centered. This means service to parents as well as to children, and opportunity for the involvement of parents in the planning and execution of programs both within and outside the home. Research results indicate that where programs have involved families as a whole there is greater likelihood of lasting effect beyond the duration of the program itself, with an impact not only on the target child but other children in the family as well. Also such programs tend to be more economical because of the greater participation of family members in the work of the program.

3. During the first six years of life, particularly during the first three, an enduring one-to-one relationship is especially important for the child's development. For this reason special encouragement should be given to arrangements which permit one of the two parents to work part-time. In particular, welfare eligibility requirements should not discriminate against families in which one or both parents are working part-time rather than full-time.

4. Many families today are unable to function effectively to meet the needs of their children because of circumstances beyond their control. The principal debilitating factor is poverty. Others include reduction of the family to only two adults, or, in many instances, only a single parent; the involvement of both parents in full-time jobs; working on different shifts; the social isolation of families—especially the mother—because of the breakdown of neighborhoods. Measures designed to alleviate these conditions can contribute to reenable parents to function more effectively. Hence such measures should become a part of any comprehensive child care program, especially because they are more economical in the long run.

5. In addition to the parents, other persons can play a significant role both in relation to the child himself and in providing support to those primarily engaged in his care, especially to the mother. The most important persons in this regard are other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, older brothers and sisters but also neighbors, friends, teachers, social workers, and other professionals. Finally, the research evidence also points to the powerful impact of older children on the development of the young. Therefore, both on psychological and economic grounds, an effective child care program should utilize and encourage the involvement of other adults and older children in the care of the young.

6. To be effective, programs must be comprehensive in nature not only in relation to the needs of the child but also those of his family in the areas of health, education, and social services. For example, the most effective and economical measure to insure the health of the child may often be to meet the health problems of his parents, or of other sick, handicapped, or aged family members who sap the parents' strength and resources.

7. Families live in widely differing circumstances. Any program of child care services must therefore supply a variety of options. In accordance with this principle, child care services should not be limited to group day care provided outside the home.

B. "Family Support Systems"

1. Revision of Welfare and Work Legislation

No single parent of young children should be forced to work full time or more to provide an income at or below the poverty line. The statement applies with equal force to families in which both parents are compelled to work full time or longer to maintain a minimal subsistence level. Under such circumstances, a parent wishing to do so should be enabled to remain at home for part of the day. The following measures could help

12

achieve this objective:

a. Welfare legislation should be amended so as to encourage rather than penalize low income parents, especially single parents, who wish to work only part-time in order to be able themselves to care for their own children.

b. To free parents in poverty from full-time employment so that one of them can care for the children. Federal and state programs should provide funds for part-time parental child care at home in lieu of wages.

c. There should be legal prohibition against unlimited compulsory overtime for parents with young children.

d. Federal or state legislatures should pass Fair Part-Time Employment Practices Acts prohibiting discrimination in job opportunity, rate of pay, seniority, fringe benefits and job status for parents who seek or are engaged in part-time employment.

2. Incentive Programs

a. Tax incentives should be extended to businesses and industries who set up family and child services for their employees such as day care programs, part-time work opportunities, flexible working hours, special programs designed to acquaint children and young people with the world of work, etc. In particular, employers should be encouraged through tax benefits to modify work schedules so as to enable parents to be home when their children return from preschool or school thus decreasing the need for baby-sitters during the child's waking hours or for "latchkey" arrangements for older children.

b. Special incentives should be provided for the development of neighborhood and community-wide programs benefiting families and children, especially on a non-age-segregated basis.

d. Incentives should be offered to groups responsible for the design of neighborhoods, housing projects, apartment complexes, churches, industrial sites, urban renewal projects, etc. to provide for the needs of children and families in the planning of these environments. For example, apartment complexes should incorporate day care facilities adapted for parent participation, large housing projects should be provided with a family neighborhood center.

e. Incentives should be offered to schools for introducing programs involving older children in responsibility for the young both within the school and in neighborhood settings (including the old and the sick, and also for the development of programs which bring members of the community in contact with school children so as to reduce the widening gap between the worlds of childhood and adolescence on the one hand, and the world of adults on the other.

3. Family Impact Assessment

Both Houses of Congress and analogous governmental bodies at state and local levels should change or establish committees to monitor all legislation or proposals coming before the body in question for possible impact in the welfare of families and children.

4. Homemaker Services

Many disadvantaged or single parents are unable to spend time in activities with their young children because of other demands in the home, such as care of old or sick relatives, meeting the needs of a large family, house-keeping under difficult conditions, etc. Local residents trained as homemakers, or high school students in special programs (see above) could take over some of these responsibilities during regular visits so that the parent could be free to engage in activities with the younger child.

5. Group Day Care

a. Day care eligibility should not be limited to parents engaged in full-time employment.

b. Some off-hour and around-the-clock day care should be available.

c. Some provisions should be made for the availability of emergency day care when parents are sick, incapacitated, or for other urgent reasons temporarily unable to provide adequate care for their children.

d. In the establishment of care programs, provision should be made for the involvement of other family members besides the parents such as adult relatives, and older children of the family.

6. Training Programs for Child Care Workers

These should be available for persons of all ages by including them in the curricula of high schools, adult education programs, community colleges, etc. They should incorporate as a regular feature voluntary child care services while in the period of training. This would make available large numbers of trained personnel at low cost for families who need such assistance.

7. Commissions for Children and Families

Federal encouragement should be given for the establishment of such commissions at the neighborhood or community level. They would have as their initial charge finding out what the community is doing for its children and their families. The commission would examine the adequacy of existing programs such as maternal and child health

services, family planning clinics, day care facilities, social service and recreational opportunities. They also would have the responsibility for looking at the entire community as an environment for children. Attention would be given not only to institutions and programs designed explicitly to serve families and children, but also to town planning, housing, traffic, entertainment, etc. from the point of view of meeting the needs of families and their children. The commission would be expected to report its findings and recommendations to appropriate executive bodies and to the public at large through the mass media. After completing the initial assessment phase, the commission would assume continued responsibility for developing and monitoring programs to implement its recommendations.

8. Research

Provision should be made for studies designed to assess the comparative effectiveness of specific strategies for furthering the development of children and families. Unlike the massive surveys employed to date, such investigations should focus on specific components of particular programs, rather than attempting an indiscriminate evaluation of many complex programs differing in content, clientele, and social setting.

9. A Family-Centered Employment Policy in the Federal Government

The Federal Government as an employer should be mandated to set an example by adopting, at least on an experimental basis, the policies and practices proposed in these recommendations.

Urgent actions

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there are two urgent steps that cannot wait for the passage of a bill in 1974. They must be taken now:

1. Reinstating and Expanding Material and Infant Care Services

In view of its urgency, a separate bill should be introduced in the Congress now to reestablish and expand the new material and infant care services and to mandate that the appropriated funds not be impounded by the Executive branch.

2. Verifying the Support of Family Programs on Revenue Sharing

Many vital federal programs for families and children have been dismantled by the present administration with the assurance that they would be "picked up" by states and local communities with support from revenue sharing. For the sake of the nation's children, it is essential that this process be monitored by an appropriate agency in the federal government, such as the office of Child Development, to identify any lapse in critical programs. An effort should then be mounted, by the Congress if necessary, to assure that the vital needs of families are being met.

Summary

Mr. Chairman, I should like to summarize with three statements:

1. The family is the most humane, efficient and economical system for making human beings human known to man.

2. With all its strength, the family cannot survive and function in a vacuum. It requires support from the neighborhood, from the world of work, and from social and political institutions at the local, state, and national level.

3. The future belongs to those nations that are prepared to make and fulfill a primary commitment to their families and their children. For, only in this way will it be possible to counteract the alienation, distrust, and breakdown of a sense of community that follow in the wake of impersonal technology, urbanization, bureaucratization, and their unplanned, dehumanizing consequences. As a nation, we have not yet been willing to make that commitment. We continue to measure the worth of our own society, and of other countries as well, by the faceless criterion of the GNP—the gross national product. We continue, in the words of the great American psychologist, William James—to "worship the bitch-goddess Success".

It appears, Mr. Chairman, that we are a "stiffnecked people". That phrase calls to mind that the worship of idols is not new in human experience, and its almost inevitable and awesome consequences are a matter of familiar record. Yet, the God of Abraham, we will recall, was merciful. He sought to warn his people by lesser calamities before Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed. Or, to translate to our own time and venacular: "Things may have to get worse before they can get better". If so, Mr. Chairman, we can take heart from the facts and figures I have brought before you; we sure are making progress!

Mr. Chairman, our nation must make and fulfill the commitment to its families and children before time runs out. Ultimately that commitment must be made and fulfilled by the people themselves. In the last analysis, it is they who must decide to change the institutions which determine how they and their neighbors live—who can get health

care for his family, a habitable dwelling in which to live, opportunity to spend time with one's children, and help and encouragement from individuals and society in the demanding and richly gratifying task of enabling the young to develop into competent and compassionate human beings.

Ultimately, all of us must make this national commitment. But it can begin only where national leadership begins, in the halls of Congress and in the White House. It is, of course, unlikely that within the next three years that commitment will be made at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. It appears to be a long way from there to the lives and hearts of the people, their families, and their children. The way is surely shorter from here, from these halls, where the representatives of the people gather to serve the people's interest. I have high hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Hearings being conducted by this Committee will mark the beginning of a new era in the history of the Congress and the country, and that the Senate of the United States, under the leadership of this bipartisan Committee, will act in behalf of the people in making a national commitment to meet the needs and realize the tragically unfulfilled potential of our families and our children.

PARENTS WITHOUT PARTNERS, INC.,

September 19, 1973.

To Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

From Parents Without Partners, Inc., George B. Williams, Executive Director, Washington, D.C.

My name is George B. Williams, and I am Executive Director of Parents Without Partners, Inc., the world's largest organization of single parents. With me today are three members of my organization who will present their personal stories and findings on several aspects of our national life affecting the dissolution of the family and the resulting deleterious effects on children and youth.

Before introducing them, let me tell you something about our organization, Parents Without Partners. We are an international, voluntary membership organization of single parents—the widowed, divorced, separated and never-married—who are bringing up children alone in what is still a dual-parent society. Custody is not a requirement for membership, and 35% of our members are men. PWP's North American membership (United States and Canada) lists 90,000 members. We were founded nearly 16 years ago and have doubled in size every third year of our existence; our growth has been phenomenal, and the future of our organization has never been brighter. This doesn't say much for the future of the traditional marriage as we have known it or of the so-called nuclear family.

More than 700 Chapters of our organization exist in all 50 States and in most Canadian Provinces. We also have large affiliated groups, exclusive of our 90,000 members in North America, in Australia, New Zealand, England, Mexico and Venezuela. Chapters range from upwards of 1,000 members in urban areas to fewer than 100 in the smaller towns and cities. Each Chapter, with elected volunteer leaders, plans and conducts its own programs of service to its members and their children, with administrative aids, materials, advice and guidance from the International Office here in Washington. We are tax-exempt as a non-profit, non-sectarian, educational organization devoted exclusively to the welfare and interests of single parents and their children.

Our members come from all walks of life and represent a kaleidoscope of occupation interests and educational attainment. Ages range from the 20's into the 60's with the bulk of the membership in the 30's and 40's. Thirty-five percent of our members are widows and widowers; but the majority are divorced. Never-marrieds are a tiny growing minority, and there are many "separateds" who do not divorce for religious or other reasons. Sixty-five percent of the total are women. The only requirement for membership in Parents Without Partners is single parenthood. We represent a typical cross-section of the millions who have suffered marriage termination, have children to worry about, and are in the throes of a reorganization of their lives. Our members come to us at all stages in the process of separation; some are only recently widowed or divorced while others have lead the "single again" life for some time.

Some have young children; others have teenagers. Some are fairly sophisticated, others naive. They are of all faiths. A few have had professional counseling; most know nothing about it. Basically middle to lower-middle class on the socio-economic scale (a marriage termination invariably means that the party or parties to it take a step or two down that scale), many are bitter about marriage, others hopeful about remarriage. About the only other generalization I can make about the organization I represent is that the members are all in the process of transi-

tion and change and have come to us for help. Having received the help they need, and having completed the process of transition, they leave. The average tenure of membership is about two years. We are a permanent organization of transients. We are a do-it-yourself, self-help organization. We've had to be.

For the most part, gentlemen, you as individuals are members of the legal profession, and you know full well that the end of a marriage, especially if children are involved, is a tremendously traumatic experience for all concerned. Even if problems were anticipated, nobody, it seems, ever expects them to be so critical. Beyond that, many unpredictable situations and problems have to be faced. In any case, demoralization and despair are the frequent response. There is much that government can do in many, many areas to make the transition smoother for those who suddenly enter the world of the formerly married because of marriage dissolution.

It is most encouraging to see, beginning with the hearings by this subcommittee, that the nation is beginning to address itself to the escalating phenomenon of broken families and marriage termination. All I can say is that it's about time.

Marriage dissolution should be the Number One subject of the decade. The family is the fundamental unit of civilization, and the traditional marriage has been a corner-stone of our society. Marriage dissolution is reaching epidemic proportions, and the societal impact on all levels of our national life is now beginning to manifest itself.

Strange things are happening to the institution of marriage as we know it in the United States and in Western society; curious things are happening to divorce in America. The pain and trauma associated with the break-up of a marriage have not impaired the prevalence of marriage dissolution. Approximately four of every 10 couples who marry this year will not live happily ever after.

They will divorce after, on the average, seven years of marriage. It can be safely said that the divorce rate is soaring to a record peak; it is beginning to approximate 50%.

One of every six children in the United States is now being raised in a single parent home. The first-marriage rate is now at its lowest ebb since the Depression. Second marriages have also leveled off dramatically. "The Pill" and liberalized abortion laws have accounted for the fact that the birth rate has reached its lowest level in our history, and even where children aren't involved directly, equally striking is the rising number of marriages that split apart after the major child-raising chores are finished. Among couples married 15 to 19 years, divorce has doubled since 1960, while in the 20-years-and-over bracket, it is up 56%.

And in spite of the pill and liberalized abortion laws, the number of so-called "illegitimate" births is rising.

Let me also state here and now that those who suffer most in a marriage dissolution are not the children. Children are amenable to change and resilient. It is the adult who suffers most.

The best thing one can do for a child is to enable him to have a reasonably well-adjusted, functioning parent or parents. We are all aware that innocent children are innocent victims of marriage dissolution. Parents can become disturbed, overwrought and traumatized when they enter the world of the formerly married, and they must readjust their lives in a happy, organized manner. Above all, this has the most beneficial effect on children. Contributing heavily to the trauma and maladjustment suffered by many members of the single parent community are several inequities which can be corrected by government, both in the legislative, enforcement and policy-making areas.

From personal experience, the three members of our organization whom I will introduce to you now will present their personal experiences as well as their recommendations in several of these areas. In order of their appearance, they are as follows:

Ms. Katherine Carroll Gallagher. Ms. Gallagher has been a member of our organization for several years and has served in several leadership capacities. In the business world, she is Assistant Secretary of Coachman Industries, Inc., of Middlebury, Indiana. She is also the Administrative Assistant to the President of that corporation, Mr. T. H. Corson. You'll be interested to know that when Mr. Corson was approached to give Ms. Gallagher the time to come to Washington to testify before this committee, he said, "My opinion of the men in government and those elected Senators has risen considerably since learning that they have asked you to discuss the problems of the single parent. They can benefit greatly from your knowledge and that of your organization, and it's gratifying to know that Congress is actually seeking the advice of those who had experience with

problems. Hopefully, they'll do more of this in all areas of government."

Ms. Gallagher became a single parent 12 years ago and at that time, her two sons were age 13 and 15 and her daughter was 14. Since her divorce, her children have successfully completed the total of 16 years of college in nine of those 12 years. Her eldest son has his doctorate from Stanford University in nuclear and systems engineering, and her younger son is a graduate of Indiana University and is now a Certified Public Accountant. Her daughter is a Registered Nurse specializing in the intensive care of newborn babies. All of them are happily married.

Ms. Martin Creasy. Ms. Creasy is a former member of the Armed Services herself and was married to a non-commissioned officer in the United States Air Force for more than 14 years. She is divorced, and a parent of three growing boys. She has direct knowledge of how politics governing the military affect the lives of enlisted servicemen and their families while on active duty. Ms. Casey is a housewife from New Ipswich, New Hampshire.

Ms. Patricia Young. Ms. Young is the divorced mother of three children and is a resident of Andover, Massachusetts. She is employed as a Secretary. Her situation is rather unique, because her divorce from a senior non-commissioned officer in the United States Army did not solve very many problems for her. Many of those problems continue because of some military policies no longer in existence but which, in her case, are not yet resolved. While she is divorced from a former Army non-commissioned officer, her testimony will show, I believe, that her divorce from problems generated by "benign military neglect" will not be final until she leaves this planet.

STATEMENT OF MS. GALLAGHER

I am personally delighted to discuss certain areas of concern which I share with other single parent women functioning in the business world.

My 12 years spent as a single parent were not easy ones. I'm not complaining, because I've been very fortunate. My children have turned out well. I've worked extremely hard in spite of the fact that both my family and I have felt like "second class" citizens because of my divorce. A man or woman divorced or separated with children is the subject of a wide variety of overt and covert discrimination, some of which is directly due to lack of governmental controls and laws. This discrimination takes many forms, and I would like to review with you some of the particularly relevant aspects. If you magnify my problems as one single parent woman by the 10,000,000 single parents in the United States today, you will easily realize my concern as an individual as well as the concern of my organization, Parents Without Partners.

(1) It goes without saying that one of the most commonly shared dilemmas of single parents is adequate income. Child support payments or life insurance benefits are rarely adequate to provide for the needs of a family. In nearly every case, it is mandatory that a single parent be employed outside the home in order adequately to support the household. This leads to ansular problems of child care, low income levels of the average woman, bringing their occupational skills current, and finding a suitable job. Today one family in nine is headed by a woman—this means 5.6 million families headed by women. In the decade between 1960 and '70, this group increased 24% in numbers.

Compounding this problem is the fact that despite women's rights movements and equal opportunity legislation from the Congress, figures on the earnings by occupational and educational levels clearly show that a working woman with a high school education earns approximately 56% of the salary attained by men on an equivalent level of age and education. From the standpoint of society, concern must be centered on the status of those single parent families with dependent children. Most are not as fortunate as I have been. I did manage to keep three children in college at the same time on earnings of approximately \$6,000 per year, plus approximately \$2,800 in child support annually.

This is a very broad problem. The proportion of mothers working outside the home is now more than double that of 25 years ago. For a graphic illustration of the problem, consider the group of mothers with children under six. Last year, there were more than 4.3 million mothers with children under six in the labor force. More appalling, there were 1.3 million mothers with children who were bringing up their families without a husband. Add to this the children from six to 17 years of age being raised by single parent women—almost 3.3 million—and one soon realizes that compared to the estimated number of licensed day-care slots of 800,000, the recent veto by the President on the matter of day care facilities only serves to aggravate immediate solutions to this gigantic problem

for single parents and their children.

(2) The second area of concern are the problems generated by inequitable taxation of the single parent. Most assuredly, child care expenses should be treated as a business expense rather than a personal expense.

An industrialist can hire 2 dozen extra secretaries and even a chauffeur and there is never any shadow of a doubt that their wages will be a legitimate tax deduction. He pays their wages from one pocket and recoups a handy tax break from the Treasury with another. The secretaries help him work more effectively. They help him spend time more productively so that he can make a greater contribution to our nation's economy. Without them and their help, he would be very much cut down to size.

But what about fathers or mothers who can't even get to the stage of taking a job at all without paying someone to look after their children or clean their homes? They don't have the resources of a millionaire, but they have to hire someone or pay someone to help them all the same. No business deduction for them—despite the fact that many of these parents could not even work at all without incurring such expenses, let alone getting to the stage of thinking in terms of help to enable them to work more effectively.

Certainly, where two divorced or separated parents provide support to children, there should be some automatic, equitable formula for allowing them to split exemptions and claim tax credit, both for support and for the education of those dependent children. Meaningful tax reform is long overdue. I would think the House Ways and Means Committee would be seriously embarrassed by their inaction. I, and other single parents, wonder exactly what the time table on this glacier is?

Let me personalize tax problems as they affect single parents. I am one of those who may have read about who was the subject of IRS harassment. On two occasions, the IRS chose to audit my returns as a single parent—the first time when my former husband claimed both me and the three children (mind you, this was two years after the divorce) and it was this incorrect filing that triggered an audit of my return, and the burden of proving the deductions and exemptions fell on my shoulders. At one point, I was threatened by the IRS auditor that he would take away all my dependent exemptions unless I would "give" some of these exemptions to my former husband. Actually, the auditor also threatened to use my older son's scholarship money against me in computing which of us contributed 50% of the total support. This, in spite of their own

printed rulings which state that scholarships are not to be considered as income in such cases. I finally had to utilize the services of a practicing tax consultant to plead the hearing successfully before an IRS examiner. All this, at unnecessary and great expense to me at a time when I could little afford it.

(3) The third area of concern are problems encountered in the areas of credit, mortgages and insurance for the widowed and divorced. Let me sight a couple of brief examples:

In 1962, I suffered the indignity of being refused automobile insurance coverage simply because I was newly-divorced, and considered a bad risk for that reason. Allstate Insurance Company refused my application, refused even to process it, because I had not been divorced for at least a year. I submit that I was a better driver after my divorce than I was before. Not only that, why could I not be considered as an individual and be judged on my own driving record?

From all that I hear in my organization, insurance discrimination against the divorced and widowed still exists and has not receded at all. From what I am told, I believe it has escalated.

As far as credit is concerned, I've been fortunate. My income level is higher than most single parent women. However, there is one interesting anecdote to indicate discrimination. In May of 1971, I sent an application for a BankAmericard to First Bank and Trust Company in South Bend, Indiana. This was while I was employed as business administrator for eight doctors, managing several X-ray facilities, and my income was indicated near \$10,000. Within that very same week, a woman appeared from the BankAmericard Central Office to apply for my job, but I never heard anything directly from BankAmericard. I wrote the banking facility to which the application had been sent and explained what had happened. I also explained that I would still like to have a card. To this day, I have never received an acknowledgment to my application or my letter, nor have I received a BankAmericard.

(4) The fourth concern I have is the problem of divorce and separation and the effect on the education of the dependent children. The education of my children has been my prime motivation these past 12 years. I was stunned when I read my divorce decree in 1961 to learn that no reference or provision had been inserted in the decree for their higher education. This is one area where a

national divorce code with mandatory provisions for shared responsibility for the education of children would be of great and lasting benefit. Such provisions will probably not exist as long as states are the control point for the issuance of divorce decrees. In addition, there should be mandatory provisions for the insurance and health protection of those children.

There are many, many reasons for a national divorce code and it could be approached through the states on the same basis that the "no-fault" automobile insurance legislation was approached: minimum standards and a time frame.

(5) Problems relating to the dissolution of marriage will continue to plague us until government makes more adequate provisions in our educational system to provide that all children, equally and fairly, are given the right to learn about marriage, about divorce, about being good, effective parents, etc., in order that they may better prepare themselves for the certainties of their life styles. The recently developed program, "Education for Parenthood", launched by the Office of Education and the Office of Child Development in September, 1972, is most exciting in all respects. This is just the type of thing our nation needs as we view with considerable anxiety the recent trends in marriage dissolution. Hopefully, similar programs in other areas will be developed and launched. My organization continues to be available as consultants and is prepared at all times to share our experience with all governmental levels concerned. Let me also add, Senators, that it is gratifying to know that you are asking us to discuss pertinent viewpoints toward speedy solutions to our shared problems of single parents and their children in our society today ... and tomorrow.

Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MS. CREAMY

I was involved with the military for 14 years. Many problems were encountered and, of course, not all of them were militarily connected. Problems common to most marriages become more prominent, however, because of the stresses of military life. Many problems encountered directly result from policies governing military personnel as well as, in some cases, the lack of covering policies.

The overriding problem for enlisted military families is money. Ninety percent of the families I knew in the military found it necessary to "moonlight" in order to survive. No matter how tight the hold on the purse strings, it was necessary for me to work on a full-time basis and for my husband to work part-time, three nights a week plus Saturdays every week. He held the rank of Technical Sergeant, at that time the second highest non-commissioned officer rank.

Even though military pay scales have escalated recently, so has the cost of living. The "tight money" situation for enlisted military families has not altered.

The necessity of "moonlighting" adds its own strain to family life. My children spent more time at under-staffed nurseries and with baby-sitters than in their own home. This factor, plus the added physical stress of "moonlighting", placed my husband and me in an atmosphere where family life was almost nil. Although low finances is one problem nearly everyone encounters at some point, one would think that men in the military service of their government, whatever their rank, would be able to support a small family without the added mental and physical stress of "moonlighting".

One of the biggest financial strains placed on wives of non-commissioned officers came when a decision was made to allow non-commissioned officers to receive family allotment checks along with their monthly pay checks. No consideration was given to the wives and children of non-commissioned officers whose husbands were already using their pay to their own personal satisfaction. This decision was a mistake.

Unnecessary transfers run a close second to financial problems for military families. Undue mental, physical and—again—financial strain is placed on families in the process of transferring from one base to another. The strain is even greater when the family is not allowed to follow.

Moving from one home to another, from one school to another, becomes more difficult as the children get older and friends become closer.

Transfers to overseas bases where life is totally different and where housing is either non-existent or of low quality places other kinds of strain on family life.

Overseas bases where only families of officers are allowed makes the enlisted man feel guilty of his rank. Another strain, perhaps the biggest strain of all is placed on those families where the wife is forced, without advance or continued counsel, to take over the full responsibility as a "head of household".

Military life makes unique demands in many ways and all members of the family have pride in service to our country and do their very best to meet those demands without complaining. However, a woman becoming both father and mother to her children for any length of time learns to be less dependent on her husband, more independent and more capable of being her own

boss. In many cases where the husband is the true foundation of the marriage, the marriage begins to falter with this type of transfer. Every effort should be made by the Armed Services to keep the families together and, where it is impossible to do so because of security reasons or war-time conditions, then counseling should be readily available for those who stand and wait. The divorce statistics of our Viet Nam POWs bear me out.

Is it too much to ask that when a serviceman is taken from his family for six months or more for security reason which cannot be divulged that a senior officer come by and explain the necessity of it to the wife and children in terms they will understand without divulging the necessity of the mission? From my experience, this would have been extremely helpful, and would have saved much strain on many marriages. After all, the percentage of field grade officers and above is at its highest point in military history. While the Armed Services do a good job of "taking care of their own" the word "own" should be more fully extended to include the military dependents, too.

The military does take care of widows and orphans. Divorce, in many respects, has the same effect as death on military dependents. Even worse effects! I believe that there must be a greater concern shown for military divorcees and their children, particularly as they may affect the children in terms of financial support and medical care.

In preparing for this testimony I was advised by a member of our organization, a field grade officer now retired from the Army, that conditions leading to marriage dissolution and resulting single parenthood are more acute in the service than among civilians. This is true because many families cannot adjust to the constant relocating which seems to be required in the military, that break-ups are caused by low pay and poor living conditions among the enlisted personnel (many of whom are on welfare), and the necessity of hardship tours" (one year overseas without family).

He found, as did I, that the military is highly sensitive about releasing any statistics to any organization on subjects which they feel might cause an unfavorable public image. Maybe you can change this. I hope so.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MS. YOUNG

Gentlemen, my gross weekly income is \$135.00; my net \$104.00. I receive no other income for either myself or my children. I can barely meet my expenses, which are greater than they need be because I have to work and that means baby-sitters.

My expenses are also larger because I have to clothe myself for my work, a greater expense than it would be if I were a housewife. Also, I don't have time to prepare economical meals, and I rely on so-called "convenience foods", and one must pay for the convenience. I am one of those heads of households whose tax base is higher, and I pay a penalty because I happen to be a single parent.

In 1957 I was married to a serviceman, attached to Army security, with the rank of SP-4. My former husband attained a rank of SP-5 in 1958, then took a year's separation from the Army in 1958-59. He re-enlisted in 1959 as an SP-5, the grade he left. Prior to our marriage, he had served 18 months in Korea, and his service record was excellent.

Upon re-enlistment, he taught as an instructor at Fort Devens, Massachusetts. He was selected for the Non-Commissioned Officers Academy in New Jersey and from there, he went on to Washington, D.C., for instructional courses. He was then selected for language school in Monterey, California. His specialty was Arabic. At this time he was promoted to the rank of E-6.

Following language school, he returned to Washington to receive instructions and await orders for assignment to Turkey. After one year in Turkey, he was assigned to Beirut

for 2 years and was promoted to the rank of E-7, the Army highest, shortly after his arrival. All throughout his military career he received numerous commendations and recommendations from his commanding officers for outstanding performance.

Prior to my leaving for Beirut with my children, another child was born and, in addition, one of our sons was hospitalized. After my arrival in Beirut, there were five additional hospitalizations for the entire family. I developed meningitis and was later operated on for a tubal ligation which, following surgery, developed serious infections. My husband also had an accident while swimming, and my son suffered complications in a routine tonsillectomy and adenoidectomy.

My husband's assignment in Beirut was extremely demanding, and the pressures were great. In addition, the frequent and serious illnesses of our family plus the death of his father (the majority of the funeral expenses were placed on my husband), the constancy of doctor and prescription bills, the cost of hiring domestic help because of my confinement to bed under doctor's orders all contributed to my husband's suffering considerable mental and nervous tension and anguish.

When we decided that he should seek professional assistance, we discovered that all

that was available in Beirut was a physician who could administer tranquilizers. Unfortunately, my husband turned to alcohol for relief, and a distinguished military career began to go down the drain.

There were no medical facilities available to us as a military family in Beirut. We incurred very costly medical and prescription bills. There was no policy established for reimbursement at the United States Embassy in Beirut. My husband's income was in no way sufficient to cover these bills in addition to the day-to-day living expenses.

After many months of medication for my son's ear infections (the operation did not help), it was upon the written statement and strong advice of my son's physician that we returned to the United States for proper medical treatment and change of climate. When my husband put in for a transfer back to the States, he was threatened that if he left his assignment in Beirut he would probably be transferred out of his outfit. And this is exactly what did occur.

While awaiting orders to be transferred back to the United States, my husband received a communication that stated he was no longer with the ASA due to "debt" (hospital, physicians and medication which the military didn't pay and for which the Embassy did not reimburse). The military used this excuse to transfer him from his unit and the resulting humiliation he suffered caused him great anguish. He had great pride in himself, his unit and his career. He was a man torn between his love for his job and his love for his family and it was at this point that he seemed to fall apart and turn totally to alcohol.

When we arrived in the States, the children and I went to Ohio. My husband continued on to his assignment in California. Shortly after reporting to his new assignment, I received a telephone call that he was absent without leave. He later turned himself in and was brought up for court martial. I flew to California and left my five-year-old and two toddlers in Ohio. After long discussions with his defense counsel and his commanding officers, they advised me that he was greatly in need of medical and psychiatric assistance. They did not want to see him court martialled. However, due to his rank, he was to be used as an "example" to others. This was actually told to my husband and me by these officers. Because he was to be an "example", no medical assistance was forthcoming.

At this time, my own physical deterioration was extreme. After the court martial, my husband was assigned to Fort Huachuca, Arizona. Before I left him in California to return to Ohio, my husband's physical and mental state was at an all-time low. After a brief period, he instructed me to bring the family to Arizona and, upon my arrival, I discovered that he was again AWOL. This time, six weeks elapsed before he returned. He was again brought up for court martial and again demoted in rank. During this entire period, he had one interview with a psychiatrist.

It was at this time that my husband was advised to "leave the military service." He left the service, but not for medical reasons. Thus, my children and I no longer have any consideration as military dependents. There is no support for my children, nor is there any available medical care or other privileges which would be available to us if he had a medical discharge.

During his year's tour of duty in Turkey, my daughter and I were hospitalized in the States. My husband was not able to be with us. In addition to this, the Army's non-reimbursement of our medical bills in Beirut had left us in great financial debt upon return to the States and I was not able to give him very much moral and physical support during his post-Beirut assignments in California and Arizona. These separations created great strains on the family as a unit and upon my husband and me as individuals and, in turn, upon our entire marriage.

After Beirut, my husband endeavored to receive reimbursement for our medical bills incurred in Lebanon. They were never honored!

When my husband was assigned to Beirut, our marriage was very sound. I feel that the lack of medical assistance to our family (as well as other families in the service, and I have plenty of examples), no family counseling, no psychiatric care and at that time no recognition of alcoholism as a disease—all of these factors assisted the deterioration of our marriage in a most viable manner.

Because my husband's illness was not recognized at the time of his discharge (after 14 years of active military service) which up to the time of Beirut was commendable, he did not receive the medical discharge for which he was qualified. Therefore, my children reap no military benefits nor do I for their care and support.

The deterioration of my husband due to alcoholism occurred while in the service. It caused great stress upon my children, and I was not able to save our marriage nor was my husband able to cope with his escalating problems. A very fine marriage ended, a very valuable soldier's service was lost to his coun-

try and my children and I continue to suffer because of the ineptitude of the military, the necessity of creating "the example" and the "benign neglect" of the fact that military wives and children are people too.

Frankly, it would be better had he died. My children would have greater security if that had happened. He might have died, and it may be that he has. I don't know. I haven't heard a thing for three years.

The ineptitude with which my husband's case was handled has caused untold emotional stress, particularly for my oldest daughter. The only assistance for her which I can afford is school counseling. She needs much, much more than that.

I might also add that after my husband's discharge and subsequent desertion of his family, our household goods were shipped to Ohio. I went back to Massachusetts with the children. I couldn't obtain a release to have the furniture sent to me because I "needed my former husband's signature". Consequently, this pedantic attention to red tape caused me to beg from relatives to have a home for my children. I also had to spend money I desperately needed for lawyers to try to obtain

my home furnishings. In addition, many of our household goods were sold in Beirut to pay some of the medical bills we owed and for which we were never reimbursed.

The Army must provide for greater cognizance for their families in trouble. Many times I thought that if the system or even one of his commanding officers had the backbone to stand up and fight for my husband that today there would be a whole family unit with a father who is a whole person. The need at that time for decent medical and psychiatric attention was acute but lacking.

Maybe it still is. My nine-year-old son tells people that his father is dead because he cannot accept the fact that he has been rejected. My seven-year-old can't remember his father, and my 12-year-old daughter is fighting a desperate battle within herself about who is to blame for her father's disappearance from her life. If this is not a destruction of the family unit by separation, military ineptitude and basic ignorance, I don't know what you would call it.

Military families have a difficult lot at best. Military men would do a much more efficient job in serving our country if the basic instability of military families caused by low pay, frequent transfers and duty-necessitating frequent and lengthy absences could be alleviated by a greater concern and awareness for the needs of military wives and children, plus more adequate psychiatric, psychological and marriage counseling services. Without that, the problems of the innocent victims of military marriage dissolution, the children, will not be appreciably alleviated.

I do hope you'll do something about it.

Thank you very much.

CONCLUSION

In summary, gentlemen, let me reiterate the fact that there are many, many things our Federal Government can do to alleviate the pain, suffering, trauma and maladjustments caused by marriage dissolution, all of which have deleterious effects on children and youth. I won't take the time to define all the reasons why it is necessary to do so because they are more eloquently stated in the testimony than I can articulate in a summary.

The four of us did not spend very much time talking about what single parents consider to be the most critical area of need . . . meaningful Day Care and Child Development legislation. From all that I have been told by not only my own 90,000 members but every single parent with young children I have talked to, this is the *Number One Priority*. Hopefully, forces can again be mustered to make this legislation a reality. Our nation needs it now, our children need it now, and it is their *right* as well as the right of those yet unborn to have it. It simply must be done. I might add that as this testimony is being drafted in its final form (Thursday, September 20) our expert on the subject of Day Care had to cancel her scheduled appearance with us . . . she couldn't find anyone to take care of her children.

In addition to unvetted Day Care and Child Development legislation, my organization also suggests the following:

1. A total end, in fact as well as theory, to class discrimination based on sex or marital status in the areas of housing, credit and insurance.

2. Immediate tax reform which, in fairness and equity, will equalize the tax base between married couples and heads of households; such legislation to provide for the deduction of child care expenses as a *business* deduction rather than a personal deduction and, in addition, a percentage consideration for the dependent deduction when two parties not in the same household contribute to child support.

3. A re-examination by the Armed Services as well as other governmental departments of all policies covering transfers and family

relocations. (I've been told by many marriage counselors, psychiatrists and psychologist that the chances of marriage dissolution rise sharply—at least 50%—following a family relocation. I believe it.)

4. The Armed Services should re-examine all their policies covering dependents with particular reference to control of allotments for child support and alimony.

5. Uniform standards by all states in divorce codes should be encouraged by the Federal Government with particular attention to "no-fault" provisions. The archaic divorce codes in many of our states encourage the adversary system in divorce practice by lawyers and usually brands a party "guilty" or "at fault." This does not end the contentiousness which a divorce purports to cure and has long term, deleterious effects on children.

6. Uniform child custody and support laws and enforcement.

THE IMPACT OF THE INCOME TAX ON THE FAMILY

(Testimony of Harvey E. Brazer, professor of economics and research associate, Institute of Public Policy Studies, the University of Michigan)

Within the tax structure of the Federal Government only the individual income tax bears directly on the stability of the family. My concern in these remarks is not with the effects of the weight of taxes in general. It lies, rather, with those features of the tax law that impose heavier burdens on the family headed by two adults as compared with the single-head family.

The joining together of two people through marriage to form a household—or their separation through divorce or death—need not be permitted to affect tax liability by more than the consequences of adding or dropping a dependent's exemption. As in Canada and some other taxing jurisdictions, a man and a woman each of whom receives income, may pay jointly the same amount of income tax irrespective of whether or not they marry or, if married, stay married. The problem arises in this country in part because under our law the unit for taxation is, essentially, the household, rather than the individual. And under an income tax that aims at taxing people according to their relative economic power or wellbeing, this is as it should be. At the same time, however, under this approach it is difficult to steer a course between the single individual, the single head of household, and the married couple that will do justice to all and also avoid either imposing tax penalties on, or offering tax bonuses for, marriage. On the other hand, the alternative of ignoring the marital status of the tax payer, largely or entirely, inevitably results in vastly different treatment of similarly circumstanced economic units or households.

In the discussion that follows it should be kept in mind that the institution of marriage may no longer be as easy to define as it once was. Changing social mores suggest that formal, legal marriages coupled with "no-fault" divorce laws, may be increasingly difficult to distinguish from less formal or non-legally sanctioned liaisons that appear to be gaining more widespread acceptability. To the extent, therefore, that "marital status" becomes more a matter of legal form rather than a description of living arrangements relevant for measuring economic and, therefore, taxpaying capacity, any differential impacts of the income tax that turn on the distinction between married and single individuals take on greater weight and may be hitting an increasingly fragile institution.

I shall discuss first the principal features of the United States income tax that differentiate between married and single taxpayers. These are the rate structure, the low income allowance and the optional standard deduction, the medical deduction, the child care allowance, and the capital loss carry-over. This is by no means a completely inclusive list, but for all except a small handful of taxpayers other aspects of the tax code that make tax liability turn in some part on marital status are irrelevant esoteria.

THE TAX RATE STRUCTURE

From 1948 to 1969 married couples enjoyed the privilege of being taxed as though they were single individuals each having half of their joint incomes. In 1951 approximately half of the benefits of income-splitting was extended to single persons who maintain a home occupied by one or more dependents. For individuals with substantial incomes who contemplated marriage with someone whose income was zero or relatively low, the law offered the opportunity, through income-splitting, to "marry into lower brackets." It also brought enormous pressures for change from single persons subject to very much higher tax rates than their married compatriots who enjoyed equal incomes. Until the 1969 Revenue Act took effect the single taxpayer's tax liability exceeded that

of the married couple with the same taxable income by an amount that ranged from 3.6 percent at taxable income of \$1,000 to 25.2 percent at \$12,000, and a peak of 42.1 percent at \$28,000.¹ Expressed in this fashion the tax law seems to have dealt harshly with the single person and most generously with the married couple only one party to which had income. It was, however, very well suited to the case of the married couple with income equally attributable to husband and wife, as compared with the single taxpayer with income equal to one half of that of the couple. Stated another way, under the pre-1970 law if brothers A and B and sisters X and Y each had \$10,000 per year of *taxable* income and continued to do so after they became married couples AX and BY, marriage would not have affected their tax liabilities.

The Revenue Act of 1969, however, changed all this. While the tax rates applicable to married couples filing either joint or separate returns remained unchanged, for single individuals rates applicable to taxable income in the brackets \$4,000 to \$6,000 up to \$38,000 to \$44,000 were reduced by from 1 at \$4,000 to \$6,000 to 10 percentage points at \$20,000 to \$26,000, or by as much as 20.8 percent (from 48 to 38 percent in the \$20,000 to \$22,000 bracket). As a consequence our taxpayers A, B, C, and D each would pay tax of \$2,090 as unmarried individuals, for a total of \$8,360. As they contemplate marriage, however, they now observe that their joint tax liabilities will rise, after marriage, to \$8,760. Thus the change under the 1969 Revenue Act in the rate structure in the circumstances described has imposed an annual tax of \$200 per couple on marriage!

Those who may file tax returns as heads of households are placed approximately half way between single persons and married couples filing joint returns in the construction of the tax rate schedules. And the tax costs of marriage vary with income and the proportions of income attributable to each member of a married couple. Thus it is difficult to generalize about the penalty borne by marriage under current tax rate schedules. Clearly it may be negative or zero, either where income is very low or where substantially more than half of the couple's income is received by only one of the parties, while it rises to a very large sum where income is

high and equally divided between the two spouses. For example, if the man and woman each earns \$50,000 in taxable income per year, as single individuals they would pay income taxes of \$20,190 each, or \$40,380. The "tax price" of marriage is \$4,800, for as a married couple their tax liability would rise to \$45,180. And, of course, if all of the \$100,000 of taxable income was earned by either the husband or wife it could be divided evenly between them through marriage followed by divorce and an appropriate alimony agreement, with a tax saving to the couple of almost \$5,000 per year. At the other extreme, with only \$1,000 of taxable income accruing to each individual, marriage would actually save \$5 per year. I will not speculate on the implications of these figures for the attitude of the Congress with respect to the relation between income and virtue.

THE OPTIONAL STANDARD DEDUCTION AND THE LOW INCOME ALLOWANCE

Taxpayers may not avail themselves of one of three options for handling non-business deductions. They may take itemized deductions for state and local taxes, charitable contributions, interest paid, medical expenses, and a miscellany of other expenses. Or they may choose instead the optional standard deduction of 15 percent of adjusted gross income subject to a maximum of \$2,000. The third option is the low income allowance of a flat \$1,300. The choice between the standard deduction and the low income allowance turns simply on income. Up to \$8,667 the low income allowance exceeds the standard deduction and will be taken unless itemized deductions are greater than \$1,300.

The standard deduction and the LIA are so designed as to impose tax costs on marriage because they apply under the same terms to married as to single taxpayers. Thus, for example, returning to brothers A and B and sisters X and Y, let us suppose that each has \$12,000 of adjusted gross income. Collectively, while single, they would be entitled to \$7,200 (\$1,800 x 4) in standard deductions. But following the marriages of A and X and B and Y, other things remaining the same, the standard deduction permissible is reduced to \$2,000 per couple, for a reduction of \$3,200 in total and an increase, on this account, of some \$600 in the tax liabilities of the four people.

¹ Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, *General Explanation of the Tax Reform Act of 1969*, H.R. 13270, 91st Congress, Public Law 91-172 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 224.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org