

Introduction

When journalist Ellen Key declared this to be the “Century of the Child” in 1909, she was hopeful that by the end of the century we would no longer have to fear for the well-being of America’s children.¹ Recognition of the problems, cooperative efforts, and understanding of children’s special needs, she believed, would certainly lead to solutions. Today, however, at the close of the century, contemporary journalists join with educators, health care professionals, psychologists, government officials, and researchers in a charged language that defines our children as still being “at risk.” The term itself declares urgency, demands action, and signals failure. Moreover, the risks implied are not only to the children, but to the future of a healthy, competitive society. Unlike times past, the language of risk today is an indictment not of children’s moral failure, but rather of the social institutions that fail children: the family, the schools, and the government.

The intention of this collection of essays is to address twentieth-century historical and contemporary issues regarding children who are considered to be at risk. The essays explore the language of risk as it is used by the courts, the schools, governmental agencies, and child advocates, those who discover risks and create correctives for children who both need protection and threaten to disturb the social order. To do so requires an exploration of differing, often contradictory, concepts of the child and society that are embedded in public policy debates. Deepening the complexity of the problems, institutions to which we look for solutions are too often faced with conflicts that arise when the needs of the child are at variance with the needs of the institutions themselves. These dilemmas are central to this volume and to understanding our failure to achieve adequate public policy solutions for children at risk.

Conceptions of childhood throughout American history have conformed to a matrix of interconnected goals, values, and institutions that form society.² Although the use of the concept of risk to define children's status is a twentieth-century practice, nonetheless fears for children's well-being, and efforts to save children when parents have failed or are absent, are evident in past centuries. Moreover, the notions of what dangers might compromise a child's well-being have changed dramatically over time.

In the colonial period, the task of society regarding children was to insure their salvation, usually through baptism or conversion.³ Puritans considered children to be deprived from birth, and the child at risk was one who might not ultimately find a home with God. While risks to children's health were high, control over a child's health was minimal, making salvation an even greater imperative.⁴ Insuring salvation was the responsibility of the parents; fathers, as a matter of law and custom, had absolute authority over the child and were responsible for instilling discipline, obedience, and self-denial in the child, all essential to a child's ultimate salvation. Reinforced in the tracts and sermons of religious leaders, the authority for childrearing practices and definitions of social and religious goals came from the church, and responsibility lay squarely with the parents. However, when parents failed, the consequences were both religious and civil.⁵ As early as 1648, according to historian Ross Beales, heads of New England families were required by law to catechize their children once a week.⁶ In the 1670s, the Massachusetts General Court appointed "tithingmen," each overseeing ten or twelve households, whose duty it was to ensure domestic harmony and be sure that parents properly disciplined unruly children.

Beyond parental training, children were expected to learn and obey a host of moral lessons. When discipline failed, children became responsible for their own behavior. Although "stubborn child" laws, enacted in Massachusetts in 1646, threatened disobedient children with the death penalty, in fact willful children were bound out as apprentices, and parents of boys over sixteen could turn to the courts to compel obedience in their children.⁷

In the Chesapeake, where the parental mortality rate was

higher than in New England, children who were orphaned became members of extended or step families, "rooting the parentless child within the society."⁸ Moreover, the fear of early death often prompted fathers to ensure their son's well-being by deeding cattle and appointing trustees to oversee that the sons received the cattle at marriage or majority.⁹ Legal mechanisms protected these children and their property, and, signaling consensus about the need for children's financial protection, historians Darrett and Anita Rutman found relatively few unscrupulous guardians or stepparents.¹⁰

In the tightly woven New England communities, the family was the basic political, economic, and religious unit, with the family deeply embedded in public life. Moreover, family responsibilities extended to the care of orphans, invalids, and the elderly. The family and the church, the principal institutions taking formal responsibility for children, shared a common set of values regarding social order and religious salvation and a common language for defining and controlling deviance.

Still, the greatest risks to children in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were childbirth and disease. Historian John Demos estimates that 25 percent of all children born in seventeenth-century Plymouth died during the first decade of life; and epidemics of smallpox, diphtheria, whooping cough, measles, and mumps that swept North America in the first half of the eighteenth century "doubled and tripled" the normal average of thirty deaths per one thousand born in Boston during those years.¹¹

By the middle of the eighteenth century, a variety of public charitable institutions began to reproduce traditional family responsibilities. Most visible in the complex commercial centers of the Atlantic seaboard, cities built almshouses to offset the cost of caring for widows, orphans, and the poor and mentally ill. Free schools and common pay schools began to replace the educational function of families, and workshops increasingly substituted for families in the apprenticeship of youth. Among civic leaders, revolutionary ideas about individualism and secularism permeated the language of public policy discourse over expectations for the youth, and therein the future, of the nation. For adolescents, the end of the century witnessed an upsurge in premarital pregnancy and weakening of the traditional parental control over young men and women. Moreover, rising educational standards coincided with an expansion of choices

available to youths, prolonging economic dependency.

Slave children were of course threatened by the risks attendant upon their status. In this period, the slave trade was at its peak. According to historian Alan Kulikoff, of the 550,00 Africans forcibly brought into the colonies, 60 percent arrived between 1720 and 1780.¹² Malnutrition, poorer health, separation from parents, and demands for work contributed to higher death rates and less protection for these children.

By the end of the eighteenth century, attitudes about strict discipline were softening, less punitive, and more nurturing. Concepts of individual rights that permeated the political landscape were reflected in greater respect for the individuality of the child and in the language of childrearing. Even before the revolution, the language of family governance changed from that of discipline and authority to that of government and laws.¹³ The goals for children were shifting from salvation to citizenship, and concern for children's religious life expanded to include education and health.¹⁴ Family law, however, did not change much during this century. The father retained absolute authority over the person and property of the child, with the exception of the poor laws.¹⁵ For example, following the Act of 1735 until the end of the century, half of Boston's eleven hundred poor children between the ages of five and nine were "bound out," boys to learn a trade and girls to domestic service. During this period, too, children could be separated from their parents and forced to work, or grandparents could be compelled to support them when their parents were incapable of doing so.¹⁶

In the case of orphans, a "reasonably effective mechanism" developed from Orphans Court to protect property and create a method of adoption, even though no common or statute law provided for the assignment of parents.¹⁷ Through the practice of apprenticeship or indenture, parents could petition the General Court for permission to change a child's name and transfer inheritance to a child "created" in this way.

At the opening of the nineteenth century, goals for the child came to reflect the goals of the new nation: republican citizenship, secular governance, and work.¹⁸ Although Christian moral goals continued to form the basis of children's education, social control and secular order were taking on equivalent importance. A growing number of larger, less intimate towns were straining to accommodate rapid population growth from increasing num-

bers of foreign immigrants and domestic southern and rural migrants. The exigencies of industrial labor and poverty shifted responsibility for orphaned or delinquent children away from families with inadequate resources to public and private institutions, to schools, and to courts. Illegitimate births, for example, led mothers in increasing numbers to abandon their infants to the care of private almshouses, churches, and convents rather than to relatives. Public discourse increased to define and ameliorate problems and to find the means to intervene on behalf of other people's children.

The Civil War, an unfortunate watershed for children, left thousands of children with one or no parents, in numbers that almshouses could not accommodate. Public outcry against incarcerating children in public poorhouses with the adult insane, vagrants, drunks, and prostitutes led, albeit slowly, to an increase in orphanages and to policies of fostering out children to families. This recognition of the special needs of children was accompanied by experiments with industrial schools, lodging homes for working youth, and foundling hospitals for abandoned infants. Attempting to house child criminals orphaned and impoverished by the loss of parents, reformatories became vastly overcrowded. Postwar inflation added to the stress on these publicly funded institutions, making contract labor inside the reformatories appealing to hard-pressed directors. These practices continued into the 1890s, when child labor laws led to their abolition.

The Civil War also created new classes of black and female juvenile delinquents. Reformatories during this period were segregated both by sex and by race. Girls were customarily incarcerated in single-sex institutions not for the petty larcenies usually associated with boys, but for precocious sexual behavior, a crime with which boys were virtually never charged.¹⁹ Moreover, few institutions admitted newly emancipated black youths at all, and those that did kept them strictly segregated. Nineteenth-century reformers expressed little concern with preventing the exposure of black children to the influences of adult criminals. Most black youths charged with crimes were locked up with adult criminals.

Linking juvenile crime with immigration, heredity, poverty, and urbanization, late-nineteenth-century reformers began to distinguish between the dependent and the delinquent. These distinctions were, however, often based more on ethnicity

and class than on children's behavior. Urban reformers feared the congestion and urban disorder associated with rapid migrations to the cities of blacks from the South and poor Catholic and Jewish immigrants from Europe, and sought to control rather than assist those groups of children born of "inferior" stock. Social Darwinists and hereditarians linked crime and school failure with the foreign born and black and turned to local governments for the solutions that would shield the community against their disruptive and unsavory influences. By the end of the century, juvenile crime was considered to be the concern of the government, with most reformatories supported by public funds. Child poverty, however, an idea more sympathetically applied to white native-born children and to children within ethnic groups, required protection from the impersonal and dangerous cities. Organized assistance remained outside the public sphere, with most orphanages supported by private charitable organizations or religious groups taking care of their own.²⁰ The Children's Aid Society, for example, proved to be a model of such child welfare efforts. Founded in 1853 by Yale-trained minister Charles Loring Brace, the Children's Aid Society sought to save the needy homeless children of New York by placing them in foster care, lodging houses, and industrial schools.²¹ Others followed this pioneering agency in efforts to protect the child from impersonal and crowded institutions, negligent parents, and urban dangers.

Often linked with the decline in rural craft and farming culture and the rise of commercial life, responsibility for children in the nineteenth century shifted from the father to the mother, both legally and in terms of education and socialization. Child custody laws came to favor the mother during a child's "tender years," and courts took on parental responsibilities when both parents failed their children.²² In addition, the complex process associated with the rise of common schooling increased the participation of women both as educators in the homes and as teachers. The idea of mother as nurturer both elevated the responsibilities of women in the home and increased their culpability for children's failures.

By the end of the nineteenth century, several dramatic shifts had occurred to reorient children's place in society. Fundamental in its significance, the school became the most pervasive public institution for socialization and control over the lives of children. An almost universal institution, reinforced by restric-

tive child labor laws, schools constituted irrevocably and increasingly a substitution for former environments of work. Thus, as the primary workplace for children, schools became entrenched as the common mediators through which the problems of risk were negotiated. Although the local authorities of family and church did not disappear, control became a shared and often contested enterprise with the schools.²³

Further, in the eyes of child advocates, children's moral failures shifted from an emphasis on personal character flaws to being the result of negative environmental and genetic influences. Moralistic children's literature of the nineteenth century gave way to social scientists' analyses of parental, neighborhood, and socioeconomic factors, thereby shifting responsibility away from the child and onto the community and its institutions.²⁴

Finally, by the end of the nineteenth century, the categories of risk were elaborated in conformity with new theories of child development.²⁵ Moreover, laws such as those limiting child labor, establishing compulsory schooling, and defining juvenile crimes combined to segregate children as a unique class of people with special needs for protection and guidance.

Broadly drawn, the goals for American children have changed from the intense colonial religious need for salvation, with the church in authority, to the nineteenth-century need for order and citizenship, controlled by private philanthropy in local communities, to the twentieth-century belief in individual development, with law, science, and government as the arbiters.

Along with these differences, the twentieth century brought new language and nuance to older, well-established concepts of the child. Armed with the new vocabulary of science and psychology, and the weight of truth associated with scientific research, reformers joined with social scientists to reinforce the values of social order, Christian morality, nativism, and racism in defining which children were at risk and which children were causing risk to society. In all times, protective policies toward children, whether private or public, have been heartfelt attempts to reconcile the conflicting values of parental responsibility and authority, the well-being of children, and the preservation of social order defined by the institutions designed to promote that order.

This volume surveys twentieth-century public policy toward children at risk as revealed in the language of public policy debates waged within the schools, the courts, and private agencies in their efforts to define which children need protection and which children threaten the unspoken but powerful matrix of established social goals. The three sections review the conceptualization of children historically, analyze the nature of dialogue among interested parties, and present a selection of contemporary public issues. Taken together, the essays look at a cross-section of risks, the institutions and authorities who take on the responsibilities for intervention, the language used to define risk, and mechanisms, objects, and goals of intervention. Although the essays do not address all risks associated with all children, they do offer ways for the reader to analyze public debate and the frequently contested goals of public policy decisions.

The first part of this volume, "Historical Public Discourse," reviews the development of public policies toward children as conceived by twentieth-century reformers, by the courts, and by the schools. The essays provide an overview of child-saving patterns in the twentieth century; a review of the history of the juvenile court system's definitions of offenders; and the history of public school policy in the service of classroom order. In each case, definitions of risk were as important as the solutions themselves, and each author explores how language and labeling were used to identify treatment while only selectively affecting the behavior or circumstances of the child.

Hamilton Cravens, in his paper "Child Saving in Modern America 1870s-1990s," presents three broad eras that have framed notions of the child in the twentieth century, showing how the social construction of the child has been malleable over time. His work suggests that there has been a change from an emphasis on conformity and adjustment, witnessed by the building of child-saving institutions in the early part of the century, to the rise of individual child rights, accompanied by the deinstitutionalization of children.²⁶ For Cravens, these changes have influenced not only how the child is viewed in society, but also the goals and methods of reform.

Using the example of Los Angeles, Steven Schlossman and Susan Turner, in chapter 2, "Status Offenders, Criminal Offenders, and Children 'at Risk' in Early Twentieth-Century Juvenile Court," examine the juvenile court, one of the primary twenti-

eth-century institutions developed to address the needs of children classified as delinquent. These included both criminals and blameless "status offenders," children whose behavior is criminal only by virtue of their age. They chronicle the rise of the juvenile court at the turn of the century as a child-saving institution and the later movement to decriminalize status offenses in the 1970s. Schlossman and Turner's data suggest a shift from the ideal of trusting institutions to protect society from the deviant child, to protecting the child from oppressive institutions. The process was achieved by relabeling the offense rather than changing the behavior of the child. Supporting Cravens's categories, Schlossman and Turner's study finds that in the 1930s the court sought the adjustment of the child to a standard for the normal. Moreover, they reveal court bias in terms of gender-appropriate behavior, and the gender division of crime and punishment.

In "Structuring Risks: The Making of Urban School Order," Joseph Tropea shows how compulsory schooling laws brought children into the schools, saving them from child labor and the streets. Underlying schools' undisputed educative purposes was the development of schools' role as the major agencies of social reform. At the turn of the century, schools began practices whose purpose was to preserve order within the institution rather than provide direct aid or assistance to "problem" children. As were the courts, the schools were little concerned with ameliorating the cause of the problems, nor was a distinction made between behavioral and learning problems. In a highly textured array of data, Tropea probes beyond school policy and rhetoric to find the underlying attitudes toward children at risk for failure within the school system. Also supporting Cravens's periodization of the years 1920-40 as one of adjustment, Tropea argues that schools used adjustment language to segregate and control the school population during the depression. Even when the rhetoric changed in the 1960s to support policies of meeting the individual needs of students, relabeling the problem child served the interests of school order rather than offered individual assistance. The rhetoric changed, but the practices remained effectively the same. Interrelating schooling, work, delinquency, and the need for school order, Tropea spans the century to argue that order has been the primary goal of schools, taking precedence over pedagogical integrity or the needs of the individual child.

The second part of this volume, "Reconceptualizing Children at Risk," directly addresses the complex conceptualizations of risk in three areas: in the schools, in the courts, and among social scientists. Public discourse, in Cravens's terms, represents the collectively agreed-upon ideas that can be found in every historical era. While debates may surface over solutions, the conception of the child is often an agreed-upon idea. Nevertheless, by looking closely at the debates over the definitions of the problem, we see how competing social goals and attitudes are translated into conflicted policy rhetoric.

Following upon Tropea's analysis of dropouts, Michelle Fine in "Making Controversy: Who's 'At Risk'?" looks at the ideological debates that surround children at risk in the schools, focusing again on the language of the debates and the policies that flow, and do not flow, from the definitions of both the problem and a narrow range of solutions. Fine analyzes the dropout problem as it is manifest in public discourse, forcing out of the debates the issues that are controversial and those that remain subjugated by exclusion from the discourse. She looks at the complexities of measurement, intervention, promotion, and retention, and discipline. Reflecting on the recent deinstitutionalization movement and the history of schools' conflicts over dropouts, Fine analyzes the current debate, suggesting that the language of students' rights to drop out recasts the issue as a benefit, rather than a detriment, to the child, thereby relieving the institution of responsibility. She also points out the conflict between the policymakers and the child advocates.

Michael Grossberg, in his essay "Children's Legal Rights: A Historical Look at a Legal Paradox," looks also at the language of rights that has obscured the role of the courts and confused questions of social responsibility. As with Fine's and Tropea's papers, Grossberg, too, looks beyond empirical studies to find the meanings in language and definitions that result in public policy toward children. The language of children's rights has dominated this decade's discourse regarding many social ills, particularly with regard to education, poverty, and protection, but it is especially apparent in the law. As Grossberg points out, children are dependent both on their parents and on the state; however, says Grossberg, "rights have become so wedded to our notions of individual entitlement and protection that denying children rights has also seemed to make them even more defenseless," thus creating the paradox of children's rights. Moreover, the

nineteenth-century ideological commitment to the private/public distinction clouded direct discussion of children's policies behind the rhetoric of the proper role of the state in family life. The law created a dual system of family law, one for middle-class families and another for lower-class families and racial and ethnic groups.

The Progressive Era, roughly the 1880s to 1920s, produced a host of new regulations, each adding to the definitions of risk and, according to Grossberg, "premised on the assumption that public regulation of childrearing had to be expanded." The law mandated cultural homogeneity in the home. As Tropea looks at the impact of compulsory schooling laws on the schools, Grossberg looks at the intersection among the courts, the prohibition of child labor, and compulsory school laws. Each act expressed the assumption that childhood should be prolonged by keeping children within their families. The result was to lengthen and strengthen children's dependence on adults and to legally remove the young from the marketplace. Grossberg emphasizes the change from custody in the Progressive period to liberty in the last few decades.

Margo Horn, in "Inventing the Problem Child: 'At Risk' Children in the Child Guidance Movement of the 1920s and 1930s," focusing on private philanthropic efforts, uses definitions of risk to see how some children were included, and others excluded, from institutional help. She turns her attention to the efforts of private-sector professionals in identifying and formulating services for children at risk. Horn's research directly addresses the period Cravens describes as one of "adjustment." Looking at the programs initiated by the Commonwealth Fund in the 1920s and 1930s, Horn argues that the designers of the child guidance movement began with the expectation of solving the delinquency problems of poor youth living in urban slums but soon redefined the at-risk population so as to serve native-born middle-class children with "mild behavioral and emotional problems, within the confines of clinic offices." By focusing attention on middle-class families, Horn suggests that the child guidance practitioners neglected the children whose needs seemed intractable, preferring the children of the middle class with whom they could show success. Redefining risk in this way both created professional opportunities and increased the legitimacy of the newly developing fields of psychology, psychiatry, and social work.

The third part of this volume, "Contemporary Public Discourse," addresses six public environments in which conflicts over policies are debated. In the first paper, "Children at Risk: Students in Special Education," Alan Gartner and Dorothy Kerzner Lipsky look at the educational effects of labeling and relabeling students and the laws and fiscal constraints that burden the schools. As do the essays that follow theirs in this part, Gartner and Lipsky introduce specific policy recommendations.

Patricia Gandara's "Language and Ethnicity as Factors in School Failure: The Case of Mexican-Americans" is a study of the multiple factors that contribute to school failure for these children. Identifying poor language abilities as the problem, she argues, obscures the more difficult issues that have to do with discrimination, strong Hispanic family and community culture, and confinement to marginal economic opportunities. Moreover, Hispanics, because of their long existence in the United States, cannot escape a history of stereotyping and negative associations.

P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale and Maris A. Vinovskis, "Adolescent Pregnancy and Child Support," along with Robert T. Lerman, "Reversing the Poverty Cycle with Job-Based Education," address the question of children in poverty, the group who are currently at the heart of public concern. Chase-Lansdale and Vinovskis's paper extends the analysis of public policy discussions in the area of teen pregnancy. Arguing that seemingly separate policy issues are in fact closely linked, they suggest that paternal involvement in teen parenthood should be encouraged, to relieve the rise in child poverty and increase the emotional health of the child.

Building on the idea of more effective enforcement of paternal support, Lerman suggests ways to improve the employment chances of young men in poverty categories. In Lerman's view, apprenticeships are comparable to internships in the academic professions, such as medicine, law, and management, and should be an integral step in job training. Related to the father's side of Chase-Lansdale and Vinovskis's advocacy of paternal support for out-of-wedlock children, Lerman advances an analysis of the fear held by young black women that they will not be able to find employable black men and that of young black men who have little hope that they will rise out of poverty.

Presenting another important aspect of the question of

parental responsibility and the risks to children of working parents, Judy Auerbach, in her essay "Public Policy and Child Care: The Question of Quality," carefully analyzes the various sides of the debate over federal child-care policy and the concerns that underlie each position. In the 1990s, Auerbach suggests, consensus has come to favor federal support of child care. As the female labor force has increased to include most mothers with preschool-age children, child care has come to be a public, rather than purely private, concern. Auerbach cautions, however, that the rationale favoring public support is based on the uncomfortable argument that children represent the economic future of the nation, rather than on their immediate needs as children.

The last essay, "Public Policy and Child Protection," is a contribution by James Garbarino, longtime child advocate in the field of child neglect and abuse. Garbarino also approaches the discourse over children from the point of view of policy. He points out the practical difficulties of reconciling policy with practice, and the conflicting underlying assumptions that inform both. Raising minimal standards of risk, he suggests, creates a gap in compliance and exaggerates the dilemmas of individual liberty versus social responsibility.

The essays as a whole intend to focus attention on how language has been used in the formation of public policy, as an historical as well as a contemporary process; the importance of understanding underlying attitudes toward the place of the child in society and the distribution of responsibility for child welfare; and the tension between fears and expectations for the society as a whole and support for the individuality and protection of the child. *Risk* as a generic term both raises the anxiety of the nation and masks the complexities that impede the formation of a national consensus and viable public policy solutions. The papers that follow explore the subjective meanings of *risk* and the debates and policies that have resulted from them. Over time, the process of discovering new problems has resulted in a patchwork of often conflicting institutional responses to child risk. Most significantly, the essays suggest that the concept of risk is a social construct that has changed over time, at various times including some children while ignoring others, always reflecting our nation's level of tolerance for criminal deviance, school failure, parental neglect, and the effects of poverty on children.

NOTES

1. Ellen Key, *The Century of the Child* (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1909).

2. Philippe Aries, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, trans. Robert Baldick (New York: Vintage Books, 1962). Aries was the first modern historian of childhood to recognize the conception of the child as a social construction.

3. Works for seventeenth-century history of childhood include: Edmond S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); Philip J. Greven, Jr., *Four Generations: Population, Land, and Family in Colonial Andover, Massachusetts* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970); Kenneth Lockridge, *A New England Town, The First Hundred Years: Dedham, Massachusetts, 1636-1736* (New York: Psychohistory Press, 1974); Thad W. Tate and David I. Ammerman, eds., *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979).

4. Health risks varied between the New England and the Chesapeake colonies. For detailed histories of both, see Peter G. Slater, "From the Cradle to the Coffin: Parental Bereavement and the Shadow of Infant Damnation in Puritan Society," in N. Ray Hiner and Joseph M. Hawes, eds., *Growing Up in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985); David E. Stannard, *The Puritan Way of Death: A Study in Religion, Culture, and Social Change* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977); John Duffy, *Epidemics in Colonial America* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1953); and Ross W. Beales, Jr., "The Child in Seventeenth-Century America," in Joseph M. Hawes and N. Ray Hiner, eds., *American Childhood: A Research Guide and Historical Handbook* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985).

5. Philip J. Greven, *Child Rearing Concepts, 1628-1861* (Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1973).

6. Ross W. Beales, "The Child in Seventeenth-Century America," 32.

7. John R. Sutton, "Stubborn Children: Law and the Socialization of Deviance in the Puritan Colonies," *Family Law Quarterly* 15 (1981): 31-64.

8. Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, "Now-Wives and Sons-in-Law: Parental Death in a Seventeenth-Century Virginia County," in

Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, eds., *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 153-82.

9. Lois Green Carr, "The Development of the Maryland Orphan's Court, 1654-1715," in Aubrey C. Land, Lois Green Carr, and Edward C. Papenfuse, eds., *Law, Society, and Politics in Early Maryland: Proceedings of the First Conference on Maryland History, June 14-15, 1974* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977).

10. Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman. Op. cit. "Now-Wives and Sons-in-Law."

11. John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); and John Duffy, *Epidemics in Colonial America*, 33-37.

12. Alan Kulikoff, "A 'Prolific' People: Black Population Growth in the Chesapeake Colonies, 1700-1790," *Southern Studies* 16 (1977): 391-428.

13. See, for example, James Axtell's *The School Upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

14. See, for example, Lawrence Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970); Barbara Finkelstein, *Regulated Children/Liberated Children: Education in Psychohistorical Perspective* (New York: Psychohistory Press, 1979).

15. Jamil S. Zainaldin, *Law in Antebellum Society: Legal Change and Economic Expansion* (New York: Random House, 1983).

16. Constance B. Schulz, "Children and Childhood in the Eighteenth Century," in Joseph M. Hawes and N. Ray Hiner, eds., *American Childhood* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985).

17. Joseph Ben-Or, "The Law of Adoption in the United States: Its Massachusetts Origins and the Statute of 1851," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 130 (1976): 259-72.

18. Barbara Finkelstein, "Casting Networks of Good Influence: The Reconstruction of Childhood in the United States, 1790-1870," in Hawes and Hiner, *American Childhood* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985).

19. Barbara Brenzel, *Daughters of the State: A Social Portrait of the First Reform School for Girls in North America, 1856-1905* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983), 120-23.

20. Gary Polster, *Inside Looking Out: The Cleveland Jewish Orphan Asylum, 1868-1924* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1990); John O'Grady, *Catholic Charities in the United States* (New York: Arno Press, 1971); Priscilla Ferguson Clement, "Families and Foster Care: Philadelphia in the Late Nineteenth Century," in Hiner and Hawes, *Growing Up in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985).

21. Thomas Bender, *Toward an Urban Vision: Ideas and Institutions in Nineteenth Century America* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1975).

22. Michael Grossberg, *Governing the Hearth: Law and the Family in Nineteenth Century America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985).

23. Barbara Finkelstein, "Casting Networks of Good Influence."

24. For analyses of nineteenth-century children's moralistic literature, see Bernard Wishy, *The Child and the Republic: The Dawn of Modern American Children* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968); Elizabeth Francis, "American Children's Literature, 1646-1880," and Sally Allen McNall, "American Children's Literature, 1880-Present," in Hiner and Hawes, *American Childhood*. On the shift to children as needing the help of others, see, for example, Anthony Platt, *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969); Ellen Ryerson, *The Best Laid Plans: America's Juvenile Court Experiment* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1978); Steven Schlossman, *Love and the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of "Progressive" Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

25. The literature on child development and efforts to address stages of mental, moral, and physical development in children is extensive, represented throughout the historical literature in the fields of psychology, education, social welfare, and sociology. In psychology, see, for example, Dorothy Ross, *G. Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972); in education, Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961); in social welfare and sociology, Robert Bremner, *From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 1956), Walter Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America* (New York: Free Press, 1974), and Roy Lubov, *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965).

26. This shift is symbolized by Emma Octavia Lundberg's 1947

work, *Unto the Least of These: Social Services for Children* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1947), and W. Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazer-son's 1982 work *Broken Promises: How Americans Fail Their Children* (New York: Basic Books, 1982).