

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 19

JULY 22, 1975 TO JULY 26, 1975

(PAGES 23935 TO 25194)



The diplomat who derides the introduction of such sentiment into any foreign intercourse—who calls it "unrealistic"—is himself out of touch with political reality in modern democracies. Public opinion counts, and it is not always determined by the neat patterns of immediate self-interest. Cultural affinity, tradition, admiration for pluckiness, common ways for doing politics and business, the expectation of returned loyalty—all this goes into the intangible making of an ally.

Our diplomats err in trying to befriend an Egypt by defriending an Israel. There are other, more complex ways to express our interest in Egypt than to join her in condemnation of our ally. We can act as honest brokers without trying to deceive one side by pretending that we do not know and are not allied to the other side: We might even pick up a point for candor.

"Blessed are the peacemakers," goes the sermon on the Mount. A less familiar portion goes, "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

Israelis have a right to their kingdom with secure borders now, here on earth, and America as peacemaker ought not to be in the least embarrassed to be known as a reliable ally in that cause.

## CHILDHOOD SOCIAL INDICATORS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the American Orthopsychiatric Association recently held its annual meeting in Washington, D.C. This association has contributed for over 50 years to the multi-disciplinary study and treatment of the problems of human behavior.

The president of the association this year is Orville G. Brim, who serves as president of the Foundation for Child Development. It has been my pleasure to have known and worked with Bert Brim for many years, both in his present position and in his previous position as president of the Russell Sage Foundation. Throughout his career, Dr. Brim has not only served well the scientific and professional communities concerned with the study of child development, but also made an outstanding contribution to the shaping of public policy to support and strengthen families and children.

In his presidential address to the association, Dr. Brim eloquently outlines many of the steps needed to link traditional research and services in child care to national policies designed to help families and children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his presidential address be printed in the RECORD, and urge all of my colleagues to review his thoughtful recommendations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### MACRO-STRUCTURAL INFLUENCES ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND THE NEED FOR CHILDHOOD SOCIAL INDICATORS\*

(By Orville G. Brim, Jr.)

The place to begin is to give you the new title for my remarks, namely, "Macro-Structural Influences on Child Development and the Need for Childhood Social Indicators."

\*Presidential Address to the American Orthopsychiatric Association Fifty-second Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., March 1975. To be published in *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, July 1975.

Now, before you head for the doors, I remind you that Ortho's unique strength is that it is multi-disciplinary—and I ask you to join me in an experiment which may test the outer limits of our multi-disciplinary nature.

I believe that we need new kinds of data to aid this nation in forming its child development policies. These new data are demanded by what is now an imperative change in the focus of our concern in child development. I say that we now must stress the macro-structural influences on child development—must look at economics, cultural values, politics, law, and sociology in relation to child development—must get these areas linked to traditional research and services in child care.

### THE CHANGED VALUE OF CHILDREN IN SOCIETY

We are, in this nation, moving into an era which may be historically the most precarious for America's children. The evolution of our society from a rural to an urban-based family system, from an extended to a nuclear family system, and from a labor-intensive to a machine economy, has made the child no longer an economic asset in the family.

Meanwhile, marked increases in the cost of raising a child cause individual parents and the economy generally to view child-bearing and child-rearing as an economic liability, in competition with other values. Moreover, at the ideological level there has been a downgrading of the sense of personal work derived from parenthood, especially for women. The ego satisfactions gained from having children are deteriorating.

How then, can children lay claim to our support in this new era? What do they have left? Children lay claim on the rest of us now because they are vulnerable; and thus engage our humanitarianism; because they are persons and hold legal rights, as we do, in society and thus demand our consideration; and because in children we see the future of man, and they are integral to our most distant visions.

But these are weakening claims, no longer backed up by the economic sanction of a productive position in society. The child's weakness is manifest in much that we see about us:

Just recently in federal cutbacks in support of child nutrition—the removal of subsidized school lunches; and, in support of child health—as in the refusal to provide free vaccinations. We can observe that when things get tight, "children are the first to go."

### MACRO-STRUCTURAL INFLUENCES ON CHILD CARE

In this era when children have become objects for manipulation, the subject of budget cuts, the targets of mass advertising, the scapegoats of prejudice, we need additional strategies. It no longer is enough to do medical and psychological research on the development of children, nor to intervene on an individual basis in providing comfort, counseling, and therapy. We need national policies for child development, and so we must add now a concern with the macro-structural influences on child development. As knowledge from the behavioral and social sciences grows, we can raise our aspirations and progress from amelioration to intervention, and to the sophisticated concept of linkages between child development and society's macro-structure.

Our blueprint for child development work in the decade ahead must include the great social forces—technology, the law, the mass media, economic and social discrimination—which affect our child care institutions—the family, the school, the clinic, the day care center. Such forces affect, too, the very purposes of child-rearing, as when military and scientific international competition pro-

duced extreme American emphasis on intellectual development of children during the late 1950's and '60's—with millions for IQ and hardly a dime for love and joy—so that only now are we once again asking children: "Show me what you can do besides read and write."

Contrast these macro-structural determinants with two other levels of influence. First, the "micro-structural" level is familiar to most of us, and deals primarily with the people who care for children. Our interest is in individual differences, and is mainly clinical in nature. Research involves fine-grain analysis of, for example, the influence of a particular kind of parental behavior on a child's personality. This includes work done during the 1940's on the effects of parental differences in weaning and toilet training practices; and more recently on the effects of different kinds of teacher-pupil interaction.

One level above this is a "meso-structural" level, or middle level of influences. It includes the institutions that serve children. Research now makes comparisons of types of families, or types of schools, or types of child-care institutions, without dealing with individual variability within such systems. Is the extended family, for instance, better than the nuclear family for certain kinds of child care? Are small classes in school superior to large classes?

Now, if one believes that the extended family system has consequences more desirable for children than does the nuclear family system, the national policy issue then is how one generates an extended family system (or perhaps its functional equivalent). This question forces us to consider the third and higher level of determinants; that is, what are the influences that produce different kinds of family structures, school systems, day care settings, and health delivery systems? One is moved inexorably to the consideration of macro-structural forces—of economic influences, of historical determinants, of cultural values, of sociological trends and political science factors. One must deal with the new histories of child care, which show the powerful influences on child-rearing of beliefs about the fundamental nature of "human nature," such as basic depravity, or predestination. We are directed to the issue of income redistribution and income maintenance policies; to questions of the effects of race discrimination and social stratification on day-to-day family operations; to the influence of the mass media on children, both detrimental and benign. And, among these macro-structural determinants of child care, we come upon the emerging issue of inequalities in possession of life management information, including information about child development. These inequalities in the possession of useful knowledge in our society seem indeed to be more gross and unjust than income inequalities.

If we are to study these large-scale societal influences on children—as I believe we must—new talents are required. As I have said often during this past year, we must get some new actors onto the child development scene. We must recruit new and different kinds of behavioral and social scientists—economists, historians, lawyers, political scientists, and sociologists—to pursue their inquiries linking macro-institutions to the lives of children, and to link up with developmental psychologists, social workers, child psychiatrists, pediatricians, in analyzing the impact of societal forces on the individual child. I illustrate with a few examples from economics, law, sociology and social psychology.

### NEW ACTORS AND NEW RESEARCH ON THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT SCENE

#### 1. Economists

The economics of child development is a rapidly growing field, albeit from a small

numerical base of experts at this time. The study of the effects of income maintenance and income redistribution on families and on non-family child care institutions is one area of special interest. Fundamental disagreements among economists as to what this country's policies should be on supporting day care dramatically illustrate the need for more research and analysis on this type of problem if we are to develop a workable national policy for children. On the one hand is the position that the federal government fund directly the establishment of child care institutions, under federal auspices or through grants to state and local organizations, meanwhile setting and maintaining standards. On the other hand is the view that parents in need can purchase day care services on the open market in a free enterprise system if we have an effective national program of income redistribution.

A second instance, in economics, is the study of "human capital," and cost/benefit analyses. What kind of early investment—probably no later than the second year of life—in a brain-damaged child might keep him in the mainstream, keep him out of special classes in the formal school system during a twelve-year period, with economic gain to the society? Referring back to the decline in federally-supported nutritional supplements in the form of school lunches, what might be the cost/benefit ratio? How much more than the price of a lunch will it cost society over the long term in lost productivity, and in the need for institutionalization, of children damaged by nutritional deficiencies? This is a cold-blooded way to make the case for the care of children in our society, but I say again that the competition for goods and services in the American economy is economic and political, and we can no longer rely solely on good will and individual acts of charity and kindness to provide for children in this country.

### 2. Lawyers

Secondly, since I am not assuming that these market place analyses are going to take care of all of our problems, some greater encouragement to the legal profession to get into this area of study must be given. The development of public interest law groups dealing with child advocacy has, of course, been a remarkable event in this country in the past decade. But I think that we need to provide, in addition, some more factual and theoretical support for their continuing work, by making a major analysis of the assumptions implicit in Western law that are made about children and child development. We need to appraise the accumulated and often irrational body of law and custom about child development which we trail behind us from twenty or thirty centuries of Western culture. As Professor John Simon states:<sup>1</sup> "Age-grading suffuses the legal order. In countless contexts, a person's rights, powers, duties and disabilities under the law depend on a determination that he or she has 'come of age.' Chronological age decides whether or not a person can—or must—go to school, go to jail, marry, work, obey parents, speak freely, worship God, see a movie, inspect school records, receive parental support, provide support to parents, have counsel, testify, own a credit card, endure beatings, buy, sell, smoke, bet, drink, drive. The most prominent of these classifications are statutory. Additional classifications are made by public officials acting under federal or state law. . . . Whatever the source of age-grading law—statutory, judicial or administrative—it has special consequences for the least advantaged children: the poor and the disabled. These are the youths most likely to drop out of school at an age when attendance is compulsory; to undergo some

variety of punishment or of criminal or civil commitment at an age when fewer procedural safeguards are available; or to need some form of government assistance, often granted or withheld according to age. Moreover, these children—as a result of personal incapacity or lack of family resources—may be least equipped to overcome or avoid governmental age-grading restrictions through persuasion, through legal challenge, or through escape to private schools, hospitals and other non-governmental systems.

Age grading not only has a differential impact according to socioeconomic class and according to health status, its rules vary as they move from one legal arena to another, from the male sex to the female sex, from state to state and town to town, and from judge to judge or from one administrator to another. Whatever its form and expression, the presence of age-grading is ubiquitous and commanding. . . ."

### 3. Sociologists and social psychologists

My fellow sociologists have many tasks and challenges before them in the field of child development, and of course, the creation of childhood social indicators is one of these. Before commenting on these new indicators I want to mention in passing one other strategic leadership role that I hope sociologists will fill. I refer to evaluation studies of major social experiments. Probably the best known instances are the evaluation of Sesame Street and of Head Start. These programs were specifically directed to children.

There are, also, many other major social experiments where even though the primary purpose is not child development, the program nevertheless may have profound influence on children. A likely case is the negative income tax experiment in New Jersey, where there is a possibility of appraising the actual consequences for children of an income maintenance program on such objective criteria as school attendance, school performance, and health records. If we are to understand the effects of these and other powerful macro-structural events on children, evaluation studies are imperative.

### SOCIAL INDICATORS FOR CHILDREN

But the main role for sociologists and social psychologists, I submit, is to take the lead in developing childhood indicators. Now, what are they? Nothing esoteric is meant by using the term "indicators of the state of the child" or "indicators of child development," or even "childhood social indicators." These all refer to the same body of information, namely: statistical time series data that measure changes (or constancies) in significant characteristics. To produce these facts clearly requires that there be identical measures, repetitively applied over time, to comparable populations of children.

As my colleague at the Foundation for Child Development, Dr. Nicholas Zill, has pointed out, "National statistics on the well-being of children, on the amounts and kinds of care they are receiving, on their physical, cognitive, and emotional development—such statistics vary greatly in availability, quality, adequacy of population coverage, geographic scope and detail, continuity, and comparability over time. Data on the psychological well-being of children and on their social and emotional development are generally much less adequate than statistics on children's physical health and development, or on their intellectual development and educational achievements."

The variety of information collected includes data on nutrition, educational attendance and achievement; possession of knowledge in science and in the arts; instances of child abuse; deficient health care; characteristics of housing; type of family structure; where children are and who they are with on, say, a given Tuesday in the Spring.

Surveys would add a vital subjective dimension to national indicators and social reports on the lives of American children today. The absence of reports from children about children is a striking deficiency in current survey research on the quality of life in America. Adults are interviewed about their attitudes and values, their "hopes and fears," and the "perceived quality" of their lives. Such assessments of subjective well-being and its relationship to objective life conditions form a major theme in modern social indicators research.

The value of these indicators is to provide a better national profile of children's lives and of the care they receive, and to allow us to relate changes in environmental factors to changes in indicators of child well-being. The successful evaluation of macro-level policies requires evaluations linking the social experiment to children, and this in turn requires data collected over time, in a systematic way on America's children. Again quoting Dr. Zill, "the administrative statistics which are so often relied on for policy debate and decision making can provide information only on the families which are covered by or make use of the particular social service. Repetitive sample surveys can provide far better estimates of the need for resources and the incidence and prevalence of various behavioral and developmental problems in the general child population.

But beyond facts and figures, the survey would help provide enlightenment on why social conditions are changing and how we can make children's lives change for the better sooner. Thus, the most important function of surveys and the development of childhood social indicators is to help shape public policies and social programs in the future. To bring about effective actions in improving the lot of children, we need not only political consensus, but facts about conditions over space and time, and understanding of the variations and covariations in these conditions. Childhood social indicators supply the facts, and causal analysis can help to furnish the understanding."

### POSSIBLE DANGERS IN CHILDHOOD SOCIAL INDICATORS

The cautions we must have in mind in advancing the development of child social indicators seem to me to fall into two classes. The first is the familiar set of concerns about privacy, confidentiality, and labeling. The second, perhaps less familiar, is about dehumanization of the child.

First, then, as for privacy: informed consent of both parent and child should continue to be the rule. This includes approval of at least one parent for interviewing a child, and also a standardized and congenial means for obtaining the child's own consent. For confidentiality, the usual rules regulating records must govern such enterprises.<sup>2</sup> The establishment of data archives from surveys in both public and private sectors now are regulated by an increasingly formal set of criteria regarding identification and access. I should say that embracing the concept of child social indicators does not imply a justification of shoddy record keeping, on the grounds that they now are a contribution to the "social indicators" enterprise. In fact, a systematic collection of data on the nation's children under acceptable conditions of informed consent and protection of confidentiality removes the current feeble justification for inferior recordkeeping in the name of science.

Labeling presents a somewhat different problem because the parallel to the individual case is not quite as direct. Mass data are

<sup>1</sup> Internal Working Paper for Yale Law School, February 1975.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, the forthcoming special position paper on confidentiality of health records prepared by AOA's Council on Social Issues under Herman Schuchman's chairmanship.

collected. Individuals are not "labelled," as they might be as a result of individual test scores or interviews. Moreover, unlike much individual labelling in clinical work, the collection of data is systematically repetitive, is updated every year or so, and the so-called "labels" thus are responsive to real changes.

As for concern with statistics dehumanizing the child, the worry seems two-fold. First is a concern about the child becoming "just a statistic." This, it seems to me, is a fact we must accept when we use aggregate data about the nation's children. Clearly, the individual child is lost—but child development in this country too long has tried to make its case on the basis of individual children—on case studies of parental love and clinical humanitarianism. We must have the information that macro-structural research, using social indicators, can bring to us as part of our arsenal of weapons.

Secondly, we say that statistical data dehumanizes the child because it is "only objective," and misses the substance of the child's character and personality. Here, on the contrary, I say that a substantial part of the child social indicator data will be psychological and subjective in nature. If, in turn, one says surveys cannot obtain important subjective data, my reply is that surveys yield psychological or personality data from adults which has proved useful in many ways, and we can expect the same to be obtained from children.

#### CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE DEVELOPMENTS

We may well ask, are there not surveys already? The answer is yes, but they have defects. First, there are population surveys. As one of my colleagues has pointed out, though, in many government surveys, children are treated merely as chattel or appendages of households—the number of children is counted along with the number of automobiles, T.V. sets, and other household possessions.

Second, even when children are used as respondents, the child populations studied are small and unrepresentative. It has been pointed out that there are an enormous number of studies of parents and children, but these studies have used such small and unrepresentative samples that it makes it impossible to get a picture of the basic situation of children and their environment in the United States.

Third, some of the surveys are not public; they have been carried out by private research firms with commercial interests and oriented to the child as a consumer.

Fourth, although the most massive efforts at survey interviewing of young children are in the government sector, they are specialized in focus, and concentrate on such matters as health checkups or intellectual testing, without dealing with the other aspects of child personality.

#### 1 First national interview survey of young children

I am pleased to report to you that there are plans well underway to undertake the first major, public, national probability sample, interview survey of young children in the United States. This project is under the direction of Dr. Nicholas Zill, Senior Staff Scientist at the Foundation for Child Development. The project will have two principal goals. The first is the improvement of statistics on the physical and psychological well-being of U.S. children and the monitoring of changes in these child-welfare measures over time. The second is the development of an accurate national profile of the way children live and the care they receive, and the relation of variations in these conditions to differences and changes in childhood well-being indicators. The survey, to be conducted in 1976, will include:

Interviews with a national sample of children to measure their perceptions, feelings, attitudes, and values;

The collection of observational and parental reports on children's behavior patterns and the circumstances of their lives;

Such subjects as the personal characteristics of the children, the socioeconomic resources of their families, the kinds of care they receive, the patterns of social behavior they are learning, the problems and stresses to which they are exposed, and their perceptions and feelings about these problems and about the quality of their lives in general.

#### 2. Government's role in the future

The private sector—say, foundations and independent research centers—have a unique and irreplaceable function in developing social indicators vis-a-vis the federal government. Surveys undertaken in the private sector must be lodged there when the data to be obtained touch on political or cultural sensitivities, e.g. the citizen is unlikely to approve of spending public tax money to ask children how they feel. The private sector is needed also when initiative is impossible for government agencies because of public—that is, political—apathy about the nature of the enterprise, as may well be the case about surveying the state of America's children.

Having made this point, I now stress the axiom that successful development of childhood social indicators over the long run depends on government because the necessary facilities and funds are too great for private ventures. Government is de facto the chief producer of national social indicators. The kind of statistics produced by the government largely determines the substantive scope, time depth and frequency, and the precision of available social indicators on children. The knowledge we have about social change in America depends on how the federal statistical agencies present their data, as well as on the contents of those data. The government also sponsors and conducts most of the large-sample, large-budget, high-quality surveys done in the United States, especially the recurring ones.

Therefore, an important component of the program proposed here is the development of close cooperative relationships between the private sector and those federal agencies that have statistical or policy responsibilities related to the care, well-being, and development of American children. Among the things we would seek to accomplish through these involvements with the agencies are the following:

(1) To encourage federal statistical agencies to make more of a commitment to thorough and sophisticated analysis of the data they collect that relate to children; and to timely, interpretive reporting of the findings of such analyses.

(2) To make federal statistical data relating to children better known and more readily available to non-federal analysts and child development researchers.

(3) To repeat major baseline studies. The replication of important federal surveys that relate to children, such as the comprehensive nationwide study on child care arrangements, allows for the measurement and analysis of over-time changes and constancies in the characteristics, settings, and services of America's children.

(4) And, finally, to lay the groundwork for eventual adoption of national surveys of children as a continuing program of one of the federal statistical agencies.

#### STUDY VERSUS ACTION

Some of us may say that this draws interest and resources away from the needs of children today, away from intervention, and action, and support, and nurturance, now. I do understand that children compete for the taxpayer's dollars in the same way that urban housing, and highway construction, and pure water, and desegregation of the labor force, compete for these same funds. I

recognize that this competition in the last analysis is a political process, or failing that, a legal process, and that activities must work both these streets. One leads to the growth of legal advocacy—with which the American Orthopsychiatric Association is quite involved. The second is the attempt to influence political processes through public consciousness-raising and transforming the aroused sentiments into action.

Still, it is my view that charting the influence of societal institutions on child development is complementary to, rather than competitive with, active intervention to change society now. And, of most fundamental importance, indicators of the state of the child contribute to both research and action. I have stressed the research function of child social indicators. Now I remind you that descriptions of group differences among children have another edge to the blade; for it is the very description of needs and deficiencies which provide the scientific basis for public policy changes and legal intervention. The Children's Defense Fund must rely on such data as the basis of its legal actions, as in the recent successful suit on behalf of children excluded from school. And two decades ago, the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision was based on just such statistical description of group differences between black and white children.

Action and study challenge and reform each other and we must do both. Use what knowledge is on the shelf, but restock with a better product. Apply the Constitution on behalf of children now, but meanwhile amend the Constitution, if necessary. Act for the children of today, but also plan for the children arriving in the twenty-first century. Indicators of the state of American children will help us do both.

#### THE ALIEN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1975

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that Zero Population Growth, a national society actively searching for solutions to world population problems, has asked Congress to review the illegal alien problem and "adopt a policy statement on immigration to guide the Immigration and Naturalization Service and other Federal agencies in their administration of the law."

I find this request uniquely appropriate.

As Americans, we have always had great sympathy for the plight of the disadvantaged millions who must endure economic conditions and standards of living far below our own. No one can deny that this country has done more than any society in history to help poor people everywhere. We cannot, however, allow the scant natural resources of this country to be divided among those who do not care to live by the rules of our society.

The facts we have available to us about the alien population are unnerving. In 1973, enough illegal aliens were apprehended to populate Washington, D.C. The number of apprehensions has doubled each year in the last decade, but is still considered only one-tenth of the actual number of illegal aliens present in the United States. The approximate number of illegals today equals the population of New York City and in the early 1980's could equal the present population of Mexico.