on farms . . . is not held to be child labor. The presumption that everything is well with the child in agriculture runs so strong that any inquiry . . . is held by some not only useless but almost improper."[73] As late as 1932, the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection still noted that "the attitude of a large part of the public is not opposed to the employment of children in agriculture."[74]

The idealization of farmwork by child labor reformers wavered as investigations in the 1920s began to uncover some of the hardships experienced by young agricultural laborers. A survey of 845 children in North Dakota, conducted by the U.S. Children's Bureau, found boys and girls under age seventeen engaged in a wide variety of farmwork. Seventy-one percent of the children were under fourteen. Aside from field work, herding cattle was their most common task. Boys and girls, often as young as six years old, were "out on the prairie alone on foot or on horseback for long hours in the heat of the summer without shelter or drink . . . in danger of being thrown from horseback . . . or trampled on by the cattle." Others were involved in the construction of barbed-wire fences, digging or drilling holes for posts as well as assisting with butchering jobs, cleaning seed for the spring planting, and even taking care of farm machinery. Out of the 845 children, almost 750 were also responsible for routine chores and housework. One nine-year-old boy, for instance, "built the fires in the morning, swept the floors of a two-room house, and brought in fuel and water; in addition, before he made a two-mile trip to school, he helped feed stock (5 horse and 12 cows) and chopped wood; in the evening he did the chores and washed dishes."

In the North Dakota study, 20 percent of the children had worked away from home during the preceding year, either for wages or for their board; the majority were under fourteen years of age and had assisted with harvesting chores or as general farm helpers. The Children's Bureau study showed that farm- and homework took children away from their schoolwork. For instance, an examination of the school records of 3,465 children in six rural areas in North Dakota revealed that 42 percent of the 2,776 children under fourteen years of age, and 59 percent of those between ages ten and fourteen, had been kept home for work in defiance of child labor regulations.[75] An earlier investigation of rural children in several North Carolina counties found a similar situation. In a typical mountain county, for instance, a father of eight was asked why he did not buy a corn planter. He responded: "I already have eight." The family's workday often began at six or seven in the morning and ended at sundown, with an hour off for dinner. The report concluded that "although early training in habits of industry is desirable, and . . . a reasonable amount of farm work would scarcely injure a healthy child of sufficient size and strength, children's work on the farm . . . as is described in this report . . . [puts] undue strain upon the strength of the child, the interruption of his schooling . . . the ill effects upon his health."[76]

But the solution was not a wholesale condemnation of farm labor; instead, reformers sought to differentiate better between "good" farmwork and exploitative farm labor. As one writer in the *American Review of Reviews* explained in 1924: "Work on the farm performed by children under parents' direction and without interference with school attendance is not child labor. Work performed by children away from home, for wages, at long hours and under conditions which endanger the child's health, education and morals is child labor."[77] Thus, commercialized agriculture joined the ranks of illegitimate occupations, while the legitimacy of work on the home farm was idyllically preserved.

Between the extremes of industrial child labor and farmwork, there was a variety of other occupations for children of a much more uncertain status and with different claims to legitimacy. Fred Hall, executive secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, identified such occupations as "the borderland or frontier of the child labor program—an area in which the public often assumes that children's work is a valuable preparation for future usefulness."[78] Working as a Senate page, for instance, was a prestigious occupation for children. Working as a cashgirl or cashboy in a department store also promised an attractive and legitimate entry into business life.[79]

Street work and particularly newsboys presented child welfare workers with a unique dilemma. As Raymond Fuller explained in his book *Child Labor and the Constitution:* "Many of us . . . are rather strongly prejudiced in favor of it, finding ourselves obliged to overcome serious difficulties in order to recognize it as child labor."[80] Legislatures similarly hesitated to challenge the legitimacy of street work. While other occupations gradually established fourteen as a minimum age limit, children in street work could legally start work at ten or twelve, and many began as young as six or seven. The White House Conference report of 1932 still considered the regulation of street work as "one of the most difficult problems in the whole field of child labor law."[81] Why, wondered an observer, did people condemn child labor in the factories, yet "tolerate it and even approve of it in the street?" Why did factory work transform a child into a slave, yet street work somehow qualified him as a respectable "little merchant"?[82] As one social worker complained in 1905: "It seems the part of the iconoclast to controvert the public conception of the newsboy."[83]

The legitimacy of newspaper sellers, as well as many child peddlers and bootblacks, was initially determined by nineteenth-century utilitarian values. Unlike factory workers or children in mercantile establishments, street traders were not employees but independent merchants, working for profits and not for wages. It was a glamorous form of entrepreneurship. J. G. Brown, a painter who specialized in nineteenth-century street boys, described them to a reporter: "My boys lived in the open. There wasn't a danger of the streets that they didn't face some time or other during the day. They would take a chance, any time, of being run down by a wagon or a

streetcar for the sake of selling a paper or selling a 'shine' . . . they were alert, strong, healthy little chaps."[84] Even twentieth-century reformers were reluctant to put such children out of work. Pioneers in child welfare such as Jacob Riis admiringly referred to the "sturdy independence, love of freedom and absolute self-reliance" of street boys.[85] In 1912, a major study of child labor in the streets marveled at the persistent "widespread delusion that . . . these little 'merchants' of the street are receiving valuable training in business methods and will later develop into leaders in the affairs of men."[86]

As with farm labor, exposés of children working in the streets gradually punctured prevailing myths. A study conducted by the Children's Bureau found children often as young as six and seven selling papers in city streets. As one eleven-year-old newsboy complained, "My little brother sells more . . . because people think he is cute."[87] Newsboys worked late hours, 10 P.M. or sometimes until midnight, especially on Saturday nights, selling the Sunday papers to the theater and restaurant crowds. Street work was found unfit for children, distracting them from school and introducing them into a life of vice and "unnatural desires." After all, if children's games were being pushed off the street, certainly children's street work could not survive much longer. As one expert in the field explained, street work was considerably more hazardous than child play:

> there is a well-known difference in the physical and moral influences surrounding street trading in the downtown district with all the freedom from external control either on the part of city or parent, as compared with . . . street play within the neighborhood . . . where the restrictions of home and friends are able to influence . . . [the child's] conduct.[88]

Once again, the boundaries of legitimacy shifted as reformers distinguished more closely between types of street work. Earlier economic criteria (that is, the distinction between wages and profits) were inadequate: "The effect on the child of work is in no wise determined by the form in which his earnings are calculated."[89] While most street occupations, including the sale of newspapers, were declared to be unfit forms of child labor, the neighborhood carrier who delivered newspapers to the homes of subscribers was gradually singled out for legitimacy. The criteria for "good work," however, were dramatically reversed, converting the previously admired independent role of a newsboy into a liability. Why was the delivery of newspapers acceptable? Precisely because "the delivery boy is in no sense an independent merchant or dealer. He neither buys nor sells . . . and he assumes no responsibility except for his own work. He is an employee."[90] Carrying newspapers, concluded the Children's Bureau investigation, "puts no temptations in the boy's way to stay out of school, nor does it bring him in contact with such influences as many of the street sellers meet." Unlike the newsboy, the carriers' hours were "unobjectionable"; boys delivering evening papers were finished usually before 6 P.M., "their work did not keep them on the streets after dark . . . nor interfere with their family life." It was a perfect occupation for the domesticated child, not real work but a "schoolboy's job."[91] The day messenger service was another form of legitimate street work for young boys. The night messenger service, on the other hand, was harshly condemned for allegedly employing youngsters to deliver telegrams but in fact using them to carry notes, food, liquor, and drugs to prostitutes, pimps, and gamblers.

Child labor in the home raised even more complex and confusing definitional problems. It also involved a different population; while selling newspapers or bootblacking was a boy's job, home occupations were largely, although not exclusively, a girl's domain. Studies suggest that young girls probably constituted from one-half to three-fourths of the children involved with homework, while of the 17,669 children ten to fourteen years of age working as newsboys in 1920, only 168 were girls. Unlike a factory, or a street, or a store, the home was sanctioned by reformers as a proper workplace: "every child needs to be taught to work; but he needs to be taught not in the factory but in the home . . ."[92] Officially, domestic activities were not even considered "real" work. Instructions to census enumerators specified that "children who work for their parents at home merely on general household work, on chores, or at odd times on other work, should be reported as having no occupation."[93]

But what about industrial homework, that is, factory work done at home mostly by mothers with their young children? It usually involved immigrant families or other unskilled low-paid groups living in the tenement districts of large cities. Industrial homework included a wide range of activities, chiefly finishing men's clothing, embroidering, making artificial flowers, and stringing tags. Children helped with the simpler tasks and often delivered the work from the home to the factory. By the late nineteenth century, homework had become one of the most prevalent forms of child labor. Yet many employers claimed that since the "little helpers" worked with their mothers, they were not really employed.[94] Parents themselves praised an occupation that kept their children busy and safely off the streets. Investigators discovered that "In certain streets home work was almost a universal occupation, and when a new family moved into the district the children would take up the work either in imitation of their playmates or at the suggestion of their parents."[95] Homework did not necessarily interfere with schoolwork; children usually worked after school hours, Saturdays, and on vacation days.

The industrialized home forced reformers to reassess the meaning of domestic child labor. Tenement homework was condemned as a "peculiarly vicious" form of child labor.[96] After all, it polluted the one traditionally legitimate workplace. As one critic regretfully remarked: "Truly a noteworthy change from the time when children got a large part . . . of their education in domestic industries to the time when domestic industries must be abolished in order to save the children from exploitation in them!"[97] Yet what

distinguished tenement homework from legitimate housework? At what point did work for a parent become exploitation? Parents themselves were considered unreliable judges: "It is obvious many parents know little of the nature of work needed by, or suited to, their children. It is still work because there is work to be done, not because certain selected work is educational."[98] George Hall, secretary of the New York Child Labor Committee, contended that " 'Helping mother' with house-work is all right, for the amount of work to be done is limited and there is little temptation to exploit the child; but 'helping mother' with paid work is another thing. The amount of work is unlimited, and ignorant and selfish parents sacrifice their children."[99]

The solution was not to remove all child work from the home, but to discriminate more intelligently among types of domestic employment. Taking factory work out of the home was only the first step. Equally important was to determine appropriate household tasks for children. As an article, significantly entitled "Ideal Child Labor in the Home," suggested: "The home will understand the educational necessity of work . . . and will allow each child . . . to contribute to the welfare of his family as a group and provide for his best development through the performance of a desirable amount of daily constructive work."[100] Fuller, for example, harshly criticized extreme parental dependence on children to do their housework. Yet he maintained with equal conviction that "Work can be . . . a good thing for children. Little girls helping their mothers with housework . . . sewing and cooking; boys raking leaves . . . these and many other kinds of home occupations are a delight to behold."[101] One progressive Birmingham school even introduced a parent's report card in order "to help the child by recognizing industry and excellence in home occupations."[102] Parents were asked to grade as satisfactory, excellent, fairly good, unsatisfactory, ordinary, or very poor a wide range of domestic activities performed by their children, such as garden work, care of household tools, care of furnace, making fires, care of horse or cow, sweeping and dusting, making beds, and general cooking.

House Chores and a Weekly Allowance: The Economic World of the Useless Child

By 1930, most children under fourteen were out of the labor market and into schools. Yet, significantly, federal regulation of child labor contained some exceptions. The most influential statute in the field of child labor, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, allowed children under fourteen to work in newspaper distribution and in motion pictures and the theater. Except for manufacturing and mining, a child also remained legally entitled to work for her or his parents. Agricultural labor, which still employed the largest number of children, was only semiregulated as children were permitted to work outside of school hours. Similar exceptions were contained in the National Industrial Recovery Act industrial codes passed in 1933 but declared

unconstitutional in 1935. The defeat of the Child Labor Amendment in the 1920s and again in the 1930s was partly the result of its failure to recognize any differentiation between children's occupations. By empowering Congress to "limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age," the amendment presumably left no room even for legitimate child work.[103]

To be sure, the cultural and legal immunity of certain occupations was partly dictated by the market, in particular, the powerful farming, newspaper, and entertainment industries that had much to lose by a child work prohibition. But it was also based on a radically revised concept of child work. As twentieth-century American children became defined by their sentimental, noneconomic value, child work could no longer remain "real" work; it was only justifiable as a form of education or as sort of game. The useful labor of the nineteenth-century child was replaced by educational work for the useless child. While child labor had served the household economy, child work would benefit primarily the child: "We are interested . . . in work for the sake of the child, and are seeking to find kinds of work best suited to develop his body, mind and character."[104] The legal and cultural differentiation between legitimate and illegitimate occupations for children was thus guided by an entirely new set of criteria suitable for the unemployed "sacred" child. Labor on the home farm, for instance, was condoned "for the unselfishness and the sense of family solidarity it develops." Newspaper work was a legitimate "character-building" occupation. The Children's Bureau investigation in the 1920s found that parents of carriers were "emphatic in their approval of the work . . . because they believed that it provides training in the formation of good habits. . . . It was not the financial reason that stood out in their expressions of approval." Job advertisements for young carriers in the *Ladies' Home Journal* explained that the magazine had solved a problem for "thousands of the brightest boys in America," by providing them with an enjoyable pastime: "They get a lot of fun out of it, earn their own spending money, and get a moral and business training of inestimable value."[105] Acting, claimed its advocates, was not work at all but a liberal education and above all, a joyful child's game. "Work?" queried the *New York Dramatic Mirror*; "most child actors consider it play, and so it is practically that, except that their little minds are being unconsciously developed in a way which would be impossible elsewhere."[106]

As child work shifted from instrumental to instructional, special consideration was given to domestic chores. When an article appearing in *Home Progress* advised parents, "Let your children work," the work referred to "some little household task," not too difficult of course, "for their tender bodies."[107] Already in 1894, popular magazines alerted their middle- and upper-class readers about their children's "eagerness to seize opportunities for sharing the work as well as the play of the home. . . . Shelling peas on Monday because the cook is washing is to him as enchanting as counting

pearls on a string."[108] As working-class children left the labor force for the classroom, their mothers were likewise instructed to keep them busy at home: "It is pitiful . . . for a woman to believe that she is 'bettering' her children by . . . allowing them to think that it is degrading for them to help in the housework."[109]

Yet the point was not to assist the mother, but to educate the child. In 1931, the Subcommittee on Housing and Home Management of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection strongly recommended that "less emphasis . . . be placed on the amount of assistance rendered and more on the educational values [to the child] of the responsibilities involved in the performance of household tasks."[110] It was not always an easy task. As Dr. Amey E. Watson, an expert in household work, acknowledged: "For a busy mother . . . it is far easier to do the job herself than to stop to teach a child to do it; but if she has the long-range point of view and is thinking of the character development of the child, the work should be planned so that . . . the mother . . . can have enough leisure to stop and teach the child."[111]

House chores were therefore not intended to be "real" work, but lessons in helpfulness, order, and unselfishness. Parents were warned to "take great care not to overburden the child with responsibility . . . lest the weight of it should crush him instead of develop a greater strength."[112] Above all, warned *Parents* magazine, one should "never give . . . children cause to suspect us of making use of them to save ourselves work."[113] It was not easy to find such an ideal domestic job. As William Ogburn remarked in 1930, "The household duties are less, and hence the child loses the training and responsibilities that go with these duties."[114] A survey of junior high school students by the 1930 White House conference noted that urban children performed about three-fourths as many household tasks as did the rural child.[115] The "servant-keeping" class was particularly limited in this respect. One well-meaning parent, reported the *Journal of Home Economics*, had tried to teach her young child the "dignity of labor," but the only available job was flower arrangement. In another family, the son simply tipped the butler to do the boy's chores. The problem of unoccupied middle-class children was not new. As Mary Beth Norton notes in a study of eighteenth-century women, "City daughters from well-to-do homes were the only eighteenth-century American women who can accurately be described as leisured."[116] Yet even they did an extensive amount of sewing for their families. The new rules and problems of child work cut across classes, equally applicable to all unemployed children. For instance, in 1915, one observer had noted the extent to which parents of former child laborers were "entirely unprepared to cope with the situation, having little means of home employment for their children." The expanding school system attempted to incorporate "good" work into their curricula. As Edward T. Devine explained, "work which we deny . . . in the factory, for profit, may be demanded in school . . . for education and training."[117]

The transformation of children's economic roles during the first half of the twentieth century illustrates the interaction between economic and non-economic factors in advanced industrial societies. Children were removed from the market between 1870 and 1930 in large part because it had become more economical and efficient to educate them than to hire them. But cultural guidelines profoundly shaped and directed the process of social change by differentiating legitimate from illegitimate occupations for children and distinguishing licit from illicit forms of child money. As children became increasingly defined as exclusively emotional and moral assets, their economic roles were not eliminated but transformed; child labor was replaced by child work and child wages with a weekly allowance. A child's new job and income were validated more by educational than economic criteria.

Notes

1. For child labor statistics: See *Children in Gainful Occupations at the Fourteenth Census of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1924); Grace Abbott, *The Child and the State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), 1:259–69; Raymond G. Fuller, "Child Labor," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (1930), 412–24.

2. A. J. McKelway, "The Awakening of the South against Child Labor," *Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference on Child Labor* (New York, 1907), 17.

3. Josephine J. Eschenbrenner, *What Is a Child Worth?* National Child Labor Committee, no 236, p. 2.

4. Representative Sumners, cited in *American Child*, July 1924, 3.

5. Elizabeth Fraser, "Children and Work," *Saturday Evening Post*, April 4, 1925, 145.

6. Michael R. Haines, "Poverty, Economic Stress, and the Family in a Late Nineteenth-Century American City: Whites in Philadelphia, 1880," in *Philadelphia*, ed. Theodore Hershberg (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 265; Claudia Goldin, "Family Strategies and the Family Economy in the Late Nineteenth Century: The Role of Secondary Workers," ibid, in Hershberg, *Philadelphia*, 284.

7. Editorial, *Journal of Home Economics* 7 (August 1915): 371.

8. Daniel T. Rodgers, *The Work Ethic in Industrial America, 1850–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 131.

9. John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 140–41. See also Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 66.

10. *Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage-Earners in the United States* (Washington, D.C., 1910–13), 6:48.

11. *Niles' Register*, October 5, 1816, cited by Edith Abbott, "A Study of the Early History of Child Labor in America," *American Journal of Sociology* 14 (July 1908): 25. See also *Woman and Child Wage-Earners*, 6:49, 52; Stanley Lebergott, *Manpower in Economic Growth* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 48–51; Robert H. Bremner, ed., *Children and Youth in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 1:145–48. On child labor in nineteenth-century England and France, see Lou-

ise A. Tilly and Joan W. Scott, *Women, Work, and Family* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978). Employment in the early American mills apparently was not restricted to the children of the poor, but included the "children of farmers, mechanics, and manufacturers, in good pecuniary circumstances." Bagnall, *Samuel Slater and the Early Development of the Cotton Manufactures in the United States* (1890), cited by Forest Chester Ensign, "Compulsory School Attendance and Child Labor," Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1921.

12. Fuller, "Child Labor," 419; Bremner, *Children and Youth* 2:601.

13. John Modell, "Changing Risks, Changing Adaptations: American Families in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," in *Kin and Communities: Families in America*, ed. Allan J. Lichtman and John R. Challinor (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1979), 128. On the importance of the family as a work unit in the early stages of industrialization, see Neil J. Smelser, *Social Change and the Industrial Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959). Michael Anderson, *Family Structure in Nineteenth-Century Lancashire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971) and Tamara Hareven, *Family Time and Industrial Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982) demonstrate the survival of the family as a work unit in the nineteenth and even twentieth centuries.

14. Modell, "Changing Risks."

15. See "Child Labor and the Teachers," *New York Times*, July 8, 1905, 7, and Joseph M. Hawes, *Children in Urban Society* (Oxford: York: Oxford University Press, 1971).

16. Edwin Markham, "The Smoke of Sacrifice," *Cosmopolitan* (February 1907), 397. See Philip S. Foner, *Women and the American Labor Movement* (New York: Free Press, 1979), 283–89. For a history of the National Child Labor Committee, see Walter I. Trattner, *Crusade for the Children* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970), and for an excellent account of child labor reform in New York State, Jeremy Felt, *Hostages of Fortune* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1965).

17. On the effect of rising real income on the reduction of child labor, see Claudia Goldin, "Household and Market Production of Families in a Late Nineteenth Century American City," *Explorations in Economic History* 16 (1979): 129. On the development of child labor and compulsory school legislation, see Ensign, "Compulsory School Attendance," and Miriam E. Loughran, *The Historical Development of Child-Labor Legislation in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1921).

18. Paul Osterman, *Getting Started: The Youth Labor Market* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1980), pp. 60–71. For additional economic explanations of the decline in child labor both in the United States and in nineteenth-century England, see Allen R. Sanderson, "Child Labor Legislation and the Labor Force Participation of Children," *Journal of Economic History* 34 (1974): 298–99, and Clark Nardinelli, "Child Labor and the Factory Acts," *Journal of Economic History* 40 (1980): 739–53.

19. *Niles' Register*, June 7, 1817, 226; Joan Huber, "Toward a Sociotechnological Theory of the Women's Movement," *Social Problems* 23 (1976): 371–88.

20. Osterman, *Getting Started*, 56–59; Selwyn K. Troen, "The Discovery of the Adolescent by American Educational Reformers, 1900–1920," in *Schooling and Society*, ed. Lawrence Stone (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 239–51.

21. On early child labor legislation, see William F. Ogburn, *Progress and Uniformity in Child-Labor Legislation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1912; Loughran, *Historical Development Woman and Child Wage-Earners*, vol. 6; Elizabeth H. Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939).

22. Elizabeth Sands Johnson, "Child Labor Legislation," in *History of Labor in the United States, 1896–1932*, ed. John R. Commons (New York: Macmillan, 1935), 446. For an excellent interpretation of the legislative aspects of the child labor controversy, see Stephen B. Wood, *Constitutional Politics in the Progressive Era* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968) and Thomas George Karis, "Congressional Behavior at Constitutional Frontiers," Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1951.

23. Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation*, 57.

24. The Child Labor Amendment was also attacked as a Communist plot designed to nationalize American children. See Anne Kruesi Brown, "Opposition to the Child Labor Amendment Found in Trade Journals, Industrial Bulletins, and Other Publications for and By Business Men," M.A. diss., University of Chicago, 1937; Katharine DuPre Lumpkin and Dorothy Wolff Douglass, *Child Workers in America* (New York: Robert McBride, 1937), chap. 12, 13; "The Child Labor Amendment," *University of Texas Bulletin*, August 1, 1925; Tom Ireland, *Child Labor* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1937).

25. Reprinted in *Charities* August 8, 1903, 130.

26. Fraser, "Children and Work," 146.

27. Iredell Meares, "Should the Nation Control Child Labor?" *Dearborn Independent*, November 8, 1924, reprinted in "The Child Labor Amendment," 146, 148.

28. Letter to the *New York Chamber of Commerce Bulletin* December 1924, 50, cited in Brown, *Opposition to Amendment*, 35–36.

29. Letter to the *Manufacturers Record*, October 9, 1924, 91 cited in Brown *Opposition to Amendment*, 34.

30. Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, "Why the Amendment Is Dangerous," *Woman Citizen*, December 27, 1924, 12; "The Twentieth Amendment," *Forum* 73 (February 1925): 281.

31. "What the Child Labor Amendment Means," in Abbott, *Child and State* 1:546; Lumpkin and Douglas, *Child Workers in America*, 219.

32. *Woman and Child Wage-Earners*, 7:43; Mary Skinner, *Child Labor in New Jersey*, U.S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau Publication no. 185 (Washington, D.C., 1928).

33. Tamara K. Hareven, "Family and Work Patterns of Immigrant Laborers in a Planned Industrial Town, 1900–1930," in *Immigrants in Industrial America*, ed. Richard L. Ehrlich (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977), 63. On the relative importance of class versus ethnicity in determining the use of child labor, see John Modell, "Patterns of Consumption, Acculturation, and Family Income Strategies in Late Nineteenth-Century America," in *Family and Population in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Tamara K. Hareven and Maris A. Vinovskis (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); Goldin, "Household and Market Production"; and Miriam Cohen, "Changing Education Strategies among Immigrant Generations: New York Italians in Comparative Perspective," *Journal of Social History* 15 (1982): 443–66. Until the 1920s, black children were less likely to be employed in the labor market than were immigrant children. See Elizabeth Pleck, "A Mother's Wages: Income Earning among Married Italian and Black Women, 1896–1911," in *The Ameri-*

can Family in Social-Historical Perspective, ed. Michael Gordon, 2d ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978).

34. *Woman and Child Wage-Earners*, 7:158; Goldin, "Household and Market Production," 118–19.

35. Viola I. Paradise, *Child Labor and the Work of Mothers in Oyster and Shrimp Canning Communities on the Gulf Coast*, U.S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau Publication no. 98 (Washington, D.C., 1922), 11, 17.

36. *Industrial Home Work of Children*, U.S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau Publication no. 100 (Washington, D.C., 1924), 23.

37. "Child Labor, the Home, and Liberty," *New Republic*, December 3, 1924, 32.

38. *Woman and Child Wage-Earners*, 1:353.

39. Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, *Family and Community: Italian Immigrants in Buffalo, 1880–1930* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1971), 193.

40. Johnson, "Child Labor Legislation" 429; Felt, *Hostages of Fortune*, 22–23.

41. *New York Times*, December 7, 1924, 19.

42. Cited in *The American Child*, April 1925, 6. Strong Catholic opposition to the Child Labor Amendment was also partly based on the perceived threat to parental authority. See Rev. Vincent A. McQuade, *The American Catholic Attitude on Child Labor since 1891* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1938).

43. J. W. Crabtree, "Dr. Pritchett, Dr. Butler, and Child Labor," *School and Society*, November 8, 1924, 585. Opponents of child labor invoked a variety of different arguments, from the physical and moral hazards of early employment to the economic inefficiency of employing young children. My discussion focuses on those arguments between the 1870s and 1930s, which centered on the changing definition of children's economic and sentimental value.

44. Quoted in *New York Times*, Feruary 2, 1925, 21.

45. Quoted in "The Nation and Child Labor," *New York Times*, April 24, 1904, 6.

46. Felix Adler, "Child Labor in the United States and Its Great Attendant Evils," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 25 (1905); Charles K. Gilbert, "The Church and Child Labor," *American Child* (August 1927), 4.

47. A. J. McKelway, "The Evil of Child Labor," *Outlook* February 16, 1907, 364.

48. Davidson, *Child Labor Legislation*, 65–66; Elinor H. Stoy, "Child-Labor," *Arena* December 1906, 586; "Education, Psychology, and Manufacturers," *American Child*, November 1926, 2.

49. Quoted in *New York Times*, February 2, 1925, 21.

50. "Potters' Clay," *American Child* January 1926, 3.

51. Marion Delcomyn, "Why Children Work," *Forum* 57 March 1917): 324–25.

52. Jacob Riis, "The Little Laborers of New York City," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* August 1973, 327.

53. Letter to the editor, *New York Times*, November 4, 1910, 8.

54. Alice L. Woodbridge, "Child Labor an Obstacle to Industrial Progress," *Arena*, June 1894, 158.

55. Editorial, *New York Times*, December 17, 1902, 8.

56. Mrs. A. O. Granger, "The Work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs against Child Labor," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 25 (May 1905): 104; A. J. McKelway, "The Leadership of the Child," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 32 (July 1908): 21.

57. Quoted in Yans-McLaughlin, *Family and Community*, 190.

58. *The Cost of Child Labor*, National Child Labor Committee, no. 5 (New York, 1905), 35.

59. Edward T. Devine, "The New View of the Child," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 32 (1908): 9. Reformers, however, recognized the need to subsidize nonworking children in families that could prove their financial need. In 1905, child labor committees instituted a scholarship system in several cities to compensate needy families who kept a child in school, with a weekly payment equivalent to the child's fore gone income. Apparently, most scholarships went to the children of widowed or deserted women.

60. *Woman and Child Wage-Earners*, 7:15.

61. Raymond G. Fuller, "Child Labor versus Children's Work," *American Child*, February 1922, 281.

62. Theresa Wolfson, "Why, When, and How Children Leave School," *American Child*, May 1919, 61.

63. William Noyes, "Overwork, Idleness, or Industrial Education," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 27 (March 1906): 87. There was also a nostalgic recollection of apprenticeship as a lost form of "good" work.

64. Arthur D. Dean, "Child-Labor, or Work for Children," *Craftsman*, March 1914, 515.

65. Raymond G. Fuller, *Child Labor and the Constitution* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1923), 32.

66. Fuller, "Child Labor versus Children's Work," 281.

67. Fuller, *Child Labor and the Constitution*, 28.

68. *Illiteracy Promoted by Perjury*, National Child Labor Committee pamphlet no. 2 (New York, 1905), 7.

69. See Ogburn, Progress and Uniformity, 90, 103; "Child Labor," *White House Conference on Child Health and Protection* (New York: Century Co., 1932), 27–30; Johnson, "Child Labor Legislation," 413, 428–30.

70. Markham, "The Smoke of Sacrifice," 393.

71. Thomas R. Dawley, *The Child That Toileth Not* (New York: Gracia, 1912), 140. Dawley's argument had some precedent. In 1909, Dr. Charles W. Stiles, an authority in hookworm disease, announced that the health of children from poor farms significantly improved after working in cotton mills. See A. J. McKelway, "The Mill or the Farm?" *Annals of the American Academy of Politial and Social Sciences*, suppl. (March 1910): 52–57.

72. Reprinted in Abbott, *Child and State*, 474.

73. Wiley H. Swift, "Is the Use of Children in Agriculture a Child Welfare Problem?" *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, 1924, 170.

74. "Child Labor," *White House Conference*, 213. Protected by their rural location, canners of fruits and vegetables sought and often won exemptions from industrial child labor laws.

75. *Child Labor in North Dakota*, U.S. Children's Bureau Publication no. 129 (Washington, D.C., 1923), 21–25, 39.

76. Frances S. Bradley, M.D., and Margaretta A. Williamson, *Rural Children in Selected Counties of North Carolina*, U.S. Children's Bureau Publication no. 33 (Washington, D.C., 1918), 85, 88, 99.

77. E. C. Lindeman, "Child Labor Amendment and the Farmers," reprinted in "The Child Labor Amendment," *University of Texas Bulletin*, August 1, 1925, 87. For an overview of the studies of children employed in agriculture, see *White House Conference*, 222–61.

78. Fred S. Hall, *Forty Years 1902–1942: The Work of the New York Child Labor Committee* (New York: New York Child Labor Committee, 1942), 77.

79. Franklin N. Brewer, "Child Labor in the Department Store," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 20 (1902): 167–77.

80. Fuller, *Child Labor and the Constitution*, 76.

81. *White House Conference*, 147. On the regulation of street work, see pp. 164–68.

82. Edward N. Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets* (1912; reprint New York: Garrett Press, 1970) 6–7.

83. Myron E. Adams, "Children in American Street Trades," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 25 (May 1905): 3.

84. *Survey*, June 14, 1913, 380.

85. Jacob A. Riis, *How the Other Half Lives* (1890; reprint New York: Dover, 1971), 153.

86. Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 7. Besides newspaper selling, other common street occupations for children included peddling, bootblacking, messenger service, delivery service, running errands, and the tending of market stands.

87. Nettie P. McGill, *Child Workers on City Streets*, U.S. Children's Bureau Publication no. 188 (Washington, D.C., 1928), 4.

88. Adams, "Children in American Street Trades," 11, 14.

89. Quoted in Clopper, *Child Labor in City Streets*, 15.

90. "Children in Gainful Occupations," Fourteenth Census (Washington, D.C., 1924), 53.

91. McGill, *Child Workers in City Streets*, 6–7, 36–37.

92. Charles W. Dabney, "Child Labor and the Public Schools," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 29 (January 1907): 112. See *White House Conference*, 128–39; "Children in Gainful Occupations," 52, 59. Most street regulations also fixed a higher minimum age for girls than for boys. Domestic and personal services were other predominantly female occupations.

93. "Children in Gainful Occupations," 16.

94. Hall, *Forty Years*, 89. No precise figures of the number of child home workers exist.

95. *Industrial Home Work of Children*, 22.

96. Fuller, *Child Labor and the Constitution*, 87.

97. Noyes, "Overwork."

98. Jessie P. Rich, "Ideal Child Labor in the Home," *Child Labor Bulletin* 3 (May 1914): 7.

99. George A. Hall, "Unrestricted Forms of Child Labor in New York State," *Proceedings of the Twelfth New York State Conference of Charities and Correction* (1911), 104.

100. Rich, "Ideal Child Labor," 8.

101. Fuller, *Child Labor and the Constitution*, 28.

102. *Journal of Education* 78 (October 2, 1913): 325.

103. See Jeremy Felt, "The Child Labor Provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act," *Labor History* 11 (1970): 467–81; "Second Thought on the Child Labor Amendment," *Massachusetts Law Quarterly* 9 (July 1924): 15–21; "Comments," *Fordham Law Review* 7 (May 1938): 223–25; Brown, "Opposition to Amendment," 46–49.

104. Rich, "Ideal Child Labor," 4. Interestingly, two of the legitimate occupations employed middle-class children. Newspaper carriers, for instance, were likely to come from more prosperous families than city newsboys. Nettie P. McGill, *Children in Street Work*, U.S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau Publication no. 183 (Washington, D.C., 1928), 38. Although information on the social class of child actors is limited, it appears that particularly in the twentieth century, acting involved middle-class as well as lower-class children. See Everett William Lord, *Children of the Stage* (New York: National Child Labor Committee, 1910); *What of the Stage Child?* (Minneapolis: Women's Cooperative Alliance, 1929).

105. McGill, *Child Workers on City Streets*, 37; "Your Boy's Christmas Money," *Ladies' Home Journal*, November 1, 1910, 1. The newspaper industry gladly encouraged the definition of newspaper work as education and not "real" labor.

106. John Mason, "The Education of the Stage Child," *New York Dramatic Mirror*, March 8, 1911, 5.

107. Lillian Davidson, "Idle Children," *Home Progress*, June 1917, 474.

108. Helen C. Candee, "In the Beginning," *Outlook*, May 5, 1894, 787.

109. Henriette E. Delamare, "Teaching Children to be Helpful at Home," *Home Progress*, November 1913, 115.

110. "The Home and the Child," *White House Conference on Child Health and Protection*, 1931 (New York: Arno Press and New York Times, 1972), 90.

111. Amey E. Watson, "The Reorganization of Household Work," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 160 (March 1932): 174.

112. Miriam Finn Scott, "The Perfect Child," *Ladies' Home Journal*, June 1922, 30.

113. Ethel Packard Cook, "All Hands Help," *Parents Magazine*, July 1934, 19.

114. William F. Ogburn, "The Changing Family with Regard to the Child," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 151 (September 1930):23.

115. "The Adolescent in the Family," *White House Conference on Child Health and Protection*, 1934 (New York: Arno Press and New York Times, 1972), 37.

116. Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty's Daughters* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), 23–24. See Thomas D. Elliot, "Money and the Child's Own Standards of Living," *Journal of Home Economics* 24 (January 1932): 4–5.

117. Devine, "New View," 9. See editorial, *Journal of Home Economics* 7 (August 1915): 372. On the development of industrial education in the early decades of the twentieth century, see Marvin Lazerson and W. Norton Grubb, *American Education and Vocationalism* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1974).