

Westegg Can have



THE CHALLENGE
FOR HOME ECONOMICS

Addresses

delivered at the

dedication of

Bevier Hall and

Child Development

Laboratory

University of Illinois

April 4, 5, and 6, 1957

THE CHALLENGE

FOR HOME ECONOMICS

Addresses

delivered at the

dedication of

Bevier Hall and

Child Development

Laboratory

April 4, 5, and 6,

1957

PRESIDENT HENRY

This introduction presented by Dr. David Dodds Henry, President of the University, opened the convocation ceremonies marking the formal dedication of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory on Friday, April 5, 1957.

We are met in formal assembly to dedicate to the service of the people of Illinois through this University the new home economics buildings. I welcome all of you to an event important in University history.

A dedication is more than a ritual, for through this ceremony we express our gratitude to all of those who have helped to bring these buildings into being; we honor those whose past achievements built a service, a program, and a profession worthy of these new, excellent facilities; and we signalize our faith in the future importance of the work here housed, and the far reaches of its benefits in the lives of the citizens of Illinois. We publicly affirm our belief in the importance of that work to the ends that the public health will be improved, domestic relations enhanced, the lives of people enriched, and the welfare of the commonwealth itself strengthened. Through this ceremonial recognition of a portion of the University's work, may we all come to greater understanding of the total meaning of the University itself and the means by which it comes to greatness in the service of the people.

David D. Henry

GREETINGS FROM THE PEOPLE OF ILLINOIS

Governor William G. Stratton

These abbreviations are from the salutatory address given by Governor William G. Stratton who represented the people of the state of Illinois at the dedication ceremonies of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory on Friday, April 5, 1957.

Dr. Henry, Dean Howard, members of the faculty, members of the Board of Trustees, distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen.

It is an inspiration to be here at this great school to participate in ceremonies which combine traditional academic formality with the air of urgency and purpose which permeates this great University of Illinois. Here are joined in friendly cooperation the leisurely ivy-clad search for perfection in learning, the strict discipline of scientific detail, the wonder of young people discovering a wonderful world and its marvelous work, and, perhaps most important of all, the opportunity to learn to live among, and be happy with, the marvels of our age.

The occasion today is to dedicate buildings especially devoted to the latter of these purposes. There must be no minimizing the significance of the work these buildings will help to accomplish. The importance of being able to live well with others in this world becomes more pointed every day. The need for healthy family life, planned spending, care devoted to child growth and development, education in consumer economics, home management, the varied vocational opportunities which are adjuncts of home economics — all of these form a fabric of necessity which this Administration has met in providing these structures.

In a way, this home economics building is a symbol of one of the early purposes of this University. Jonathan Baldwin Turner, a Jacksonville educator who did perhaps most to obtain passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act which made institutions such as this possible, had a vision of education for the many rather than for a chosen few. He fought for what he called the industrial college which would extend educational opportunities along industrial and agricultural lines to an extent not then dreamed possible. After President Lincoln signed the bill to establish the Land Grant, Turner continued his interest in this state; and, although he lost his fight to center the school in Jacksonville rather than Champaign, he never lost the vision nor relaxed his efforts to develop what he then called the Champaign University. He

would be a little stunned at the four million dollars these two buildings cost to construct and equip. As a matter of fact, the entire University would be a bit amazing to him.

Our efforts to keep up the building pace required by the expansion of the University of Illinois and other state-supported higher educational institutions has by necessity been somewhat piecemeal. The balanced budget under which Illinois operates its government leaves only so much for capital expenditures each year, spread, of course, over the needs of its universities, its colleges, its hospitals and its other institutions. Obviously, when the wave of children which are now straining our common school facilities hits the colleges, this method of meeting building needs will be entirely unsatisfactory. For that reason, I have devised a plan of issuing bonds in the amount of nearly \$250,000,000 for capital improvement at our universities, colleges and welfare department hospitals. That plan is now before the legislature. I am confident of its passage there; and I am confident also that with the help of our people within our colleges and universities, it will be approved by the citizens of our state in the 1958 referendum. Then, and then alone, will we be able really to build to meet our school needs.

We in Illinois are proud of the programs our state-supported schools are offering in the educational field under the leadership of such men as Dr. Henry, here at the University of Illinois; but here again there are new problems ahead — not mere physical problems of building space but problems of general growth of higher educational facilities, increased staffing and increased opportunities for our citizens. This Administration has had the benefit over the last two years of a Commission on Higher Education whose work has clearly pointed up the need for careful planning, advanced planning, that is, for the future. As I said in my Inaugural Address last January, there is prospect that when the post-war spurt in elementary population bursts upon the colleges, they will be sorely pressed. Indeed, it is likely, according to the Commission on Higher Education, that in twenty years our college and university population in Illinois, both public and private, will be doubled. I know that some of the officers of our public institutions of higher learning shy away from the word coordination in regards to their school planning and I wish that I had a better word. Perhaps we could use something like harmonious adjustment or co-operation, but in any case there has to be some central planning agency to see that our publicly-supported colleges and universities, of course in close harmony with our private schools, can meet the forth-

coming problem with all its challenge for the future progress of the state. Legislation is being drawn now in Springfield to establish a permanent commission for the study of higher education. The decision to have this done, which I announced in my Inaugural, follows the excellent work of the temporary commission established in 1955. Under the plan which I have worked out with Superintendent Nickell and in cooperation with the presidents of our colleges and universities, such a commission would have nine members, would be by-partisan in nature, and would have the right to make recommendations to the governor, the general assembly and the governing board of the state schools concerning higher education, the needs of the future and the planning to meet those needs. The commission would have adequate staffing for its purposes and the governing boards of our state schools of education would be required to assign delegates from their membership to attend all meetings of the commission in a non-voting capacity. In this way we can develop a coordinated — and there's that word again — plan of meeting our future problems in this all important field.

These two things, then, new buildings and better planning, are in the definite future for higher education in Illinois. As Governor, I am happy to take part in these programs of the future just as I am happy to be here today in the present taking part in this dedication. It has been a pleasant day. It always is pleasant to be with you here. It is particularly pleasant when I can be here as a representative of your state government turning over for your use a fine facility such as this. And incidentally, I hope that I can be here often for the same purpose. Thank you.

MAP FOR LIVING — 50 YEAR PLAN

Honorable Florence Ellenwood Allen

Judge Florence Ellenwood Allen, the only woman in the world ever to sit in a federal court of general jurisdiction, was born March 23, 1884, at Salt Lake City, Utah. She was educated at Salt Lake Academy and New Lyme Institute, Ashland, Ohio. She received her master's degree in political science and constitutional law from Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, in 1908 and was graduated from the New York University Law School in 1913. She was admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1914. In 1922 she was elected to the Supreme Court of Ohio for a six-year term, and re-elected in 1928 and appointed as United States Circuit Judge, Sixth Circuit in 1934. Judge Allen holds honorary degrees from many universities and colleges and has written extensively in her field.

The following is the convocation address given by the Honorable Florence Allen, on Friday, April 5, 1957, at the dedication ceremonies' convocation of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory.

We meet to dedicate a building erected by this great university primarily for the cultivation of the domestic arts. It is a living token of the affection and concern of the state of Illinois for its girls and young women and also of the public realization that all that concerns the home has a professional aspect. The domestic arts need to be cultivated with intelligence just as other arts.

Time was when any desire of women to do their work professionally was frowned upon. Even as distinguished an educational institution as Vassar Female College issued a prospectus published in *Godey's Ladies Book* in 1865. It stated:

"The intellectual course of study is to be ample but not crushing.

"A special school of physical training will be provided under the charge of a lady professor who will instruct in the arts of riding, flower gardening, boating and other physical accomplishments suitable for ladies to acquire.

"The play grounds are large and secluded and the apparatus for such simple feminine sports as archery, croquet, graces, shuttlecock, etc., will be supplied by the college.

"There will be a special course in the fine art of entertaining, with suggestions for small talk suitable for kettledrums, routs and banquets."

About this same time there was a Dr. Gregory who wrote a popular book called *Advice to my Daughters*. One of his most interesting bits of counsel was, "If you have any learning keep it a profound secret, especially from men, who look with a jealous and malignant eye upon women of great parts and understanding."

The great women doctors fought a battle with community prejudice which seems almost incredible. The distinguished Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania, when it was first established met with actual physical opposition. The girls had done their work so well that they were invited to cooperate in the clinic of the Philadelphia General Hospital. As they left the college to go to the clinic the young men of the medical profession, incited by their elders, actually threw rocks at the women. The uphill fight has now been won and in Philadelphia last year I heard representatives of practically every important medical association in the state rise and give public tribute to the magnificent work in cancer research done by Dr. Katherine MacFarlane. And today the fight for a professional attitude toward the domestic arts has been so far won that the more forward looking states add to their schools other professional skills beside those of cooking and care of the individual home. They study the chemistry of foods, the management of hotels and restaurants, and the preparation of meals on a large and professional scale. All of this means that the importance of the home economics department of a great state university is recognized by lawmakers and the public alike.

But this beautiful building will fail of its purpose without the larger courses which must inspire its use — the leadership of those who teach, the serious and responsible attitude of those who study, and the consciousness on both sides of the dignity of the task which they approach.

And, indeed, approaching the task from its more traditional aspects, it is one worthy of every student's mettle.

In the days of the great westward movement across the plains, they tell us that all along the road the way was marked by objects that had been discarded in the difficult passage. Here and there were pieces of furniture, rocking-chairs, and chests of drawers. Articles which had been conserved with affection from generation to generation were abandoned in crossing steep and perilous passes over the mountains in order that the covered wagon with its human freight might not be overbalanced and crash down to the rocks below.

We are now passing over steep and perilous roads, and we are confronted with the question as to what we shall discard and what we

shall keep as we go into the new era that we approach. The question is, as we go on in this crisis of the cold war, of the breakup of the old order, of the downfall of ancient governments and civilizations, what shall we keep, regardless of the things we discard.

I trust that we shall not discard the home. Out of the home came the sanity and the strength which have made this country what it is. And when I talk about the home I do not mean simply the physical center which develops around a house where a family lives. The home is not just a place to gather up the blankets for an automobile trip or to make sandwiches for an excursion; it is not just the base from which to leap off to some place else. The home should be the spiritual center of the family, that citadel of quiet in which the individual can develop himself to his fullest capacity. In order to build that kind of home, the mother's responsibility is not limited to cleaning the house and making excellent pie, and the father's responsibility is not limited to paying the grocery bills. There is an ethical and spiritual responsibility which rests upon everyone who makes the home, and in that task the cooperation of both the mother and father along spiritual lines is essential. They have to develop the sense of partnership between themselves and between themselves and their children if it is to be a real home.

You have here in Illinois a supreme example of the influence of the home. Abraham Lincoln lived in an open-faced cabin in Kentucky without floor or door or windows. While later Thomas Lincoln secured a cabin enclosed on all sides, Abraham Lincoln slept in a loft, to which he climbed on pegs driven in the wall. The bedstead was covered with skins, leaves and old clothes. Lincoln's mother, Nancy Hanks, died when he was ten years old and within a year or two Thomas Lincoln fortunately married that rare and capable woman, Sarah Bush Johnston, who was a widow.

She, by the standards of those days, was not a poor widow, for she had furniture and household goods such as the Lincolns had never seen. Herndon says that she had a walnut bureau valued at \$50. She set out at once to improve the physical aspects of the home and to create that sense of order and gracious living which a woman, even under difficult circumstances, can supply. She made her husband floor the cabin, put in doors and windows, and plaster up the cracks between the logs. She substituted a feather bed for the skins and leaves on which the children had slept, but more than that, she was aware of the children's personalities and needs. She induced her husband, against his definite will to allow Abe to read and study at home as

well as at school, and finally made him willing to encourage Lincoln to a certain degree. She saw to it that he was permitted to sit by the fire at night and cover the wooden shovel with essays and arithmetic, which he would shave off so that he could begin again. She sensed the rare qualities in this ungainly boy and read and studied with him, cherishing in every possible way his interest in education and his love of books, and so she created a home for the man who at a time of supreme crisis headed the nation and led it out of its perilous paths.

Think what this particular home created by Lincoln's stepmother meant to the world. As you go along a little side path in the beautiful Vigeland Park at Oslo you come upon a bust of Lincoln and the inscription says, "Given by Citizens of North Dakota who are of Scandinavian Descent." As you pass out of Westminster Abbey in London, in a little grassy enclosure you see a statue to Abraham Lincoln, quoting from the Gettysburg address. In one of the books of our generation which has stirred the English-speaking world with its emphasis upon freedom, tolerance and charity, a description is given of a young man killed in South Africa by one of the natives so cruelly mistreated by the modern South African government. The book describes the library of this young man, whose life was devoted to an effort to achieve friendship between the races. It says, "Jarvis sat there in his son's house. Books, books, books, hundreds of books about Abraham Lincoln. He had not known that so many books had been written about any one man. One bookcase was full of them." And so this home helped to develop a personality which has left its stamp upon the entire world.

I like to think that we shall revert to the old-fashioned standards of right and wrong that existed before we entered into this bewildering modern life. Many of you, and I, myself, remember when there had never been an automobile, a moving picture, a radio, a submarine, or most miraculous of all, an airplane. But no new standards of conduct have been erected with all of these marvelous devices. We might put it this way. If Abraham Lincoln or Abigail Adams were walking on the main street of Boston or New York today they might be puzzled as to how to cross the street. Abraham Lincoln would never have seen a red light. He might walk on the red light and be killed, but Abraham Lincoln would understand perfectly the answer to some question of right and wrong. When you and I come down to the end of things we shall be asked exactly the same old questions that have been asked of men and women of all time from the beginning down — whether we have done justice and loved mercy and walked humbly with God.

I also believe that we have to take into this new era our ancient faith.

Some of the most previous words in the language like "home" and "love" escape the boundaries of definition, and faith is one of these. Faith, the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, is the mainspring not only of individual ethical living, but of law and civilization based on law. Love is greater than faith, said Paul, but love without faith becomes futile and barren.

Faith in the basic ethical standards, in the ultimate victory of right, and trust in the destiny of mankind are the bases of all human advance.

The lives lost in the world wars and their cruel aftermath are not the only appalling loss. The lessening of our beliefs, of our established principles, of faith in the individual and of trust between nations is equally tragic.

Our country was built upon faith. Because they had faith our fathers established the fullest freedom in the world today.

Faith that obstacles could be surmounted made men and women venture upon the seas, dare the wilderness, cross the rivers, the plains, the Rockies and the High Sierras to open up America.

There are no "wonder drugs" for the healing of nations. The task seems superhuman; but if prehistoric man could invent the wheel and the alphabet and apply ethical standards in the group through law, then with faith and intelligence we can go forward to substitute law for war. This cannot be done without faith to set free our "disinherited minds."

For it is still and always true that they who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

Also I think we must take with us faith in America. When this country was founded something new was declared. The forefathers, fine lawyers as they were, in the founding of the country were expressing something more than careful deceptions of law. They were expressing their hopes and dreams of freedom. It was stated both in the preamble and in the Constitution itself that the purpose of government was the promotion of the general welfare. That had not been the purpose of government in England, which had as good a government as there was at the time. A main purpose of the government there was the protection of the special welfare of the nobles and the ruling classes. Here the purpose was that government should be run for men, not men for government. That was why for the first time in

history the Northwest Ordinance stated that schools should forever be encouraged. The school system of Europe, with the exception of the Scandanavian countries, down to the First World War was a system in which there was one school for the poor boy and a totally different set of schools for the gentleman's son. Here in the United States we intended that there should be schools for all children, paid for by all citizens, accessible to all citizens. The library was developed upon the same theory, paid for by all, accessible to all. In Europe the conception of going to a library, freely looking at the books and taking a book from the shelves has been for centuries an unthinkable thing. Here in the United States in many counties of most states, in innumerable small towns, there is the public library bringing books to the whole community. When I visited Mexico several years ago Dwight Morrow told me that the parks in Mexico under Dias were not allowed to be used by the Peons. No Indian in those days was permitted to enter Chapultapec Park. But in the United States from the founding of Yellowstone long years ago there has developed this amazing system of parks — national parks, state parks, municipal parks — paid for by all, accessible to all. This promotion of the general welfare which we take so for granted is the effect of the greatest gift of all under the Constitution, the liberty under which we live.

But what can you and I do to rebuild this faith?

Jane Addams threw the whole problem, with its intermingling of physical, emotional, and spiritual needs, into immortal highlight in *The Spirit of Youth in the City Streets*. With militant conscience, poetic eloquence, and prophetic insight, she discerned the wastage of human power caused by the transition to the machine age and the loss of partnership between the child and the family, between the child and the community.

But Jane Addams did not end there. Her final chapter is "The Thirst for Righteousness," in which she paints the moral havoc wrought by the clash between the ideal and reality in this changing world. And this is, I think, our most difficult and challenging problem today, that of awakening in the adults and youth of today what Benjamin Kiddhhas so aptly called "the emotion of the ideal," the sense of belonging to the country and the nation, the sense of ownership in the country and the nation.

"We do little or nothing," Jane Addams said, "with the splendid store of youthful ardor and creative enthusiasm, and yet it is perhaps what American cities need above all else, for it is too true that the Democracy — 'a people ruling' — the very name which the Greeks

considered so beautiful, no longer stirs the blood of American youth. To preach and seek justice in human affairs is one of the oldest obligations of religion and morality." "All that would be necessary," she continues, "would be to attach your teaching to the contemporary world in such wise that the eager youth might feel a tug upon his faculties and the sense or partnership in the moral life about him."

The Athenian youth considered ethical problems, such as justice. In the debate between Socrates and Thrasymachus, set forth in Plato's *Republic*, Thrasymachus contends that there is no such thing as right and justice. Socrates opposes him; and then Adeimantus turns to Socrates with a classic appeal which points out the thing I try to say to you today. Socrates says, "No one has ever blamed injustice or praised justice except with a view to the glories, honors, and benefits which flow from it." He goes on, "Our teachers and our parents say that if we are just we shall have good offices." And he quaintly adds, "We shall make profitable marriages. I want you to tell us something different, namely, what essential good or evil justice and injustice work in those who possess them. You show what they or either of them do to the possessor of them which makes one good and the other evil, whether seen or unseen by God and man."

That is what Jane Addams is saying. Across the centuries comes this same thought. She says that justice affects the soul of the man who is just. . . . She says that we waste this rich human material because we have not taken advantage of the natural trend of youth toward justice. She says that the passion and ardor of youth and its instinct for righteousness could be arrayed in America to help us work out justice — and I add for myself that it could be arrayed on the side of cherishing, maintaining and extending American freedom.

Is it too much to say that we have taught Americans to get instead of to give; to enjoy privileges instead of to carry obligations? And yet no greater re-creation — (the state of being created anew) — could come than from changing this attitude and none so necessary in this particular changing world of ours.

Here in America we have as dramatic an opportunity to vivify life, through group action, through ethical group action, as the world has ever known. Any intelligent boy or girl will thrill to the Bill of Rights and its solemn promises, if they know what they are. Any intelligent boy or girl can understand what it means that not so very long before our Constitution, historically speaking, a man was executed in England for writing in a book that was never published that the Parliament, instead of the King should be supreme.

Every intelligent boy or girl can understand that when the first amendment to the Constitution was written, a landmark was established in human freedom. Every intelligent boy or girl can understand that when this amendment was written, freedom of religion did not exist, not even in this country — that members of many sects had been harried and humiliated and beaten and put in jail, and that in other countries of the world they had been put to death; and that here, by some miracle, we wrote in the first amendment that there should be no established religion, nor any prohibition of the free exercise of religion.

Any intelligent boy or girl would thrill to the history of the proposition to write into the Constitution of the United States a provision attaching a property qualification to voting for the only elected officers (members of the House of Representatives) — so that only a man with considerable property could vote for such officers, and only a man with very much property could hold such an office. That proposition was actually supported by Gouverneur Morris (to whose fine and facile phrasing we owe the beauty of the instrument). He said he believed a property qualification should be a condition of voting because the main purpose of government was to protect property. But James Wilson of Pennsylvania replied that he disagreed, that the main purpose of government was to cultivate and improve the human mind — and the proposition was rejected. Every intelligent boy and girl would know that a standard for human freedom was raised when the property qualification was rejected in the framing of the Constitution.

I refuse to believe that Americans cannot thrill to the romance of their own culture just as strongly as Facists, Communists, and Nazis. And this is our supreme task, yours and mine; professional efficiency is not enough. We have to rebuild the spirit. We have not only to keep the home, not only to maintain the ethical standards, not only to cling to our faith; we have to teach the eager boys and girls the meaning of America so that they feel a tug upon their faculties and a sense of Partnership in the moral life about them. When we achieve this America will go on to a new birth of freedom; for when the coming race thrills to the meaning of the old American dream of justice and liberty it will become reality.

THE CHALLENGE FOR HOME ECONOMICS IN THE HOME

Pauline Park Wilson Knapp

Dr. Pauline Park Wilson Knapp is director of the Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, Michigan. Her bachelor's degree in home economics is from the University of Kentucky and her master's degree and doctorate in psychology from Teachers College, Columbia University. She was dean of women at the University of Alabama 1945-1946 and dean of home economics at the University of Georgia 1946-1952. She is the author of many publications and articles on the education of college women.

The following is a digest of the talk given by Pauline Park Wilson Knapp, on Thursday, April 4, 1957, at the dedication symposium of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory.

The dedication of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory marks not only this period of growth in the School of Home Economics at the University of Illinois, but gives tangible evidence of the effectiveness of the field of home economics as an ongoing part of higher education and of the belief on the part of those who made these buildings possible in the importance of the field to the people of the state. The major goal of home economics is to provide the kind of education that makes possible a better way of life for individuals and for families. In achieving this goal, home economics relates the subject matter from the many fields which do contribute to a better understanding of how individuals can find for themselves the kind of life that is enriching and satisfying through their life within the family and through extension into the broader community living. Education in the field of home economics cannot ever be standardized since it must be so integrated with the changing scene that it offers the kind of education which is individualized within the home to meet the particular needs of that family.

With its basic objective — the home — the field of home economics is then primarily concerned with three major foci around which all subject matter, whether from the social sciences, arts, humanities, or biological or physical sciences, is related. The first focus, and the most important, is the individual who lives, grows up and learns his way of life within the family. The teaching of home economics must place its emphasis upon those individuals who are in families today and who will ultimately form families for themselves. It is their understanding and acceptance of themselves, what they

learn of behavior, and the interrelatedness of family members which will determine the effectiveness of the families in which they live. It is within the home that health is built or interfered with, both mental and physical. The nurturing of normal growth in its physical, intellectual, emotional and social phases ultimately determines not only the happiness of one individual but the satisfaction of the families of the future which are formed by these individuals. The teaching of home economics can never lose sight of the dynamics of the family and the changing development of an individual through his different stages of living. In viewing its contribution to the home, the field of home economics cannot lose track of the importance of the guiding philosophy within the home; the value systems which are established, as well as the religious beliefs. Family pleasure and individual fun throughout the growth process must be incorporated in an educational program that is to meet the needs of people. The recognition of individual differences and respect for as well as acceptance of these are integral parts of good family living. In meeting the challenge of education for the home, the field of home economics cannot lose track of the importance of broadening the horizon of the individual family to include community awareness, as well as participation. No family can live alone under the circumstances of modern times, nor should it fail to appreciate the strength which comes from seeing beyond its own satisfying, intimate group.

The second focus which home economics must deal with if it is to provide education for the family is that of management. Management within the home is for the purpose of achieving a situation in which goals, aims and desires of the family can be accomplished. Management in time, in money and in other resources makes possible a satisfying way of life. Motivation is a key factor which cannot be lost track of.

The third focus for home economics is the introduction of skills which when perfected help to meet the needs and wishes of individuals and families. The understanding of the importance of nutrition and the meaning of food are essential for the well-being of every home. Clothing and shelter in the broadest sense for the family group and the individuals in it are dependent upon the kinds of skills which the family members have mastered. The learning of skills is determined by the family life of the individual, the attitudes which have developed toward these, and the creative use which is made of skills.

What is the challenge for home economics in the home? The biggest challenge is the people who are to be educated throughout

the entire life span for a greater understanding and appreciation of family life. From the very young to the very old, and for men as well as women, home economics has a significant contribution to make. There is a real challenge for the improvement of teaching which begins with the teachers themselves and their continued refreshment which they must gain in order that the educational experience which they are providing continues on an increasingly broadened basis. The challenge of working more with those representing other professions, making better use of facilities available and seeing the interrelatedness of the fields within home economics is essential. Home economics must be challenged by the need to test the reality of its goal implementation, and this can be done through increased and varied research.

No other field of education has assumed such responsibilities as home economics has in its effort to affect family life, both urban and rural through its changing program. It must continue as a creative, imaginative, individualized kind of education which is exciting to those people who teach, as well as to those who receive this kind of education. If home economics is to fulfill its long-time goal which I firmly believe it can and must, there is a tremendous challenge to it in the education of families and individuals who are living in the contemporary world.

THE CHALLENGE FOR HOME ECONOMICS IN THE COMMUNITY

Kathryn Van Aken Burns

Mrs. Kathryn Van Aken Burns, professor of home economics and state leader of home economics extension, emerita, is a graduate of Hillsdale College, Michigan, and has her master's degree from Teachers College, Columbia University. She was hospital dietitian at Ann Arbor, Michigan, nutrition specialist at the University of Illinois and state leader of home economics extension at the University of Illinois from 1923 until her retirement in 1956. She was acting head of the Department of Home Economics of the University of Illinois from 1948-1949. At present, she is special assistant to the American Home Economics Association Committee on federal research. Mrs. Burns was president of AHEA from 1936-1938 and has served on many committees including the Budget Committee, Headquarters Fund Committee and the Committee on Criteria for Evaluating College Programs in Home Economics. She served two four-year terms as a member of the Land Grant College Association Extension Organization and Policy Committee, and is a member of the Board of Trustees of the National 4-H Foundation. She is the author of a number of articles on adult education.

The following is the talk given by Kathryn Van Aken Burns, on Thursday, April 4, 1957, at the dedication symposium of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory.

Some of us present here today at this celebration of a new milestone for homemakers in Illinois can recall when a good many homemakers not only took little responsibility for community affairs, but even prided themselves in doing nothing outside their homes except perhaps for the church. In November or December they might indulge in such do-good activities as the distribution of baskets of food or toys to the needy poor because it gave them a pleasant inner glow of satisfaction at that time of year. When asked to help with a more routine or prosaic community enterprise, they usually said, with some bristling of pride, that they found more than they could do within the four walls of their homes. They seemed to have no qualms of conscience in leaving to others the solution of vexing problems connected with school and civic betterment or social welfare — let alone any possible soiling participation in political affairs.

When homes were production centers that took care of most food and clothing needs, days were full. Only too often the days were

further complicated by an elderly relative or two who lived in the home. Perhaps the homemaker had to drive the children to school and go after them. It would be trite to list the many changes in modern equipment, food processing, ready-made clothing, and home furnishings that have freed women from hours of work.

Likewise, many services once performed in the home have moved into the community, as witness the general acceptance of school health services, school lunches, community hospitals, well-baby clinics, preventive shots of all kinds, public playgrounds, the school bus, and inspection of milk and water supplies, to mention only a fraction of services that have moved out of homes. And the trend seems to be for such services to continue. In fact, the modern home and the community are so closely intertwined that it would be difficult to maintain a home that is socially and physically healthy in a community that did not furnish such services.

In spite of the great technological changes in the home and the endless services that have moved out of it into the community, it is not uncommon today to find women who still assume little or no responsibility for community housekeeping. Many of them are still hiding under that old umbrella of excuses about being too busy, even if the umbrella no longer holds water.

Moving some housekeeping detail outside the home does not relieve the homemaker from all responsibility of seeing that the job is well done. Community housekeeping, to be successful, needs that same scrupulous attention to detail that a good homemaker gives to the order and management of her home. Moreover, it is only right and fair that she should expect to give some time and attention to it, for if the community programs just mentioned did not exist, each homemaker would be facing all these problems independently in her own home. You cannot turn over all responsibility for community projects to professional personnel, competent though they may be, and have them successful. My long experience in extension work in Illinois makes me certain that it is unsafe to turn over all responsibility for county extension programs to the county home adviser and the state staff.

May I give one other example to point up what I am talking about: In years gone by I have been literally amazed at the days and weeks of work women would give to get a county health unit voted in for the county. But once the program was established, they turned over most, if not all, responsibility for its execution to the professional staff.

At this point I wish to make it very clear that only technical and professional personnel are qualified to carry out the technical and professional aspects of a health program. However, few health projects, no matter how worthy, will succeed without the interest, the backing, and active participation of local people. Nor will professional leaders ordinarily advance much faster than key local leaders who are convinced about the value of a project for the community. Professional personnel, capable as they may be in their professional capacities, are not intimately acquainted with local situations, people, and institutions that can ruin any program, no matter how worthy, unless taken into consideration.

When a community project is not successful, there is a tendency to blame the professional personnel. Before doing that, we may need to answer some questions:

How well informed was I about the project?

How much did I do to inform or interest others?

If local participation was necessary, was I willing to help?

At this point you may be thinking: But these are responsibilities that all women face. Is the responsibility of the home economist any greater than that of any homemaker? . . . The answer is yes! The fundamental principles of science and art which she studied as a student and applied in her home can be carried over and applied to community housekeeping. At least one would hope that she would see the social significance of the knowledge and skills she has acquired.

The home economist is trained to know the factors that contribute to positive health. She is trained to know the importance of order and beauty in her home, as well as something about how to achieve them. Order and beauty in the community are not totally unrelated to order and beauty in the home. Her training helps her keep the family budget in line. The same watchful eye and managerial skills that keep family expenses in line will carry over into the management of budgets for community enterprises. The same ability that it takes to keep interpersonal relations healthy within the family can be carried over to boards of directors. In fact, the problems of most agencies and organizations set up to further community or political housekeeping are usually expanded versions of ones a homemaker has met in her own home.

A home economist should be uniquely qualified to manage her home so that she can spare some time and energy for community service. One might add that, unless she does, she is probably not helping the cause of home economics in her community or attracting her young friends to it as a career.

Perhaps here I should add that I am not suggesting that the mother of young children neglect them to take on community responsibility. However, with changing patterns of marriage and child-bearing and with ten years added to the life span of each individual, there will be long periods when home responsibilities are lessened and when the homemaker still has abundant health and vitality.

The National Manpower Council has recently published some interesting findings about the status of women. With earlier marriage and a trend to have children earlier, the average woman is now only 26 years old when her last child is born and 32 when it enters school. Before she is 45, all her children have graduated from high school and perhaps left home. Because of advances in medical care, women are healthier and living longer. Hence most women can look forward to a 15- or 20-year span when they will be physically active and have diminishing home demands.

There is a need for new interests if those years are not to become ones of loneliness, dullness, chatter, bridge, shopping, and perhaps belonging to endless clubs to gain a sense of activity.

Certainly the homemaker should not consider that any community service she performs is one-way only. Participation in such community problems as health, education, recreation or housing or in the political life of her community will sharpen her mind and keep her on her toes at a time when it is easy to slump. Such service can also be a pleasant antidote for some housekeeping routine which even the most zealous homemaker has to admit is still routine.

However, one would certainly hope that all participation in community housekeeping would not be left to middle-aged women whose children are grown. One does not need to be away from home from eight a.m. to five p.m. to make some contribution. There is probably no better way for children to acquire an interest in community and civic affairs than to live in a home where they are practised in contrast to hearing such virtues discussed academically.

At the last meeting of the American Home Economics Association, Mrs. Agnes Meyer (herself an exponent of what one can do in a community) spoke about how daily life can be the finest sort of education for the woman in her home if she has a vision of the forces that lie at her doorstep and if she does not let her mind go to sleep on leaving school. It was Mrs. Meyer's thesis that voluntary leadership and action are the wellspring of this nation's political, economic, and social progress, but that it has been impoverished lately by our dependence on government to do things for us. It was her contention that, when local leadership fails in the community, state and federal

government move in to fill the void. If you belong to the group that is concerned about the encroachment of state and federal government in everyday affairs, is not the first requisite to doing something about the acceptance of the fact that in today's life it is hard to draw a hard-and-fast line between home and community responsibility? As someone has expressed it, the wall between home and community is down, and the dust is blowing in something like a gale.

Every day the boundary of the community is changing, and each time it reaches out. The community of my grandmother, born in 1832, did not extend more than a few miles from her home. Today one can cross the entire continent a great deal more easily than she could cross her county. Each time the boundaries of our community move outward, responsibilities move outward too. We should be hiding our heads in the sand if we did not admit that life is vastly more complicated today than it was even at the end of World War II.

The home economist knows the importance of continuing education for family well-being. She has seen how developments in science, almost overnight, have completely changed practices she once accepted. She knows the dangers of terminal education, the inadequacies of college education (even if she is lucky enough to have an M.A. or a Ph.D), and she realizes that she must constantly keep in touch with current knowledge.

Since she realizes so well the importance of adult education for family well-being, and since family well-being is so closely and inseparably tied to community well being, can we not reasonably look to her to be a leader in establishing adult education for public affairs in her community? It will probably not be easy. Securing an enrollment for a course in ceramics will be much easier. But in the words of Dr. Virginia Gildersleeve, former dean of Barnard College, "There is abiding satisfaction in having fought a good crusade for many a good lost cause."

It is commonly said that today woman power is the nation's greatest untapped resource. But woman power needs to be trained to be effective, and training must ever be kept up to date. The home economist can and should push the broad interests of adult education in her community. Nor will such activity bring its rewards only to others, to those she seeks to serve in her community. As Mr. E. C. Lindeman, one of our earliest scholars of adult education, expressed it, "The person who has not yet begun to realize that it is he himself who needs to be reeducated, has not taken the first step in confronting the modern world. . . . It is a joyous enterprise that brings its own rewards."

✓

THE CHALLENGE FOR HOME ECONOMICS IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Jean W. McNaughton

Jean W. McNaughton was born in Victoria, Australia, and graduated from the University of Melbourne with the degree of bachelor of science and diploma of dietetics. She was nutritionist for the Australian Commonwealth Department of Health for several years and joined the Nutrition Division of FAO in 1952. She was stationed at FAO headquarters in Rome until 1951 when she was assigned to the FAO North American Regional Office, Washington, D. C., as Regional Nutrition Officer.

The following is the talk given by Jean McNaughton, on Thursday, April 4, 1957, at the dedication symposium of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory.

Home economics is concerned with family welfare. It deals with many aspects of the home and family living—it is concerned with child development, with family relationships, with nutrition and family meals, with housing and home furnishing—in short, with all those things which contribute to a happy and stable family.

A mother in, say, Thailand, is just as interested in seeing that her child grows up strong and healthy as any mother in the United States. Home economics has just as important a role to play in the home and in the community in other countries as it has in the United States. Many governments are only just beginning to realize what this role is, and to turn to home economists in the United States, in Canada, and other so-called “developed” countries for advice in expanding their programs.

This places a great responsibility on us, and at the same time offers a tremendous challenge. Can we meet it?

It is over one hundred years since home economists in the United States started their rural programs. A great deal has been accomplished, but extension workers still have plans for improving their programs. Do we really feel competent to advise other countries on what is best for them? I think we all realize that there is no *one* right way to begin home economics work. What is right for the United States may be quite wrong in, say, India. However, sharing our technical knowledge will, we hope, help India, or Brazil or Egypt, in developing its own philosophy of home economics. It is a pooling of technical skills, and each side has something to learn from the other.

Although rural families form the bulk of the population in most

countries in the world, it is only recently that attention has been given to their welfare. Home economics has reached only small numbers of girls, mostly in cities; very often it has been limited to teaching cooking, sewing and embroidery. There is, however, a growing realization that home economics extension services can contribute much to improving the living conditions of rural people. Such services have already been established, or are planned in most countries. Usually they are associated with rural agricultural extension programs which aim at improving farming practices and increasing food production. In some countries women are responsible for much more of the agricultural work on the farm than is usual here in the United States. Therefore, women's programs in these countries cover areas we would not think of as women's work.

It is probably difficult for those of us who have not visited rural areas in countries such as India, Egypt or Brazil, to picture living conditions in the villages there. Just last week I read a description of the daily pattern of living of a family in a small village in India. It was written by a Dutch home economist who spent a week living with this family. The house was built of mud bricks. There was no kitchen — meals were cooked over a little stove in one corner of the courtyard, in another corner there was an open space where the women of the family bathed. The husband was one of the leading men in the village; he was a member of the Cooperative Society and active in the affairs of the community; yet he was very conservative about his womenfolk. His wife, daughter-in-law and daughters observed strict purdah, and therefore could not go outside the house or the walled courtyard. This meant that the father did everything outside the house, even to collecting vegetables from the field and bringing them home to be cooked. He also did all the shopping from the local store. Following local custom, father and sons were served first for meals, the women waited until the men finished eating and then had their meal. In the evening, the women and children sat together around a fire in the backyard while the husband and his sons and friends sat in the front of the house at another fire. The family did not ever sit together. The home economist wrote that in these sessions around the fire in the evenings, the father read aloud from booklets prepared by the Literary Committee on subjects such as "We the Government," "Why to Vote," "What to Eat." The men's group appeared very interested in this. She comments, "It would be wonderful if the womenfolk were also permitted to listen and learn during the evening."

She goes on to say, "Let us think of the life of this homemaker. Her sphere of activity has been strictly confined to the backyard. She entered this house as a young daughter-in-law twenty-eight years ago. She learned the pattern of food preparation from her mother-in-law. Now it is her turn to teach her daughter-in-law. During the past two decades, India has made steady progress but this woman has been left behind."

The government of India, along with governments of many other countries, has been aware of the need to develop home economics extension services. However, it is one thing to recognize the need for such services — it is another to develop an effective program in a short period of time. The biggest need in the rapidly developing countries is for trained staff. Home economists from the countries where home economics programs are already well-established, have been able to do a great deal to help their counterparts in these countries. This technical cooperation and sharing of experience is carried out through many channels, through the Food and Agriculture Organization, through the International Cooperation Administration of the United States, through private foundations such as the Ford Foundation, and the Near East Foundation, and through fellowship programs such as that of the American Home Economics Association.

At the present time there are between eighty and ninety United States home economists on assignments abroad with one of the agencies I have just mentioned.

I would now like to tell you a little about some of the home economics programs of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, or FAO, as it is usually called. FAO came into being on October 16, 1945, when forty-two countries signed its constitution. Since that time other countries have become members of FAO, until at the present time there are 74 member countries. The United States and Australia — I am an Australian — were both foundation members of FAO. The preamble of FAO's constitution states: "The Nations accepting this Constitution, being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of —

- raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions;
- securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products;
- bettering the conditions of rural populations and thus contributing towards an expanding world economy;

hereby establish the Food and Agriculture Organization."

As Lester B. Pearson of Canada who was chairman of the first FAO conference said, "FAO is the first international agency which sets out with so bold an aim as that of helping nations achieve freedom from want. Never before have the nations got together for such a purpose."

"Raising levels of nutrition and standards of living"; "Bettering the conditions of rural populations." With these as two of the objectives of FAO, it was obvious that the home economist would have an important role to play in FAO's program.

The home economist's role in FAO is varied. There is a small staff of home economists stationed at FAO headquarters in Rome, or outposted to one of FAO's regional offices. In addition to these posts, which are permanent, there are openings for home economists to carry out short-term assignments in member countries. These assignments are usually in the fields of home economics education, nutrition education, or home economics extension.

Mary Ross, who was formerly public health nutritionist in Maine, has just completed an assignment of thirty-two months in Egypt. She was a member of a team which was given the job of developing a program to improve living standards of villages in an area near Cairo. This project was to serve as a pilot study for the development of a program over a wider area. First of all, Miss Ross spent some time getting acquainted with the villages in which she was to work, and with the lives of the village women. She collected information on food habits, methods of child care, and on the daily activities of women and girls. Her next step was to select and train young women to work with her in the villages on an extension program. These girls had no background in home economics, as the schools and colleges in Egypt are only just beginning to teach home economics. Miss Ross gave training courses for the girls, and experimented with ways of reaching village women. Her first projects were concerned with child care and nutrition.

In addition to her work in the villages, she had to interpret the meaning of home economics to government officials and others and explain the part it could play in improving village life. The authorities could understand the importance of educating village women in improved agricultural practices in order to increase farm income, but it was harder to get them to see how home economics could help develop better living standards.

This sounds quite a task for a young American woman, but the last time I saw Mary she was busy thinking up plans for new activ-

ities. She has now been sent to Burma to work in a nutrition program which was started by a Dutch home economist a couple of years ago.

Frances McKay of Canada has been in Iraq for more than two years on a different type of assignment. She has been teaching in the newly-established department of home economics in a girls' college in Baghdad. The development of this home economics department is a good example of cooperation between various agencies working in international home economics programs. The government of Iraq decided back in 1951 that it would like to set up a home economics department, and asked FAO for advice. FAO sent Dean Ava Milam Clark from Oregon to Baghdad to have a look at the situation. She recommended that a home economics department be established in the Queen Aliya College, and helped plan a curriculum for a four-year course.

Three other home economists, Miss McKay from Canada, and Dr. Jane Cape and Miss Bertha Strange from the United States then worked together getting the department going. Dr. Cape was there as a Fulbright professor, Miss Strange was supplied by the International Cooperation Administration.

These three people had first to decide how classrooms and laboratories should be fitted, draw detailed plans of equipment and supervise the workmen making it. Finally, the department was ready for students. Several Iraqi women who had studied home economics in the United States or at the American College in Beirut were enrolled as teachers. Now there are about one hundred students taking home economics at Queen Aliya College. The first class to complete the four-year course graduated at the end of last year. Some of these girls are teaching home economics in the schools, a few are working as nutritionists at the Institute of Nutrition, and one or two are working in rural extension programs. So far, there is no Iraqi home economist with sufficient experience to take over the administration of the department. However, several Iraqi women are in the United States doing post-graduate work in home economics. A beginning has been made — although there are still more jobs for home economists in Iraq than graduates to fill them.

I could go on telling you about the jobs home economists are doing abroad, but these two examples will give you some idea of the types of program in which they are working. It will also give you some idea of what is expected of a home economist on a foreign assignment. For the most part, she is to be a leader who will assist in developing a program to be carried on by the local home economists. She must

be able to interpret home economics to policy-making officials in government. To do this she must, of course, be technically well trained. She must also be adaptable to living conditions which differ from those of the country where she grew up. As one of my co-workers, an American home economist, said a while ago, "To be successful in a foreign assignment, a person must have a temperament for frustration." What she meant was that you must accept the fact that things will move slowly in a new program and that there will be unexpected hitches. These things happen here, so it is to be expected they will happen more often in countries which are just starting along the road you've come.

To me, the most important thing about a home economist who is going on a foreign assignment is that she must like people. She must be interested in other people's way of doing things. She must enjoy learning as well as teaching.

The foreign home economist brings her specialized training and a fresh point of view, but in the long run the strength of the home economics program in any country, and the contribution it makes to the improvement of levels of living will depend on the local home economists.

We can help them by sharing our knowledge and skills. What is the most effective way of doing this? As I see it, finding the answer to this question is the biggest challenge facing home economists in the international field today.

A CHALLENGE FOR HOME ECONOMICS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

James A. McCain

Dr. James A. McCain combines experience in higher education, journalism, business, and civic affairs. For thirteen years he was on the staff of Colorado A & M College, first as teacher of journalism and director of publications, and later an assistant to the president, and dean of the summer session. During World War II he served in the U. S. Navy, beginning as lieutenant (j.g.) and rising to the rank of lieutenant commander. From 1945 to 1950 he was president of the University of Montana. He became president of Kansas State College on July 1, 1950.

In 1948 and 1949 he served as consultant to the state of New York on the administrative organization of the new state university.

Dr. McCain has had three years' experience as a newspaper editorial writer. While living in Montana, he served as director and chairman of the board of the Helena Branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.

He holds an A.B. from Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.; a master's degree from Duke University; and a doctor's degree from Stanford.

He is the author of articles which have appeared in numerous professional publications and the co-author of two books.

The following is an abstract of the talk given by James A. McCain, Friday, April 5, 1957, at the dedication symposium of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory.

Three contemporary conditions challenge the land-grant colleges and universities with unparalleled opportunities for the fulfillment of the aims and ideals of education in home economics.

First, the prospects for professional employment now facing graduates from all specialized areas of home economics are absolutely without precedent in both numbers and variety. The fact is that women trained in home economics are in desperately short supply.

Second, such mass information and entertainment media as radio, television, cheap printing, long-play records, and universal availability of first-rate art make possible the enrichment of the American home in a manner undreamed of two generations ago.

Third, many behavioral science studies completed in recent years have produced knowledge and techniques of incalculable effectiveness for improving human relationships including those involving home and family.

In all candor it must be acknowledged that each of these exciting opportunities has its negative manifestation. In face of this abundance of career opportunities, enrollment in home economics is showing little or no gain and in many land-grant institutions is actually decreasing. By contrast, college enrollments generally are rising in tidal wave proportions.

The self same media now giving the American family daily access to first-rate art, music, drama, and ballet can with equal force corrupt and degrade the home.

Despite our vastly improved understanding of child behavior and the nature of human relationships, the nation now suffers from an alarmingly high incidence of juvenile delinquency and broken homes, phenomena by no means unrelated.

The shortage of women trained for all types of home economics professions is annually growing more acute. A survey recently published by the United States Office of Education revealed such facts as the following: College placement services and other agencies consistently report from 5 to 10 demands for every home economics graduate. To provide replacements for homemaking teachers in secondary schools requires from 4,000 to 5,000 new teachers annually; the supply has ranged from 3,200 to 3,500. The American Dietetics Association reports ten times as many demands as trained persons available for hospital dietitians. To fill the openings which develop annually for dietitians and institutional managers would require that 1,500 be graduated in contrast to the 1,000 being graduated at the present time.

Most of us can document this problem from personal experience. I think, for example, of the twelve vacancies now existing in my own state for home demonstration agents, a dozen unfilled faculty positions in the School of Home Economics, and the perennial difficulty of staffing campus food services.

All of these positions represent opportunities not only for personal success and satisfaction but for the highest levels of service as well. Hardly a person is unaware today of the indispensability of the scientist and engineer to the nation's security. Far too few people understand that home economists also play a vital role in conserving and improving the national strength and vigor.

In the face of these opportunities and needs, student enrollment trends in home economics are discouraging. Enrollments generally in the nation's higher institutions are now increasing at a rate of almost 10 per cent annually, and enrollments of women students 7 per cent

annually. Registration in engineering is rising at an annual rate of 14 per cent. By contrast, the numbers of students majoring in home economics has grown less than 2 per cent a year, and in many land-grant colleges is actually declining. The land-grant institutions of the North-Central Region enrolled 33,553 women in 1954; 34,512 in 1955; and 39,712 in 1956. The home economics enrollments in these institutions for these same years were 6,846, 6,955, and 6,883 respectively.

Fundamentally, the problem is one of increasing the output of home economics graduates sufficiently to bring supply in line with demand. Undoubtedly, the women now enrolling annually in home economics courses represent only a fraction of those capable of preparing themselves successfully for home economics professions. The conditions depressing home economics enrollments are numerous, complex, and often obscure. However, at the risk of oversimplification, I would suggest three measures for solving the problem.

In the first place, we must furnish students and student advisors in the high schools with much more adequate information about professional careers in home economics and how these relate to other professional careers open to both men and women.

Secondly, critical examination should be made to determine whether the science requirements in various home economics majors are unrealistic in terms of the needs of homemakers and many home economics professions. Such a survey should reveal educational justification in some specialized areas for reducing science requirements in favor of more work in the humanities and the social sciences.

The curricula thus modified would undoubtedly attract into home economics many young women of high ability who are now diverted to other fields because of a lack of interest in or aptitude for predominantly scientific courses.

To meet the challenge posed by the mass entertainment media accessible to the contemporary home requires the rededication of home economics faculties to two basic principles: first, that education for homemaking is equal in importance to education for professional home economics careers and, secondly, that home economics as a professional field is based as solidly upon the liberal arts as upon the sciences.

Vigorous advocates of these principles were included among the great pioneer leaders of the field. In the biography of Isabel Bevier, to whom this magnificent building is dedicated, it is stated that the department under her leadership had not given "such exclusive attention to the professional as to break the contact with that great mass

of university women who are to become, not teachers or professionals of any kind, but the heads of American homes. To achieve this double purpose has been the great ambition of the department, in which it has eminently succeeded."

During her first year on the faculty of the University of Illinois, Miss Bevier in addressing the Farmers' Institute at Jacksonville, defined the position of household science in a university as follows:

"To provide a place and an opportunity for the correlation and application of the arts and sciences to the home. I know of no one place which affords so many opportunities for these applications. Neither do I know of a place more fateful for good or evil in the life of the individual or the nation than the home. As the equipment and advantages of the University greatly exceed those of any single college, so are the opportunities for the household science department greatly multiplied. . . .

"The College of Science can reveal to the students some of the mysteries of the laws of life. The College of Liberal Arts can give them a better conception of their own place and work in the world by the study of the history and literature of other peoples and tongues. The eye can be trained to recognize beauty of color and outline, and the hand to express it in constructing and adorning the house beautiful."

Again in 1918 she wrote:

"Home Economics has a chance to teach something of the beauty of life and the unity of life, to teach that there is an art in a well-ordered home and a well-ordered life; and that perhaps is the greatest thing that home economics has to do."

And her biographer, Miss Lita Bane, writes of her:

"She was consistently unwilling to offer college courses devoted almost entirely to skills, unwilling to mortgage the students' time with specialized home economics subjects to the point where courses in history, economics, literature, and art were crowded out. She stood for a liberal college course with a major only in home economics."

Confronted with today's incomparable facilities for the cultural enrichment of family life, home economics should embrace more fully the liberal arts in the preparation not only of future homemakers but teachers of home economics and home demonstration agents as well.

The quality of a home today might well be gauged by whether the television set is tuned to Elvis the Pelvis or the American premiere of Prokofiev's opera "War and Peace." The reading materials that

predominate in a home, whether comic books or idea magazines, might reflect its contributions to the community.

These various vehicles of mass information and entertainment are effecting a profound transformation in the American home. Without minimizing professional knowledge and skills, it is patently obvious that in the education of homemakers, more adequate provision must be made for liberal studies designed to elevate taste, to cultivate a sense of values, and to develop the capacity for logical thinking.

A third challenge to home economics in our universities stems from the vast increase in knowledge developed through prodigious research undertaken in recent years in the social sciences. The behavioral sciences in particular can now contribute more significantly than ever to the education of homemakers and of professional workers in several specialized areas of home economics.

It is interesting to observe the unusual awareness of the general public of developments in these areas. Dr. Gesell, for example, has become a household word, and over a half million copies have been sold on news stands of a paperback edition of Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture*. Professional home economists, of course, are aware of many other studies that provide the basis for enrichment of the curriculum. Even the exhaustive investigations into the nature of human relations in industry have produced findings which are relevant to the problem of human relations within the home and family.

One encouraging development of recent years has been the increasing emphasis upon the vital role of the home and family in the life of the community. Increasingly the community in this respect is considered in its broadest sense to encompass not only its immediate environment but the nation and the world as well. The ideal homemaker today interests herself in public affairs and works energetically in behalf of a better community. To equip her for active and enlightened citizenship, the home economics curriculum must draw more heavily upon the social sciences as well as the humanities.

Despite new emphases, this is by no means a new concept of the central function of the family. Confucius once observed:

"The men of old, when they wished their virtues to shine throughout the land, first had to govern their states well. To govern their states well, they first had to establish harmony in their families. To establish harmony in their families, they first had to discipline themselves. To discipline themselves, they first had to set their minds in order. To set their minds in order, they first had to make their purpose sincere. To make their purpose

sincere, they first had to extend their knowledge to the utmost. Such knowledge is acquired through a careful investigation of things. For with things investigated knowledge becomes complete. With knowledge complete the purpose becomes sincere. With the purpose sincere the mind is set in order. With the mind set in order there is real self-discipline. With real self-discipline the family achieves harmony. With harmony in the family the state becomes well governed. With the state well governed there is peace throughout the land."

THE CHALLENGE FOR HOME ECONOMICS IN RESEARCH

Pearl P. Swanson

Dr. Pearl P. Swanson is assistant director of Iowa Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station. She received her bachelor's degree from Carleton College, Minnesota, her master's degree from the University of Minnesota and her doctorate from Yale University. She was associate professor of foods and nutrition, Iowa State College from 1930-1936 and was made professor of nutrition in 1936. She has received many honors including the Sterling Scholarship and the Alexander Broune Cox Fellow, Yale University and the Borden Award for studies of basic problems in nutrition and contributions to research in human nutrition. She has held offices in AIIFA, American Institute of Nutrition and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Her research and publications have been concerned with the metabolism of proteins; nutritional status of population groups; dietary requirements of reproduction; inorganic salts in nutrition.

The following talk, journal paper number J-3237, for the Iowa Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station, Ames, Iowa, project no. 1028, was given by Pearl P. Swanson, on Friday, April 5, 1957, at the dedication symposium of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory.

Some of our richest experiences in living have had their origin in the cohesiveness of the family unit. We all know how a family rallies for rejoicing when good fortune comes to one of its members and how it stands by in strong support in times of trouble or misfortune. Today we, representing a group of sister institutions of higher learning, are gathered together to rejoice with one of our members in the dedication of its beautiful new home economics building. As we have moved through its spacious halls and visited its well-equipped laboratories we experienced no envy. We only rejoiced that one of our family had been given this great opportunity to extend its influence.

It is, indeed, a pleasure and a privilege to share these days of dedication to a greater and more significant home economics program at the University of Illinois. I bring with me the congratulations and good wishes of the Iowa State College and particularly those of its Division of Home Economics and of its Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station.

We are living in an era of technology, and it has created a strange

and wonderful world for us. While this new age has enriched our way of life in many ways, it has, at the same time, produced profound changes. At the turn of the century, our world was our neighborhood. Today our neighborhood has become the world. Our homes have been made sanitary, beautiful, and easy to live in. Our food has taken on new characteristics, and changes with each year that passes. Many items have become standard household possessions — labor-saving equipment, television, radio, automobiles.

But in creating all this, technology also has brought about changes in our industrial, economic, and social systems. Our population has become mobile; there has been migration from farm to city; "suburbia" may be defined as a new pattern of living.

And war engendered through technology also has left its imprint. Ways of living developing from our adaptation to it and its aftermath have bounded and rebounded against our home and family structures shattering old values and not always giving rise to new.

But out of this a new America is emerging and out of the new America, a new American home. In this new American home lies the challenge of home economics research today. Always the heart of the home economics profession has been its interest in home and family life. But understanding and solving the problems confronting families of today and anticipating those of families of tomorrow is a task of no mean magnitude. Indeed, we might even compare our job to a battle — a battle waged in this world of changing technology for a good and stable family life. And as we look ahead, it is clear that this battle must be fought on several fronts. Of these, there are at least four.¹

The first front is well defined; its attack is centered against factors that work against the health of people. Medicine and sanitation have been campaigning here for a relatively long time. More recently, home economics has sent up a gallant little company to help fight the battle. It found that it had, not only methodologies that might serve as machine guns and ammunition, but also soldiers with special skills and training that it could move to the front, ready and able to broaden the objective for which the battle was being waged — a total health defined as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease and infirmity.²

Defined thus, health represents the end point of the various forces, influences, and reactions that converge upon each member of the family in whatever phase of the life cycle he may be in — infancy, childhood, adolescence, maturity, adulthood, or old age. Nutritional

state basically depends on the availability of an adequate supply of food and on the efficient utilization of this food. But nutritional state is a mobile and fluid condition and may be modified — perhaps adversely — by many conditions and experiences of living even in the presence of an adequate food supply. Some of these modifiers of nutrition are related to social and economic conditions; others reflect environment and education; still others are of physiological, psychological, or ethnic origin. Sometimes these forces impinge upon the nutrition of a person singly; at other times they react with each other before they make their impact.

Just what are some of the problems challenging nutritionists today? Time does not permit a comprehensive review but examples from current research will point up a few of the things that concern nutritionists.

During the past few years, a considerable number of studies have been completed about the food consumption of families, individuals, and various population groups segregated in many ways — in respect to age perhaps, or socio-economics status, or place of abode, etc. Studies like these are important because they tell us what people are eating in these changing times, whether they are choosing food adequate, insofar as we can judge, for the support of good nutrition. When data obtained are expressed in terms of average figures, the picture is fairly bright. But mean figures can be very misleading. They contain high values, intermediate values, and low values. When we break down a mean depicting the average amount of some nutrient provided by the food consumed by a population group and sort out the satisfactory and unsatisfactory values, we are forced to conclude that a considerable portion of our population, even in this land of plenty, is undernourished in terms of present day standards. For example, we have found that in the state of Iowa, 57 per cent of the women over age 30 were getting 0.6 gram of calcium or *less* from their day's food. At present 0.8 gram is recommended. Also, 19 per cent were getting *less* than 45 grams of protein; the recommended amount is 55 grams per day.

But statistics like these are cold — even meaningless — to people in general. It is so easy for a person to say, "Oh yes, so what?" Perhaps a little dramatization of these figures will make them more significant.³ May we take the calcium story first? What about this figure of 57 per cent? It tells us that least 380,000 Iowa women in this age group were not using enough milk. If we could induce these women to step up their milk consumption so that their calcium re-

quirement would be satisfied, 40,000 gallons of extra milk would be consumed each day by this group alone. And what about the protein? About 130,000 women in Iowa were eating diets providing less than 45 grams of protein a day. If similarly they could be persuaded to step up the consumption of protein foods to meet their protein requirement, they would consume *extra* every day in terms of their accustomed food patterns:

18000 pounds of meat, poultry, and fish
plus 3000 dozens of eggs
plus 1100 pounds of cheese
plus 9000 quarts of milk
plus 15000 loaves of bread.

And this could be achieved without increasing the energy value of their diets by letting the protein foods replace some of the "empty" calories adorning their meals in the form of rich pastries, sweets, and desserts.

Do not figures like these make us appreciate that even today under-nutrition may represent an important nutritional problem although instances of frank deficiency disease have disappeared almost entirely? Do they not suggest that the lack of interest in life, the fatigability, the emotional instability, the anxiety states, the pre-mature aging and changes in physical appearance that we find in many individuals of an adult and aging population may have their origin in inadequate diets?

But these figures are saying something else too. To me, they are saying, "*You are not putting your nutrition education programs across very effectively.*" And why have we not been successful? Perhaps, because we have not taken into account the modifiers of nutrition that I mentioned earlier. Have we paid enough attention to various factors affecting eating patterns — factors of ethnic, environmental, economic and social origin? How do irregular eating times growing out of our present mode of life affect food intakes? What effect does a working mother in a family have on the adequacy of the meals served at that family table? What changes are coming about in the way in which food is prepared, and what relation may these changes have to food acceptance? These questions suggest that the time has come to bring in reinforcements from other fronts to help the nutritionist get this important supporting information.

There are other aspects to the problem also. As teachers, extensioners, and researchers we appreciate that we have not succeeded always in converting our nutrition education programs into nutrition action programs. What can we do that will make people want to change

poor food practices? Perhaps, the time has come for a critical evaluation of the traditional approaches of teaching nutrition in terms of calories, proteins, vitamins, and minerals or of the seven basic food groups. Research based on modern educational philosophy is providing new keys that need to be tried out and tested under many situations. Motivation is a powerful tool, and programs taking into account the goals and aims of the individuals in the group being reached may represent a big wedge in the improvement of food habits. For example, just what kind of persons would they like to be? In a group of adolescent girls, might not emphasis of nutritional practices that are reflected in improved personal appearance — glossier hair, clearer skin, better posture, more pep — be important?

A group of overweights might be challenged by an appeal to reduce body size in light of benefits to be derived — reflected in things like improved appearance and better health. Our own research experience at Iowa with an overweight individual provides a dramatic example. This woman, 52 years old when we first knew her, was some 30 pounds overweight. She had never used milk in her diet, was stingy with protein foods, and used relatively few fresh fruits and vegetables. She came to us as a subject in one of our metabolic studies. Balance tests showed that both calcium and nitrogen were being drained from her body tissues. She expressed a desire to lose weight and we planned a diet of reduced caloric value and ample in protein-rich foods and milk. She took the job seriously and modified her eating practices around our dietary recommendations. We have studied this subject at regular intervals, and over the past 8 years on this improved diet she has been storing calcium and nitrogen and her weight has fallen by 30 pounds. Recently, her physician evaluated his observations of her over the years. He said that she looked three years younger. He noted that her skin had taken on a good color and a surprisingly soft texture for a woman of her age, that her hair was lustrous, her musculature firm. A slight spinal curvature was more flexible than it was initially. The subject herself is keenly aware of an improvement in her sense of well-being. An animation and a zeal that she did not exhibit when we first knew her are evident. Also, there is her pride in being able to wear a size 14 dress!

I have dwelt at length on the performance of this woman for she not only is an example of what motivation will do in reaching nutritional goals but she also is a demonstration of another most important nutrition fact. And this is it: *Nutrition can be improved.* Make people believe this statement and another powerful nutrition education tool

will become available. Nutrition researchers must vitalize this basic tenet; they must prove it to the general public. This I consider one of their most important challenges. And how can they meet it? Only by the production of specific and direct evidence from human experience — that more calcium in the diet, for example, really will make people feel better; that in this day of automation and inactive recreation, fewer calories in the diet will have a pay-off in health and improved well-being.

Before leaving the subject of nutrition there is one other thought I would like to bring to the fore. That is the job that the researcher in this field has of standing as a liaison person between Mr. Scientist sending forth new and ever-changing reports of researches from his laboratories and Mr. General Public. It is one of the research nutritionist's jobs to assemble and appraise new information and to avoid too early interpretation — in other words — to hold the fort until all the evidence is in. It is the nutritionist's job also, because of special qualifications for conducting certain kinds of researches, to assume her share in securing data that will contribute toward the unravelling of any tangles that may develop. In the long run, then, she will be able to tell Mrs. American Public why she is getting fat when she is eating far fewer calories than the text books recommend. And perhaps she can reply to Mr. American Public when he asks,⁴ "Am I drinking so much milk and eating so many eggs and so much meat that my arteries are hardening?" Or, "How can foods that were called nutritious five years ago now be called bad for my heart?" In his concern for his collective heart, the reactions of Mr. American Public begin to take on the qualities of mass hysteria. The questions that he is asking, indeed, do put the nutritionist in a box because carefully controlled research has not progressed to the stage where answers are known. But at the same time, the nutritionist can serve as a balance wheel through honest assessment of data, cool reaction, and more experimentation. And as researchers, they know that some day the correct answers will be found.

And now let us move on to another front where home economics research also must meet its responsibility. This is a front entangled with barbed wire, in line of shrapnel fire, and of difficult terrain to travel. It is a front that has to do with the security of the home and the personal development of its members. The home is the keystone of family development; family development the cornerstone of individual development. Here are nurtured the citizens of tomorrow and upon whose stability the security of the world rests.

These are many evidences today of instability and difficulty in the American family.⁵ The divorce rate is high; in 1954, there were 379,000 divorces in the United States. Delinquency troubles our courts and our families. About one-half of the people in American hospitals are there because they are mental cases.

To feel secure in a family one must have a feeling of being wanted. This is a basic need of every member of the family from the very young to the very old, and frustration of this need may induce an anti-social pattern of behavior. Wherein lies the source of strength in families that leads to well adjusted personalities secure in their sense of security? To get an answer, studies must be directed to the *family itself*. In many investigations to date, the family has been treated as a factorial unit in tracing and analyzing socio-economics movements or programs. It seems to me that if we are to understand the family itself, the experimental approach must be changed and that we must look for forces within the home and its environment that are enhancing or curtailing or stifling growth of family members.

As an example, let us think about research with children in the family. A good deal of work has been done in this area. However, even though children in families have been mentioned as variables in this so-called family research, in many instances, the child himself, his attitudes and his feeling about family living and its attendant relationships have not served as topics of research. The child has been neither a subject nor a research datum.⁶ Instead, in the words of Hawkes, "Dennis isolated them, Gesell watched them, Terman & Goodenough measured their I.Q.'s." All this has been good, but it is taking a long time for the child to come into his own and to be treated as a family member in the handling of research. If researchers are to understand the child, they must see through the eyes of the child as a subject in order to understand what the subject sees. And to understand a child as a member of a family we must examine the child *in his family*. We need to study his perceptions of his parents, his family, and his environment. The child is a member of a primary group and acts as well as is acted upon. Studies are showing that the child does perceive various home and family influences and suggest that the home, indeed, nurtures the seed of the developing personality and that in the family may be found resources that not only prevent frustrations and mental breakdowns but provide capacities for individuals to enjoy life through adulthood and old age as well balanced, serene personalities.

But the problem of personality development of children is only one

of the problems researchers in this area must face. What is the significance, for example, of early marriages, more children in the home, employed mothers, suburban living? There is the ever mounting problem of women freed from the dominant mother role early in life — fired from her job so to speak —, changes in roles of husbands and wives, relations to aged parents. What are these things and others doing to people?

Home economics must not fail to make its contribution to this basic understanding of the family and of its members. It can spearhead the kind of research that is needed, but this in turn can be enriched by close cooperation with the allied sciences, sociology, anthropology, economics. We should not proceed alone. A team can pull much more than the lone horse.

And now our strategists in home economics are moving us to another front — good management of family resources. Although we can spot our objective in the distance, there are blockades and entanglements ahead. For what does good management mean, particularly when we must think of it in terms of money, of time, of energy, and of human resources? This new world is one of changing standards. It is making available goods and services of which our mothers and grandmothers never dreamed. It has taken production out of the home. It is producing changes in time-honored roles of both men and women in our society. No wonder that management has become a complex thing. What are family goals under these conditions? What kind of decisions must be involved if these goals are to be reached? What are standards for improved management within the family?

The use of consumer credit offers a good illustration of problems in this area. In the United States today, consumer credit amounts to more than 37 million dollars.⁷ A great deal is known about the sources of this credit, items for which it is used, and its relationship both to total national income and family income. But very little is known about the decision-making in terms of family goals and family welfare that entered into these commitments. We need to know also what effect fixed installment buying has on important family values such as the adequacy of the food coming into the household, kind and amount of clothing purchased, recreation potentials, medical services needed, and provision of educational opportunities.

But there is still another front on which home economics research must wage its battle for a good and stable family life. The family is a tremendous consuming group in providing for its food, shelter, and clothing. What it spends its money for, as well as how much it spends, determines not only its own but the national economy.

Much can be done to help the consumer in the acquisition of goods from a market flooded with items needed for the meeting of each of the basic needs. In general to make wise selection of goods the consumer should have information on which to base judgments of quality and value. Only a start has been made on developing easily understood quality-identification criteria for evaluation of goods at time of purchase. Factors are operating in all areas supplying primary needs that complicate the consumer's problem and that accentuate the need for more information. Developments in technology are giving us a new and wondrous food supply — much of it specifically produced to meet the needs of the modern homemaker in her busy world and packaged to catch her eye and fancy. But as technology creates and develops new foods, it also may change the chemical composition of the natural products. These alterations may be associated with shifts in nutritive value or in certain functional properties demanded by the homemaker in her use of the product. For example, why does a food product based on a starch paste have a tendency to bleed although no principle of cookery has been overlooked in its preparation. Possibly such syneresis may be explained in terms of a new technology used in the production of starch. And is it not interesting how hydrogenated fats have been accepted since their introduction decades ago? But it is only now that nutritionists are beginning to wonder whether or not the processing is associated with changes in nutritive value.

Housing for a family no longer means a house. The kind of housing we have today reflects socio-economics forces at work in our population. We have seen housing shift from houses to apartments to housing developments crowded with duplexes and small one-floor houses. The change has only emphasized what needs to be done, i.e., measurement of the influence of the house on the well-being of its family and its importance as a place to nurture the development of children. What would happen if housing could be planned to meet the functional needs of family members — a place for each to do the things he should and wants to be doing? When will house planning fully take into account the needs of a family in its various cycles as a new, a growing, and a contracting family? Only the surfaces of the problems needing solution have been scratched.

As we round out our thinking as to where home economics research is finding its challenges in meeting the basic needs of the family, we must not forget problems involved in the provision of clothing for all members of the family and in meeting needs for household fabrics, both utilitarian and aesthetic.

This is a day of miracles in the textile world. Clothing and house-

hold fabrics have taken on a new look. No longer are cotton, wool, and linen the key fibers. Complementing and supplementing them are the man-made fibers — nylon, dacron, orlon, etc. Fabrics made of these various fibers, and blends thereof, have been put to multitudinous uses. Actually, very little is known about the role and function these fibers play in meeting the requirements of textiles for clothing and household uses. All vary in respect to durability, wearability, ease of maintenance, comfort, beauty, and adaptability to different uses. In addition they vary in the way a person reacts to them, both physiologically and mentally.

As a result of requirements of the military, a considerable back-log of basic research is behind recommendations for fabrics to be used for the construction of clothing for various services in the Armed Forces. Similar research is needed on civilian clothing. How may desired warmth or coolness of clothing be achieved? What factors contribute to comfort in wearing? Which fabrics have particular characteristics that contribute to hygienic quality? It is important that people know what qualities can be expected in clothing made of different fabrics and blends of fabrics. People will be asking research workers these and many other questions.

And now, in recapitulation, how can we define the challenge of home economics research? Its essence, I think, can be found in the verb, "to stretch." Why? Because to stretch means to grow in length and breadth. Surely, this has been happening as home economics research first recognized and then began to solve problems associated with the attainment of physical and mental health, with the personality development of family members and their relations to each other, with family security and management practices, with the collection of information about consumer goods in respect to wise buying practices. Surely, home economics research is standing on the threshold of great accomplishment, but it must go on stretching.

To stretch has another meaning. It also means "to reach out." And this too the home economics of the future will be doing when it reaches out to increase its opportunities by working for a new research agency in the government dedicated to the betterment of family life, i.e., a Research Foundation for the American Home.⁷ Through its research programs of enduring quality — of length, of breadth, and also of depth — may be catalyzed. May I salute our own national American Home Economics Association for undertaking the Herculean task of working for the passage of a bill by our Congress that would create such a foundation.

To stretch also means "to extend," and this is another thing home economics research must do as it moves forth to meet its challenge. It will extend if its workers will make its information available for all to know, interpreting it, and developing with teachers and extension workers new ways of making new information vital to people in their everyday lives.

And finally, in a more abstract sense, Webster says that to stretch means "to put forth." To put forth, to establish new facts, new information — always more. Only thus will our profession grow. Research is its very lifeblood. Only through it can home economics meet its goals of educating for citizenship, for an improved family life, for an enrichment of living, and for the development of an individual's self-understanding.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Am. Home Econ. Assoc. Committee on Federal Research
1957. Areas of research related to the proposed research foundation related to the American Home
Minutes of Conference, Washington, D. C. April 29, 1957.
2. World Health Organization
1946. Constitution of the World Health Organization
Am. J. Public Health and the Nation's Health, 36, 1315-1323.
3. Swanson, Pearl, Willis, Elisabeth, and Eppright, Ercel
1956. Nutrition research and the agricultural program
Paper presented to the Agricultural Advisory Committee, Feb. 22, 1956
Journal Paper J-2926 of the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, Ames, Iowa Projects 1021 & 1028.
4. Editorial
1957. Facts on fats
J. Am. Med. Assoc., 163, 743.
5. Dye, Marie
1956. Needs in research for the American family
Brochure (Copyright, Dec. 1956), Am. Home Economics Assoc., Washington, D. C.
6. Hawkes, G. E.
1957. The child in the family
Marriage and family living, 19, 46-51.
7. Am. Home Econ. Assoc.
1956. Needed an expanded program of research for the nation's families
A proposal for a research institute for the American home to further the well-being of the nation's family
Leaflet (Copyright 1956) by the Am. Home Econ. Assoc., Washington, D. C.

THE CHALLENGE FOR HOME ECONOMICS IN BUSINESS

Gertrude Austin

Mrs. Gertrude Austin, director of the Consumer Service Division, Sunkist Growers, California, is a home economics graduate of the University of Illinois. She received her master's degree from the University of Chicago, then was research assistant to the head of the Home Economics Department, University of Chicago. At the Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund she worked with both professional and lay groups concerned with families. For six years she was director of Consumer Education for the American Institute of Baking. She authored "Eat and Grow Slim" and "The Wheel of Good Eating" both of which earned the seal of acceptance of the Council on Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association.

The following talk was given by Gertrude Austin on Friday, April 5, 1957, at the dedication symposium of Bevier Hall and the Child Development Laboratory.

Our association with each other in these dedication days is thrilling evidence that we share basic concepts of life and simultaneously the basic challenge to carry on creatively in our own sphere of activity. We speak each from our diverse positions in life; yet the concepts of which we speak are so encompassing that they unite us as we know we are united in our profession.

The focus of home economics is not narrow but, rather, so far-reaching that its influence is felt in every area of life. The fulfillment of our collective professional aims depends on the way we individually accept the challenge that has been set before us. It is for us in home economics to justify such confidence as that displayed in the erection of Bevier Hall by those who guide the over-all policy of education. In it is a meeting of three great and productive activities in our economy today: education, research and business; all three are interdependent.

Have you felt as I have, as we've listened to these stimulating discussions, that we owe so much to others, that we'd not have come this far in our profession had it not been for the fundamental truth that *we live so abundantly on the work of others?* We are co-heirs of the past with a legacy to pass on to the future.

Our great cultural heritage from workers in the past and from our contemporaries means that we can go on creatively where others have left off without ourselves going back to beginnings — through lengthy trial and error methods. Examples of our heritage and of today's in-

terdependencies are all around us. The engineering know-how to erect beautiful Bevier Hall is the result of research, education and business through the ages. Much of the same knowledge involved in creating such beauty and utility is used every day to develop better equipment for every possible use, and it carries over into my own field — nutrition. The dependence of science on tools and techniques is thought-provoking, to say the least.

I take it as a sign of growth that we use freely the work and ideas of others and the opportunities all around us. But to make us comfortable about our creative cribbing: Wasn't it Emerson who said that when we live with an idea, absorb it and use it, the idea becomes our own. I personally can never repay what I have received from books and from the many warm and helpful people with whom I've been privileged to work. I've helped myself to the ideas of others — put them through the mill of my own mind and coordinated them to suit my countless needs. There are people here today to whom I shall be eternally grateful for the helping hand, the stimulating idea and example.

It is a thrilling thought that the creative mind that stimulates a child or young person — or oldster, for that matter — to grow becomes a part of that person's thoughts and activities from then on. "The creation of a thousand forests is in one acorn."

Here is where the challenge lies, to my way of thinking — to accept our legacy from others, then strive to grow so that what we pass on to the future will stimulate our heirs to richer giving in their turn.

I go on in this philosophic vein — not to belabor the point — but because *business is so beholden to others and to so many disciplines*. Business takes freely from both the present and the past.

Take my own company, SUNKIST, for example. Chemistry, physics, economics, psychology, and the arts all are an integral part of every activity of SUNKIST GROWERS. Think of the interdependencies of one knowledge on another: in breeding the best strains of oranges and lemons; in growing sturdy, productive trees; in selecting, protecting and pampering the sweet juicy fruit for shipping; in marketing that fruit to families all over the world; and in producing the by-products that will share with fresh fruit in building the profit structure which keeps SUNKIST GROWERS, INC., the live and growing cooperative that it is in Southern California.

I do not have the answers as to just what is the challenge for Home Economics in Business, but because I accepted the invitation to be here today I've been obliged to do something in that direction.

When I tried to answer this question, I faltered. My quick reply was that the challenge for a Home Economist in Business (or HEIB, as we call her in these alphabetizing days) is to be or become a "person."

But does a "person" mean to you what it means to me — both as a word and as an idea. The dictionary helps unite us broadly. It defines a person as "a human being who is conscious of his social relations to other human beings toward whom he acts," and further, "the actual self or individual personality of a human being: to assume a duty in one's own person."

That's better. A home economist does require special qualities and training; but I'll not go into that, for it is spelled out in the home economics curriculum. Above all she must be alive and able and willing to grow; she must have the inquiring mind; and she must have the mental and physical health to carry out her job with others. For all of us live *with* and *for* people — even more than we live for ourselves.

And so the challenge for an HEIB is to be a person who assumes responsibility, knows the ingredients that make up her job, then masters the delicate trick of putting those ingredients together.

My thesis is that *a good home economist can become a good home economist in business*, and the other way around. Each requires that the candidate be well-grounded in the knowledge and skills of her field in home economics. But she must have far more than that.

Just as higher education and research call for home economics women of top character and training, so does business. To qualify for membership in Home Economics in Business (HEIB), a 34-year-old section of the American Home Economics Association, an applicant must: be a member of AHEA; hold a degree in home economics or a major in home economics from an accredited college with specified high standards; be connected in a home economics capacity with a business run for profit or with an association supported by business run for profit. There now are nearly 2000 HEIB members.

HEIBs work in many industries. I suspect that there's not a facet of home economics subject matter for which an HEIB does not have a responsibility — family economics and home management; family relations and child development; food and nutrition; housing and household equipment; textiles and clothing.

Actually, every home economist contributes to and builds on the work and stature of the other, whether she is in business or not. At SUNKIST we learn from all groups and are mighty proud to be able to give and take from our professional associates.

The keystone of our program lies in offering convincing useful

materials to a food editor, teacher, extension, public health or welfare worker, to accept or reject as she sees fit. If an HEIB's job is a contributing part of advertising, her program in effect precedes and follows advertising as such. It is a market conditioner and perpetuator, shall we say, which paves the way for increased acceptance of her company's advertising and sales promotion message.

Business no longer thinks of home economists as jolly little recipe developers. I'm not belittling the value of a recipe, for an appetizing, understandable recipe has immeasurable value in selling a product. Joseph Conrad paid a great tribute to recipes and to the writing involved in them. He said in effect that the intention of every other piece of prose may be discussed and even mistrusted, but the purpose of a recipe is one and unmistakable. Its object, he said, can be no other than to increase the happiness of mankind. But back to business.

In most organizations HEIBs participate in over-all company objectives. Consumer Service (the usual designation for home economics departments in business today) has a prime responsibility for building and retaining the confidence and friendship of the consuming public for their companies or organizations. As a professional group we have accomplished much, but we have a long way to go. This projecting of ourselves and our profession takes some doing. We haven't yet as a profession learned to sell the value of our services as high as they might be, but if we do not receive the recognition we feel we deserve, it is no one's fault but our own. It is about accomplishing this that I'd like to talk. And I do have a point, though it may not yet have seemed so.

You've perhaps heard the story of the farmer whose mule wouldn't budge. He looked about him, found a twelve foot two-by-four, then hauled off with this weapon and gave the mule a terrific whack. The mule stood unconcernedly in the same spot. Again he hauled off with an even more resounding wack. The mule didn't quiver a muscle, not even an eyelid. In despair, the farmer looked over at another man sitting on the fence. "What do I do to get this fellow moving?" he asked. "That's simple," said the man on the fence. "You've got to get his attention first."

How can we grow into the "person" with the qualities that will make for success in our jobs, our professions, and our lives?

As I ask myself these questions they divide into three groups: (1) Do I work creatively with myself? (2) Do I work creatively with others? (3) Do I live creatively?

Do I work creatively with myself?

You've heard it said that the most important word in the English language is "I." It is a thrilling fact that to each of the nearly two-and-a-half billion souls on this earth the center — the focus of all being — is in himself — myself, to be explicit. We just don't do any creative growing unless we feel it will "mean" something to us and somehow fulfill our individual goals. And so I ask questions of myself.

Am I accepting the challenges that home economics puts to me as a woman in business? More than that, am I not only taking on obvious challenges, but am I looking around for more?

It is a simple fact that no one can greatly help anyone else. We must do our own growing — master the simple, then go on from there. Luckily, everything we have to do in life is related to something we have learned to do in the past. My little red-headed grandson David, at the proud age of one year, is learning to walk. He'll soon run, too, but it will take time to learn to stop in the midst of a run. We know he will struggle on — even though the struggle is joyous. In any case his strength lies in single-handedly working out his own problems so he will be able to shoulder the next. His four-year-old brother Stevie can even ride a bike, and he's trying to read, too.

Another strength — and this to me as an HEIB — is that if I've prepared myself to meet the problems that can be expected to come up in my job, I'll be set to take on new and unexpected responsibilities. I flew here in a DC-7. I'll never in the wide world be able to operate even a tiny plane, and the deepest secrets about other fields — atomic energy, for instance — could be whispered to me and I'd not have the slightest idea they were secrets, much less understand them. But I do have formal background for my work in home economics, both from the University of Illinois and the University of Chicago — with a bit from other universities thrown in. The question for me is: Do I "keep up" in subject matter essential to my work so that my mind will be ready to take on the new? Most HEIBs don't have formal training for all the work they'll do in business. But they'll learn by doing because their basic understanding is well developed. They'll learn to write and edit copy, take pictures, work on layouts, test and develop recipes, and be nutritionists and idea-raisers for telling people about their company's products.

Actually, don't you feel that scientists have great optimism and courage that springs from a *partial* knowledge. They seem to gain much patience from knowing that as yet their knowledge is anything but complete.

Certainly an HEIB must be well-trained, seasoned, experienced,

but she must go on from there. It is one thing to feel the impulse to get up and do something, and another to see what you can get up and do, and yet another to plan ahead to improve your doing.

And so I must check myself to be sure I am using fully my varied resources — my skills, my intelligence, my imagination; do I make the most of time — planning time, writing time, other working time — so that I will do my work well with the least effort and most enjoyment; am I enjoying life, keeping healthy and being a responsible member of my staff and my community? That's a large order, but it's crucial to the work of a Home Economist in Business.

The next question I ask myself is: Do I work creatively with others?

We all get things done through people — whether it is a teacher selling an idea to a pupil, an extension worker inspiring leaders to action, or an HEIB motivating people to use her product.

It is obvious that to get anybody to do anything an HEIB must transfer her ideas about her product to others. (I feel you'll forgive this aside: It is a personal satisfaction to me to feel that my urging others to use citrus fruits has sound social value. Most studies of people's food practices show that a high percentage do not get enough of several nutrients that are found richly in citrus. In fact, the USDA says that the practical way to be sure of filling the day's allowance of ascorbic acid under our way of eating is to eat an orange a day. For many reasons my job carries the sense of service given which is the essence of a professional contribution.)

Another challenge to HEIBs (in addition to selling their product to the public) is to sell their own particular function to their associates in their company. I recall hearing a gentleman speaking to HEIBs several years ago say that *justifying a service* requires a higher type of salesmanship than is required to sell a commodity. In selling home economics as a service to business, he said, many of the greatest values can be presented only through the imagination of the person to whom we are selling. Often we become so wrapped up in the performance of that service that we make the mistake of taking for granted that all others in the organization fully appreciate the fine work we are doing, while quite likely the opposite is true. Chances are that practically no one in the organization outside of the immediate sphere of the job knows of more than a small percentage of the benefits being developed. When a service function is first started in an organization, someone in authority has authorized it; and that someone had imagination, resourcefulness and a progressive spirit. That may

have been years ago, and the person who originally authorized the work may have moved into another sphere of influence, or he may delegate much of the work so that the thinking behind the original decision to establish the Home Economics Department has become clouded.

So he said that we need to know where we're heading, and let others know too. Columbus didn't know where he was going, where he was when he got there, or where he'd been when he got back.

Mr. Russell Z. Eller, advertising manager of SUNKIST, spoke at the Los Angeles HEIB "Bosses' Night" banquet last month. He reflected the thinking of others who have top management responsibilities for directing the work for Consumer Service. "Never has the opportunity for an HEIB been richer and never has the challenge to creative thinking been greater," he said. "The Home Economist, no matter what her sphere, ought to be the spearhead of the industry for more facts, greater depth of understanding. Since we cannot impart knowledge unless we possess it, the well-qualified Home Economist in Business today has a major part in interpreting an industry's message to the eager, intelligent mass of women consumers."

Mr. Eller said that today every phase of business is under scrutiny. He posed several provocative questions: Is what we are doing the right thing; is it done as well as it might be; does it serve the needs of today or does it mirror traditions that are fading into the sentimental past; do we know enough about women in this new age so that we may best serve her needs; are we using new research techniques such as motivation studies and market surveys to check our opinions and information? Do we keep up with the times? Ten years ago we thought the bumper crop of babies was a phenomenon of war—to be dealt with on a temporary basis. Now it seems the sky's the limit on population projections—on national income too. Do we know about the new market of teenage wives—and about the needs of the growing number of senior citizens. All such knowledge is important to successful work with others.

Planning Ahead for Better Marketing, a bulletin put out by the Grocery Manufacturers of America, gives an interesting definition of management which I'd like to include in discussing the question, "Do I work creatively with others?" Grocery Manufacturers of America's Bulletin says, "The science of management is the talent of getting people to work effectively towards an established goal. In medium- and large-scale business, successful management means 50 percent the management of people." (It does not surprise you, I'm sure, that

businessmen attribute such great importance to getting along with people.) The definition goes on: "20 percent technical knowledge or ability" (which in no way, of course, belittles technical knowledge, for without it you'd not have your job in the first place). Then it continues ". . . and the balance made up of ability to adjust to change, ability to interpret changes and their effect upon your industry, ability to see and appreciate the other fellow's point of view, ability to formulate correct policies, and in varying degrees the ability to relax, laugh at yourself and others, to concentrate, to overcome the routine of your work."

To sum up my first two questions about myself and about the way I work with others: Do I think and act creatively in regard to the basic skills and information I need to "sell" the ideas and services of my organization and my Home Economics Department? Do I understand what motivates me to action and do I translate that understanding into compassion and a spirit of helpfulness to others? Do I cooperate creatively with the work of others that is there for me to use — the work of other technologies, schools of thought and discipline. And do I have enthusiasm for my work? Enthusiasm is just as contagious as the measles that my little grandson is due to come down with tomorrow. But unlike the measles, enthusiasm is uniquely creative.

The third and last question that I ask myself is: Do I live creatively?

"Earning a living" has strong connotations, both physical and moral. We must grow up in our capacity to earn a living — not money alone (and indeed, it's best to forget about that) but we "earn" a "living" both on the job and away. Of course, it is necessary to provide the essentials: food, clothing, and shelter. But that's only part of the story.

"Living" means personal satisfactions 24 hours a day and throughout a lifetime. Can you separate your on-the-job time from the other portion of your day? I can't. My job is so vital that even my relaxing and resting times are tied to my SUNKIST life. I love it, and I hope you do your working life, too. Believe me, I'm for fun and relaxation. But it's true for me, at least, that what I put into my working time strongly affects what I get out of life.

An asset from enjoying your job is that friends react pleasantly and often helpfully because of the aura you've created around the way you "earn" your "living." My little four-year-old grandson Stevie's Valentine to me said "I love you" in wavering print along with a smudged magazine clip of a lemon grove. The grove was the

essence of what I mean. He loves me, I know. But to him I am a mixture of the fun we have when I visit him in Iowa — of his satisfactions of digging into the sweet golden oranges I send from California. I suspect mostly, though, that he smeared a lemon grove to my Valentine because of his delight every day in watching and dancing to the SUNKIST lilt on Queen for a Day: Remember to Remember Lemons. That program, the oranges he eats, and our letters regularly link me to him even though we are thousands of miles apart. I must admit that winter visits in my sunny Southern California home have influenced his idea about this particular grandmother. To him I'm all mixed up with such ideas as California — which to him is synonymous with SUNKIST — and tidepools. Until he waded into one out on the West Coast, he associated one of astronomy's great subjects, "tides," with "Tide's In — Dirt's Out."

That is just a personal aside to point out that we like to be liked for what we do: The help we give another, the way we ask for help — the security and warmth of friends, old and new. For me as an individual it is a strength to know that I can do the tasks of today and tomorrow, if I set myself to them. And I can in my small way help others if I understand their problems — their capacities. I like the Indian adage: Don't judge a man until you have walked two days in his moccasins.

And so, all we have to do to accept the challenge for Home Economics in Business is to do what we are doing every day with energy and fun, but to do it knowing we are taking from the past, the present, and working toward the future. The challenge is not a question of my partaking of the knowledge of others but of my *capacity* to take.

The concept of our profession as a dynamic unfolding activity allows for the highest possible expression of growth on the part of each of us. In fact it demands individual action — but creative, intelligent action that grows in full rich knowledge of our true goals. We are growing toward — building — a profession with rich variety and unity.

I believe the years ahead will be exciting ones in our fields. Home economics and indeed, business itself, is living through a challenge to play a constructive part in maintaining a full and healthy economy. Home Economics in Business is on the threshold of new developments in basic information, subject matter, and techniques.

Are we building a profession worthy of such tangible evidence of trust as we find on the campus at the University of Illinois today?

The words I'm going to repeat to you are a gift to me from an associate, Mr. Eller, who spoke to HEIBs in Los Angeles recently. He concluded with this story:

"Near our city a most unusual building has been under construction for several months. It is unusual in shape, in design, and in material. Several weeks ago, determined to find out what was planned, I stopped my car and approached a group of laborers. 'What are you doing?' I asked. 'I'm laying stone,' one said. The second indicated he was mixing mortar—the third volunteered that he was a plumber. When the same query was put to the fourth, he raised his eyes in thoughtful expression and gave me an answer I shall always remember. He said, 'I am helping to build a great Cathedral.'"

HOME ECONOMICS HOSPITALITY DAY

This welcome presented by Dr. Louis B. Howard, Dean of the College of Agriculture and Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Extension Service in Agriculture and Home Economics, opened the Hospitality Day activities for Illinois High School students on Saturday, April 6, 1957.

It is a genuine privilege to welcome to the University of Illinois this fine group of mothers and daughters that today have assembled in such large numbers as to overtax the capacity of the Lincoln Hall Theatre. It is a wonderful conclusion to the three days of ceremonies dedicating our splendid new home economics building.

Perhaps some of you may wonder why the Dean of the College of Agriculture is here to extend a greeting to the guests of Home Economics Hospitality Day. For those of you who are not aware of our organizational setup at Illinois, I should say that the Department of Home Economics has a very close administrative relationship in the College of Agriculture as one of its most important departments.

For example, the many significant research activities carried on in the field of home economics are supported and administered through the Agricultural Experiment Station. Moreover, the very vital home economics extension program, carried out in most of the counties of the state, through home advisers and youth advisers, is a part of the Extension Service administered by the University of Illinois College of Agriculture. It is for these reasons that I have a most sincere interest in the activities of the Department of Home Economics and that I am privileged to welcome you to the campus today.

We think that we are most fortunate indeed to have these wonderful new home economics facilities — the main home economics building which many of you have seen, and the splendid child development laboratory of which we are so rightfully proud. I have seen a number of other home economics facilities in the United States, but I sincerely believe that ours today is the best of them all. Not only do we have these remarkable facilities, but we have the all important staff to go with them — a staff which is without comparison.

To those of you who are graduating seniors in high school, I hope you will all come to the University of Illinois next year and register in the home economics curriculum. You can have fun, learn, and if necessary you can earn part of your expenses all at the same time.

Now I should like to say just a few words to the mothers who have come along today. I am sure that you all will agree with me that

education is, in essence, a process of maturing. I like to think of this as a process of developing maturity in at least four different areas.

For example, there is first the development of intellectual maturity — the learning of the many aspects of the world in which we live so that we may be better able to enjoy and adjust ourselves to our surroundings in the years to come.

Secondly, there is the development of a social maturity. Surely nowhere can this be acquired more effectively than on a college campus where girls from different areas of our society and with different interests can live and work together and understand each other's objectives.

Thirdly, there is the development of a vocational maturity. This involves the preparation of our daughters to enter into adult life with a feeling of competence and ability to earn their living in some vocation.

Finally, but by no means the least important, is the development of an aesthetic maturity in which one learns to enjoy and appreciate the beauty of the world in its manifold aspects.

In my opinion, the curriculum offered in home economics is the best combination of these four different areas. I sincerely hope that many of you will choose to come to Illinois for home economics — either next year or in the early future.